

THE CATHAR & ALBIGENSIAN CRUSADE

~ A SOURCEBOOK ~



BERSERKER

BOOKS



THE CATHARS AND THE ALBIGENSIAN CRUSADE

The Cathars and the Albigensian Crusade brings together a rich and diverse range of medieval sources to examine key aspects of the growth of heresy and dissent in southern France in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and the Church's response to that threat through the subsequent authorisation of the Albigensian crusade.

Aimed at students and scholars alike, the documents it discusses – papal letters, troubadour songs, contemporary chronicles in Latin and the vernacular, and inquisitorial documents – reflect a deeper perception of medieval heresy and the social, political and religious implications of crusading than has hitherto been possible. The reader is introduced to themes which are crucial to our understanding of the medieval world: ideologies of crusading and holy war, the complex nature of Catharism, the Church's implementation of diverse strategies to counter heresy, the growth of papal inquisition, southern French counter-strategies of resistance and rebellion, and the uses of Latin and the vernacular to express regional and cultural identity.

This timely and highly original collection not only brings together previously unexplored and in some cases unedited material, but provides a nuanced and multi-layered view of the religious, social and political dimensions of one of the most infamous conflicts of the High Middle Ages. This book is a valuable resource for all students, teachers and researchers of medieval history and the crusades.

Catherine Léglu is Professor of French and Occitan Literature at the University of Reading. She has published extensively on troubadour poetry and related literary works of the High and Late Middle Ages. She has published two monographs, respectively on satirical poetry (2000) and the theme of multilingualism in Occitan, French and Catalan literature (2010).

Rebecca Rist is an Associate Professor in History at the University of Reading. Her research interests include the history of crusading, the papacy, medieval heresy, and Jewish–Christian relations. She has published a monograph on the papacy's authorisation of crusades in Europe during the first half of the thirteenth century (2009).

Claire Taylor is an Associate Professor in History at the University of Nottingham. Her work is on the south-west of France in the high-medieval period, with an emphasis on its religious, political and social life. She has published two monographs on heresy in the region (2005 and 2011).

good god. The perfect's life of renunciation was far too difficult for most people, however. But that did not in fact matter. What mattered was not how you lived, but how you died. As long as the believer in the heresy (called a *credens*; plural: *credentes*) received the *consolamentum* (the heretication rite performed by *perfecti*) on their deathbed and did nothing forbidden after this, their souls too would escape to heaven when they died, because they too were 'perfected'. In comparison to the Catholic, who had to strive all of his/her life against sin and had to experience genuine remorse for it, according to our sources (see 4.5.1), the Cathar faith allowed *credentes* to live as they pleased until just before the point of death. For the worldly and warlike southern French lords this was a non-judgemental and simple sect to favour, even if some followers do not appear to have understood dualist theology in a meaningful way (see 3.2.3, 3.6.2). As a result, the towns and *castra* of Languedoc were full of Cathars and they were closely woven into its social as well as religious life.

As well as a very distinctive set of beliefs, the sect had its own ecclesiastical hierarchy. The *perfecti* were its élite, living in houses together, and each had a companion (a *socius* or, for *perfectae*, a *socia*) with whom they travelled. They were also organised into dioceses with their own bishops and deacons, such as Bernard of La Mothe (see 3.2.1). Bishops had an 'elder' and 'younger son' (*filius maior* and *filius minor*). When a bishop died, the elder would replace him and the younger would replace the elder. These structures were established at Cathar councils such as that at Saint-Félix-de-Caraman in either 1167 or between 1174 and 1177 (the date is still debated), when the Bogomil Papa Nicetas travelled to Languedoc and established bishops at Toulouse, Carcassonne and Agen, as well as consoling a new bishop of Albi. He also reformed Cathar belief. The western dualists had been 'moderate' dualists, believing that the good god had been tricked into allowing his eldest son to create the world. 'Absolute' dualists like Nicetas and the Cathars of Languedoc after him considered the two gods to be 'co-eternal', that is, to have always existed. Now all the perfects had to be consoled by someone who had been consoled by Nicetas, or someone consoled by him, rather than by discredited 'moderate' dualists, or their own *consolamentum* was not valid. Nicetas' mission had therefore raised issues of belief about the nature of creation, and about lineages in organisational authority. There would be another, brief schism in the Cathar church in 1226, during the crusade, when the heretic Bartholemew of Carcassonne, based at Montolieu, converted the Cathar bishop of Agen, Vigouroux of la Bacone and his followers back to moderate dualism. By c.1200 there would also be another heretical sect for Cathars to compete with.

Waldensians

Many documents that refer to the heretics in the Languedoc and other regions throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries refer to ‘heretics and Waldensians’. The Waldensians were the ‘Poor Men of Lyons’, a community founded by a merchant of that town, Valdes. They were Christians who rejected ecclesiastical hierarchy and who practised a form of apostolic poverty. They preached without official licence, and translated scripture and liturgical texts into the vernacular. Some sources list them alongside *ensabatatz* (clog-wearers) although they are now assumed to have comprised the same sect.

In 1170 Valdes had renounced worldly affairs and took to preaching the Gospel in the vernacular and living strictly by its precepts. It was his unlicensed preaching – that is to say, preaching not approved by local clerical authority, which was specifically outlawed in the papal bull *Ad abolendam* of 1184 – and it is his criticism of the clergy that marks him out as heretical, as opposed to his beliefs about Creation and the incarnation of Christ. Indeed, the Waldensian profession of faith, elicited by the Church, distances the suspected heretic from the key traits of dualism. But like Cathars, the Waldensian brothers and sisters struck a chord with the southern European laity. They practised personal poverty, and women had a relatively high profile. Waldensians came to reject all violence, even judicial, and by the early thirteenth century they too denied the authority of unworthy clergy almost as far as being ‘Donatists’ (that is to say, believing that the sacraments cannot be performed effectively by priests who have sinned, whereas Cathars believed that the sacraments were meaningless in any case). By the 1190s Waldensians were established in many small towns of Languedoc, openly preaching, their leading lights including Peter of Les Vals (see 3.1.1), and anathema was pronounced against them at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215.

Medieval clergy distinguished clearly between Cathars and Waldensians. Peter of Les-Vaux-de-Cernay, one of the chroniclers of the Albigensian Crusade, observed differences between heretics who, on the one hand, ‘postulated two creators’ and are called ‘the Perfect’ or ‘Good men’ and, on the other, the ‘sect of heretics who received the name “Valdenses” from Valdius, a citizen of Lyon’. Manuals for inquisitors were structured to deal separately with Cathars and Waldensians. William Pelhisson, chronicler of early inquisition, refers to Cathars as *heretici perfecti* and Waldensians as *Valdenses*, distinguishing clearly and using terminology noting the Cathar elect. A particular characteristic of Waldensians in Languedoc was that they were often medical doctors (see 3.1.1).

The Albigensian Crusade

The Albigensian Crusade, essentially of 1209–29 but with subsequent crusades in the south as late as 1244, was not the Catholic Church's first or even preferred method for eradicating heresy. Church councils and also secular rulers had long tried to isolate and undermine it on a Europe-wide basis. The first secular legislation was enacted by Henry II of England in 1166 against European migrants called 'Poplicani'. Canon 27 of the Third Lateran Council of 1179 forbade social interaction with or practical support for Cathars. In 1198 Innocent III sent Cistercians to preach against heresy (see 1.1.1) and in 1205 suspended the bishop of Béziers for failing to suppress heresy in his diocese. The bishop had compelled local noblemen, including the guardian of the viscount, to swear as early as 1194 that they would not allow 'heretics or Waldensians' into the diocese. However, in 1206 the Cistercians Dominic Guzmán, Diego of Osma and the papal legate Peter of Castelnau failed to convert a group of heretics in the city, Raymond-Roger Trencavel's capital. The failure of Guzmán and his fellow preachers genuinely surprised the pope because, like the heretics, they led the simple life and preached in the vernacular. There were even suspicions that some leading clergy themselves favoured heretics (see 1.1.6). Through such failures Pope Innocent knew that the church of the diocese of southern France was ill-equipped to address Catharism and to break the bonds attaching the laity to it. In 1207 Count Raymond VI was excommunicated for his reluctance to act effectively against heretics.

But holy warfare had long been brewing. In 1181, the papal legate and abbot of Cîteaux, Henry of Marcy, had led an army against the heretics in the *castrum* of Lavaur. Innocent III had been trying, and failing, for some years to involve the kings of France and England in such a venture against Count Raymond VI of Toulouse (see 1.1.2, 1.1.3). But the two kings were more concerned about their squabbles with each other. Thus the murder of Peter of Castelnau in Languedoc on 15 January 1208 (see 1.1.4) was an opportunity for the proclamation on 10 March 1208 of a crusade against those powerful noblemen and towns that were said to offer protection to heretics. In papal letters, the ensuing conflict is often described euphemistically as 'the business of faith' or 'the business of faith and peace'. Thus Rome determined on a social and political programme to be undertaken militarily to undermine political support for heresy by excommunicating local rulers who were *fautores* ('favourers' or 'patrons'; singular: *fautor*) of Catharism, thereby allowing lords loyal to Rome to replace them. Even as he made arrangements for the crusade, the pope envisaged that such loyal lords would be from the Languedoc.

In June 1209 the pope entrusted the crusade's operations to his legates Milo and Arnold Amalric, abbot of Cîteaux. It was a crusade, but the pilgrims who made up the armies were for the most part paid for their services. Hiring professional military men had become a standard feature of warfare, and the most fervent crusaders also had to equip, feed and control the men and their personal entourage. Many clerics, ranging from archbishops to canons, joined the expedition too. One of these was Peter of Les-Vaux-de-Cernay, who accompanied his uncle and Abbot Guy, and who wrote an eyewitness account of the early years of the conflict between 1213 and 1218. The vernacular chronicler William of Tudela, who was also a witness to the crusade's early campaigns, was a secular canon in the household of Baldwin of Toulouse, and can be assumed to have followed the crusaders when his master defected to their side in 1211; he says that he was rewarded for his services by the papal legate with a prebend in Montauban.

As this vast, essentially French army travelled into Provence via the Rhône, Raymond VI of Toulouse wisely met it and submitted to the legates, taking the cross and, for now, saving himself and his lands. After a brief campaign in the Agenais and Quercy in May–June 1209, led by the count of Auvergne and the archbishop of Bordeaux and including lords of Quercy, the crusaders concentrated on securing the submission of the count's enemy Raymond-Roger Trencavel. His towns of Béziers and Carcassonne fell that summer and the viscount would soon perish in prison in the latter (see 2.1.1). The towns fell almost as soon as they were besieged, and this was the form of combat that would dominate the crusade. Pitched battle was costly in terms of men, horses, weaponry and hostages, but siege warfare was less dangerous to the aggressor and was guaranteed to conclude once either the *castrum* ran out of food and water, or the army decided to move on.

During the early campaigns a relatively lowly lord of the Île-de-France emerged as an able general. He was Simon of Montfort, nephew of the count of Évreux. But although he bestowed the Trencavel titles upon himself, most of the army returned to the north and he lost his rather brief alliance with the count of Foix, suffered rebellions at the hands of subjugated southerners such as Guiraud of Pépieux and Amalric of Montréal. In late winter 1210, with fresh soldiers (see 1.1.5), he set about punishing rebels. His vengeance on the garrison of Bram is legendary. He blinded and cut off the noses of over a hundred men, leaving one with a single eye, so that he could lead the other wretches. Western Europe was a warlike society, and southerners were frequently brutal to crusaders, but in terms of understanding the experience of war on society, violence on the scale of Béziers was traumatic. Then in the

summer of 1210, crusaders besieged and took Minerve, burning 140 unrepentant *perfecti* at the stake. Its lord was Guiraud of Pépieux, who was allowed to become an ally of Montfort again, as was Amalric of Montréal, and the two were given lands to hold of him.

Montfort secured a second excommunication of Raymond VI in early 1211, and in the spring besieged Lavaur, a town long associated with Catharism and held by Guiraud of Laurac, sister of Amalric of Montréal (see 4.1.2, 4.2.2). The siege was significant in several ways. In 1210, Arnold Amalric had offered the citizenry of Toulouse the chance to pay off their collective excommunication, and the former troubadour Bishop Fulk of Toulouse (see 2.2.8 and 2.1.2) founded the short-lived White Confraternity to wear the cross in order to campaign against alleged heretics and usurers who seemed to correspond to prominent families in the region. So the White Confraternity joined the crusaders at Lavaur. In early May the town fell. Amalric and the garrison were executed, around four hundred heretics were burned, with no attempt to convert them. Guiraud was thrown down a well, followed by large rocks which crushed her.

Many more *castra* fell to the crusaders after this. In the summer the army undertook the first siege of Toulouse itself, which was unsuccessful. The southerners began amassing large forces for a counter offensive, but they were not confident enough to take Castelnaudary or win the battle of Saint-Martin-Lalande. As such, by 1212 most of the count's lands had fallen too and also those of key allies such as the count of Foix.

In 1212 Simon of Montfort also secured much of the northern Languedoc, lower Quercy, Biron in Périgord, and the Agenais including the castle at Penne d'Agenais, which was garrisoned by Hugh of Alfaro, Raymond VI's seneschal at Agen and son-in-law. Castelsarrasin, Raymond VI's administrative centre for Quercy (see 3.2.1), was also captured. In this year also Arnold Amalric was invested as the new archbishop of Narbonne (see 2.2.1). In December 1212, the Statutes of Pamiers attempted without success to impose 'the custom of France near Paris' concerning fealty and primogeniture on the southern nobility, making military provision for a long-term war and at the same legalistically imposing northern French socio-political structures. In 1212, the king of France intervened indirectly with a separate campaign against the count of Auvergne (see 2.2.2), and the county of Auvergne was eventually absorbed into French royal possessions.

Another important aim of the crusaders was to limit the power of King Peter II of Aragon. Peter and his brother Alfonso, count of Provence, were overlords of most of the regions between the northern Pyrenees and Provence that were not claimed by Raymond VI. His marriage in

1204 had made him lord of Montpellier. Peter was compelled to hand his 3-year-old son James, as hostage to Simon of Montfort in 1211, and to agree to James' betrothal to Simon's daughter Amicie. He regained prestige by defeating an Almohad army at Las Navas de Tolosa (Arabic: Al-Uqab) on 16 July 1212 (see 2.1.3). From January 1213, he undermined the Montfort hold over Toulouse, Béarn and Comminges (all of which abutted onto the Pyrenees), and impelled Innocent III to cancel the crusade indulgences, accusing the crusaders and legates of having indulged in a greedy campaign of land acquisition (see 2.1.4). This accorded with the pope's desire to end the crusade and concentrate on campaigning in the Near East (see 1.1.7). Indulgences were limited in May to those fighting in 'Provence' as Innocent launched the Fifth Crusade with the bull *Quia maior* (April 1213). However, clergy in southern France changed the pope's mind and in May the crusade was resumed to put pressure on King Peter II of Aragon to renounce his support for his vassal the count of Toulouse (see 1.1.8). William of Tudela's narrative ends around this time and the Anonymous Continuator, a partisan of the count of Toulouse, takes up the story.

On 22 September 1213, Peter's troops met Simon's at the siege of Muret, south of Toulouse, which had fallen to the crusade in the previous year (see 2.1.3, 2.1.5, 4.1.3, 4.2.3, 4.3.1). In spite of leading the largest army raised in the whole crusade and facing a depleted and disadvantaged crusader force, Peter of Aragon and his closest allies died on the field of battle, leaving his son James as the new king of Aragon and the young Raymond Berenguer as count of Provence. Accounts that we have blame Peter's personal flaws, but it is clear that they tend to contradict each other about what actually happened. Muret ended the expansion of the crown of Aragon northwards; James would focus on conquering lands in the Iberian Peninsula and the Balearic Islands.

Peter of Aragon had recognised that, whatever strategy for eradicating heresy the pope and his legates had envisaged, the secular 'policy' of the crusaders was invasion. Slaughters at Casseneuil, Béziers (see 4.1.1) and Lavaur (see 4.1.2, 4.2.2) had terrorised the region and ensured the swift surrender of its *castra*. Many named heretics were members of noble and military families. It was precisely those networks of secular power and kinship that were targeted by the crusaders. Lands were confiscated by them, or the heiresses were marrying lands. A handful of religious houses received dozens of gifts of confiscated lands and goods.

As such, this crusade also served the ambitions of religious orders, as can be seen in several parts of this sourcebook. The new Order of Preachers (the Dominicans), founded in 1206, took on the antiheretical preaching mission of the Cistercian Order. The south of France was an

important source of income and recruits for the Templar and Hospitaller Military Orders. The Knights Templar was already one of the most famous Christian Military Orders. Its members were both monks and soldiers, and it played a key role in a large number of the crusades and innovated many of the financial techniques that form the basis of modern banking. The Hospitallers, or Knights of Saint John, were another Military Order, originally organised before the First Crusade to protect a hospice and infirmary for pilgrims journeying to the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Like the Templars, they provided military service in the Holy Land. Others, like the Cistercian-based Order of Calatrava, were limited to the Iberian Peninsula. In 1221 Pope Honorius III (1216–27) would order his legate Cardinal Romanus of Saint Angelo to set up a new Military Order which was to be known as the ‘Militia of Jesus Christ’ (see 1.2.5). Its structure was based on the Order of the Knights Templar and its aim was to counter heresy in the south of France, although it seems to have failed to secure enough support and it soon disappeared.

After Simon of Montfort’s decisive victory at Muret and the shock-waves it sent throughout Languedoc, the southerners persuaded the pope to accept their contrition (see 1.1.9). In April 1214 the counts of Comminges and Foix were reconciled with the Church, but not through his doing. A rebellion took place in that year, begun by the murder of Baldwin of Toulouse in Quercy (see 2.1.6), and again the northern Languedoc received the crusaders’ full attention. The castle of the *routier* Bernard of Cazenac also fell, although he himself was not taken (see 4.1.4).

A council convened by the papal legate Peter of Benevento was held at Montpellier in January 1215. It confirmed Montfort’s right to what he had conquered in the south, in spite of Raymond VI having again been welcomed back into the fold by this time. Lacking the title ‘count of Toulouse’, Montfort behaved as count nonetheless. His high-handed manner even alienated Arnold Amalric, now archbishop of Narbonne (see 1.1.10, 2.1.7). The count and his son could now only hope for justice to be done in their favour at the Fourth Lateran Council, to be held that summer. This was one of the most important councils in medieval Church history, as it redefined confession, masses, doctrines, and many other aspects of worship. It was also where Pope Innocent III attempted to decide the fate of Toulouse. He granted Simon of Montfort the duchy of Narbonne and the county of Toulouse, both of them held from the king of France. The marquise of Provence and other lands east of the river Rhône were under the authority of the Holy Roman Emperor; they were entrusted to the papacy until Raymond VI’s heir (Raymond VII) reached the age of 21.

After the council's decision, Raymond VI and his son worked to regain their lands on two fronts. Raymond VII gained the support of communes in Provence, notably Marseille, Avignon and Tarascon. Provence was an unstable region that combined rural areas with towns that had hopes of independent civic status. There had been a series of attempts by the counts of Toulouse to conquer the county of Provence from the counts of Barcelona (kings of Aragon) during the late twelfth century. Several lineages, notably the lords of Montpellier and of Baux, had traditionally preferred to side with the Aragonese ruler rather than the Toulousains. The new count of Provence, Raymond Berenguer V, only came of age in 1216. He and Sancho, regent of the child-king James, failed to maintain their network of loyalty. A series of skirmishes and sieges occurred between 1216 and 1218. Some of the most efficient propaganda concerning the Albigensian conflict was commissioned in these regions at that time, and the figures leading the revolts include the patron Adhemar of Poitiers, count of Valentinois, as well as a member of the households of Aragon and Toulouse, the troubadour Gui de Cavaillon (see 2.1.9, 2.1.10, 2.1.12). Empire lands, such as the kingdom of Arles in Provence, had been involved in the disputed election of the Holy Roman Emperor Otto IV, who was defeated by the French at Bouvines in July 1214. His successful rival was Frederick II Hohenstaufen (1220–50), king of Sicily, an adept propagandist and patron of troubadours who was often in conflict with the papacy. Frederick swiftly wrote to Raymond VII to encourage him to reclaim his Provençal lands, amongst the most important of which was the *castrum* of Beaucaire (see 2.1.8, 2.1.9).

Raymond VI himself travelled to Aragon after the council to recruit troops. In 1216 Simon of Montfort took possession of the Château Narbonnais at Toulouse, but crucially, he alienated the population with his exactions. When Raymond VI re-entered the city the following year, Simon of Montfort was forced to besiege it, from October 1217 to 25 July 1218, and Pope Honorius III ordered the French archbishops to aid this new crusade offensive (see 1.2.1). Aiding the defence of the city were Hugh of Alfaro, Bernard of Cazenac, and Hugh of La Mothe. Simon of Montfort was killed as his men attempted to breach the walls inside a siege 'cat' (see 2.1.11, 4.1.4). He had been struck on the head by a stone from a mangonel, worked by the women of the town. The siege soon collapsed.

Between 1218 and 1226, during the pontificate of Honorius III (1216–27), the Montforts seemed to lose divine favour, in spite of papal attempts to support the efforts of Amalric of Montfort, Simon's son and successor (see 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.6). Amalric failed to cover himself in glory at the sieges of Marmande (1218–19) and Castelnaudary (July

1220 to February 1221) (see 2.1.10). In 1219, Prince Louis of France took La Rochelle from the English and joined the crusade, although he failed to take Toulouse for Amalric. Another of Simon's sons, Guy, died of his wounds in July 1220.

Raymond VI died unconfessed and excommunicated in 1222, and his body was not given Christian burial for decades. Raymond VII made several unsuccessful attempts to end his marriage to James of Aragon's sister Sancia in order to wed a Montfort daughter. In 1224, Amalric of Montfort ceded his claims to the county of Toulouse to King Louis VIII of France (1223–6) in exchange for the title of constable of the kingdom. From 1225, the Montfort ascendancy gave way to Capetian expansion.

Papal anxiety about heresy did not lessen as a result (see 1.2.8). King Louis, having taken the cross in 1223 (see 1.2.7), set out on crusade in spring 1226 (see 2.1.12) and met with initial success along the Rhône valley, with the support of Count Ramon Berenguer of Provence. Avignon (which was under the suzerainty of Emperor Frederick II) fell (see 2.1.13) and the army turned towards Toulouse, but Louis VIII died of a lingering illness in November 1226, and his throne was inherited by a child, Louis IX (1226–70). It was an uncanny echo of the death of Peter II of Aragon 13 years earlier, and it cast doubt on the validity of the Albigensian conflict (see 2.2.7 and 2.1.16). Pope Gregory IX had no such misgivings, however (see 1.3.1, 1.3.2), and in a last joint effort to disprove the doubters, a crusading force devastated the Toulousain and invaded the county of Foix in 1228.

The Albigensian Crusade ended formally with the Treaties of Meaux (January 1229) and Paris (April 1229) (see 2.1.14, 2.1.15). Raymond VII was allowed to keep only the city and diocese of Toulouse until his death. His daughter and heir Joan was married to the French king's brother Alphonse of Poitiers. That Easter, *perfecti* of Languedoc fled their houses (see 3.1.1) and regrouped in defensible centres such as the castle of Montségur in the county of Foix.

Raymond spent his last years attempting to regain lands in Provence and to achieve an alliance with the house of Aragon. In spite of his undoubted orthodoxy he often found himself opposing inquisitors introduced into his lands by the papacy. He was even blamed for the massacre of inquisitors at Avignonet in 1242 (see 3.2.3). His *bailli* Raymond of Alfaro was probably responsible for betraying the inquisitors to Peter Roger of Mirepoix, lord of Montségur, and his son-in-law Raymond of Péreille.

Raymond VII was caught between French, Church and Aragonese interests during a revolt led by the count of Foix. He was likewise fighting his own corner even as he responded to the threat posed by the last bastion of the Cathar church, the fortress of Montségur, which the

Cathar bishops of Toulouse, Guilabert of Castres and Bertrand Marty, made their new seat (see 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.5.2). It was besieged from 1242–4. When it fell, 200 *perfecti* perished in a huge pyre built at the foot of the mountain on which it stood.

William of Puylaurens tells us that Raymond VII ordered the execution by fire of 80 heretics at Agen in the year 1249, shortly before the count's own death. This was the last mass burning of heretics in Languedoc. According to William of Puylaurens, the count chose to die at Millau (in former Aragonese lands) rather than in Toulouse, and asked to be buried far away at the Poitevin abbey of Fontevault, at the feet of his mother Joan and near their Aquitanian relatives, who had been rulers of England. When Alphonse of Poitiers died without issue in 1271, the county of Toulouse and all its former territories became part of the French Crown.

The experience of crusade and the settlement of 1229 had transformed the Languedoc irreversibly. Part of its legacy was to impose northern legal and social norms. The imposition of northern-style bonds between warriors undermined some of the values of southern culture and this provoked resistance to the invasion as well as the actual seizure and re-allocation of lands. This is demonstrated by the rebellion of people who initially allied themselves with the crusade: knights such as Guiraud of Pepieux and Amalric of Montréal and also those undoubtedly orthodox at the start of the war such as the lords in Quercy. Nonetheless, the descendants of many crusaders merged with the noble families into which they had married. There was little sign of a division between 'French' and 'Occitan' communities, and Occitan remained the language of local government and literature even after 1539, when the *Ordonnance* of Villers-Cotterêts made French the official language of the kingdom of France. Anglo-French conflicts of the later Middle Ages and the Wars of Religion redefined loyalties more sharply and more enduringly in regional and linguistic terms. However, the memory of the conflict stayed vivid.

Inquisition in Languedoc

With Catholic lords, as allies of the French Crown, now in control of Languedoc, the Church no longer needed to undertake wars in the region. The fight against heresy could now take place on an entirely different level. Franciscans were settled in Toulouse in 1222 and established a *scola* (school) (see 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3). In 1229 the University of Toulouse was founded, attracting many Paris scholars (see 4.4.1). Most significantly of all, in 1233, Pope Gregory IX (1227–41) appointed the Order of Preachers to sit on inquisition tribunals that enquired into matters of heresy and faith (see 2.2.5, 2.2.6, 2.2.7).

Bernard Hamilton considers inquisition to have been an antidote to the more extreme expressions of social hostility that had resulted in lynching of supposed heretics by mobs and soldiers, often on a mass scale such as at Béziers in 1209. The concern of Rome and its representatives was to save souls and it valued this above punishing miscreants. This hostility originated not in the heretics' criticism of clerical failings, which was a common enough viewpoint at a popular level, but because they attacked core Christian beliefs, social order and the very existence of the Church itself. Recent scholarship on inquisition reflects R. I. Moore's focus on repression as an expression and imposition of power from above, through which a repressive clerical agenda could be acted out, rather than as a popular phenomenon. Inquisition as a practice would draw on a body of earlier legislation and its application in practice. The bull *Ad abolendam* (1184) of Lucius III (1181–5) placed the responsibility of investigating heresy on bishops. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) advocated the corporal punishment of unrepentant adherents to heresy – if they had been tried and found guilty by qualified clergy – by handing over to 'the secular arm', i.e. to legitimate lay authorities who, unlike clergy, had the moral right to punish through violence. Thus the threat of violence, needed to make inquisition successful, was already in place. However, the specific office of inquisitor was introduced during the pontificate of Gregory IX.

In order for its strategies to be realised, however, heretics had to be separated from their base of support in southern French towns and *castra*. This had not happened as a result of the crusade, and so new methods were needed to drive a wedge between those who adamantly supported heretics and those who could be induced to expose them. In 1229, therefore, the people of the region had been sworn to reveal heretics where they found them, and public officials sworn to arrest them. This portion of the legislation links the Peace of Paris directly to inquisition. In 1229 we also see the start of practices with which the inquisition would become synonymous. The trial of the *perfectus* William Solier (see 3.2.4, 3.5.1–2) at Toulouse concealed the names and evidence of his accusers from the defendant, for their protection but also as an effective weapon of fear. The heretic himself yielded the names of numerous further suspects, and so the net of the inquisition fanned out. The Dominicans Peter Seilan and William Arnold became inquisitors for Toulouse and instigated an inquest based at Cahors from 1234 to 1239. The first inquest in the diocese of Albi was that of Arnold Cathala. Ferrer and Durand were inquisitors for the Archdiocese of Narbonne in 1244 and for the dioceses of Albi, Rodez, Mende and Le Puy.

However, *Inquisitio hereticae pravitatis* (inquisition of heretical wickedness) was also undertaken by bishops. Bishop Fulk's successor Raymond of Falgar (1232–70), previously prior of the Order of Preachers, oversaw a period of intensive repression against heresy across much of the Languedoc and the surrounding regions to the north and west of the Rhône. Until the bull of Innocent IV (1243–54) *Ad extirpanda* (1252) he and his colleagues had a good deal of authority over the Dominicans. Inquisitors could not, for example, award sentences of death or life imprisonment without reference to the diocese, and could be suspended from their duties and even excommunicated by bishops. But it was nonetheless the case that Dominican inquisitors were answerable primarily to Rome, and they became specialists, undertaking the most systematic investigation, not distracted from the other concerns that occupied the time of bishops. In this they were supported by meticulous record keeping. Their registers were not filed away, but were working documents providing evidence for further investigations, so that it was possible to know whether defendants had appeared before inquisitors previously and recanted their beliefs once already and been reconciled with the Church. A lapse after this had serious implications for the suspect. As such the records themselves were the target of violence, being destroyed by the people of Narbonne in 1235, for example, as part of the violent response to the inquisition of Brother Ferrer in the town. Inquisitors were physically attacked themselves by the populace on several occasions, for example at Albi in 1234, where Arnold Cathala was lucky to escape with his life after attempting the exhumation of the bodies of people convicted posthumously for heresy.

As the Order of Preachers began to operate more independently, their autonomy led to conflict with lay authority too. There is no question that Raymond VII was genuine in his desire to eradicate heresy. In 1233–4 he established his own inquest supported by the bishop of Agen, and enacted extensive statutes against heresy and the protectors of heretics. However this was in part an assertion of his own authority in the face of the Order of Preachers. As such, Othon of Berètges, the count's *bailli* for Moissac and Montcuq, tried in 1244, claimed that he had been instructed to dispute the judicial authority of the Order of Preachers and forbade anyone convicted from accepting their penance (see 3.2.2).

Because the pope wanted to maintain peace with the count as well as to eliminate heresy, he removed Peter Seilan from the Toulousain in 1235 and confined him to operations in the diocese of Cahors. In April 1236, William Arnold, also at Toulouse, was moved to Carcassonne. Between 1238 and 1241 he suspended the inquests entirely. But as late

as 1248, the year before the count's death, conflict was still deep enough that Pope Innocent IV (1243–54) put inquisition in the region under the control of Bishop William II of Agen. This is why it was the bishop and the count, not the Dominicans, who were responsible for the burning of 80 relapsed *credentes* that took place at Agen in 1249. This is not to imply that Dominican inquisition was not thorough and effective. It could be successfully resisted by non-compliance like that of Othon of Berètges, but at other times whole communities were efficiently summoned and gave evidence, for example in the Lauragais in the inquisition of Bernard of Caux and John of Saint-Peter of 1245–6, preserved in MS 609. In this period the inquisitors supported propaganda campaigns targeting the laity (see 4.5.1).

The first stage of inquest was an advance warning that inquisitors were arriving. People were summoned by their parish priest and an inquisitor addressed them concerning the sinful nature of heresy, indicating their obligation to come to him with anything they knew, or even their suspicions, within 12 days. The majority of the deponents came forward voluntarily during this 'period of grace', when confessing and recanting meant they would not be 'handed over to the secular arm' for corporal or capital punishment. The accused was likely to confess and recant within the period of grace, receiving a sentence less severe than they otherwise might, in particular if they were forthcoming with regard to other people. Where inquisitors could find two witnesses whose evidence implicated someone, they would be brought in for detailed questioning. People were thus accused and investigated on the basis of widely known stories or rumours (*fama*) about them as much as demonstrable fact, because the secret nature of accusation meant that 'evidence' was not necessarily verifiable. The most minor crimes were important, such as seeing a *perfectus* or *perfecta* without reporting it. Testimony was heard only by the inquisitors, the notary, and two or so other men not connected to the deponents, often also Dominicans. Although defence lawyers were not banned, no lawyer wanted to destroy his career by defending someone found guilty of heresy.

The secrecy in which accusations were made of course added to the power of the inquisition. However, it quite possibly did originate in the desire to protect witnesses from the vengeance of relatives of the implicated person. The situation was ameliorated to some extent by the practice of allowing suspects to name people who might bear them a grudge, and allowing them to provide witnesses to verify this and support their good character.

After the inquests, a *sermo generalis* was preached at which sentences were read out. Punishments awarded ranged from the wearing of yellow

crosses to burning at the stake, which would take place immediately, although the latter was not in fact common and it remained the case that large-scale burning such as those following the siege of Montségur were the initiative of lay authorities. But even the more minor punishments could be severe, often involving lengthy pilgrimages. Lea argues that, although it is not made explicit in most sentences involving pilgrimage, flogging on arrival at the penitent's destination was so commonplace as to be assumed routine. Pilgrimages were often made barefoot. As well as, or instead of pilgrimages, Peter Seilan's sentences often involved a command to support a pauper for a year (this possibly replaced fining, which was open to abuse and ceased with the Council of Narbonne in 1244, which forbade inquisitors from receiving gifts). The stain of heresy ran in the family. By 1239, a person's property could be confiscated and their heirs disinherited and unable to hold office themselves for two generations.

But the severest penalty of all, burning at the stake, was not often used by inquisitors, even in the case of relapsed heretics and even though the papal bull *Excommunicamus* (1229) of Gregory IX encouraged it. Usually only those too stubborn to renounce heresy on this second occasion faced death. But it was Innocent IV's bull *Ad extirpanda* (1252) that marked the shift towards what came to typify inquisition as we think of it. It allowed for torture by lay officials – not by the inquisitors themselves – and insisted that *all* heretics and relapsed converts be burned (see 1.4.1). Although in the first instance *Ad extirpanda* was addressed to an Italian, rather than a southern French audience, it was of immense significance because for the first time the papacy was sanctioning the use of torture in ecclesiastical inquisitorial processes. For this reason it is included in our collection.

From Montségur to Montaillou

The organised Cathar church effectively died at Montségur. The presence of royal officials in Languedoc, who dominated in particular after 1249, made life more difficult for heretics and their protectors than had been the case in the days of Othon of Berèges. In response, many surviving heretics began to relocate to Lombardy and those that remained were forced into an even more precarious, peripatetic lifestyle than previously, as were their leading followers, such as Peter Garcias of Toulouse (see 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3) and the knights of Lanta (see 3.5.1–2), investigated in 1245–7. By c.1290 Catharism itself was virtually extinct in Languedoc. However, a remarkable thing happened. Just as its last flicker was about to be snuffed out by the passage of time and exhaustion, two brothers from the county of Foix, Peter and William Autier, decided to receive

training as *perfecti* in Lombardy and were consoled there. They returned to their homeland in 1298 and re-introduced dualist belief and practice to a limited extent, most famously at the village of Montailhou. The records of the resultant inquest by James Fournier, bishop of Pamiers (later Pope Benedict XII, 1334–42), provide one of the richest and most important source bases for the social life and inner lives of mountain peasants that we have for the Middle Ages, forming the basis of narratives by Ladurie and Weis (see Further Reading). From it we learn that dualist belief was by this time merely one of a variety of ideas held by those questioned. As a coherent faith, southern-French Catharism ended with the death of Peter Autier in 1311. However, inquisition tribunals at Toulouse, Carcassonne and Pamiers continued to seek out, identify and condemn heretics well into the fourteenth century.

Section 1

PAPAL LETTERS



INTRODUCTION



This first section of the sourcebook examines a small selection of the large number of letters that were issued by the papal curia during the Albigensian Crusade. The sheer number during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and the diversity of their subject matter make them one of the most important types of sources of information for the historian of the Central Middle Ages. They are crucial primary sources for the Albigensian Crusade because they give plentiful, detailed evidence not only about its progress, but also about the ideas of those who authorised and organised it.

The Popes who Endorsed the Albigensian Crusade

Innocent III, born Lothar of Segni in 1160/1, became pope at only 37 years of age and enjoyed a long pontificate of 18 years (1198–1216). He was a man of many talents, well-versed in both theology and canon law, the author of sermons and books of mystical theology, enthusiastic for pastoral reform, interested in the workings of the papal chancery and responsible for authorising crusades both to the Near East and in Europe, including the Albigensian Crusade. In 1208, anger at the death of his legate, Peter of Castelnau, reportedly at the hands of Raymond VI of Toulouse, encouraged him to authorise this crusade in the south of France, but as early as 1204 and 1205 he had already urged Philip Augustus, king of France to involve himself in combating heresy and in 1207 had promised a plenary indulgence to those who took part in a military campaign.

Throughout his pontificate Innocent implemented a whole series of initiatives to tackle heresy: issuing a number of important bulls such as *Vergentis in senium* (1199) against heretics; deposing southern French bishops whom he regarded as heretical or too influenced by heretics; ordering bishops in good standing to hold investigations into heresy in the ecclesiastical courts; persuading potentially heretical groups such as the ‘Humiliati’ to be reconciled with Mother Church; encouraging the Cistercians and eventually the mendicant orders to preach and teach against heresy. Yet he was impatient for quick results. Not only did he want to uphold the unity of the Church and encourage secular

authorities to intervene on its behalf, but he also wished to destroy those heretics whose pernicious influence was corrupting southern French society. He came to believe that, as well as continuing to encourage preaching and teaching, these goals could be achieved much quicker by military means. This belief was only strengthened by the death of his legate, Peter of Castelnau. By the last years of his pontificate, he was becoming increasingly disillusioned with the Albigensian Crusade, wishing instead to concentrate European military forces on the Fifth Crusade to the Near East. Yet the precedent he set in calling for a crusade against heretics would profoundly influence the crusading policies of his successors.

Like Innocent III, Honorius III (1216–27) came from an old Roman family. Before becoming pope he had worked his way up through the papal curia, holding a number of important posts. His *cursus honorum* was traditional and conservative: he was a diplomat, chamberlain and auditor, interested in taxation and the workings of papal government. Yet he was no mere pen-pusher. During his 11-year pontificate he found time to compile a book of sermons that he had first delivered to the clergy and people of Rome as a cardinal, as well as assembling the *Compilatio quinta*, an important canon law collection. One of his first acts on becoming pope was to reinvigorate the Albigensian Crusade in the south of France and to call for the diversion of taxes originally intended for the Fifth Crusade, while at the same time cautiously maintaining the language and rhetoric of his predecessor who had continuously emphasised the importance of crusades to the Near East.

Honorius' letters to the south of France do not have the same rhetorical power or linguistic ability of Innocent III and they are principally concerned with practical matters, in particular taxation. Yet his contribution to the cause of the Albigensian Crusade was not negligible, particularly since he was instrumental in persuading King Louis VIII of France to take part in crusading – an important milestone, because in the long term the French Crown became the principal beneficiary from the crusade. This suited the papacy that in general preferred to cooperate with centralised secular power rather than the local authority of southern French counts, whose marauding, faction fighting and private wars had brought chaos to the region and a weakening of ecclesiastical authority. Until 1229 the southern lands were only notionally under the authority of the king of France and it was only with the Peace of Paris that the Crown gained long-term control.

Honorius III's successor, Gregory IX (1227–41), had a distinguished career before becoming pope, having studied law at Paris and Bologna, held a number of important positions in and around Rome, and acted as

papal legate in Germany during Innocent III's dispute with Markward of Anweiler and the struggle of Otto of Brunswick and Philip of Swabia for the imperial throne. Honorius had also given him a legatine commission and entrusted him with preaching the Fifth Crusade in Italy. Gregory was deeply interested in canon law and one of the most important acts of his pontificate was the commissioning of the authoritative and highly influential collection of decretals known as the *Liber extra decretalium*. Throughout his pontificate he maintained a close relationship with the mendicant orders, both Franciscans and Dominicans, and was enthusiastic about establishing inquisitorial procedures to tackle heresy. As pope he became increasingly active in the power struggle between papacy and German Empire and eventually called for a crusade against the Holy Roman Emperor, Frederick II.

Like Honorius, Gregory was greatly influenced by the crusade policies of Innocent III. From the very beginning of his pontificate he reissued the grant of the indulgence for crusading against heretics and was careful to employ his predecessors' language in order to emphasise continuity with their policies. Yet, like Innocent, Gregory came to realise that crusading was not necessarily the most effective weapon against heresy and that in the long term a papal inquisition, headed by the friars, was a much better way of dealing with heretics in the south of France. In 1229, two years into his pontificate, a political settlement was reached between crusaders and the southern French at the Peace of Paris: there was no longer the political will to ensure adequate support for the continuation of the crusade. The inquisition became the principal method which the Church employed to tackle heresy in the south of France. Nevertheless, in response to local pressures, Gregory would go on to authorise a number of crusades against heretics in other parts of Europe, alongside the establishment of inquisitorial procedures.

The Composition of Papal Letters

Although the papacy was at the height of its political power in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, we know surprisingly little about the workings of the papal chancery at this period. What we do know is that popes authorised the dispatch of different types of letters from the papal curia. These letters can be divided into two main groups, the most numerous being the 'common letters', which were issued in response to petitioners, and the other, much smaller group, being the 'curial letters', which concerned matters to which the pope and his administration attached particular importance and which were composed at the pope's own request. The majority of papal letters were carefully thought out responses to

secular and religious authorities who petitioned the curia from a wide variety of cultures and traditions, rather than the product of papal initiatives. They must be understood in the context of the great political, social and economic changes that were taking place in the Central Middle Ages, with an appreciation of the characters and concerns of individual pontiffs, and with an understanding of the theological and doctrinal precepts which underlay their pronouncements. In the case of the Albigensian Crusade, popes were often far removed both physically and emotionally from the specific problems on which they were called to pronounce and correspondingly far more competent at expounding these theological precepts than at dealing with practicalities.

By the thirteenth century, 'common letters' were framed in accordance with the *stilus curiae Romanae*, a style of rhythmical prose that the papal chancery had evolved in the twelfth century which both formalised and standardised correspondence. The composition of these letters, which were issued in response to petitioners, was a complex business and there were probably usually at least two major stages in the process. The first was the redrafting at the curia of the original letter from the petitioner as a formal petition which was then presented to the pope. The second was the papal letter in response which was drafted on the basis of this petition and which might then be read out to the pontiff himself, or if he was not present, to his officials. It was the notaries, senior officials of the curia and confidential secretaries of the chancery, specially trained and skilled in drawing up acts, in applying the stylistic rules of the *stilus curiae Romanae* and in composing letters and in collecting forms, who were responsible for these different drafts.

Following this work by the notaries, scribes then engrossed or copied out the letters, often receiving a fee from the petitioner for doing so. Selected from among the scribes were the *correctores* whose job was to oversee the correction of engrossments (final copies of the letters) to examine the language employed, to check for scribal errors, and if necessary to return the document to the original scribe for further work. Once the letter was finished, the *bullatores* would then seal the document and ensure that the proper tax was exacted, which would pay for the cost of its production. The vice-chancellor, who increasingly in the thirteenth century seems to have presided over the composition of letters at the papal chancery, might, if he so wished, completely revise the content of the letter either when the petition was first drafted for presentation to the pope, or later in the process when a fair copy of the papal letter had been composed. These letters were therefore the result of careful planning, execution and literary skill on the part of a great number of professional officials at the curia.

The employment of such notaries, scribes, *correctores* and *bullatores* in constructing papal letters, the working conditions under which they were composed and the political circumstances for which they were written are all important considerations when assessing the letters as primary sources for the Albigensian Crusade. To what degree and at what point in their creation were popes personally involved in the production of their correspondence? Did the pope actually compose the texts of their letters, or at least parts of them and, if so, then in what proportion? What exactly was the contribution of the vice-chancellor, notaries and scribes in composing important letters? Were some letters drafted under a pope's personal supervision or were notaries left a free hand to write using appropriate language and expressions? Did the pope accept petitions presented to the curia as they stood or did he model these petitions in accordance with his own ideas and policies? To what extent did the original petition become part of the final papal letter? How often were letters read out to the pope himself before being despatched? How long did it take a letter to arrive in the south of France after it had been sent from Rome? And, perhaps even more significantly, since timing was often so crucial during complex political negotiations, when did the pope and curial officials *think* that it would or had arrived?

These are questions that it is almost impossible for historians to determine with absolute certainty. Nevertheless, it seems likely that the pope was present at least at some point during the composition of general letters addressed to the whole Christian faithful, even if he could not be personally involved in the production of all the letters that were despatched from the curia to individual rulers or clergy. It also appears likely that the pope dictated some of his correspondence and that in many cases he inspired the essential content of a letter, if not every word. No doubt popes also took advice about content from their cardinals, since letters were often the result of decisions made by consultation with these men in consistory (the formal meeting of the Sacred College of Cardinals). So despite the input of notaries and scribes, it is certainly possible to discern the pope's own 'voice' in many letters, as becomes apparent in the very different styles of the correspondence of Innocent III, Honorius III, Gregory IX and Innocent IV which we have selected for this volume. Although it is extremely difficult for the historian to reconstruct exactly how notaries were employed at the curia, precisely how letters were composed and the contribution of a particular pope to the writing process, nevertheless the pope's own views, interests and ambitions can be clearly discernible.

As can be seen from the selection of letters chosen, different popes favoured different scriptural passages and used different biblical images

to express their ideas. The notaries involved in the production of papal letters may also have inserted their own favourite scriptural passages and metaphors, but could not have done so without papal consent. Undoubtedly some letters are more informative about the policies of individual popes than others, particularly those less formulaic examples which not merely repeated stock phrases and sentiments, but contained new and original material. Letters concerned with the Albigensian Crusade differ greatly in style. Some are extremely formulaic, drawing heavily on a well-established genre of ecclesiastical writing and expressing their message in very conventional terms. Others are highly rhetorical, employing metaphors, similes and biblical citations to great effect to express the popes' own belief that the crusade was a moral obligation of the papacy in the Church's continuing fight against heresy.

Yet papal letters also display great continuity. This is not surprising – the papacy was an age-old institution and popes were conservative creatures, who, in keeping with their belief that the papacy was the continuation of apostolic tradition, deliberately sought to maintain that institution and to show continuity with their predecessors. Hence, for example, popes used similar metaphors to describe heresy in conventional terms, as a disease. Nevertheless, we can see from their letters the subtle differences in the way these were employed. Innocent III elaborated on standard metaphors, using them much more creatively than his successor, Honorius III. So although letters are highly formulaic, we can glean a great deal from them not only about the particular political and religious issues of a pontificate, but also about the characters of the popes themselves. As well as the successors of St Peter, popes were individuals with their own aims and agendas and their correspondence will often allow the historian to build up a much more complex picture of events and personalities than we get from chronicles, annals or biographies alone.

The Editions of Papal Letters used in this Sourcebook

Often papal letters have not been re-edited since the editions of papal correspondence produced by historians in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The major source for Innocent III's Register, which contains a vast amount of his 'official' correspondence, remains the *Patrologia Latina*. This great work was compiled by Abbé Migne in the nineteenth century and drew on the earlier works of editors such as Baluze, La Porte du Theil and Bosquet. Fortunately, as mentioned earlier, there is an excellent ongoing project by Hageneder, Strnad, Haidacher and others to completely re-edit the Register of Innocent III, although since this is still in progress, we as yet have only the correspondence of some of

the years of his pontificate in their entirety. For the letters of popes subsequent to Innocent III, this volume relies on editions such as the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century series *Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, 2nd Series (Paris: Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 1890–1955). Yet many of the letters in this work are only calendared, rather than produced in full, and for this reason sometimes other sources have been used, for example, the nineteenth-century three-volume *Epistolae selectae saeculi XIII e regestis pontificum Romanorum*, edited by Carl Rodenberg, part of the massive *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* series edited by Georg Heinrich Pertz (Berlin: *Deutsches Institut für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 1883–94), or, for example, the five-volume *Honorii III romani pontifici opera omnia quae extant* (Paris: Imprimerie de la Bibliothèque ecclésiastique, 1863–1909) edited by César Auguste Horoy. In each case the edition used at the beginning of the translation of the papal letter has been cited.

Nevertheless, as useful as they are, such editions must be treated with caution as the Registers themselves give an incomplete picture of papal correspondence. Evidence from other types of primary sources including chronicles and annals, show that many important letters emanating from the papal chancery were never enregistered, entered into the papal registers, presumably because of the cost. Since the Registers contain copies of only a small proportion of the letters issued by the curia, there is therefore the problem of how far they are reliable sources for understanding the complexities of papal pronouncements. Furthermore, the Registers themselves do not produce the original letters exactly: the protocol is sometimes abridged and different scribes had different practices of dating. The enregistered copy also presents other problems: if copied from a draft, this may have been retouched before engrossment; if of interest to canonists it may have been altered to make a better legal text. And the fact of registration does not itself prove that a letter was despatched: it might be unclaimed by petitioners, superseded by new orders, or issued with strict instructions that it only be published under particular circumstances. The process is further complicated by the fact that increasingly in the thirteenth century petitioners employed proctors to represent their interests and set forth their case at the curia, rather than going to Rome themselves.

Secondly, there is the serious problem that papal letters have often been lost, in particular in the case of Innocent III, where large parts of the Register for the third year of his pontificate and the entire Registers for years 4, 17, 18 and 19 are missing. For year 17 this means a complete loss of material, while years 4, 18 and 19 are dependent on a surviving table of contents which was written on three parchment quires during the pontificate of one of his successors, Innocent VI (1352–62). Thirdly,

early editors of papal Registers had incomplete source material at their disposal, so that although, for example, Baluze's edition of the Register of Innocent III, upon which Migne heavily relies, is more comprehensive than earlier editions, it is not necessarily reliable because Baluze did not have access to the actual manuscripts of the Registers in the Vatican and so was forced either to use the work of previous editors or relied on transcripts of manuscripts which he sometimes altered. Building a picture of the Albigensian Crusade from papal correspondence is therefore an extremely complex and difficult undertaking.

A Word about the Selection and Translation of Texts

We can only hope in this sourcebook to translate a few of the many letters concerned with the Albigensian Crusade from the vast correspondence of Popes Innocent III, Honorius III and Gregory IX. We have not always chosen to translate an entire letter, but sometimes just those parts which are representative of, and therefore give a flavour of, the whole. In making our selection we have concentrated on those letters which we think will be particularly interesting to students and scholars alike. Some are striking because of the language they employ – the use of biblical and scriptural images and metaphors to describe heresy, many of which were traditional discourse, but which were often expanded upon and embellished, in particular by Innocent III. Other letters are of interest because they highlight a special policy which a pope chose to pursue at a particular time – for example, Honorius III on the taxation of the crusades. Others again are interesting because they show papal support for certain of the crusade leaders – in the case of Innocent III, for Simon of Montfort, or, in the case of Honorius III, for Louis VIII. We have also included Innocent IV's famous bull *Ad extirpanda* (1252) since it was of immense importance for the future direction of the inquisition.

The Latin of these letters is very difficult to translate, in large part because sentences are often so long and extremely complex. In order to render them into intelligible prose we have frequently had to break them down into much smaller units. We have tried to render the letters into English which will be accessible, while at the same time retaining as much as possible of the traditional, and often verbose style of the original, and this has been a fine balancing act.

Many of the letters are replete with references to the Old and to the New Testament: different popes favoured particular passages from Scripture. The language and style of each pope is distinct and this means that the more one translates their correspondence, the more one feels one gets to know the characters and attitudes of the pontiffs themselves.

INTRODUCTION

Other scholars before us have translated a few, but not the majority of these letters, but the translations are entirely our own, as are any inaccuracies. We hope that they will prove useful in an age where increasingly Medievalists know so much less Latin than they used to and that we have managed to convey and retain much of the flavour of the original, while making them accessible to as wide an audience as possible.

Part 1.1

INNOCENT III



The editions of letters used here are *Die Register Innocenz III, Publikationen des Österreichischen Kulturinstituts in Rom*, eds O. Hageneder, H. Haidacher, A. Strnad *et al.* (Rome, Graz, Vienna and Cologne: H. Böhlau Folger, Verlag des Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1964 ff.), vols 1ff.; PL; *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, vols 18 and 19, ed. Dom M. Bouquet (Paris: reprinted by V. Palmé, 1879–80).

1.1.1 Innocent III, *Cum unus Dominus* (21 April 1198) (Hageneder *et al.*, vol. 1, pp. 135–8)

This long and highly emotive letter was written right at the beginning of Innocent III's pontificate and was addressed to the archbishop of Aix-en-Provence and his suffragan bishops as well as to a number of other important archbishops and the Christian faithful of their dioceses. Innocent informed them of his decision to send his legates, the Cistercian monks Guy and Rainier, to tackle the problem of heresy in the south of France through preaching and teaching. The pope used biblical images and metaphors to describe the heretics and their supporters and he granted his legates spiritual powers to excommunicate and impose interdict when necessary. Strikingly, Innocent also promised that all those who aided Guy and Rainier would gain the same indulgence for their sins as those who visited the medieval pilgrimage centres of Rome and Saint-James of de Compostela – showing that he believed it to be of the utmost importance for the well-being of the Church to put an end to the Cathar heresy. The letter is an excellent example of the power of rhetorical language.

To the archbishop of Aix-en-Provence and his suffragans.

Since the one Lord Jesus Christ has chosen one bride for himself, namely the Church assembled from the nations, which has neither stain nor

wrinkle, and which in the unity of faith is devoted to Him as to her head, we marvel exceedingly and we grieve that certain men, trying to tear this seamless tunic, form for themselves separate churches, or rather synagogues of Satan, corrupting evangelical, apostolic and prophetic teaching, and in defence of their heresy perverting it to the ruin of their own salvation . . .¹

Since therefore, in order to capture such little foxes which destroy the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts – indeed although they have different forms their tails are bound to one another because they combine into one by reason of their vanity – and in order that the rod of Moses might consume the fantasies of wicked men, we have directed that our dear son, Brother Rainier, a man of upright life and honourable practices, powerful with a divine gift in deed and word, and with him our dear son Brother Guy, a man who fears God and is zealous in works of charity, should be appointed to go to these very places. We order and we strictly enjoin you in brotherhood, through apostolic letters, that by receiving them kindly and treating them with affection, you may assist them against the heretics, so that through these men they may be recalled to the Lord from the error of their ways. And if by chance they cannot convert some of them, let these be excluded from your territories, lest they drag down that element which is pure. May the word of your preaching be received with joy and may it bear fruit in due season, so that you may completely put to flight from your land such sorts of ministers of Satan. We enjoin you in these matters with the same rigour, that you may humbly accept and strictly observe everything the same Brother Rainier has directed be decreed against the heretics, their supporters and defenders. For on the Lord's authority we will ensure that those things which he has decreed against them shall be observed as absolutely as the judgement which he has pronounced against the obstinate . . .

But we have given to the said Brother Rainier full power so that, having removed the right of appeal, he may compel the heretics in this matter by means of a sentence of excommunication and an interdict on the land. For since we are so strictly enjoining that those men be compelled to follow through in that matter, we want them to some degree to have a hard and difficult time of it. Indeed we are intending to pass severe judgement to no further purpose than to root out these heretics, who strive to steal from us not temporal substance but rather spiritual life. For he who takes away faith steals life: for the just man lives by faith.

Also we are writing to all the people of your province that, since they have been required to do so by the same Brothers Rainier and Guy, they may gird themselves against the heretics, just as Rainier and Guy have ordered. For those who assist these men faithfully and devotedly for the preservation of the Christian faith in such a crisis which threatens the

Church, we concede that indulgence for their sins as we concede to those visiting the thresholds of Blessed Peter and James.²

In our instructions we have also definitively granted to the same Brother Rainier that he should not put off solemnly pronouncing a sentence of excommunication against all who, after he has excommunicated them, have provided a refuge to the heretics and have dared to participate in their business dealings or marriages or to foster them in their perversity; and equally that he should decree that they submit to the same penalties exactly as the heretics. Indeed by the authority of the Lord and without any kind of let up, we will ensure that the same sentence is observed until there is suitable satisfaction.

Given at Rome at St Peter's, XI Kalends May in the first year of our pontificate.

The same letter was written to the archbishop of Narbonne and his suffragans. Also in addition to this the same letter was written to the archbishop of Auch and his suffragans, of Vienne and his suffragans, Arles and his suffragans, Embrun and his suffragans, Tarragona and his suffragans, Lyons and his suffragans, and to all the princes, barons, counts and all peoples established in the provinces of the same dioceses.

1.1.2 Innocent III, *Ad sponse sue* (28 May 1204) (Hageneder *et al.*, vol. 7, pp. 127–9)

This letter of Innocent III was addressed to Philip II Augustus, king of France. In it the pope drew on the famous medieval image of the Two Swords to explain his vision of how both spiritual and secular authorities should fight together for the good of the Church and how the secular authority should aid the Church in times of need.³ Drawing on Matthew 7:15 and John 10:12, Innocent also used the well-known biblical image of the Church as Christ's flock which was being ravaged in the south of France by heretics who were likened to rapacious wolves. He enjoined Philip Augustus to assist the papal legates Peter of Castelnau and Ralph, Cistercian monks of the abbey of Fontfroide, in their work against heresy, and declared that heretics and all those who supported them were to be proscribed and their goods confiscated.⁴ In return for this assistance Innocent promised the king the same indulgence as the papacy granted to those going to the aid of the Holy Land.

To Philip, illustrious king of the Franks.

For His bride, namely the universal Church, the Lord instituted a pontifical protection and a kingly rank, one of these to favour her sons, the other to overcome her adversaries; the one to provide life for her subjects by word

and example, the other to curb the jaws of the wicked with the bridle and the muzzle, lest they should disturb the peace of the Church; the one to love its enemies and even pray for its persecutors; the other to employ the material sword for the punishment of evil doers and the praise of good men, and to safeguard ecclesiastical peace with weapons. Therefore it is expedient that both the spiritual authority and the secular power, attentive of the reason for their foundation, fight as one for the defence of the Church and that each support the other, so that the secular arm may restrain those whom ecclesiastical discipline does not recall from evil, and that spiritual vengeance may follow close upon those who, trusting in their own ferocity, do not fear the material sword. Therefore in order that you might not seem to carry the sword without cause, it is necessary that, seizing weapons and shield, you rise up powerfully to the aid of that man, whose tunic – which we refer to with grief – suffers a tearing in the kingdom of the Franks, whose vineyard the little vixen destroys and whose sheep are exposed to the onslaughts of wolves. For rapacious wolves in sheep's clothing, who seize and scatter the sheep, have even entered into the kingdom itself. And since they do not fear ecclesiastical discipline, in so far as they are separated from the Church, to such an extent do they rage shamelessly against the sheep-pen of Christ. Yet they do so by so much the less in so far as they have finally found someone to resist them in the temporal world and to enforce God's cause upon them with the sword.

Therefore we warn Your Serene Majesty and we exhort you in the Lord, and we enjoin you for the remission of your sins, that, either through you yourself, if it can be done, or through our most dear son in Christ, Louis, your son, or some other prudent man, you will powerfully oppose their perversity and show openly how much you love the unity of the Church and, using the heavenly power which has been handed over to you, compel both counts and barons to confiscate their goods and proscribe their persons. But in order that an equal penalty may restrain those who practise and those who consent – since there is no lack of scheming in secret fellowship such as to block the resistance to blatant villainy – if any of the counts, barons or citizens is unwilling to drive them from their territory, or presumes to harbour those heretics, or dares to encourage them, you may confiscate his goods and not delay adding the whole of his territory to the king's domain. Thus may Your Royal Power also assist our dear sons the Cistercian abbots Peter and Ralph, monks of Fontfroide, legates of the Apostolic See, whom we assign especially to this matter, so that it may be confirmed that the material sword may supplement the weakness of the spiritual sword, and that you, besides the temporal glory which you will acquire from so pious and praiseworthy a work, may obtain that pardon for your sins which we grant as an indulgence for those crossing over the sea to bring aid to the Holy Land.

Given at the Lateran, V Kalends of June, in the seventh year of our pontificate.⁵

The same letter was written to the archbishop of Sens and his suffragans, in order that they should give effective warning and encouragement to the king with regard to this business.

1.1.3 Innocent III, *Inveterata pravitatis heretice* (17 November 1207) (Hageneder *et al.*, vol. 10, pp. 254–7)

In 1207 Innocent III issued a fresh appeal to King Philip II Augustus of France. In this letter the pope complained bitterly about heresy in the south of France, in particular in the town of Toulouse and the surrounding area. As usual, Innocent employed a number of colourful and distinctive metaphors and similes of cultivation and medical intervention to explain to the Christian faithful the urgent need to counter heresy which was likened simultaneously to a rotten vine and to a wound. He enjoined on Philip Augustus to eradicate heretics and confiscate their goods and he placed the king's territories under papal protection. Furthermore, he now promised the same crusade indulgence of the remission of sins for those who took up arms against heretics as for those who worked to bring succour to the Holy Land. The letter was also sent to a number of counts and barons in the Kingdom of France.

To the illustrious king of the Franks.

The age-old seduction of wicked heresy, which is constantly sprouting in the regions of Toulouse, does not cease to bring forth monstrous offspring, by which, with corruption derived from its own insanity, it immediately revives to the detriment of others. And a detestable succession of the damned multiplies, who, glorying in the novelties of their own vanity, spurn the doctrine of true faith. And – since abyss calls to abyss and night shows its knowledge to night – the more they hear the truth preached to them, the more do they regard themselves as unique in their false assertions, piling up more liberally a false fabrication of their lies for others . . .

And therefore, since wounds which do not respond to the medicine of poultices must be cut out with steel, and those who hold ecclesiastical correction in slight esteem are to be restrained by the arm of the secular power, we have thought it good, O most dear son, to invoke your help in order to vindicate the injury done to Jesus Christ, and to catch the little foxes which do not cease to destroy the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts among the simple minded. We warn Your Serene Majesty more attentively and we exhort you in the Lord, enjoining you for the remission of your sins, that for the extirpation of such rotten vine shoots which, with roots deeply

extended, bring forth wild vines and not grapes, you too may gird yourself manfully and powerfully to eliminate such injurious filth, so that both the purity of your faith, which as a Catholic prince you keep in mind, may be exhibited in deed by strenuous actions, and the followers of treacherous heresy, crushed by the strength of your power, may be brought back to the knowledge of truth – at least by the sufferings of war. For, to the extent that your Lord God has in His kindness stood by you in the disturbances of your kingdom and has granted you a glorious outcome, placing your land in restful tranquillity, to such an extent does it suit His enemies and the enemies of His Church to stand more robustly in your way. Indeed, in order that you may be able to attend to these things more securely, we meanwhile receive your land, your people and their goods under the protection of Blessed Peter and of ourselves.⁶ And if anyone – which we do not believe – should wretchedly presume to trouble you or yours, we shall take care to avenge through canonical censure such injury, which we should reckon to be principally inflicted on the Apostolic See. We will, moreover, that all the goods of the heretics themselves be confiscated; and, both for you, whether labouring in your own person, or providing the necessary help, and for the men of your land, who have taken up arms for the overthrow of the perfidious, may that remission of sins avail which we have designated as an indulgence for those who labour for the aid of the Holy Land – of which necessity we want you and them to be mindful, so that it should not come to pass that help in that matter be impeded.

Given at Rome at St Peter's, XV Kalends of December in the tenth year of our pontificate.

A letter was written almost in the same way and with the same date to all the counts, barons and soldiers, and to all the Christian faithful established in the kingdom of France. In almost the same way a letter with the same date was written to the counts of Troyes and Vermandois and Blois. In almost the same way a letter was written to the count of Bar-le-Duc with the same date. In almost the same way a letter was written with the same date to the duke of Burgundy and to the counts of Nevers and Dreux and to the noble Guy of Dampierre.

1.1.4 Innocent III, *Ne nos ejus* (10 March 1208) (PL, vol. 215, cols 1353–9)

In this letter addressed to the archbishops of the south of France Innocent III again used well-known biblical metaphors and similes to describe the Church's continuing struggle against heresy. The pope was extremely angry at the death of his beloved legate, the Cistercian monk Peter of Castelnau for which he blamed Raymond VI, count of Toulouse.

Raymond had long been at odds with the Church, accused of heresy and of harbouring heretics in his lands and Innocent pulled no punches in describing the count as cunning and inconstant. He recounted the events of Peter's death in great detail, regarding him as no less than a martyr for the Faith. Indeed his legate's death spurred Innocent on to call for a crusade. Although it is clear from the grant of indulgences in his previous letters that he had been contemplating a crusade for some time, only now did Innocent promise the indulgence of the remission of all sins for all those who, with contrite hearts and having made a true confession of their sins, took up arms against the heretics.

To the archbishops of Narbonne, Arles, Embrun, Aix-en-Provence and Vienne and their suffragans.

In order that the rebukes of that man should not touch us – who, passing through the field of the indolent fellow and the vineyard of the foolish man, has made it a matter of reproach that stinging nettles have filled them entirely – we have gone forth, firstly, as it were, in the morning of our advancement, and later through a regular succession of evangelical exchanges, to send labourers into the vineyard of the Lord entrusted to our cultivation. Therefore, having waited now for a long time, since plants of vice have grown too much in the south of France, and in order that longer roots should not put out illegitimate shoots, we have appointed there suitable men to tear up the unserviceable roots from the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts and generate profitable ones, capturing the little foxes which strive to destroy that vineyard. Those emissaries, after setting out, found there, according to the word of the Apostle, pestilential men, who upheld no sound doctrine at all, but rather piled up teachers of error to serve their own desires . . .

Truly we have heard something abominable which ought to be presented as a communal grief of the whole Church. Brother Peter of Castelnau of holy memory, a monk and a priest, a man in life outstanding among virtuous men in skill and fame, appointed by us with others to preach peace and build faith in the same province, had laudably set out on the ministry committed to him and was making constant progress. Truly he was a man who had learnt wholly in the school of Christ what he should teach. And by making use of discourse in accord with faithful teaching, he had been able to exhort with sound doctrine and refute his opponents. He was always prepared to return an answer to all who asked – that is to say he was a man Catholic in faith, skilled in law and eloquent in speech. The Devil stirred up against him his minister, the count of Toulouse, who, through the many great excesses which he had committed against the Church and against God, had often incurred ecclesiastical censure, and who had often been

absolved – as one would expect of a cunning and clever man, slippery and inconstant – through a feigned repentance. Finally, not managing to contain his hatred, which he had conceived against Peter, and on account of the fact that in Peter's mouth the word of the Lord was not restrained from administering justice among the nations and rebukes among the people – hatred which was the stronger in that same count, because he himself was to be rebuked the more for his great crimes – he summoned both Peter and his colleague,⁷ legates of the same Apostolic See, to the town of Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, promising to provide complete reparation for all those items for which it was sought.⁸ But when they convened in the appointed house the aforementioned count, at one moment as a truthful and good natured man promised that he would carry out the salutary warnings that had been given to him, and at another, as a faithless and obdurate man, refused outright to do these things. Finally, when those men wanted to depart from the same house, he publicly threatened their death, saying that wherever they should go on their separate ways, either by land or by water, he would vigilantly observe their departure.

And immediately making good his words with deeds, he designated his accomplices to lay carefully planned traps. And since neither the prayers of our dear friend the abbot of Saint-Gilles-du-Gard,⁹ nor the insistence of the consuls and the burgesses, had been able to mitigate the madness of his fury, the consuls and burgesses led the legates away – although the count was unwilling and complaining exceedingly – under the protection of an armed band, close to the bank of the river Rhône. Here, when night was pressing on and they took their rest, certain supporters of the count, wholly unbeknown to their guests – were seeking their blood – as in fact would become apparent. And so on the next day morning came, and mass was celebrated as was customary, and when the guiltless soldiers of Christ were preparing to cross the river, one of the aforementioned servants of Satan, brandishing his lance, wounded the aforementioned Peter in the ribs from behind, Peter, founded upon Christ the rock with immoveable firmness being unaware of such treachery. The pious man, looking back upon his impious assailant, and following the example of Christ his master, as well as the blessed Stephen, said to him: 'May God forgive you, because I also forgive you', repeating over and over again these words of such great piety and patience. Then thus transfixed, in hope of heavenly things, he forgot the bitterness of the wound inflicted on him. And although the moment of his precious death was pressing on him, he did not cease to establish peace, together with the companions of his ministry who were promoting the faith. Finally, after many words, he happily fell asleep in Christ . . .

But to those who, kindled with the zeal of orthodox faith to avenge just blood – which does not cease to cry out from earth to heaven, until the

Lord of Vengeance shall descend from heaven to earth to confound both subverted and subvertors – shall have girded themselves manfully against pestilential people of this kind, who together in unison assail both peace and truth, you may unambiguously promise an indulgence of the remission of sins from God and his vicar, in order that the labour for the adequate completion of this kind of work may suffice for them on account of those sins for which they shall offer a contrite heart and a true oral confession to the true God . . .

Given at the Lateran, VIII Ides of March, in the eleventh year of our pontificate.

1.1.5 Innocent III, *Devotionem vestram dignis* (13 November 1209)
(PL, vol. 216, col. 156)

Men flocked to join the Albigensian Crusade. In July 1209 the crusaders took Béziers and massacred its inhabitants and in August 1209 they besieged and captured Carcassonne. Yet although these were significant victories, by November 1209 Innocent III was concerned that Simon of Montfort, the crusade's overall leader, would have insufficient forces to retain the territories he had conquered. In this short, practical letter, unusually devoid of rhetoric, the pope therefore addressed the crusading army, reminding them that, despite their recent military successes, Simon still needed them to remain in the field to fight. Innocent urged them to continue to protect their newly won territories and in return he promised that, with God's aid, he would be able to provide them with reinforcements at Easter.

To the noble barons and soldiers from the army of crusaders who remained with lord Simon of Montfort.

With worthy praises in the Lord we commend your devotion because, fired with the zeal of orthodox faith, you have striven piously and zealously against the subvertors of our faith. Although a marvellous victory has been gained in their contrition, and land, long possessed by the heralds of the Antichrist, has been brought back to the territory of Jesus Christ, you have remained in His defence, together with our dear son lord Simon of Montfort to whose command it has been entrusted, waiting prudently, since it is no less the part of courage to guard what has been obtained than to acquire it. Since, therefore, the outcome, not the fight, wins the crown, we beseech and advise Your Nobility the more earnestly, enjoining you for the remission of your sins – in order that you may crown your laudable resolution with a more praiseworthy and zealous perseverance – that you manfully assist the aforementioned lord to protect that land, content with your pay from next

Easter onwards, until new help is despatched – which we are procuring for you and for him in various ways, if the Lord should grant it.

Given at the Lateran, the Ides of November, in the twelfth year of our pontificate.

1.1.6 Innocent III, *In tantum clamor* (28 June 1210) (PL, vol. 216, cols 283–4)

In this letter addressed to his legates in the south of France, Hugh bishop of Riez and the Cistercian monk Arnold Amalric, Innocent III showed that he was keen to continue to tackle heresy in a number of different ways – not only by means of the crusade. In particular Innocent urged the legates to inquire into the alleged heretical beliefs of archbishop Berengar of Narbonne, as well as those of the bishop of Auch, since he had for some time received complaints about the orthodoxy of both men and their apparent failure to take appropriate action against heretics in their dioceses. Although he felt that he could no longer put off a formal inquiry, Innocent was nevertheless also very careful to emphasise that this must be conducted with great care and in accordance with due canonical procedures.

To the bishop of Riez and the Cistercian abbot, legates of the Apostolic See. The clamour which has already arisen against the archbishops of Narbonne and Auch is becoming so powerful that we cannot neglect it any further without danger. In order, then, that they not be able to obtain some comfort from their wickedness, since they are not only negligent, as is asserted, but also pestilential, we entrust to your discretion, through our apostolic letters, the extent to which you may decide to act more diligently in the truth and, having before your eyes God alone, the enquiries into everything which has been set out against them. You must determine what is to be done in accordance with canonical rules, withdrawing all right of appeal and ensuring by ecclesiastical censure that your acts are strictly observed.

Given at the Lateran, IV Kalends of July in the thirteenth year of our pontificate.

1.1.7 Innocent III, *Cum jam captis* (15 January 1213) (PL, vol. 216, cols 744–5)

By 1213 Innocent III was wishing to turn the attentions of Christian Europe to the launch of a new crusade to the Holy Land – the Fifth Crusade. This letter was addressed to his legate, Arnold Amalric, one

of the leaders of the Albigensian Crusade and by now archbishop of Narbonne. Innocent enjoined Arnold Amalric to ensure that the crusade against heresy was brought to an end and to conclude a peace, and he ordered him to take a central role in organising peace treaties between the crusaders and the southern French nobility who had tried to resist their conquests. Innocent emphasised that he was happy that the Albigensian Crusade had achieved its desired results in tackling heresy, thereby justifying its termination. His plan was that all crusading military efforts would henceforth be centred on the new crusade against Muslims in the Near East.

To the archbishop of Narbonne, legate of the Apostolic See.
 Since now in the south of France the little foxes have been captured which were destroying the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts, which had been infected by the virus of heretical wickedness and oppressed by military devastation, the business of faith has sufficiently prospered through the grace of God.¹⁰ And since a more urgent cause now presents itself, it is expedient that the hand of the Christian people be turned to it. Indeed we have received news that the king of the Saracens equips his forces for battle, striving to rise the more strongly against the believers in the Christian faith, in as much as he has suffered a greater fall at the hands of the Christian people, nay indeed at the hands of Christ himself, who judges His cause with a judgement appropriate to us. Indeed the Holy Land, which is also a slender rope of the heritage of the Lord, because it is much in need of help, seeks and looks for the support of the Christian people. Often, and indeed normally, forces assembled together prevail; but, on the contrary, if they are scattered, they easily fail. So, in as much as we shall be less occupied with other things, in respect of this general and special business of Christ's worshippers we may proceed the more effectively against the faithlessness of the Saracen race. We entrust to you, our brother, through apostolic letters, together with our most dear son in Christ, Peter, the illustrious king of the Aragonese, and as many counts as barons and other prudent men as you know to be requisite for this, that by arranging peace and treaties, and with careful handling of the case, you diligently take pains to provide for the whole of the south of France by peace treaties or firm and secure truces. So that in respect of this matter, through the indulgences which have flowed from the Apostolic See against the heretics, you may not call to arms or tire the Christian people, unless by chance you should receive a special mandate from the Apostolic See to that effect.

Given at the Lateran, XVIII Kalends of February in the fifteenth year of our pontificate.

1.1.8 Innocent III, *Is in cuius* (21 May/1 June 1213) (PL, vol. 216, cols 849–52)

In this letter addressed to Peter II, king of Aragon, Innocent III revoked the decision he had made in January 1213 to end crusading in the south of France. His change of heart seems to have been as a result of pressure from southern French clergy who continued to be worried about heretics in their dioceses. In particular the Council of Lavaur (which had met in January 1213) had complained about the ongoing hostility of Peter's vassal, Count Raymond VI of Toulouse. The pope reminded Peter that, although the curia held him in high esteem on account of his victory over the Moors at the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa in Spain (1212), nevertheless he had acted wrongly in protecting the city of Toulouse, which lay under interdict, from the crusaders. Innocent demanded that Peter renounce his support for Toulouse and also emphasised that if the citizens of that town persisted in their heresy he would encourage crusaders to fight against them by once again granting indulgences. Hence he made it clear that Peter must in no way impede the crusade.

To the illustrious king of Aragon.

God, in whose hands are the hearts of all kings, should inspire you, after he has been humbly prayed to, so that attending prudently to what, according to the apostolic mandate befits us – namely to entreat, to assert and to rebuke – you may receive with filial devotion our rebukes, which we lay upon you with paternal affection. Thus may you obey our wholesome warnings and advice, so that, by receiving apostolic correction devotedly, you may demonstrate that you also have sincere good-will in those things concerning which you know that, without any doubt, your performance has been found wanting. Certainly it has now come to the notice of almost the whole world – nor do we believe that Your Serenity is ignorant of or even denies it – that among the other Christian princes we have especially taken care to honour you, and on account of this you have accrued both power and fame. I would that your prudence and devotion had similarly increased along with these rewards, since although we grant that this would have been useful to us, it would also have been more advantageous to you! In fact in this matter, you have neither discerned well for yourself, nor, as was fitting, have you conveyed the matter to us. The citizens of Toulouse have been cut off from the body of the Church with the dagger of excommunication, and their city was placed under interdict for this reason: certain of them are obvious heretics, and a larger group are believers, supporters and shelterers of such men, and even their defenders. The army of Christ¹¹ – indeed more truly Christ himself whom they have provoked against

themselves by their machinations – has forced others of them to depart from their tents to the city of Toulouse, as to the sewer of error. There, like locusts coming out from the well of an abyss, they take heed of the time and await the opportunity when they may be strong enough to demolish the faith which has been planted in these parts almost again from scratch. But you, forgetful of the fear of God, and as though you were able to prevail against God or avert His hand stretched out against those whose sins drive them on, have recognised them and their accomplices. You practise impiety under the appearance of piety, to the scandal of the Christian people and the loss of your own reputation. You have done this despite the prohibition made to you most strictly by our legate on God's and on our own behalf, not without a mark of grave disgrace and the danger of even graver suspicion.

Recently, therefore, we have listened to those things that our venerable brother, the bishop of Segorbe and our dear son, master Colombus, your messengers and the messengers of our legates, and of lord Simon, count of Montfort, wanted to propose in our presence.¹² Now letters directed from both parties have been more fully understood and meetings and careful consultations have been held with our brothers. Wanting to take care of your honour as much as your reputation, your health as much as your spirit and your security as much as the land, in our paternal solicitude we have strictly provided that Your Serenity be enjoined, by virtue of the Holy Spirit, under the pretext of divine and apostolic grace, to abandon the aforementioned people of Toulouse and their accomplices without delay. No kind of promise or obligation given or received with a view to eluding ecclesiastical discipline should stand in your way. And as long as they shall remain as they are, you should not dispense, through yourself or others, advice, help or favour to them. If indeed certain of them want to return to the unity of the Church, as the said messengers proposed in our presence, we give our venerable brother Fulk, bishop of Toulouse – a man of sound opinion and life, who has testimony not only from those who are within the Church, but also from those who are outside – our letters as mandates, so that with two prudent and honourable men as well as to himself, he should reconcile to ecclesiastical unity – after he has received a sufficient guarantee from them – those who wish to return out of a pure heart and a good conscience and not from a feigned faith. But we have ordered that those whom, persisting in the shadows of their error, the same bishop has noted down as stained with the sickness of heretical depravity, be driven from the aforementioned city and all their goods confiscated. Thus in this matter let them never be received in that same city, unless by chance, inspired by divine inspiration, they should demonstrate by open works that they are men who follow the orthodox faith. And thus the city itself, equally reconciled and purged, may be at rest under the protection of the Apostolic See

and is not to otherwise be harmed by the aforementioned count or other faithful Catholics, but rather defended and supported . . .

Meanwhile, therefore, we wish and we order that firm truces be made and preserved between you and your land and the said count of Montfort and his own land, with the complete exception of the heretics. It is not fitting that those who profess orthodox faith should make truces or peace with these men, since there is no commonality of light with shadow, Christ has no common cause with Belial, nor does the faithful man have common cause with the unfaithful. At the same time we order the aforementioned count that in respect of the land which he holds from you, he may reverently perform the duties which he is obliged to perform. But we do not want it to escape the notice of Your Excellency that if the people of Toulouse and the aforementioned nobles still also think that they can persist in their error, we have ordered that crusaders and other faithful men be stirred up through new indulgences, in order that, rising up to extirpate a plague of this kind and relying on divine help, they may proceed in the name of the Lord God of Hosts, both against the heretics themselves and against those who, of whatever kind, are their shelterers and defenders, who are more harmful than the heretics themselves. Therefore we warn Your Serenity, we ask and we beseech you in the Lord, that in respect of these things which we have set before you, you should follow through with a willing spirit to the extent that they pertain to you. You will know for certain that if you should cause it to be done otherwise – which we do not believe – besides divine indignation, which from following this course you would doubtless provoke against you from afar – you would be likely to incur grave and irreparable harm. Nor would we, however much we love your person, be able to spare you or exempt you in opposition to the business of the Christian faith. For not only ancient, but also modern examples are able to teach you the extent that danger should threaten you, if you should oppose God and the Church, especially over the cause of faith, so that you impeded the completion of this holy work.

Given at the Lateran on the Kalends of June, in the sixteenth year of our pontificate.

In almost the same way and dated as above a letter was written to the lord Simon, count of Montfort. 'That man in the hands of whom' etc. up to 'Lord God of Hosts'. 'For if the aforementioned king should cause it to be done otherwise' etc. up to 'to teach'. Therefore we warn Your Nobility and we exhort you more attentively, ordering you through apostolic writings, that you complete these things which we have set before you with a ready spirit, as much as pertains to you. Dated as above.

In almost the same way a letter was written to the archbishop of Narbonne, legate of the Apostolic See. 'That man in the hand of whom' etc.

up to 'to teach'. From whence we have warned the aforementioned king and count through our letters, that in respect of the things which we have set out they may complete with a ready spirit as much as pertains to them. And therefore we order you fraternally, through apostolic writings, that warning the aforementioned king and count and leading them on to do this efficiently, you should proceed with regard to the three aforementioned nobles, according to the plan more comprehensively set out above. You finally, brother archbishop, etc.

In almost the same way a letter was written to the bishop of Toulouse. 'That man in the hand of whom' etc. up to 'leading on', you may proceed against the aforementioned citizens according to the plan more comprehensively set out above. You finally, brother bishop, etc. Dated as above.

1.1.9 Innocent III, *Etsi Tolosanorum excessus* (25 January 1214)
(Bouquet, vol. 19, pp. 589–90)

In this short letter Innocent III addressed Peter of Benevento, his newly appointed legate for the south of France, encouraging him to continue to pursue the legation which had been entrusted to him. Although Innocent was fully aware that Toulouse had recently been a centre of heresy and one of the principal targets of the crusaders, nevertheless, he ordered that, since the people of Toulouse had pleaded for reconciliation with the Church, this should be granted and that they should not be harassed any further by Simon of Montfort and the crusaders. Yet Innocent also threatened the citizens of Toulouse with serious consequences if they did not make amends for their recent insurgency and made it clear that if they persisted in heresy he would renew the grant of indulgences. He knew that this would once again encourage crusaders to take up arms against heretics and all those who protected and defended them.

To Peter, cardinal deacon of Santa Maria in Aquiro, legate of the Apostolic See.

Although the deviation of the people of Toulouse is grave and abnormal, yet because often and recently through their messengers, our dear sons Peter Guilard and Bernard Guilabert, they have knocked on the door – and for those humbly knocking an approach to the Church is not to be shut off – we commit it to your discretion, through apostolic writings, that, according to what seems to you expedient, and provided that the guarantee you have received from them is sufficient, you may reconcile them to ecclesiastical unity.¹³ And thus the city itself, having been reconciled, may continue to be under the protection of the Apostolic See. Moreover, the city is not

to be harmed by the count of Montfort or others who are Catholic in faith, provided that the people of Toulouse decide to continue steadfastly in the Catholic faith and in the peace of the Church. But if by chance they should not want to make satisfaction, and decide to persist in their error, we have ordered crusaders and other faithful persons to be called out through renewed indulgences, so that rising up to extirpate this sort of plague and relying on divine help, they may proceed in the name of the Lord God of Hosts, both against those men themselves and against certain others who are their shelterers or defenders, who are more harmful than the heretics themselves.

Given at the Lateran, VIII Kalends of February, in the sixteenth year of our pontificate.

1.1.10 Innocent III, *Quot et quanta* (2 July 1215) (Bouquet, vol. 19, pp. 596–7)

This letter was addressed to Simon of Montfort, the leader of the crusade and was concerned with Simon's recent quarrel with the Cistercian monk Arnold Amalric, papal legate and archbishop of Narbonne. The crusaders had recently captured the town of Narbonne and Simon of Montfort and Arnold Amalric had quarrelled over the right to the dukedom. When Arnold Amalric had assumed the title of duke, in retaliation Simon had ordered the walls of Narbonne to be demolished, thereby exposing the town to its enemies. Innocent III warned Simon not to take offensive action against Arnold Amalric, reminded him of the debt of gratitude he owed the archbishop for his support during the crusade, and urged him to make peace and adequate reparation for any injuries suffered. Innocent also insisted that Simon wait until the Fourth Lateran Council, to be held in Rome in November 1215, for a final decision about the dukedom.

To Lord Simon, count of Montfort.

To a great extent the Lord has worked through the ministry of our venerable brother, Arnold, archbishop of Narbonne, both before he was elected to the bishopric and afterwards, when he was fighting against the Albigensian heretics for the truth of the Faith with the sword of the word of God and with the zeal of unwearied solicitude. It is not necessary for us to record to those present how prudently, faithfully and wisely he has also stood by you in your fortunes and the extent that his prudence has been necessary to you, since these things are now fully known through the different provinces. So we are forced to marvel that, as we have heard from the same bishop, although you have paid homage to him and offered an oath of fidelity, nevertheless, to the extent that it has pleased you, you have

arranged that the walls and the towers of his city be demolished. And both he himself and the clergy and people remain exposed to their enemies, although he was prepared, in the presence of our dear son Peter, cardinal deacon of Santa Maria in Aquiro, legate of the Apostolic See, to act wholly equitably in these matters. Meanwhile, you have withdrawn the loyalty you owe to him as viscount and the loyalties of those of Narbonne who were held as hostages at Carcassonne without just cause. You were thereby intending to deprive him of the dukedom of Narbonne, which from the time of his promotion he claims that he has held peacefully. Besides this, without just cause you have harmed him in relation to the castle of Cabrières and in relation to other matters which are known to pertain to him and his church by law, including Montégut, the castle of Saint-Marcel and half of the castle of Ventignac. And you have held on to certain other goods of his Church seized contrary to justice.

Since therefore God does not forget the few good things among many evils, nor ought any one to forget many good things among a few evils, if perhaps certain matters have come about through somebody's negligence, we beseech Your Nobility attentively, and we urge you, enjoining you through apostolic letters, to show him adequate satisfaction concerning these losses and inflicted injuries, lest they justly redound to your discredit and the vice of ingratitude be ascribed to you in your sin if you perhaps dishonour the man who has been zealous to honour you, and endeavour both to offend and put down he who formerly aspired most zealously to promote you. And in other respects you should desist from undeservedly harming that man in relation to present and other matters so that when, if the Lord allows it, he comes to the general council, he may not have just cause for complaining to us about you. Furthermore, since we do not want to depute as an executor in this matter any other than ourselves, if, having despised our warnings and mandates, you neglect to satisfy us in these matters, we will endeavour, as far as seems good and fitting, to correct this.

Given at Forenza, VI Nones of July in the seventeenth year of our pontificate.

Notes

- 1 The term 'synagogue', the place of worship of Jews is used by Innocent III to describe the meeting places of heretics. Bernard of Clairvaux also used the word to refer to heretical assemblies in the south of France, see Bernard of Clairvaux, 'Epistolae', *Opera Sancti Bernardi*, vol. 8, ed. J. Leclercq, C. H. Talbot, H. M. Rochais (Rome: Editiones Cistercienses, 1957-78), p. 125. And, as we shall see, Honorius III used it in his letter *Ad*

colligendum zizania of 1219 (1.2.3) which was addressed to William bishop of Châlons who was about to embark on the Albigensian Crusade.

- 2 i.e. the pilgrimage centres of Rome and Saint-James of Compostela.
- 3 For example, St Bernard's renowned use of the image in *Five Books of Consideration. Advice to a Pope*, trans. J. D. Anderson and E. T. Kennan (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1976), p. 118.
- 4 The abbey of Fontfroide was a Cistercian monastery situated 15 km south-west of Narbonne near the Spanish border.
- 5 The Lateran palace was where the pope lived when in Rome.
- 6 'Under the protection of Blessed Peter' means under apostolic protection.
- 7 Bishop Navarre of Couserans, papal legate since May 1207.
- 8 The town of Saint-Gilles-du-Gard is about 15 km west of Arles and 20 km south of Nîmes.
- 9 Pons, abbot of the abbey of Saint-Gilles-du-Gard in 1208.
- 10 The 'business of faith' and the 'business of peace and faith' are euphemistic terms for the Albigensian Crusade.
- 11 The 'army of Christ' is a euphemistic term for the crusading army.
- 12 Colombus was a seasoned diplomatist and had known Innocent III since 1200.
- 13 Guilard and Bernard Guilabert were consuls in Toulouse in 1217.

Part 1.2

HONORIUS III



The edition used is *Honorii III romani pontificis opera omnia quae extant*, ed. C. A. Horoy, 5 vols (Paris: Imprimerie de la Bibliothèque ecclésiastique, 1879–82).

1.2.1 Honorius III, *Populus Israel a* (3 January 1218) (Horoy, vol. 3, cols 573–5)

In this letter Pope Honorius III addressed the archbishops of France and their suffragans, asking them to procure aid for the crusade leader, Simon of Montfort. By this point Simon had overrun the south of France, had been formally invested with the county of Toulouse by Innocent III at the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, and had subsequently done homage to King Philip II Augustus. This sparked a major uprising and the citizens of Toulouse, led by Raymond VI, rebelled against Simon's rule. In order to encourage the faithful to take up arms, Honorius renewed the promise of the plenary indulgence which Innocent III had originally granted to all those who took the Cross, thereby signalling his commitment to the Albigensian Crusade which in 1213 Innocent had called to be scaled down in favour of the Fifth Crusade to the Near East. Yet Honorius made it clear that those who had already vowed to go to the Holy Land should not commute their crusade vows in order to fight against heretics; rather he urged the prelates to encourage those not already vowed to go to the Holy Land.

To the archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans.

The people of Israel are violently afflicted by Pharaoh . . . Nevertheless, great pains have been taken, with great labour and expenditure of persons and chattels, so that the faith, which had been dead in those parts, should revive, and the desired peace, which had been taken from the land, should finally return. This we believe has come to your attention, so that regarding

this matter it is in no way fitting for us to linger too long. But we are not able to keep quiet about it, indeed we are compelled to speak and with grief in our heart and with grave anxiety in our mind, recounting that when, through zeal for the Apostolic See and the forces of the kingdom of the Franks, and most greatly through the vigour and dangers of the most noble and energetic man, Simon, count of Montfort, the darkness of errors had been scattered and the disasters of war repelled, now times of peace and faith seemed to have returned. Yet the count of Toulouse, who looks with envy at favourable outcomes, has thus armed on his behalf the citizens of Toulouse and their supporters, so that, unmindful of the past and not anticipating the future, they strive to reduce everything into the former state of confusion to the detriment of the aforementioned Count Simon. Nay indeed to the detriment of the Catholic faith, whose defender he is. They themselves, having assumed a spirit of rebellion, arise and are busy repelling from their boundaries the count himself and many others of the Frankish people. Such a thing – may it not succeed! – would not only redound as an injury to God and the Apostolic See, but in truth be an injury to the aforementioned kingdom of the Franks. Since the aforementioned count has received that land, for the most part in fealty, from our most dear son in Christ, Philip, the illustrious king of the Franks, let whatever has been done there for the extermination of wicked heresy and the restoration of the Christian faith, be particularly enacted through the forces of that kingdom and its own people.

In case this matter, which for a long time has been in the making, should in a very short time go to ruin and the last state of affairs be worse than the first, and a new persecution should arise, especially against churches and men of the Church – since it is clear that the plan of the aforementioned citizens is unjust and they are not afraid to pursue it in the sight of a legate of the Apostolic See – we ask Your Universality, we warn and we beseech you in the Lord, instructing you through apostolic letters, and enjoining you for the remission of your sins, to attend prudently – since it is better to fall in with a plan in time than to beg for tardy remedies after the event – and carefully focus on helping Count Simon by animating through zealous exhortations those faithful men within your dioceses who are not signed with the Cross for the aid of the Holy Land, to go to the speedy aid of the above-mentioned count, having conceded on your authority a sure indulgence of sins to them, such as has seemed good to you to grant. But may you prudently take care in case by such a pretext you hold back certain others who are signed with the Cross from aiding the Holy Land itself, since we do not want through this to impede in any way the business of that Holy Land, to which we aspire with an ardent desire.¹

Given at the Lateran, III Nones of January, in the second year of our pontificate.

In this way a letter was also written to the archbishops of Sens, Tours, Rouen, Bourges, Lyons and Bordeaux, and their suffragans, as well as to the abbots and other prelates of the churches established throughout their provinces.

1.2.2 Honorius III, *Deo in cuius* (5 September 1218) (Horoy, vol. 3, cols 24–7)

In this long letter Honorius III addressed King Philip II Augustus of France and the French bishops, hoping to persuade the king to partake in the military campaign against the citizens of Toulouse, and to aid Amalric of Montfort, the son of Simon of Montfort, who had become the new leader of the crusade on his father's death in June 1218. Honorius reminded the recipients of his letter of the tax of a twentieth which had been collected from the Church for the Fifth Crusade to the Holy Land. He now urged that half of this tax should be used to pay for a new expedition against heretics in the south of France and also detailed that the king's son Louis, and his followers, who were under excommunication for their invasion of England, should pay respectively a tenth and a twentieth towards the Albigensian Crusade. Furthermore, Honorius decreed that in the southern French dioceses of Arles, Vienne, Narbonne, Auch, Embrun and Aix-en-Provence, not just half but the whole of the tax of the twentieth should be committed to the crusade against heresy. This was a significant diversion of resources from the Holy Land and signalled both Honorius' interest in crusade taxation and his deep commitment to military campaigns against heretics.

To Philip, king of the Franks.

To God, in whose hands are the hearts of kings, we return thanks for acts of kindness, that, before our letters – by which we were eager to arouse Your Magnificence to restrain the evil of the treacherous people of Toulouse and their accomplices – were presented to you, you, inspired by the divine spirit, have taken up that proposal, just as your letters delivered to us have pointed out. Doubtless, however, the thing which you demanded in those same letters – namely that with regard to the tax of the twentieth of the kingdom of France and the other revenues collected and to be collected in that very place, we should be concerned to give assistance to this business – has touched our spirit with a certain perplexity. For from the beginning of our pontificate we decreed that in individual dioceses the twentieth should be collected both for the aforementioned kingdom, as for

the others – and even through the bishop of the place, if he had been signed with the Cross. Otherwise it should be carried across the sea through other faithful and suitable men signed with the Cross in the diocese to be spent on forces which are of use for the business of the Holy Land. For, if we had done otherwise, it would have seemed to others that we were willing to direct it or another part of it to our own uses. We have not only considered that we would in no way do that, but we have also, by expending more than twenty thousand marks, drained our treasury on behalf of the business of that Holy Land. Therefore when we thought carefully about your petition and the aforementioned statute, it seemed very dangerous and an opportunity for slander, to convert the money deputed for the business of the Holy Land to other uses, and to defraud in any way the Holy Land itself of that same money.

But again, to those considering how much the business of Faith and Peace is relapsing into confusion in the districts of Toulouse and its neighbourhood, unless powerful and immediate help is brought to it, it seems very serious that that business be robbed of apostolic aid, when so great expense of materials and soldiers have been thus far procured, especially since the promotion of this business pertains to the honour of your kingdom, which, as God is our witness, we love before the other kingdoms of the world. And may He who inclines the hearts of kings to His wishes, inspire a proposal which is worthy of you to lend aid in this business.

Therefore, choosing the middle course in this seeming controversy, we have considered that we should provide as follows: we leave aside the twentieth levy on those dioceses of which the bishops are in parts overseas, or who are about to undertake the journey of going there up until the next feast of St John the Baptist; we leave aside also the concessions which we have made to certain bishops and barons who have taken the Cross, or to whoever else we have made them concerning the twentieth of land or of their churches, as well as the twentieth which has been already granted to crusaders so that through their means it might be carried to the assistance of the Holy Land itself. As for the whole other twentieth of the said kingdom – provided the provinces of Narbonne and Auch are excepted – both that which has been collected and that which is still to be collected – as also the revenues from the money-chests and that both donated and to be donated for the redeeming of vows: in sum, that it be equally divided and a half having been assigned to the assistance of the Holy Land itself, that the remainder be expended, in accordance with your petition, on the aforesaid business.

But we have thought it good that our venerable brothers, the bishops of Noyon and Meaux, and our dear son the Cistercian abbot, be authorised in

order that the money be collected and, as we have said before, divided. After reserving one half as a subsidy for the aforementioned Holy Land, they may assign to you the rest to be spent on stipends and other useful aids for this business in the south of France, as far as you shall deem necessary.

Also we completely depute to this local business a tenth of the returns of our dear son the noble Louis, your first-born, and the twentieth of those who entered England with him, which according to the mandate of our legate, they are obliged to send overseas every two years. Those men may retain it for themselves who have undertaken this labour personally. Others should assign it to you to be used for the assistance of the aforementioned business in the south of France. Also we have granted that those who with your same first-born son have incurred the bond of excommunication in this matter – not by entering England but by lending favour to him in other ways – if they wish to go personally to support the aforementioned business, in accordance with their resources, being competent at least to supply help in the form of soldiers or of money – they may be able to receive the benefit of absolution according to the accustomed form of the Church, from the bishops as well as from those to whom the office of preaching has been commissioned. Moreover, through our venerable brother, the bishop of Sant' Agata de' Goti, we have established apostolic indulgences, which we want to remain in all their strength for all who in persons or goods have shown help in the aforementioned business. In respect of these things, because in Arles, Vienne, Narbonne, Auch, Embrun and the province of Aix-en-Provence there are few signed with the Cross for the help of the Holy Land, we depute absolutely a twentieth of those for the said business, through the hands of our dear sons, Bertrand, cardinal priest of the titular churches of Saints John and Paul, apostolic legate, and the nobleman Amalric, count of Toulouse, to be used for that business. Therefore we urge Your Highness and we beseech you in the Lord, that with regard to this business of faith and peace – which up to this point it is acknowledged has been promoted through your forces and those of your kingdom – you may thus press on magnificently and powerfully, so that through this matter Your Magnificence and the magnificence of your kingdom may be especially related over the earth, and an eternal reward may be reserved for you in heaven.

Given at the Lateran, the Nones of September, in the third year of our pontificate.

In almost the same way a letter was written on this matter to the bishops of Noyon and Meaux and the abbot of the Cistercians: 'God, in whose hands are the hearts of kings' etc. up to 'may be expended on the aforementioned business'. Then is added: And to such an extent we

mandate to your discretion through apostolic letters, that, diligently collecting the same and dividing it equally, with one half reserved now as aid for the said Holy Land, you may assign the rest faithfully to the aforementioned king to be spent on stipends and other services for the business in the south of France – just as much as he shall deem expedient. And since we have thought it good that a tenth of the returns of our dear son the nobleman Louis, the first-born of the said king, be deputed absolutely to this business, as well as a twentieth of the returns of those men who entered England with him, which they are obliged, according to the mandate of our legate, to send every two years over the sea – so may those men retain it for themselves, who have undertaken this labour personally. Others may assign it to the king himself to be converted for the support of the aforementioned business. We order that you ensure these things are mandated by official authority under two headings: against objectors, if there have been any, or rebels, by exerting ecclesiastical censure, with the right of appeal abolished.

Given at the Lateran, the Nones of September, in the third year of our pontificate.

In the same way a letter was written to the archbishops and bishops, abbots, priors and all the cities established through the kingdom of France, with a few changes made to the meaning.

1.2.3 Honorius III, *Ad colligendum zizania* (1 April 1219) (Horoy, vol. 3, cols 185–6)

In this letter Honorius III addressed his bishop, William of Châlons, employing the familiar biblical metaphors of the wheat and the tares (Matthew 13:24–30) to describe the ongoing problem of heresy in the south of France. Using traditional language, he railed against the blasphemous heretics whom he considered to be undermining Christianity, and described the crusaders in complimentary terms as soldiers of Christ. He praised the bishop for taking up the Cross and for being prepared to lead men to take part in the Albigensian Crusade. Furthermore, in response to the bishop's appeal, Honorius granted a special exemption from the Apostolic See, conceding that since the bishop had insufficient resources, and there was a great need for monetary assistance, he should be allowed to retain the whole of the tax of the twentieth, which was being collected for the Fifth Crusade to Holy Land, to fund his campaigns in the south of France. This was a very significant concession to a northern French bishop and shows that Honorius believed it was vital for the Church to continue to endorse crusading against heresy as well as against Muslims in the Near East.

To William, bishop of Châlons.

In order to bind the tares which the enemy of the human race has sown in the middle of the wheat, it is necessary that the labourers of Christ, namely the preachers of evangelical truth and those who are zealous for the orthodox faith, should take it upon themselves to convene frequently, in order that they may capture those who are enemies of His Name and may manfully overcome those who fight against the Catholic faith. For without doubt, if we diligently attend to the extent to which Christ the Lord has honoured Christians – since He reckons that those men themselves are specifically His own whom He has renewed in the water of baptism – He has established by the unction of sacred chrism that He should fortify them with the privilege of such a description, so that we are able to suffer no major injury and sustain no insult. With regard to this matter the disgraceful scandals of scandalous blasphemers, who, like their master in error, come forward from the synagogue of the Albigensians, are zealous in staining, or rather obscuring, the clarity of the Christian name. On account of this, just as you intimate in your letters, zeal for the Lord's house not undeservedly consumes you, and you arm yourself, with the sign of the Cross affixed to your shoulders, to confound the heresy of sinners of this kind. You, who are about to bring with you sturdy fighters, extirpating the tares from the field of the Lord's inheritance, may bind those tares into bundles for burning. They themselves will preserve the wheat, which is to be restored to the barn of the Lord.

Truly, however, since as you say, weighed down with a heavy burden of obligations, your own faculties are not sufficient to complete so great a business, you have implored the help of apostolic aid. But although we cannot attend to such things without a scruple of conscience, we nevertheless want to listen to your prayers in any way we can. We have thought it good that the twentieth of the yields of those who, as it were, sit at your table, which you were about to send to the help of the Holy Land, those collected and to be collected, shall be remitted by a special grace. So with regard to the monies which it is fitting for you to expend in carrying forward the business you spoke of, a sure apostolic concession has been made to Your Serene Majesty. We warn Your Fraternity and we exhort you in the Lord, that thus you may help the soldiers of Christ who are subduing the aforementioned heretics, so that, with God's assistance, they may experience for themselves that your help and the help of your people will assist them, and that with worthy praises in the Lord we may be able to commend the zeal of your prudence and care.

Given at the Lateran, the Kalends of April, in the third year of our pontificate.

1.2.4 Honorius III, *Justis petentium desideriis* (3 June 1220) (Horoy, vol. 3, cols 445–6)

The recipient of this letter was Amalric of Montfort, count of Toulouse and son of the crusade leader Simon of Montfort. When the crusading armies gained possession of lands in the south of France, Simon had promised the papacy that three denarii from every home in the conquered lands would be given annually to the Church as a sign that the crusade was being fought out of devotion to the papacy and in defence of Catholicism. While the crusaders were besieging Toulouse in 1218 Simon was killed and Amalric took over leadership of the crusade. In this letter Honorius III therefore confirmed that Amalric was indeed the rightful possessor of all those territories in the south of France which had been previously conquered by his father and overrun by the crusading armies. Innocent III had already formally conceded these lands to Simon at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. The reference to Innocent's Registers reveals the importance Honorius attributed to the writings of his predecessor on the throne of Saint Peter and how he looked to his letters for inspiration and guidance when composing his own.

To Amalric of Montfort, count of Toulouse.

It is worthy of the just desires of your petitions that we show proper agreement, and that we fulfil our promises, which do not diverge from the path of reason, with continuing effect. Certainly in the Registers of our predecessor of good memory, Pope Innocent, we note that it is recorded that he himself confirmed that the cities of Béziers, Carcassonne and Albi and the other heretical lands which the Lord gave into the hands of your father of glorious remembrance and to the Christian army, shall fall to that same man, your father, to whom the chiefs of his armies had agreed that those cities should be controlled on the advice of the legates of the Apostolic See. And Innocent confirmed that rule for his heirs if they remained in the Catholic faith and devoted to the Apostolic See. As for the principal lords and others to whom it is relevant in accordance with the law, apart from the heretics and their favourers, believers, defenders and shelterers, your father annually promised three denarii for each of the homes in that same land to the Roman Church, as an indication that he was arranging that those lands be preserved from the rest in devotion to the Apostolic See and to holy religion. Our same predecessor decreed in the general council that the land which the crusaders obtained from the heretics and their believers, favourers and shelterers, together with Montauban and Toulouse, should be broken up and conceded to the aforementioned count, with their rights preserved in all particulars for Catholic men, their

women and their churches, so that he should hold it from those men from whom it is justly to be held. We, yielding to your just prayers, by apostolic authority, and with reference to the example of that man, confirm to you and to your heirs those lands which our said predecessor is known to have confirmed to your father himself and to his heirs and we ratify it by the patronage of the present document. Indeed in respect of what he ordained be conceded and discharged in other matters to your same father in the general council, we determine perpetual support for you and your heirs. Therefore let no one at all be allowed to act contrary to this letter.

Given at the Lateran, III Nones of June, in the fourth year of our pontificate.

1.2.5 Honorius III, *Quum quidam Christianae* (7 June 1221)
(Horoy, vol. 3, col. 844)

In this short and practical letter of 1221 Honorius III addressed Cardinal Romanus of Saint Angelo, bishop of Porto, his legate to the south of France. Following petitioning to set up a ‘Militia of Jesus Christ’, the pope wrote to Romanus instructing him to establish a new Military Order whose *raison d’être* would be to counter heresy in the south of France. The aim was that its members would fight against heretics just as the Order of the Knights Templar, which had been founded by Hugh of Payens in the twelfth century, fought against Muslims for the defence of the Holy Land. Those who joined were to be allowed to follow any religious practices of which Romanus approved and were to live in the manner of the Templars. To avoid any confusion or possible rivalries, Honorius also stated that the new Order was to have no jurisdiction over the Templars, unless the latter should agree to this. However, there is no further mention of the Militia of Jesus Christ in subsequent papal letters which suggests that the Order did not engender enough popular support to get off the ground. The lack of rhetoric in this letter is in stark contrast to the flowery language of Innocent III’s correspondence.

To Romanus, bishop of Porto.

Certain of those who are zealous for the Christian faith are desirous that an Order of soldiers should be instituted in the province of Narbonne, who, just as the Templars fight against the Saracens in the Eastern parts, so in those parts they should strive against heretical depravity for the sake of the business of peace, faith and ecclesiastical liberty. We, granting apostolic favour to their praiseworthy desire to set up an Order of this kind according to approved religious practices, concede unrestricted power to you, on the authority of those present. But those men who have chosen the way of life

by which the aforementioned soldiers (the Templars), have chosen to live, shall have no jurisdiction over them, unless by chance these want to subordinate themselves by deliberate choice.

Given at the Lateran, VII Ides of June, in the fifth year of our pontificate.

1.2.6 Honorius III, *Cum venerabiles fratres* (15 November 1221)
(Horoy, vol. 4, cols 24–5)

In 1221 Honorius III addressed the abbots, priors, deacons, archdeacons, prelates and clerics of the province of Rheims on the subject of crusade taxation and also sent a very similar letter to the archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans. This was the first of a number of letters in which the pope called for a tax of a twentieth to be levied on the clergy of the *whole* of France for the Albigensian Crusade for three years. It was therefore a very significant grant and shows just how important Honorius considered the crusade against heresy to be. Previously Honorius had only allowed the southern French dioceses to use the *whole* of the tax of the twentieth originally committed to the Holy Land for the crusade against heretics – see his letter ‘Deo in cujus’ (1.2.2). The reason for the change of policy was that the Fifth Crusade had now come to an end with the loss of the port of Damietta which meant that all resources could be focused on the Albigensian Crusade. Honorius stipulated that only certain occupations and religious orders were to be exempted from payment of the tax and in his letter to the archbishop of Rheims he ruled that arsonists and disturbers of the peace were to be absolved of their sins in order that they could join the crusade.

To the abbots, priors, deacons, etc., established throughout the province of Rheims.

Our venerable brothers, the archbishop of Rheims, legate of the Apostolic See and his suffragans, have established by the authority of our mandate – by which we ourselves have given to the archbishop the power of acting in his own province and in the provinces of Rheims, both in indulgences and in other matters, so that he would know how to expedite everything concerning the assisting of the business of faith which is being waged in parts of the south of France – by their communal council and consensus, that they themselves and all the clergy established in the province of Rheims, may bring together the entire twentieth of ecclesiastical revenues for a three-year period, for the alleviation of the aforementioned business, with the exception of taxes on hunting and fisheries, which cannot easily be calculated. And they shall also impose such a burden on all the religious, with the exception only of the Cistercians, Templars, Hospitallers and

Carthusians. We confirm this statute, which has been carefully put together, by apostolic authority, giving to the same archbishop unrestricted power, that, with the removal of the right of appeal, objectors, if any, may be compelled to pay out the twentieth in accordance with canonical rulings. And therefore we so order Your Excellency, through apostolic letters, so that you may thus be able to pay this twentieth liberally and freely – a duty which you might otherwise not be able to perform at this difficult and critical moment.

Given at the Lateran, XVII Kalends of December, in the sixth year of our pontificate.

In almost the same way a letter was written on this matter to the archbishop of Rheims and his suffragans: 'With the authority of our mandates, by which we have given the power to you, brother archbishop, of acting in your own province and in the provinces of Rouen, as in indulgences' etc. as above up to 'having been done prudently, we confirm by apostolic authority and we confirm it by the support of the present letter, by a sure mandate of the Apostolic See, giving to you, brother archbishop, free power to compel objectors, if there are any', etc. as above up to 'may be compelled'. Also, we grant you by the authority of these present letters as a favour the power to absolve, according to the formula of the Church and your legation, arsonists and those who have committed violent acts, in order that you may thus be able to encourage them the more efficiently to aid this memorable business. Dated as above.

1.2.7 Honorius III, *Dignas Deo laudes* (13 December 1223) (Horoy, vol. 4, cols 483–4)

In this letter Honorius III addressed Louis VIII, who had become king of France in 1223, urging him to take part in the Albigensian Crusade and describing him as a most Christian king for his public devotion to the cause. Honorius praised the king for despatching ten thousand marks of silver from his father's coffers to promote the crusade and also promised that, in order to further aid the king, he intended to facilitate the extension of peace treaties between himself and Henry III, king of England. This refers to the fact that Louis had invaded England in 1216, and although initially successful, had been defeated and forced to make peace in 1217. Louis had already taken part in crusading in the south of France in 1219 but the campaign had had limited success. Nevertheless, following this letter he agreed to crusade once more. In doing so he showed religious piety and, by differentiating himself from his father Philip II Augustus, who had repeatedly ignored papal appeals to join the crusade, he also emphasised his new authority as king. Ironically, in 1224 Honorius

called for the postponement of crusading, much to Louis' fury, but in 1225 he again renewed the crusade indulgence and Louis led the crusade in 1226, dying at Avignon while on campaign.

To Louis VIII, king of the Franks.

We offer fitting praise to God and great thanks to you because, just as our venerable Brother Conrad, the bishop of Porto, proposed in our presence and in the presence of our brothers, in those initial days following your coronation you imitated your predecessors no less in Christian devotion than in your lineage. And to the extent that anxiety was weighing you down, in particular putting the business of Christ and the public good before any private interest, you have in the matter of the Albigensians shown the goodwill of a most Christian prince, in so far as any injury to orthodox faith distresses you, by declaring in public that you are willing to sustain failure in your cause rather than allow the same business to suffer loss through your own men not coming to its aid. Hence you have bestowed a helpful and kindly licence on the prelates and others who themselves, on the occasion of your action, were withdrawing their support for that business, by personally attending to that same business which had been left to you.

In brief, since you were moved by the importance of this matter and since, as was fitting, you were urging that it be advanced by action, you have despatched ten thousand marks of silver from the alms of Philip, your father of famous memory, to aid that business. Wherefore we trust and we hope of Your Serene Majesty, that He who has stirred up your spirit so promptly in this matter, will also bring it about that, as we require in other letters from Your Excellency, you may assume for yourself that business, and you may happily achieve that matter to the praise of His name and to the increase of your honour and prosperity. And indeed we do not believe that you can do anything else for the present for which you might more easily acquire divine thanks and the thanks of the Apostolic See, or whatever further should pertain to the situation and honour of your kingdom. As for the rest, we propose to extend truces between you and our most dear son in Christ, the illustrious king of England, in order that you may be able to attend more efficiently and freely to the business of Jesus Christ.

Given at the Lateran, the Ides of December, in the eighth year of our pontificate.

1.2.8 Honorius III, *Mirabiles elationes maris* (15 February 1225) (Horoy, vol. 4, cols 781–4)

In this long letter of 1225, Honorius III addressed the archbishops, bishops and prelates of the whole of France, showing his deep concern

about the continuing problem of heresy in the south of the country and lamenting the current situation of ‘the business of peace and faith’. He used traditional and very colourful biblical metaphors and similes to describe the Church’s struggle against heresy – images which were much more usually found in the correspondence of Innocent III. One of the most striking of these was that of the barque (ship) of Saint Peter being buffeted on the waves, a long-standing and popular medieval image of the Church. By means of this letter Honorius showed once again that he was fully committed to the Albigensian Crusade. Indeed as part of a renewed drive against heresy, the pope announced the nomination of his new legate, Romanus of Saint Angelo, bestowed on him the customary legatine powers of binding and loosing, and asked that the clergy welcome him and help him in his endeavours in every way they could.

To the archbishops, bishops and prelates of the kingdom of France.

The swellings of the sea are wondrous, but the Lord in the heights is more wondrous, because, as the waves of the tempests of the world swell against the ship of Peter, that is the Church, so the Lord seems to sleep in the same and permits it to be shaken, agitated by the storms and waves. However, stirred by the clamour of His own faithful people crying out with their whole heart, He rises up and gives orders to the winds and to the sea, and produces a great tranquillity, so that seeing this they may respect divine power.

Truly the miserable state, indeed the enduring wretchedness, of the provinces of Narbonne and the surrounding regions, has tortured us with anxiety and suspended us in doubt. Indeed, we have been anxious to find ways and means by which we might be able to assist the business of peace and faith, which seems in those parts to have been, as it were, corroded from within. And we are concerned lest that land might be turned into a completely brackish state because our labour was broken and useless, and lest we should be unable – however much loving attention has been applied to its cultivation – to carry back from it the desired sheaves. For it does not seem to be like that land about which we read that ‘the land, drinking the rain showers which often come upon it from above, and producing a suitable crop for those by whom it is cultivated, will receive a blessing from the Lord’. But rather it seems to be like that about which is fitly added: ‘putting forward thorns and thistles, it has been condemned and is close to the accursed’ . . .

Behold, we have provided that our most dear son Romanus, cardinal deacon of Saint Angelo, a man outstanding in nobility and character, conspicuous in determination and industry, especially dear to us and received among our other brethren for the worth of his virtue, be appointed

here so that, with the aid of divine piety leading him on, he may correct errors and reform deformities, may tear up noxious things and plant healthy ones, and in respect of that land which for a long time has been besieged by the thorns of vices, offering up fruits of iniquity and bitterness, he may make fruits of piety and sweetness sprout forth by God's authority. And since in order to do these things the help of our most dear son in Christ, Louis, the illustrious king of the Franks and his kingdom is needed, and the Apostolic See deposes other business in that kingdom to be handled by the same cardinal – as much in that kingdom as in the south of France, and similarly in the provinces of Tarentaise, Besançon, Embrun, Aix-en-Provence, Arles and Vienne – we have thought it good that the office of a full legation be bestowed on him, with complete power to destroy and tear up, build and plant, arrange, ordain, establish, divide and do whatever things he sees ought to be done, according to the practical wisdom given to him by God. And we enjoin Your Highness, by apostolic letters and we order you strictly that you treat him zealously and devotedly, as much as he himself is a legate of the Apostolic See – indeed more truly since we are represented by him. And assisting him diligently and faithfully, may you humbly receive his salubrious warnings and mandates, and may they be unshakeably observed. For we will hold those of his judgements valid which, with good reason, he determines against the rebels, and we will ensure that they are inviolably observed, by the authority of God.

Given at the Lateran, XV Kalends of March, in the ninth year of our pontificate.

Note

- 1 'Business of that Holy Land', i.e. the Fifth Crusade.

Part 1.3

GREGORY IX



The edition used is *Les Registres de Grégoire IX*, ed. L. Auvray, 4 vols, *Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, 2nd series (Paris: Bocard, 1890–1955).

1.3.1 Gregory IX, *Ardenti desiderio aspirantes* (21 October 1228)
(Auvray, vol. 1, pp. 141–3)

Pope Gregory IX addressed this letter to the French archbishops, their suffragans and the other clergy of their dioceses, renewing the indulgences which his predecessors Innocent III and Honorius III had granted for the Albigensian Crusade. Gregory praised the work of his legate Romanus, cardinal deacon of Saint Angelo, and stated that he was prolonging his legation. He granted the plenary indulgence to those who fought at their own expense, to those who paid others to campaign for them, and to those who were paid by others to fight. He also granted lesser indulgences for those who aided the crusaders, depending on the quality and quantity of the help provided, and declared that crusaders must not be burdened by usury, focusing in particular on curtailing the activities of Jewish usurers. In general he commanded all his addressees to continue to encourage and support the crusade.

To the archbishops of Rheims, Sens, Rouen, Tours, Bourges, Bordeaux, Auch, Narbonne, Lyons, Embrun, Tarantaise, Besançon, Aix-en-Provence, Arles and Vienne, and their suffragans, and the abbots, priors, chapters and other ecclesiastical prelates established in their dioceses.

Aspiring with an ardent desire to purge the Albigensian land of heretical deformity, we renew the indulgences which were once conceded by the Apostolic See to those who have been on crusade or to the faithful who are labouring on this endeavour. And we have thought it right that our dear son Romanus, cardinal deacon of Saint Angelo, legate of the Apostolic See,

who knows the nature and circumstances of that business, and is someone who has laboured efficiently in this matter in another role, be appointed on our behalf to your dioceses on account of the said business and for other matters which the Apostolic See has to investigate there. He is a man outstanding in counsel and discretion, loving the honour of the kingdom of the Franks and zealous in that labour. However much he has been especially necessary to us at the Apostolic See, and his presence there opportune, nevertheless the project itself, because of its difficulty, has required the diligence of so fine and so great a man. And so, by the mercy of Almighty God and trusting in the authority of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, in virtue of that power of binding and loosing which, although unworthy, God has bestowed on us, to all who have undertaken that labour in their own persons and at their own expenses, we grant as an indulgence full pardon for those sins, of which they are truly contrite in heart and have made verbal confession. And we promise them an increase of eternal salvation as the recompense of just men. Moreover for those who have undertaken to go there, not in their own persons, but at least at their own expense, and have appointed suitable men, according to their ability and quality, and to those similarly who, although at others' expenses, have nevertheless gone in their own persons, we concede full pardon for their sins. Also we wish and we concede that all be sharers of that remission who from their own goods will minister suitably to the assistance of that business, or who have provided suitable advice and help concerning the aforementioned matters, in proportion to the quantity of their help and the disposition of their devotion. Obviously, since they adhere in their devotions to the just judgements of the Emperor of Heaven, and since they ought to rejoice in a special prerogative, we wish and we command that, if some of those setting out there are strictly bound by oath to repay outstanding interest, you may force their creditors, by ecclesiastical censure, to release them from the oath they have taken and to desist from the exaction of interest. But if any of the creditors has forced them to pay out interest, you may compel these same people to restore it by similar censure. Furthermore you may ensure that by means of the secular power the Jews are compelled to remit interest and, until they have remitted it, that they be denied dealings with the faithful. Henceforth if any crusaders at the present time are not able to pay their debts to the Jews, you may take care to labour so that the secular judges may thus procure a suitable deferral for them. So that after the journey of pilgrimage has been undertaken, and there is most certain knowledge about their death or return, they may not incur the inconveniences of paying interest. And equally the Jews shall be compelled to add to the capital, after the necessary expenses have been deducted, the revenues which they themselves shall meanwhile have collected. Also you may compel debtors

of the crusaders to pay off the debts in which they are held by the Jews, without interest, inducing their creditors, as far as is necessary, to extend the limits previously fixed for the settling of debts. Indeed, since some are said to have put down the cross which they had assumed against the said heretics on their own authority, you may force them to resume it. Therefore we warn your discretion, and we urge you in the Lord Jesus Christ, ordering you by the authority of those present, that diligently setting forth all the above-mentioned things to the peoples subject to you, and disposing them to expend help on the aforementioned business in terms of material goods and human resources, with sedulous exhortations you follow through on the above-mentioned individual articles one by one, in whatever is acknowledged to be part of your responsibility. So that showing yourselves thus careful and attentive, the ardour of your charity itself may inflame those nearest to you, and you may in the present obtain thanks from us, and a reward from God in the future.

Given at the Lateran, in the second year of our pontificate.

1.3.2 Gregory IX, *Licet alia vice* (June/July 1228) (Auvray, vol. 1, pp. 143–4)

In this letter Gregory IX addressed his legate, Romanus, cardinal deacon of Saint Angelo. Gregory's predecessor, Honorius III, had appointed Romanus as legate for the kingdom of France as for the south of France. Gregory reminded Romanus that he had renewed his legation to the south of France on account of his sterling work against heresy in the region and granted him full powers to act on behalf of the Apostolic See in order to find a happy outcome to the turbulent political and religious situation there. In particular Gregory wished his legate to finalise negotiations between the warring parties with a view to ending the crusade. Romanus' diplomatic efforts eventually led to the Peace of Paris of 1229 by which Raymond VII of Toulouse was reconciled to the Church and swore loyalty to King Louis IX of France. In the future, Gregory would encourage the establishment of the papal inquisition, led by the mendicant orders, as an alternative method of dealing with heresy.

To Romanus, cardinal deacon of Saint Angelo, legate of the Apostolic See. It is granted that when at another time Pope Honorius of good memory, our predecessor, appointed you as his legate *a latere* to the kingdom of France and to the Albigensian territories and the nearby regions, on behalf of the business of peace and faith and with regard to other matters which the Apostolic See had in mind to investigate there, you profitably pursued that business at great personal cost to yourself and with tremendous

labour. However, because the matter itself, because of its difficulty, has demanded your personal presence, since you are a man outstanding in counsel and discretion, fervent in the same business, and since you understand fully its nature and circumstances, we have arranged that you be appointed there again. And however much you are necessary to us at the Apostolic See, and your presence there opportune, we have conceded to you the duty of a full legation and granted complete power to destroy and root out, to dissipate and disperse, to build and to plant, to dispose, to ordain, to establish, to divide and to do whatever things you think ought to be done according to the wisdom given to you. Wherefore we order through apostolic letters that at your discretion you may follow through this business which has been begun in days long past, with accustomed diligence so that thus, with Divine Grace leading the way and with the accompanying zeal of your foresight, a happy outcome may be obtained. For we will assist you and the same business, with God's help, as much as we are able, so that we will consider valid the decrees which you shall rationally bring against the rebels, and we will make sure by God's authority that they are inviolably observed, with no privileges or indulgences standing in the way, if any shall seem to have been obtained from the Apostolic See.

Given at Perugia in the second year of our pontificate.

INNOCENT IV



The edition used is *Bullarium Ordinis FF Praedicatorum*, eds T. Ripoll and A. Bremond, 8 vols (Rome: Ex Typographia Hieronymi Mainardi, 1729–40).

1.4.1 Innocent IV, *Ad extirpanda* (15 May 1252) (*Bullarium Ordinis FF Praedicatorum*, vol. 1, pp. 209–12)

In 1252 Innocent IV (1243–54) wrote this letter to the podestàs, rectors, councils and communes of cities throughout Italy.¹ In it he likened heretics to thieves and murderers of the soul and declared that they ought to be treated no better than literal thieves and murderers – a familiar analogy between heretics and other types of criminals which had been used by a number of his predecessors. By now the use of inquisitorial process to counter heresy had become widespread not only in the centre and south of France, but also in the cities of northern and central Italy. When inquisitorial procedures were first established the inquisitors, as clergymen, were not permitted to torture heretics or those suspected of heresy in order to extract information or confessions – rather, torture could only be used by lay judges in lay courts. *Ad extirpanda* was a revolutionary decretal because for the first time the papacy sanctioned the use of torture in ecclesiastical inquisitorial processes. Nevertheless, Innocent did not allow the inquisitors to inflict this torture; instead, it was to be carried out by lay officials. Only four years later, in the decretal *Ut negotium* of 1256, did Alexander IV (1254–61) allow the inquisitors themselves to absolve each other if they incurred any canonical irregularities while carrying out their inquisitorial duties – which included torture.² Thus it was only from the mid-thirteenth century onwards that torture became an accepted part of ecclesiastical inquisitorial procedures.

Innocent IV to the podestàs, rectors, councils and communes of the cities of Italy.

In order to extirpate the darnel of heretical wickedness from the midst of the Christian people, which has sprouted more abundantly than usual because the Enemy is sowing ever more freely in these times, we propose to labour so much the more studiously according to the care entrusted to us, in so far as the more ruinously we neglect these same, the heretics, the more they disseminate to the destruction of Catholic seed.³ But wanting people to rise up against the labourers of that kind of wickedness, and that the sons of the Church and those zealous for orthodox faith should adhere to us, we have issued certain statutes for the extirpation of heretical pestilence, which as faithful defenders of the same faith you are to observe with diligent precision. These statutes are contained below, one by one. Regarding this matter we order all, through apostolic letters, that, each man individually ensure that those statutes are inscribed in your law codes and once there are never abolished, so that you may proceed without any omission, in accordance with those statutes, against every heresy which raises itself against this holy Church. As for the rest, we have announced to our dear sons, the provincial prior and our brother Inquisitors into heretical depravity of the Order of Preachers in Lombardy, in the Marches of Ancona and in the Romagna, through our letters as mandates, that they should compel your people, one by one, to attend to this matter by means of excommunication of persons and an interdict on the land, with no right of appeal.⁴

These then are the statutes:

We have decreed that the magistrate, or Rector, who is in charge in the city, or other places, at the present time or in future times, in Lombardy, Romagna, or the Marches of Ancona, should judge with care, and with no unwillingness about acting shall attend to them inviolably. And he shall keep them, and ensure that they are observed by all for the whole duration of his rule, both in the city or in the place of his reign, as in the lands subject to his authority, all and each one singly, both those transcribed below and other statutes and laws, ecclesiastical and civil which have been promulgated against wicked heresy. And in addition to these being precisely observed, they shall receive oaths from any in the council of Podestàs, or any succeeding in rule. If anyone does not wish to do this, let them in no way be considered Podestà or Rector, and whatever as Podestàs or as Rectors they have done, shall have no inner sanction. And let none be bound either that he should follow them, even if he shall have made an oath about lending his following. But if the Podestà, or any Rector, shall not wish to serve in all or any of these things, or shall neglect them, besides his

contumely being noted down for perjury and perpetual infamy, let him incur a penalty of two hundred marks, which shall be exacted from him without remission and directed *in toto* to the use of the Community – even so as a perjurer and a malefactor, and equivalent to a favourer of heretics, and one suspect in Faith, let him be put out of the honour and the office of his rule: nor let him be considered Podestà nor Rector in any place, or for the rest of his days promoted to any honour, or assume a public function for any purpose . . .

Also the same Podestà, or Rector, should be obliged, within the third day following the beginning of his rule, to appoint twelve men, of probity and Catholic, and two notaries, and two servitors, or as many as are necessary, such as the diocesan bishop, if he is present and wants to be involved. And they shall determine that two Friars Preacher and two Franciscans be deputed for this by their priors, if there be consistories of these same Orders there. Indeed, they should be established and elected in this way to seize heretical men and women and take away their goods from them, and ensure that their goods are carried away by others, and they must take care of these matters, both in the city and in the entire area of their jurisdiction and they must be empowered with full authority. And they must bring the captives and ensure that they are brought into the power of the diocesan bishop, or of his vicars, or of the inquisitors . . .

Besides this, the Podestà or the Rector should be allowed, without damage to their bodies and lives, to force all the heretics whom he has held captive – as if they are really thieves and murderers of souls, and robbers of the Sacraments of God and of the Christian faith – to confess their errors unambiguously and to accuse other heretics whom they know, and to proscribe their goods, and to accuse fellow believers, and those who receive them and their defenders – just as robbers and thieves of temporal things are forced to accuse their accomplices and to confess the evils which they have committed. Indeed any home in which some heretical man or heretical woman has been found should be rased to the ground from its foundation without any possibility of re-building – unless their overlord shall have arranged that houses be found for them. And if the overlord of that same house shall own other houses neighbouring that house, all those homes are to be similarly destroyed, and the goods, which shall have been found in that house, and in the case of the neighbouring houses, are to be confiscated. And these goods may become the property of those who carry them off, unless those seizing them have been established in public office. And moreover, the overlord of that house, besides the mark of perpetual infamy which he will incur, will pay to the community of the city or of the place ready money of fifty imperial pounds in cash, for which, if he shall not have

paid it, he may be cast into perpetual imprisonment. Indeed, any castle in which heretics have been captured, or found, should pay a hundred pounds to the commune of the city; and a country-house, fifty pounds; and the neighbourhoods of both a castle and a city, ready money of fifty imperial pounds in cash is to be paid – unless within three days the receivers of those men shall have presented the captives to the Podestà. Indeed, whoever shall have been apprehended giving advice or help or favour to any heretical man or woman, besides the other penalty mentioned above and the penalty added below, from then onwards, by the same law, shall be made infamous in perpetuity. Nor may he be admitted to public offices, or councils, nor to choose any people to that kind of office, nor to act as a witness. Let him also be intestate, so that he may neither have the free right to make a will, nor may he accede to hereditary succession. Besides this, no one should be forced to act to his advantage in any sort of business dealings, but he himself may be forced to respond to others. But if by chance he is a judge, his sentence shall have no authority, nor for any reason may people be brought to be heard by him in any law-suit. If he is a lawyer his patronage shall be admitted in no way. If he is a notary, the documents prepared by him are to be absolutely of no avail. Also, believers in the errors of heretics are to be punished as the heretics. Besides this the Podestà or Rector should ensure that the names of all the men who have been made infamous as heretics or have been banned are registered in four books of one and the same tenor; of which the commune of the city or of the place may keep one, while another is to be held by the diocesan bishop, a third by the Friars Preacher and a fourth by the Friars Minor. And he should ensure that their names be solemnly read out three times a year at a public gathering. Also, the Podestà or Rector should be obliged to investigate diligently the sons and grandsons of heretics and their receivers, defenders and favourers, and in future in no way admit them to any public office or council . . .

Besides these matters, all the things which have been agreed, whether statutes or laws – and if there are certain other laws against heretics and their accomplices, which at any other time are condemned by the authority of the Apostolic See – ought to be contained in four volumes of one and the same tenor. Of these one should be in the record office of the commune of each city, the second should be kept by the diocesan bishop, the third by the Friars Preacher, the fourth by the Friars Minor, lest they be corrupted in some way by forgers.

This decree was given at Perugia on the Ides of May, in the ninth year of our pontificate.

Notes

- 1 A podestà was the chief magistrate in a medieval Italian town. A rector was also a high-ranking city official.
- 2 For *Ut negotium* (1256) of Alexander IV see Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy. Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), pp. 101–2.
- 3 ‘The Enemy’ refers to Satan.
- 4 ‘Order of Preachers’ refers to the Dominicans.

Section 2

TROUBADOUR POETRY



INTRODUCTION



Music was a weapon in the Albigensian Crusade. Peter of Les-Vaux-de-Cernay says that the crusading bishops and abbots sang the hymn ‘Veni, Creator Spiritus’ at the siege of Moissac to miraculous effect. When they sang the line ‘Hostem repellas longius’ (‘Drive forth our enemy’), the besieged garrison scattered (§§ 226, 351). The crusade took place in lands where poetry had a political dimension. For over a century, troubadours and *trobairitz* (women poets) had composed and performed songs in the vernacular about love as well as about political and moral issues of their day. This was an international courtly phenomenon: famous troubadours were fêted in the courts and cities of Lombardy, Castile, Aragon as well as further afield. Among the main players of the Albigensian Crusade, the bishop of Toulouse had had a successful career as the troubadour Folquet de Marseille.

Old Occitan was a Romance language that was believed to be well suited to sung (lyric) poetry. Its grammar was easy to learn and it could be understood by speakers of all the Romance languages. The first manuals that taught the Occitan language and how to compose poetry in it were produced around the years 1200–50 in Catalonia, Sardinia and Lombardy. These are the oldest grammar manuals for a European vernacular language. It was fashionable, and synonymous with elegant, courtly tastes.

The art of composing lyric poetry in Occitan was known as *trobar* (‘to find’), and its poets were called *trobadors* (‘those who find’). Troubadours worked with professional entertainers who were called *joglars* (‘jugglers’, in other words minstrels), who were variously singers, musicians or skilled acrobats. Those *trobairitz* whose works have survived were mostly married noblewomen, but some may have been nuns (see 2.2.7). Some troubadours like Raimon de Miraval were poor knights who might not otherwise have gained access to powerful courts (see 2.1.5). Peire Cardenal and William of Tudela typically drew on their clerical education to combine poetry with careers as scribes or chaplains (see the *vidas* below). Noblemen and *milites* such as Gui de Cavaillon or the double-act Tomier and Palaizi composed political poetry. The Albigensian Crusade altered the patronage network in the region, and several troubadours included in this section appear to have moved after 1215 to established

audiences in Catalonia, Castile and Lombardy. However, lyric poetry had already become less fashionable in Occitan-speaking regions by the end of the twelfth century so this may have confirmed a decline that had nothing to do with the crusade. Contrary to what has been claimed, troubadour poetry was not banned by either the church or the secular rulers and it thrived for another century in some courts as well as in cities.

Troubadours and the language of courtly love played a role in the political and diplomatic world that was clear to their Occitan-speaking or Mediterranean patrons but that puzzled the literal-minded northern French crusade leaders (see 2.5.1 and 4.3.2). The troubadour Uc de Lescura described a diverse group of fellow poets who were associated with the city and the comital court of Toulouse (this quotation also gives you an idea of how the language looks):

De mots rics no tem Peire Vidal
 ni N'Albertet de sa votz a ben dir
 ni N'Perdigon de greu sonet bastir,
 ni N'Pegulhan de chansos metr' en sal,
 ni de gabar sos chans N'Arnaut Romieu,
 ni de lausar Fonsalada son fieu,
 ni N Pelardit de contrafar la gen,
 ni N Gualaubet de viular coindamen.¹

(I have nothing to fear from Peire Vidal's noble words, nor from Albertet's eloquent voice, nor from Perdigon's way of designing a difficult melody, nor from how Pegulhan spices up his love songs, nor from Arnaut Romieu's boastful singing, nor from Fonsalada's way of praising his own fief, nor from Pelardit's imitations of others, nor from Gualaubet's elegant fiddle-playing.)

Peire Vidal was one of the celebrities of his day; the son of a furrier, he performed at noble and royal courts in Lombardy, Hungary and Cyprus. Aimeric de Pegulhan was rumoured to have died a heretic in Lombardy (see the *vida* below) but he was a well-known love-poet. They are cited alongside the instrumentalist Gualaubet and the impressionist Pelardit ('Burned Hair'), a Toulousain celebrity who soon had a street named after him. Either Arnaut Romieu specialised in the *gab*, a genre of boasting song, or he was far too proud of his own voice; Elias Fonsalada was of middle-class birth, so the comment about him 'praising his fief' is probably ironic. Famous or not, Uc grants all of them the courtesy title *En* (Sir).

Troubadour poems are not chronicles or *chansons de geste*. They present a snapshot of a situation rather than a narrative, and they are preserved in compilations that gather pieces from different places and

periods. Nor are they confessional poetry. Rhetoric is the science of persuading and moving its audiences through praise and blame. It serves a public purpose, and it may well represent only the ideas and prejudices of the audiences for which it was composed. As Peire Cardenal says: ‘There is a great trade in words and I have been hired to talk, so I should make an abundance of them, because “a hired tongue never tires”.’² Although these poems are collective statements, they should not be viewed in a romantic light as the expression of a community, still less of a ‘people’. The seigneurs of the Auvergne, Aquitaine, Languedoc and Provence perceived themselves primarily as members of complex networks of family and allegiance, not of a ‘nation’ in the modern sense.

A Note on the Editions

There are some four hundred and sixty named troubadours, plus some anonymous poems. Their works mostly survive in some forty parchment and paper manuscripts called *chansonniers*. Most of these collections of troubadour poetry were copied in northern Italy between 1254 and the late fourteenth century. These *chansonniers* tend to classify poems by three genres: love poetry (*cansos*), political or moralising poetry (*sirventès* or *vers*), and debate poetry (*tensos*). Some of the songs in this collection are very short debate poems known as *coblas esparsas* (‘scattered stanzas’) (2.1.9 and 2.1.10). Typically, the first set of *coblas* challenges its addressee, and the recipient of the *coblas* composes a response, using the same metrical and rhyme scheme.

Chansonniers treat each troubadour as an individual, and many provide a short biography (*vida*), sometimes with an author portrait. Some connect a series of songs into a cycle with short biographical narratives (*razos*). A handful of *razos* are inspired by events in the Albigensian Crusade, and may reflect the interests and opinions of Occitan communities that had gone into exile in Lombardy.

The last troubadour *chansonniers* were copied by Italian and Provençal humanists in the sixteenth century. Michel de Nostredame (brother of Nostradamus) was an early editor of troubadour poems. Modern editions started in 1816 with the six-volume *Choix des poésies originales des troubadours* by François Raynouard (Paris: Didot, 1821), then Henri de Rochegude’s *Parnasse occitanien* of 1819 (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1977), and the editions and studies by Friedrich Diez, starting with *Die Poesie der Troubadours* (Zwickau, 1826). The development in nineteenth-century Germany of the academic discipline of Romance Philology produced such landmark publications as Carl Appel’s *Provenzalische Chrestomathie* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1891), and the standard dictionary of Old Occitan,

the *Provenzalisches Etymologische Supplement-Wörterbuch* by Emil Levy (Leipzig: Reisland, 1894–1921). Other scholars in Germany as well as in Italy, France, Great Britain, the United States and Spain produced editions, dictionaries and textbooks. By the mid-twentieth century, nearly all known troubadour works were in print. There is no anthology of the whole corpus, but Martín de Riquer's three-volume *Los Trovadores: historia literaria y textos* gives the largest and most representative selection to date. The poems selected in this sourcebook are drawn from the standard editions of individual troubadours. Some translations are based on several editions, either because a given poem may appear in different versions across several manuscripts, or because there are divergences in editors' choices. The *vidas* and *razos* are taken from the standard edition by Jean Boutière and A.-H. Schutz.

A Note on the Translations

Troubadours of the thirteenth century used a standardised poetic language. We have chosen to use some expressions that now seem archaic, as they seem more true to the cultural values of the time. There was no inclusive speech: 'good men' do not include women or peasants unless the poet says so. Despite some evidence that noblewomen in these regions had more temporal power than in northern France, there was little gender equality. The concept of *cortesía* (courtliness) is grounded in the power, strength and money of the male lord. The term for a troubadour's revered and beloved lady was often *Midons*, which literally means 'my lord'. A *domna* (lady, from the Latin *domina*) was understood to be better than a mere *femna* (woman).

Cortesía equates desirable qualities with high social rank and power. Personal qualities were expressed with names that were derived from Latin: *Pretz* (from *pretium*) is an individual's 'price' or personal worth; a man (or lady) could have *Valors*, 'value', and could display *Proeza* (*proditia*), their courage and strength. To be a 'worthy knight', to show 'prowess', to be 'valorous' sounds Victorian to modern ears, and has lost its economic connotations. What underpinned courtly society was a system of gift giving. A good *seigneur* was expected to distribute and to share his wealth among his vassals, friends and of course those who entertained him. This was called *donars* ('giving'), the equivalent of the Old French noun *largesse*. 'Largesse' will strike a Victorian note to many readers, but 'generosity' is not quite appropriate, as *donars* consists of conspicuous wastage, not moral action. Lands that were handed over by a seigneur to a vassal were called *honors* (from the Latin, *honorem*). To

be *ricx* was to be either rich or noble, or preferably both. Here, *ricx* is usually translated as 'noble'. In keeping with their system of values, troubadours often condemn avarice, tight-fistedness or greed. A bad person was the mirror opposite of the courtly person, exhibiting *avols pretz* (low or low-born price or worth). He was a *vilan* (non noble), and he kept his wealth to himself (*escas*).

Beyond the castle walls, a standard education for a clerk in the regions south of the Loire would have included Roman law. There were proportionally more notaries and other clerical staff than in other parts of western Europe, so the crusade is often discussed in legal terms. Finally, *bos homs* is translated throughout as 'good people' or 'good men'. The term occurs repeatedly in inquisition documents to refer to those Cathars whom Peter of les-Vaux-de-Cernay and modern scholars call the *perfecti*. However, to be a *bos homs* in troubadour poetry equated with observing a high standard of social and ethical behaviour and (in some cases) being of high social rank. Indeed, the term might best be translated as 'respectable people'.

Three *Vidas* (J. Boutière and A.-H. Schutz, 2nd revised edition with I.-M. Cluzel and M. Woronoff, *Biographies des troubadours: Textes provençaux des XIIIe et XIVe siècles* (Paris: Nizet, 1973)).

Vida of Peire Cardenal

Nearly one hundred *sirventés* and versified sermons are attributed to Peire Cardenal, who was active between around 1205 and after 1265. Some of them are not by him; his fame was such that others wrote using his name. He was especially well known in the Crown of Aragon, and numerous Catalan poets later copied his particular style of moralising verse. The *vida* gives very little information about Cardenal's adult life, and it hints that some of his songs are only comprehensible to those who are 'in the know'. It depicts Cardenal as an educated man who employed a professional minstrel to sing for him. He may have had a dignified role at the courts he frequented. It is thought that he was a lawyer or a notary; a single document of 1204 shows that a scribe called Petrus Cardinalis worked that year in the chancery of the count of Toulouse.

His style was neither romantic nor glamorous, and he mocked the posturings of love poets. Some of the portraits of Cardenal in the *chansonnières* show a bearded old man dressed in drab secular clothes. Cardenal's songs are pithy, ironic and sometimes fierce. He was not a Cathar, but the fact that he composed sermons when he was not a priest or a friar could point to sympathies with Waldensianism.

Vida

Peire Cardenal was from the Velay, from the city of Le Puy-Notre-Dame. He was from an honoured family of *Paratge*, the son of a knight and a lady. When he was little, his father put him into the major college of canons of Le Puy to become a cathedral canon, where he learned Latin, and was trained in reading and singing. When he had reached adulthood, he fell for the vanity of this world, because he felt himself to be joyous, handsome and young. He composed many beautiful *razos* (stories) and lovely songs. He made some *cansos*, but not many; he composed many *sirventés*, and he found them both attractive and good. In those *sirventés* he displayed many lovely stories and attractive exempla for whoever could understand them well, because he often criticised the folly of this world and admonished false clergymen most strongly – as his *sirventés* show. He visited the courts of kings and noble barons, and took with him his *joglar*, who sang his *sirventés* for him. He was honoured and thanked by my lord the good king James of Aragon, and by honourable barons. And I, the scribe Miquel de la Tor, let it be known about *En* Peire Cardenal that when he left this life, he was nearly one hundred years old. And I, the aforementioned Miquel, have written down these *sirventés* and these sermons in the city of Nîmes.

Vida of Aimeric de Pegulhan

The *vida* of Aimeric de Pegulhan places him in three key regions for Catharism: Toulouse, northern Catalonia and Lombardy. If he was a heretic, then it did him no harm: some fifty poems of his survive, and they show that he enjoyed patronage in the kingdom of Castile as well as from Frederick II Hohenstaufen.

Vida

En Aimeric de Pegulhan was from Toulouse, the son of a merchant townsman who sold cloth. He learned *cansos* and *sirventés* but he sang very badly. He fell in love with a townswoman who was his neighbour. This love taught him how to compose poetry, and he made many good *cansos* about her. Her husband quarrelled with him and acted in a dishonourable way towards him. Aimeric took revenge by killing him by a sword-thrust to the head. He went to Catalonia and *En* Guillem de Berguedan welcomed him [into his court], and he [William] praised him in his poems, in the first *canso* that he composed. He made him a *joglar* by giving him his palfrey and his clothing. He presented him to King Alfonso of Castile, who gave him more horse equipment and honour. He stayed in those regions a long time, then he went to Lombardy, where all the good men [*bon ome*] honoured him, and he died in Lombardy.

(One manuscript adds: '\ . . and he died in Lombardy in a state of heresy, so it is reported'.)

Vida of Perdigon

There are two versions of the life of Perdigon. His name is unusual; it may be a stage name, in keeping with his lowly birth. One is a short account of a career that suddenly collapsed. The other describes him as a propagandist for the crusade. This is the version given here. There is no evidence in his poems that Perdigon enjoyed the patronage of either Simon of Montfort or of William of Baux, but as both men died in the summer of 1218, he may well have fallen on hard times that year. The *vida* says that the disgraced Perdigon entered a Cistercian monastery called 'Silvabela' under the patronage of Lambert of Monteil (who was not the son-in-law of William of Baux). It was possibly the Baux family's foundation at Silvacane, at La Roque-d'Anthéron, near Aix-en-Provence.

Vida

Perdigon was a *joglar* who could play the fiddle and compose poetry very well. He came from the diocese of Gévaudan, from a little town called Lespéron. He was the son of a poor man who was a fisherman. Thanks to his intelligence and his poetry, he rose to high wealth and honour, because Dalfin of Auvergne employed him as one of his knights,³ and for a long time provided him with clothing and weapons, and gave him lands and revenues. All the princes and the barons honoured him, and he enjoyed good fortune for a long time.

While he was held in honour and worth, he set off for Rome with the Prince of Orange, William of Baux, Folquet de Marseille, the bishop of Toulouse, and the abbot of Cîteaux, all of them wanting to do harm to the Count of Toulouse, and to organise the crusade.⁴ This is why good Count Raymond of Toulouse was disinherited, and why his nephew, the Count of Béziers, was killed, [why] the Toulousain, the Quercy and the Biterrois were devastated, and why King Peter of Aragon was killed with a thousand knights at Muret, and why another 20,000 men were killed.

Perdigon carried out and arranged all these actions, and he preached about them in song, so people would take the cross. He praised God because the French had defeated and killed the king of Aragon (who had once clothed him). This is why he fell down from Worth, Honour and Wealth. All the worthy men who were still alive held him in contempt, because they did not wish to see or hear him.

All the barons who had shown him friendship were killed in the war: the Count of Montfort, William of Baux, and all the others who brought about

the crusade; and Count Raymond took back his lands. Perdigon did not dare travel. Dalfin of Auvergne had taken back the lands and revenues he had granted him. He went to see Lambert of Monteil,⁵ the son-in-law of William of Baux, and begged him to put him in a monastery of the Cistercian Order called *Silvabela*. He [Lambert] had him received into the monastery as a monk. That is where he died.

Notes

- 1 Uc de Lescura, 'De motz,' M. de Riquer, *Los trovadores: Historia literaria y textos*, 3 vols (Barcelona: Editorial Ariel, 1983), II, pp. 925–30.
- 2 Peire Cardenal, 'De paraulas es grans mercatz', *Poésies complètes du troubadour Peire Cardenal (1180–1278)*, edited by René Lavaud (Toulouse: Privat, 1957), no. 48, ll. 1–4.
- 3 Robert IV, 'Dalfin' of Auvergne (1150–1234) was a prominent patron.
- 4 This must refer to the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215.
- 5 Also identified as Lambert of Montélimard.

Part 2.1

POLITICAL POEMS



Some troubadours appear to have specialised in political and moralising poetry. The *sirventés* usually uses an existing melody and metrical scheme, often taken from a love poem (*canso*). The poet signals that there is no time to waste on composing music, because there is a pressing need for a public message. The term was thought to derive from *sirvens*, a servant, mercenary, or slave: these poems ‘serve’ both an older metre and melody as well as a political, religious or moralising agenda. Like the *canso*, the *sirventés* is commonly made up of between six and eight stanzas (*coblas*). It ends with at least one *tornada*, a short dedication, and it is often entrusted to a *joglar* who is asked to perform the song to that named addressee. This name is sometimes concealed by a nickname (known as a *senhal*). The *senhal* enabled the troubadour to recycle songs and it ostensibly protected the identity of his ladies, such as *Bels Papagais* (see 2.1.1). It also designated male patrons, such as the *senhal Audiart* (2.1.5).

Senhals and an allusive style often make the dates and content of songs obscure, so the introductions to the songs provide interpretations that have been suggested by modern scholars. Some troubadours who supported the counts of Toulouse associated the struggle against the crusaders with the noun *Paratge*. *Paratge* means both ‘noble rank’ and high moral worth; it hardly ever appears in poetry before the Albigensian Crusade, so it can identify a song that is connected with the conflict.

1209–15: *The First Campaigns*

2.1.1 Guilhem Augier Novella, ‘Quascus plor e planh son damnatge’ (M. de Riquer, *Los trovadores*, vol. 2, pp. 1178–80)

Guilhem Augier Novella’s career is virtually unknown, but his nickname ‘novella’ implies that he specialised in narrative poems, or *novas*. This is

a *planh* (a *planctus*, mourning lament) for Raymond Roger Trencavel, viscount of Béziers, Carcassonne and Albi. It may have been composed shortly after the young viscount's mysterious death, and it depicts him as a Christlike figure.

1

Every man weeps and laments over his losses, his misfortune and his griefs, but (alas!), I have such rage and such sorrow in my heart that never, in all the days that are allotted to me, shall I have lamented or wept enough for that brave, valued, noble viscount who is dead, the one from Béziers, the bold and courtly one, the joyful, most skilful, gentle one: the best knight in the world.

2

They have killed him! Never has such a crime or misdeed been witnessed before, nor such a source of estrangement from God and Our Lord, as the one committed by these renegade dogs, those descendants of the false lineage of Pilate.¹ For they have killed him, and since God chose to die in order to save us, so he [the viscount] resembles Him, for he has crossed the same bridge to save his own people.

3

A thousand knights of high lineage and a thousand ladies of great worth shall feel despondent after his death, as shall one thousand *bourgeois* and one thousand serving men, for all of them would have been well provided with wealth and lands, had he lived. Now he is dead! God, what a crime! Look at who you are, and who came with us! Look at those who killed him, at who they are and where they have come from! For now he can no longer welcome us or respond to our words.

4

Ah my lords! How very fearsome it must be for the great and the small when we remember his honoured status as our seigneur, and the honour and the fealty he showed to us, when they have condemned him to death for our sakes. Now he is dead! Ah, God! What a crime that was! Wretches, look at how we are all surrendered to evil! To whom can we turn, and where can we go? Where can we find a safe harbour? It makes my heart melt.

5

Noble knight, noble in lineage, noble through pride, noble through worth, noble in mind, noble through vassal-service, noble through giving and a good serving-man. Noble in your pride, noble in humility, noble in mind and

noble in folly. Handsome and good, accomplished in all good things, there was never any man equal to you. In you, we have lost the fountain from which everyone came away full of joy.

Tornada 1

I pray to that God who made the Trinity, divine in Himself, that He might (without questioning it) place this soul in the Heaven where resides the greatest Joy, and that He might rescue and aid all those who pray to Him for the sake of His goodness.

Tornada 2

Bels Papagais [Beautiful Parrot], Love never affected me more than the distress that has overcome me from my loss of the best lord ever to be born in that place that the sea encloses. They have killed me, those traitors from 'I know not where'.

2.1.2 Gavaudan, 'A la pus longa nuech de l'an' (*Il trovatore* Gavaudan, ed. Saverio Guida (Modena: STEM Mucchi, 1979), 10, pp. 396–416)²

We know nothing about this troubadour, except that his name implies that he was born in the county of Gévaudan. Gavaudan's opening references to the sun allude to the star of sun on the seal of Raymond VI, who used the triple title of count of Toulouse, duke of Narbonne and marquis of Provence. *Cobla 1* marks the winter solstice in late December, when 'the sun stands still' (*solstitium*). The sun was believed to move around the earth over a period of six months. At the solstice, it stood still for a period of up to two days, and then reversed its course. Here the count embodies the enduring but fragile sun. The 'stupid white people' who are inciting violence through their preaching, and who have been paid off by the barons, are the white-clad Cistercian Order. They may be either Bishop Fulk of Toulouse and his White Confraternity, or the papal legate and abbot of Cîteaux Arnold Amalric. The unnamed target of Gavaudan's invective may have sustained a leg injury (*cobla 3*), possibly while trying to cross a bridge (*coblas 2* and *6*). However, this may also allude to the traditional belief that souls had to cross a narrow bridge to enter the afterlife.

1

We have come to the longest night of the year and the shortest day. And the sun is there, (through whom the world shines) for he neither sets nor flees. Since the firmament is at rest and the body of the cosmos turns, it is quite right that the 'limping side' should lower its pride and put it at rest.

2

Now it is not right (there is no deceit in these words), nor should anyone fighting such a noble seigneur ever have imagined that they could obtain a peace of this sort without effort. Over a broken bridge, over a weak plank of wood passes the Rejoicing that is destined to turn into Rage. And as for you, you stupid white people, you would make red a thing that is white!

3

For he does not serve the Duke, Count and Marquis. Rather, he would have him killed and vanquished. All the gold you have given will help you no more than an acorn. The man who encloses or locks his heart will not be deceived. With mendacious preaching he piles up Rage, and it would be better for the man I am speaking about to have broken his hip: it was an unlucky day you ever saw him!

4

Whatever you might say, give you the command it would be best for all of you to be dumb. Knights, remember Roland, for you have been sold with false coin.³ You shall lower yourselves from the highest seat to the bench because of the Count (in whom Price gazes on itself). In front of Pride he barricades himself. So return to your seats!

5

He is a fool who sows his seed in a place where he does not expect any crops to grow – and they imagined that they could pass through with trickery, those men who he has brought over from Martianne!⁴ The whole world is not worth a penny to the man who betrays and takes away the legitimate power of a king, and who makes slaves of those who have been free.

6

I can do no more. I commend myself to God. Those who had come together in the hope of prizes are enquiring into how they have put down Price, for they are now supported as if they were peasants. Believe this: Even if it is getting late, the punishment of those who God hates shall not be forgotten. Over there, like the man who falls from a little bridge, they shall fall into the mud. I do not think that it shall be omitted.

Tornada

May God not save me if I lament over that.

1213: The Battle of Muret

2.1.3 Pons de Capduelh, ‘So c’om plus vol e plus es volontos’
(M. de Riquer, *Los trovadores*, vol. 2, pp. 1267–9)

The *tornada* of this crusade song praises the victory of King Peter II of Aragon over a Muslim army at Las Navas de Tolosa, on 16 July 1212, so the poem is datable to the early summer of 1213. There is documentary evidence for a late twelfth-century nobleman, ‘Pontius de Capitolio’, who was a vassal of the count of Auvergne. His birthplace is now called Saint Julien-Chapteuil. The troubadour’s *vida* alleges that he died on crusade in the Holy Land. The king and the emperor who are at war with each other in *cobla* 3 are the Holy Roman Emperor Otto IV and his elected rival, King Frederick I of Sicily (the future Emperor Frederick II).

1

Whatever a man wants the most and desires the most, and whatever he wishes for the most and holds most dear, he must relinquish it and leave it behind, because we can all see that the time and the season have come when we must serve that Lord that is a loyal absolver of sins, a king of mercy, just and salvatific, for He was made for us, truly, and He accepted Death in order to save us.

2

Now we shall be able to know that He was made for us: for He allowed himself to be crowned with thorns, to be beaten, injured, and to drink bitterness for our sake, and He redeemed us with his precious blood. Alas, poor wretches! How badly do they set about their business, those men who do not go there and who imagine they can take their neighbours’ lands here through falsehood! They shall have to be afraid at the Last Judgement.

3

Whoever shall stay behind shall be neither wise nor worthy, because one man will not be able to put his trust in another. That is why people say that the secular world cannot last much longer, and that the rich barons will stay in place, ashamed, if the secular world lasts at all. The king and the emperor will be in turmoil as long as they stay in place, waging war over silver or over lands, for in that case everything will disappear from their grasp.

4

Regardless of who shall stay behind, I shall set off willingly, because here I cannot gain any reward for the good things that God has given me, nor

can I right the wrongs that I have committed. Which is why I pray to Him, as He is merciful, and I beg mercy of Him, just as the thief did. May His sweet Mother support us, and may Saint John support us too, that we might defeat that false people.

5

Those who know Latin and the scriptures, and know about about Good and Evil do not want to go, for I know some of them who would rather disinherit Christians than felonious Saracens. If you talk about it, they will say you are a sinner. The man who sets himself up as a preacher to others should also preach to himself. But greed takes good sense away from the clergy.

Tornada

King of Aragon, loyal, humble, of good lineage, you serve God humbly with all your heart. May He be with you, and let us all say 'Amen'.

2.1.4 Anonymous, 'Vai Hugonet, ses bistenssa' (M. de Riquer, *Los Trovadores*, III, pp. 1702–4, with translation into Spanish)

Posing as a message to be transmitted by the *joglar* Hugonet, this *sirventés* invites Peter II of Aragon to join the count of Toulouse's campaign against the crusaders. It is dated to the early part of the year 1213. It is no longer attributed to Raimon de Miraval.

1

Hugonet, go without hesitation to the good Aragonese king. Sing him a new *sirventés* and tell him that he is too tolerant, to the point that people think he is doing wrong. They say in these parts that the French have squatted his lands unchallenged for so long that they have as good as conquered them. May he bear this in mind!

2

Tell him that his great merit will be increased threefold if we see him in the Carcassès, defending his land-income like a good king. Should he find defences raised against him, may he give the impression that it upsets him, and let him defeat them in that frame of mind, with fire and blood, and may he attack them so forcefully that the walls shall not protect them.

3

This is how to put an end to the bad tittle-tattle that the French are spreading concerning you, my lord (may God curse them!). As you do not take revenge for this folly of theirs, and because you have behaved so shamefacedly,

I would rather not speak more openly about it. *Paratge* could return, which has disappeared from our midst because an idiot cannot recognise his own path.

4

Helms and hauberks would make me happy; we would see lances with good pennons in the meadows, and all types of coats of arms. Let us find an occasion to meet up with the French one day, to see who can best display their chivalry, and (for this is my point), let us see what damage would be done to them!

Tornada

Worthy Count, noble Marquis: By striking blows and handing out gifts on the battlefield, the damage that was done to me was put right. You have recovered many dwelling-places.

2.1.5 Raimon de Miraval, *razo* and *canço* ‘Bel m’es qu’ieu chant e coindei’ (Boutière and Schutz, *Biographies des troubadours*, 58, E (*razo* to PC 406, 12), and song from *Les Poésies du troubadour Raimon de Miraval*, ed. L. T. Topsfield (Paris: Nizet, 1971), 47, pp. 358–60)

Raimon de Miraval (active around 1180–1216) was a poor knight from the region of Carcassonne who inherited only a quarter of the *castrum* of Miraval. In the 1180s a relative of his had been a leading member of the court of Roger Trencavel, viscount of Béziers. The castle of Miraval may have been taken by the crusaders between 1209 and 1211. If Raimon de Miraval accompanied Raymond VI on his travels around northern Spain after 1215, his name never appears in documents issued for the count of Toulouse. Raimon de Miraval’s *vida* says that he spent his last years in a religious house near Lérida (Lleida) in the kingdom of Aragon, and a document of 1229 does offer some support for that claim.

The *razos* concerning Raimon de Miraval are frivolous and often funny. They depict a conceited heart-throb who repudiated his wife on the grounds that there was not enough room for two poets under the same roof. The wife promptly married her lover, whereupon his noble mistress broke up with Miraval. In one *razo*, one of Miraval’s mistresses humiliates him by spending the night with King Peter II of Aragon. The *razo* concerning Muret echoes the anecdote reported by William of Puylaurens (see Section 4) about an intercepted love letter. Here, Miraval’s song pretends to be a love poem to Eleanor, the wife of Raymond VI of Toulouse and the sister of Peter II of Aragon. As you will

see (2.1.6), the *canço* that Miraval composes here was rewritten a few months after Muret to mark the execution of Count Raymond's brother Baldwin.

Razo

When the Count of Toulouse was dispossessed by the Church and the French, when he had lost Argence and Beaucaire, and the French had taken Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, the Albigeois, the Carcassès, and when Béziers had been destroyed and the viscount of Béziers was dead, and all the good people of these regions were either killed or had fled to Toulouse, Miraval was with the count of Toulouse (with whom he used the *senhal* Audiart). He lived in great sorrow because all the good people of whom he was the lord and master – the ladies and knights – were either dead or landless, and he had lost his wife (as you shall hear), his lady had betrayed and deceived him, and he had lost his castle.

Then it happened that the king of Aragon came to Toulouse to speak to the count and to see his sisters, my lady Eleanor and my lady Sanchia. He comforted his sisters, the count, his godson [the future Raymond VIII], and all the good people of Toulouse, and he promised the count that he would recapture Beaucaire and Carcassonne for him, and that he would restore his castle to Miraval, and that the good people would regain the joy that they had lost.

Out of the joy he felt at the king's promise to the count and to him that he would restore the things they had lost, because summertime had come (for he had decided to compose no more *cansos* until he had regained the castle that he had lost), because he was in love with the count's wife Eleanor, the most beautiful and the best lady in the world, but had not yet made any show of love to her, Sir Miraval composed this song:

Bel m'es qu'ieu chant e coindei,
Pos l'aur'es dousa e.l temps guais,

You will hear it, for it is written below. When he had completed the song, he sent it to the king in Aragon. Because of this the king came with a thousand knights to serve the count of Toulouse, in fulfilment of the promise that he had made to recapture the lands that the count had lost. As a result, the king was killed by the French outside Muret, along with the thousand knights that he had brought with him, for not a single one escaped with his life.

1

It pleases me to sing and to be elegant because the air is soft and the weather is joyous; because I can hear the twittering and the racket through the orchards and hedges of the many little birds amidst the green, the white

and the grey. So the man who would want Love to assist him should consider behaving like a lover.

2

I am not her acknowledged lover but I am paying court to her. Nor do I fear either to suffer or to be burdened; nor do I get resentful or angry, nor do I let Pride worry me. But fearfulness makes me mute, so that I do not dare to show or describe my heart to this lovely beauty. I keep it hidden because I have come to recognise her Worth.

3

Without pleading and without giving gifts, I have gone to great trouble to work out how I could appear to be sincere when I unfold the account of her great valour, for no lady born of woman could hope to measure up to her. I know many ladies who are highly valued, but she has defeated even the best of them.

4

She accepts a man's pleasant courtship, and she likes pastimes and games. She does not approve of a rough man who turns away from such things, or who commits foolish acts. She shows such a pleasant face to those worthy men who have assembled before her that each one sings her praises once he has left her presence – that is more than he would do had he sold himself to her.

5

I do not believe that the beauty of any other woman could be compared to hers, because the flower of the rose bush is no fresher than she. A shapely, well-proportioned body, her mouth and eyes brighten the world. Beauty found nothing that She could do to improve her further, and instead put all Her power into adorning her, leaving nothing for any other lady.

6

Let my lady not complain if I strive to ask for her mercy, because I do not desire to lower myself in her esteem, or to turn towards a baser kind of love. I have always looked for the best, both within and beyond my home. I am not boasting about her, because I have wanted nothing more from her than a pleasant welcome and greeting.

7

Song, go on my behalf to the king who is guided, dressed, and fed by Joy, so that there is nothing blameworthy in him, to the point that I see him just as I would want him to be. As long as he captures Montégut and recaptures

Carcassonne, then he will be the Emperor of Worth, and his shield will be feared by the French over here, and the Muslims over there.

Tornada 1

Lady, you have always had such value for me that I am a singer for your sake. I did not dream of composing a song until I had returned to you the fief of Miraval that I had lost.

Tornada 2

But the king has agreed with me that I shall get it back soon, and that my Audiart shall regain Beaucaire. Then shall ladies and lovers return to the Joy that they have lost.

2.1.6 Peire Cardenal, ‘Razos es qu’ieu m’esbaudei’ (Lavaud, 69)

This *sirventés* borrows the metrical scheme and many of the rhyme words of Raimon de Miraval’s *canço* (see above) to celebrate the death by hanging of Raymond VI’s brother Baldwin in February 1214. Baldwin of Toulouse (who had fought at Muret) is depicted as Cain. William of Puylaurens would later call his execution fratricide (§ XXII). Cardenal associates Baldwin with Martin Algai, who earned himself a seneschalcy in the service of the Plantagenet kings then joined the crusader army, only to change sides in 1211.⁵ Martin Algai was hanged at the *castrum* of Biron by Simon of Montfort in the summer of 1212. The poem echoes the Bible, notably in ascribing a vengeful bow to God (Zechariah 9:14).

1

I have the right to rejoice, to be cheerful and happy, to recite love songs and *lais*, and to unfurl a *sirventés*, because Loyalty has defeated Falsehood and I just heard that a mighty traitor has lost both his power and his strength.

2

God grants, shall grant and has granted (as he is a true God) Justice over the worthy and the vicious, as well as Mercy to all according to their Law. For they all go to be paid, the deceived with the deceiver, like Abel to his brother. For the traitors shall be destroyed, and those who have been betrayed shall be made welcome.

3

I pray to God that He might cast down the traitors, cut their throats and bring them down low, just as He did with the Algaïs, because they are the

worst to trade with. This is well known: A traitor is worse than a thief, and just as you can make a tonsured monk from a novice, so you can make a hanged man from a traitor.

4

I can see among the wolves and ewes that ewes are more numerous, and a thousand partridges are born for every goshawk, trust me! From this we know that a murderous or robbing man does not please God the Father so well, and He does not love that man's offspring as much as He loves the humble people.

5

A nobleman can have plenty of armour, steel-grey and bay horses, towers, walls, and palaces, provided he denies God. Therefore the man has indeed lost his senses who fantasises that he might gain salvation by taking the house of another man, or who hopes that God will give him something because he has taken something else!

Tornada

For God keeps his bow pulled taut, and He shoots where He must, and He strikes the blow that He has to land on each person according to his merit: his vice or his virtue.

1216–20

2.1.7 Peire Cardenal, 'Tals cuida be' (Lavaud, 73)

This is probably an attack on Simon of Montfort for 'illegitimately' taking the titles and lands of Count Raymond VI of Toulouse. Simon paid homage to King Philip II Augustus for the lands in 1216.⁶

1

Someone thinks he has had a son by his wife who had no more to do with it than that man of Toulouse! Because it can happen that a wife who is in a hurry might welcome in an ugly fraudster from whom she might get to keep (nastier than any other wench) a son whom she makes the seigneur's heir. This is why I am sure that Wickedness is settling within someone who I believe to be the son of a prior.

2

The world has turned to such excess that Falsehood sits in the place of Right, and Covetousness grows unstoppable and worsens. Wickedness is in

the place of Worth, Pity finds itself homeless, and Charity is complaining about the secular world. He who does not care about God is praised, and the one who wishes to have His love is disdained.

3

If anyone from here to Turkey, and from over there to beyond Normandy, would want to give everything to a vicious baron, I neither imagine nor believe that he would live on without recriminations. It is very hard for a gift of enormous wealth to appease the desire to conquer still more. Unlucky that such a great barony should fall to him, because it does not exonerate him from being called a robber.

4

Far worthier is a poor *ribaudo*⁷ who lives in peace and endures his needs than a wicked count who piles up his shameful profit day by day, and who is not afraid of dishonour. For the *ribaudo* likes the straight path, and the count is tired of God and of sanctity. Since the lowborn man keeps his perfect Worth and the count does not, I value the better man of the two.

5

And what will these misbegotten barons do, who are doing wrong every day and hardly ever do good? How shall they be able to undo the wrongs that they have done? For their children shall be greater thieves still, and they will value their fathers' souls no more than the price of a single glove. Nor will anyone value theirs. And the deceiver's tricks shall fall back on the deceiver!

Tornada

I have no desire to have a manor that would make me sing today only to weep over it for the rest of time.

2.1.8 Tomier and Palaizi (or Guilhem Rainol d'Apt), 'A tornar m'er enquer al premier us' (I. Frank, 'Tomier et Palaizi, troubadours tarasconnais (1199–1226)', *Romania* 78 (1957), 46–85)

This poem is about the end of the siege of Beaucaire in September 1216, and more specifically about the surrender to the crusaders by a number of the vassals of Raymond VI. It criticises the regent of the kingdom of Aragon for refusing to send an army. The *castrum* of Beaucaire had both strategic and dynastic importance, because it was a key fortress on the river Rhône, and Raymond VII had been born there. It lay on the west bank of the Rhône, and had been a possession of the archbishops of Arles until it was handed to Simon of Montfort in 1215. Raymond the

Younger's entrance into the town of Beaucaire and siege of the garrison took Simon of Montfort by surprise. He rode from France down to Nîmes, and reached Beaucaire on 7 June. The siege-of-a-siege held until 25 September when Simon negotiated a truce that would allow the garrison to leave unharmed.

A list of *dominos ac milites* compiled in 1199 in Tarascon in Provence (Bouches-du-Rhône) includes two noblemen (*dominus*) called Tomierus and Palaizinus. Their birthplace would have made them vassals of the count of Provence. According to their *vida*, the pair were knights (*milites*) who composed poems together.

1

I have to return to my old ways now that I can see a great matter emerging. If my song sounds a bit remote, then that is your fault, not that of my skill, because there is no comfort to be found among people who have been wronged. Yes, I shall sing because it pleases the count for me to do so, and I shall thereby draw some anger out of my decorous manner and send it to Simon of Montfort.

2

If he wishes to come here to collect his earnings, I would not advise him to seek lodgings at Beaucaire, the town he fled on the eve of battle, which means that since then his reputation has not stopped declining. Now Cunning is known to be with him and with the clergy. From now on, whoever withdraws from the fight will have been 'more bewitched than an old wolf', and will show that he does not want a safe haven. And if he should suffer for that, who could I possibly blame?

3

A man who fails once shows every sign of failing more whenever he gets the opportunity to do so. What about you, stuck like a rat in a trap, can you not see the damage you could end up enduring? Barons! Move your hands and those big, strong arms of yours against those arrogant men! Effort has saved many men who would otherwise have been defeated and killed.

4

Now we have moved into the light, so let the man who can show his worth step forward! Let us defend our plains and our marshlands, and let them not fall through our lack of concern. Once the French came back without their weapons we should have known what their intentions were, but God and Justice have changed their destiny, despite those who were working towards an agreement.

5

Peace wants to honour, educate, raise up, and support the aims of everyone, but the Peace that Simon has brought us robs, kills, and takes away high rank. Ah, cowardly barons, those clerics and those Frenchmen have tangled you up in their pretence of Peace. If you grant them what they are demanding, they will turn our town into an orchard.

6

Tell me now, you lazy Catalans, where is that honour you used to have? You will have to live in shame until war cleanses you. Do you see that good king who used to keep you honourable? You are mourning for him inappropriately and not seeking to avenge his death, while the one who killed him is sleeping at your side. Anyone over there who remembers that fact will condemn your behaviour all the more.

Tornada

Men of Aragon, contain your anger until I have said more. I want you to know this: You are so much to blame for the king's failure and death that your wrongdoing makes for an ugly plea in court.

2.1.9 Gui de Cavaillon, 'Senh'en coms, saber volria' (S. Guida, 'L'attività poetica di Gui de Cavaillon durante la crociata albigese', *Cultura neolatina*, 33 (1973), 235–71)

Gui de Cavaillon was a prominent nobleman of Provence in the entourage of the Aragonese count of Provence Alfonso II (d.1209). He was a witness to the wedding of Peter II of Aragon and Marie of Montpellier in 1204. His lands passed into papal hands as part of the county of the Venaissin in 1215. On 27 August 1216, Raymond VI made Gui *viguier* for the Venaissin. He was one of the two men entrusted with Raymond VII's letter to the French king in 1222, and in April 1229 his is the first name on the list of 120 hostages who guaranteed the demolition of the walls of Toulouse, as agreed in the Treaty of Paris. Around 1225, he began to use the title 'viscount of Cavaillon', presumably a gift from the count; by the 1230s he had lost almost all his lands. His career, opinions and poetic style all make him almost identical to the Anonymous Continuator of the *Song of the Albigensian Crusade*, who writes some flattering remarks about him; he was probably closely connected with him.

Coblas esparsas exchanged with the count of Toulouse, possibly Raymond VII:

Gui de Cavaillon:

My lord Sir Count, I would like to know which it is you think is best: for the pope to give you back your lands through his love, or for you to conquer them back through knightly action, with honour, enduring both heat and cold. For I know which option I would take, if it was so noble that mistreatment could be turned into a life of leisure.

Count of Toulouse:

My lord Gui, I would prefer to conquer Price and Worth than any other wealth that would put me into a dishonourable position. I do not say this as an attack on the clergy, nor do I recant out of fear, because I do not want a *castrum* or a tower if I have not conquered it myself – and my honoured helpers would know that the reward shall be theirs.

2.1.10 Gui de Cavaillon, ‘Doas coblas farai’ (Guida, ‘L’attività poetica di Gui de Cavaillon’)

Coblas esparsas. In 1220, Gui de Cavaillon defended the *castrum* of Castelnaudary on behalf of Raymond VII. Bernart Falcon was the count’s *baile* at Avignon, and one of the city’s consuls.

1

I shall make two *coblas* for this tune, which I shall send to En Bertran d’Avignon, and may he know that we are inside Castelnaudary, and that the French are encircling us. I remember well whose liegeman I am, for I often set forth and I spur on my horse for his sake, and I raise up my standard and unfurl my lion, which is why I send it to Bertran d’Avignon. Yes, to En Bertran.

2

I send word to En Bertran, like a besieged man, to make him want to come over to us, for we are outside in the daylight and our horses are armoured and then, in the evening, when we have eaten an early supper, we hold our watch between the walls and the ditch. And there has not yet been a truce with the French, instead many blows have been received and given, and three months have passed in this way by now. He spent his time in sweet leisure there, when he left us without taking his leave, that Bernart Falcon!

Bernart Falcon

1

I shall never believe that En Gui de Cavaillon flourishes his lion among the French for the sake of anything a lady would promise or give him, because

he did so badly at the defeat at Usson, where there were no French or Burgundian troops. Then we heard from En Guillem d'Esparron that he abandoned the place, pissing himself with fear. Gui did badly in that, because I say that they were never in that place, En Gui!

2

By God, En Gui, it is known and proved that the count imprisoned you in Castelnaudary, because he will find your thanks too weak for him to have put you in there with your full consent. I will not believe that you fought as much against the French as you have claimed to me in what you have sent to me here. I place it in the jurisdiction of En Reforzat [Sir Fortified], to decide if indeed you are inside a besieged castle, by God, En Gui!

2.1.11 Raimon Escrivan, 'Senhors, l'autrier vi ses falhida' (Martín de Riquer, *Los trovadores*, II, pp. 1108–11)

A song composed during the siege of Toulouse, possibly around the death of Simon of Montfort, who was killed by a missile while he was at a siege engine on 25 June 1218. It pits the cat, a wooden shelter protected from fire by layers of raw hide against the besieged Toulousains' trebuchet (or a mangonel, in other sources). The cat was used to smash through the *lissas*, wooden stakes that were raised in the areas that lay between ditches and fortifications. It seems here to be combined with a 'mouse', a long pole that screwed into smaller sections of wall. Raimon Escrivan (Raymond the Scribe) is otherwise unknown.

1

My lords! The other day, I undoubtedly saw the Cat (may I never forget that sight!). She was nicely cared for and even better adorned, and she spoke like a distinguished woman and said to the Trebuchet: 'I am strong and you can't damage me. I shall make a gateway in the *lissas* because I want to stay a while in the city.'

2

The Trebuchet said, 'The Devil guide you, miserable, downcast Lady Cat! When I shall have struck you three blows, you shall have no cure from me. For if you get that pole moving in there, we shall know how your heart feels about it, for I shall deal you a mortal blow if you get near to the walls.'

3

With that the Cat set off, for she could no longer hold back, until she had come up to the town, and showed her wizened face. She moved softly,

secretively, little by little, and she took and grabbed things until there was no resistance, until they were inside the old building.

4

When he saw her and recognised her, the Trebuchet said, 'Hard-bitten Cat, I will soon knock you down,' and he hit her on the front of her helm with such a blow that she shook all over. Then he said to her, 'You are foolish, Cat, for starting a fight with me, and I shall make you aware of that soon enough.'

5

That made the Cat's hairs stand on end, for she is big, fat and bulky, and she said that she still had a strong skin, and that she would make it to the *lissa*. She put her paws together and pounced, then she yelled, 'Trebuchet, you are as worthless as a grappling-iron, for my assault brings me right by your side!'

6

That made the Trebuchet's hairs stand on end, for he is fierce and strong, cruel and true, and he said, 'Miserable Lady Cat, you will need that tough skin, because you will not escape!' And he sent her a flaying missile that not even three *ribauts* could have picked up, and he shot it, hot, into her body, and that made everyone happy and glad.

Tornada 1

And the Cat that felt the blow nearly died of grief, and cried out, 'Trebuchet, it was an unlucky day I saw you. I release you. Now let me be.'

Tornada 2

And the Trebuchet replied to her, 'Lady Cat, let it not be so, for you shall have no truce or remission from me. Instead, I shall kill you here.'

1226: The Crusade of King Louis VIII

2.1.12 Peire Cardenal, 'Ben volgra, si dieus o volgues' (Lavaud, 15)

Emperor Frederick II urged Raymond VII in a letter dated 31 March 1225 to recapture those fiefs of the empire that had been taken by the French. Cardenal presents the young Raymond as the 'Light' or sunbeam [*rai*] of the 'World' [*mon*], but royal emissaries were gained submissions from most of his vassals. The audience 'here' corresponds to the counties of Vivarais and Valentinois, which owed allegiance to Raymond's unreliable ally, Adhemar of Poitiers, count of Valentinois. The first *cobla* refers to

the emperor's attempts in 1226 to organise a crusade and to subdue the Lombard League. Raymond VII was viceroy of Arles, but it was invaded by Louis VIII of France in May 1226, and Avignon fell in September after a three-month siege.

1

I wish (provided God wanted it) that we had taken Syria back, that the brave emperor had recaptured Lombardy, and that here, the valiant Count, Duke, and Marquis had regained the Vivarais.

2

May Marseille, Arles and Avignon steer the same course over there. Also, may Carpentras, Cavaillon, Valence, Die, Vienne, Pipet and the Drôme take as their king the best man to be found wearing hose or spurs from here to Turkey, because if he gains nothing from it, he is wasting his time being valiant!

3

Just as it is more useful to be on a ship than in a rowing boat or galley when you are on the open sea, as a lion is preferable to a wild boar, and a gracious gift is nicer than 'Get lost!', so the count worthier than other barons. Because by taking from the liars and giving to the loyal, he is following the path of Value, climbing the peak of Price without falling downhill, and he is masterful in noble deeds.

4

The count of Toulouse is so worthy, so successful and so energetic that he flatters no one in the world with ill intent (whoever you might wish that to be). He is just as I would want him to be: generous, brave, fun-loving, honest, of good company, truthful, upright, loyal and not deceitful, good-looking, and a good talker.

5

In Toulouse there is such a Raymond/Light of the World, the Count (may God be his guide!). Just as water issues from the spring, so chivalry is born from him, because he defends himself and the whole world from the worst men that are to be found. Neither the French nor the clergy can browbeat him, but he bows down before the good people, and he destroys the wicked.

Tornada

And since his Valour attacks all, then up over the world climbs his seigneurial power, renowned as that of the Count-Duke. For his name carries that meaning: *Rai-Mon*.

2.1.13 Tomier and Palaizi, 'De chantar farai una esdemessa'
(I. Frank, 'Tomier et Palaizi')

On 10 June 1226, negotiations broke down between the consuls of the city of Avignon and King Louis VIII. Avignon closed its gates, endured a three-month siege and surrendered bloodlessly on 9 September. Louis had contracted dysentery during the siege and died in November. The song is set shortly before the arrival of the French army (*cobla* 3), and refers to the consuls' failed attempt to buy off the king by giving him Beaucaire (*cobla* 6). They also asked to have their 12-year excommunication lifted by the cardinal-legate Conrad of Urach. Tomier and Palaizi are correct in thinking that the city would get no help from Aragon (*cobla* 4), but they are wrong in hoping that King Henry III of England might come to their rescue (*cobla* 5).

1

I will make an attempt to sing. Time goes by and the promise still stands.
But in our great distress, God will defend us soon. Let us be firm my lords,
and let us count on powerful support.

2

We shall have powerful support (I have faith in God) and we will defeat the
people of France. God is swift to take revenge on an army that does not
fear him. Let us be firm my lords, and let us count on powerful support.

3

One man arrives under cover of crusading who will have to run away without
having lit his campfires. By striking well, one man can easily rout a whole
battalion. Let us be firm my lords, and let us count on powerful support.

4

I have wasted my *sirventés* and my efforts with the Aragonese and the
Catalans. Their king, who is young, has no one to spur him on. Let us be
firm my lords, and let us count on powerful support.

5

And although Frederick, the ruler of Germany, tolerates Louis unpicking
his empire, the king from beyond Brittany will be most upset by it. Let us
be firm my lords, and let us count on powerful support.

6

They have withdrawn their help and support for the Holy Sepulchre, those
who have diverted the crusade, and that is a crime towards faith. Those

lying, absolved oafs shall never see Argence. Let us be firm my lords, and let us count on powerful support.

7

The perfidious bishops are not concerned with the loss of the Holy Sepulchre, where Our Lord was buried after he left the desert. They would rather have Beaucaire. Let us be firm my lords, and let us count on powerful support.

8

As for Avignon, it seems to me that it will never give in. We can all clearly see its noble Prowess and all its deeds growing firmer every day. A curse on anyone that this displeases! Let us be firm my lords, and let us count on powerful support.

1229: Reactions to the Treaty of Paris

2.1.14 Bernart de la Barta, ‘Foilla ni flors, ni chautz temps ni freidura’ (F. Chambers, ‘Three Troubadour Poems with Historical Overtones’, *Speculum*, 54 (1979), 42–54 (pp. 51–4). Re-edited by P. Ricketts, ‘*Foilla ni flors, ni chautz temps ni freidura* de Bernart de la Barta: édition critique et traduction’, *La France latine*, 142 (2006), 141–5.)

1

Neither the leaf nor the flower, neither hot nor cold weather make me sing or affect my desire to do so, but I sing when I hear people say that good must come to the one who foresees for himself (God!) some good fortune, a Duke of Peace, who is a Count and a Marquis, and the Peace of clerics and the French.

2

A peace, as long as it is good, firm and secure; a peace of friendship, attractive to all; a peace made by noble-hearted men, and loyally made; a peace that can be loved without resentment; a good peace pleases me, as long as it lasts. And a forced peace does not please me at all. From a lowborn peace comes more harm than good.

3

In a royal court you should find justice, and merciful and discerning minds in the church, and an honest pardon for mortal failings, according to the

words of Holy Scripture. And the king should observe moderation, for if he does not maintain it, he shall be the worse for it. It would be cause for harm to come his way.

4

Just as a man dies for a mortal crime, so should he become noble who serves a good seigneur a long time with all his strength. For the good master enhances his own man and improves his lot, and the bad seigneur only harms himself. This is why it pleases me enormously when the worthy ones are given support and the wicked ones are harmed.

5

A king should love and honour his own kind, and he should reward the best man with improvement, giving him more landholdings and more honour, and he should protect his court from immoderate behaviour. The king who cares about his good Price must believe in the advice of trustworthy men, of courtly men, of those who are the most honoured and the best informed.

2.1.15 Bernart Sicart de Marvéjols, 'Ab greu cossire' (Riquer, *Los Trovadores*, vol. 3, pp. 1202–6)

Bernart Sicart de Marvéjols was from the Gévaudan. This is his only surviving song. Peter II of Aragon sold the lapsed title of count of Gévaudan to the count of Toulouse in 1204. In 1214, the county was placed under the authority of the bishop of Mende, on the grounds that the lands of Peter of Aragon were the confiscated possessions of a deceased heretic. However, this was contested repeatedly by James I of Aragon and in 1233 the bishop invited the seneschal of Beaucaire to take control on behalf of Louis IX of France. The lord of Anduze (whose family had occasionally claimed the title of count of Toulouse) exclaimed to the bishop in exasperation: 'We are of great blood and it is not good that we are being sold like pigs or sheep.'⁸

1

With great concern, I compose a cutting *sirventés*. God! Who can either express or understand this torment? For when I think about it, I feel great sadness. I cannot describe in writing the rage or the sorrow, because I see the secular world in turmoil, and the law being corrupted, along with the sacrament [or oath] and the faith [or fealty], so each man thinks that he can defeat his equal with malevolence, and sets about killing both other men and himself with neither a reason nor justice.

2

All day long I grow angry and I feel rage; by night, I sigh, both when I am awake and when I am asleep. Wherever I turn, I can hear courtly people crying 'Messire!' to the French. The French are merciful as long as they see high-ranking paraphernalia, for I do not see any other evidence of justice there. Alas, Toulouse, Provence, the Agenais, Béziers and the Carcassès, how I saw you then, and how I see you now!

3

Knighthood, be it of the Hospital or of the Temple, or of any other order, does not please or seem good to me. I find them deceitful and arrogant thanks to simony and great acquisitions. No man will be called to them if he does not have great wealth or good inherited lands. Those men live in abundance and great wellbeing. Trickery and treason are what they confess.

4

Loyal (*francs*) clergy, I have to say good things about you, and if I could, I would say them twice over. You stay on your appealing path and you show it to us, but the one who acts as a good guide will have a good reward for it. I do not see you forsaking anything. You give away as much as you can, you endure great discomfort and you dress without taking care of your appearance. May God be good to us, because I am not telling the truth about you!

5

Just as the fierce man changes his tune when the weather turns bad, so I desire to sing in the front line, because *Paratge* is degenerating, and the noble lineages are falling and growing false, and Wickedness is growing. The vicious barons (those who are deceivers and those who are deceived), put Worth in the rearguard and put Dishonour in front. The low-minded, wicked nobleman receives a bad inheritance.

Tornada

King of Aragon, if it pleases you, I shall be honoured by you.

2.1.16 The view from England: Extracts from William the Cleric of Normandy (Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie, *Le Besant de Dieu*, mit ein Einleitung über den Dichter und seine sämtlichen Werke, ed. E. Martin (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1975))

William 'the cleric of Normandy' was a married clerk who lived in England. His long satirical poem is influenced by a treatise by Lothar

of Segni (Pope Innocent III), *De miseria condicionis humane* ('On the Misery of the Human Condition', c.1196), a work that urged people to meditate on the repulsiveness of the body in order to move beyond worldly ties. William admires 'Father Innocent' but he disapproves of the papacy's failure to control powerful secular rulers who abuse their superior military strength by waging war on weaker neighbours. He views the death of Louis VIII in 1226 as a symptom of a wider malaise affecting all Christendom: 'In the barque of Saint Peter, in which we sail, my lords, there are very worthy men and lots of bastards' (ll. 2373–4). The lines in Extract 2 have often been quoted out of context as evidence that William viewed the Albigensian Crusade as an unjust war. It is clear from the poem as a whole that William's argument is slightly different: Count Raymond had pledged to make amends and it was the duty of the Church to wait and see what he would do. In Extract 3, William imagines what would happen if the Last Judgement took place at this point in history. Would the crusaders be able to justify their actions to God?

Extract 1:

... [A]nd at the time that he [William] composed this poem, Death had cast down Louis, the king of France, who had left his lands in order to seize the territories of others. He imagined that he could chase away the Provençaux and capture and shame the Toulousains. Just as he thought he had grabbed, conquered and secured everything for himself, all his ambitions collapsed. Of France, Normandy and all the great lands that he held (rightly or wrongly), he got only six feet. That is what became of his rule over lands: he got nothing at all, because the soil (I know this well) got him! For he had no strength and he could no longer move his body. In a matter of hours he became a cadaver, and the worms traced their path across his tongue, his loins and his nose, which had been his finest feature. (ll. 159–82)

Extract 2:

If one of her sons has done wrong and wants to right that error, Rome must not (I think) wrongly send her greater son to defeat him. She should instead summon, persuade and admonish him, rather than destroying his kingdom. When the French march on the Toulousains (whom they call *Popelicans*), and the Roman legation leads and guides them to that end, it is not good, in my opinion. There are good and bad people in every land, and that is why God wants people to wait, because He is very pleased when men make amends. If anyone pledges to stay just, I think that others should wait to see what amends he is going to make. Holy Church should not do wrong to the man who wishes to return to her. (ll. 2395–2408)

Extract 3:

What shall He say to these Frenchmen, such valued knights, who often get themselves marked with the cross on their chests against these Albigensians? There are many of these Frenchmen who are nevertheless just as blameworthy as those against whom they are marching. For sure, it does not upset me (nor shall you hear the contrary), when you harm miscreants, drag them out from among the good men, throw them out of the ship into the waves, and drown them in the deep sea. That does not upset me! But before that has been achieved, many good sons shall perish through the fault of the bad sons. You cannot thresh the best wheat from the chaff without hitting and stripping it. It would be better (so it seems to many) if the Council of Rome decided to spend its money elsewhere, and allowed the ryegrass to grow alongside the wheat. For God shall have separated and decided the fate of everyone in an instant. At that moment there will be no reflection, He shall say 'Come!' to His own, and 'Go away!' to the wretched. (ll. 2483–512)

Notes

- 1 The descendants of Pilate should be officers of Rome; the poem insinuates that the crusaders and clergy killed the viscount.
- 2 My thanks to Anne Lawrence for assistance with the comprehension of *cobla* 1.
- 3 In the *Song of Roland*, a *chanson de geste*, Roland offends his stepfather Ganelon. Ganelon joins the Saracen side and allows the rearguard of Charlemagne's army, led by Roland, to be slaughtered. No money changes hands: to 'sell with false coin' is to tell lies.
- 4 This may be the village of Sainte-Martianne (Tarn), near Albi.
- 5 On Martin Algai, see Shirley, *Song of the Cathar Wars*, ll. 2450–6, and Peter of les-Vaux-de-Cernay, §337.
- 6 On accusations of illegitimacy, see Sibly and Sibly, *Guillaume de Puylaurens*, §V, n. 62, referring to PL, vol. 216, cols 754–5.
- 7 A churl, ruffian or mercenary.
- 8 For the lord of Anduze's words, see J. K. Bulman, *The Court Book of Mende and the Secular Lordship of the Bishop: Recollecting the Past in Thirteenth-century Gévaudan* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), p. 36.

Part 2.2

RELIGION



Many *sirventés* in the previous section treat the accusation of heresy as a pretext in a conflict over power, land and wealth, and no troubadour declares support for heresy. It is therefore important to exercise caution when reading violent attacks on the clergy, such as the following by Peire Cardenal:

Neither the buzzard nor the vulture is as swift to sniff out stinking meat as clerics and preachers are in scenting a rich man. They immediately become his bosom friends, and when he is struck down by illness, they get him to make donations, so that his own relatives do not profit from him.

Peire Cardenal also composed a famous meditation on the Cross that might have been read as a crusade song:

Of the four extremities of the Cross, one stretches up towards the firmament, another looks down towards that abyss below; another stretches East, another stretches West. It shows through this that Christ has everything in His power.¹

Attacks on the clergy are not evidence of heresy. An inquisition deposition taken in Toulouse on 25 August 1274 shows that a local man of the merchant class knew Guilhem Figueira's *sirventés* against Rome (see 2.2.6).² He also handed over the book in French entitled *Bible* that the inquisitor was looking for, with the incipit 'On the stinking, horrible world . . .' An inquisitor might well have been alarmed by a 'Bible' that described the world as a stinking pit of corruption, but it was not a dualist tract. The *Bible Guiot* (c.1206) by the Cluniac monk Guiot de Provins is a conventional satire on the world and the clergy. Yet Guiot accuses the pope of homicide: 'When the father kills his children, he commits a great sin. Ah, Rome, Rome! You would still like to kill many men; you would kill us every day . . .' (ll. 660–4). Later, he complains: 'Rome assaults and strangles us, Rome betrays and destroys everything,

Rome is the rod of malice from which the wicked vices emerge. It is a fishpond full of vermin' (ll. 769–75). Anticlerical invective of this sort was only *potentially* heretical; Guiot did not have the same agenda as Figueira (see 2.2.4), but it is interesting to see that a citizen of Toulouse owned copies of both texts.

Anticlerical and anti-monastic actions need to be distinguished. Peter of Les-Vaux-de-Cernay complains that he was shot at while he was advising the army besieging Moissac (§347). His outrage is based on his belief that his white Cistercian robes should have marked him out as a non-combatant, although the siege of Moissac was led by a group of bishops, as well as the abbot of Saint-Pierre-de-Moissac who was keen to gain military control of his fortified monastic building. Later, Peter expresses further outrage when Folquet of Toulouse sent a monk's cowl to the populace of Toulouse, to signify that 'he was a monk as well as a bishop' (§464) and therefore presumably a man of peace. The cowl was torn down in contempt. Such anecdotes draw attention to an important distinction between regular clergy such as monks and those more worldly clerics who could engage in warfare.

2.2.1 Peire Cardenal, 'L'arcivesques de Narbona' (Lavaud, 19)

Arnold Amalric, abbot of Cîteaux, was made archbishop of Narbonne in 1212. The 'wicked character' in *coblas* 1–3 may be either Simon of Montfort (who was notoriously grasping), or the murderous Cistercian who appears in *cobla* 4. *Cobla* 5 alludes to the Old French *chansons de geste* of *Beuve de Haumtone* and *Gui de Nanteuil* (the son of Aye d'Avignon), both of which depict the misadventures of noble heroes (and sometimes their Saracen supporters) at the hands of treacherous northern usurpers and the king of France.³

1

Neither the archbishop of Narbonne nor the King has sufficient good sense to make a worthy man out of a wicked character. They can give him gold and silver, cloth, wine and wheat, but good breeding is something that only God can confer.

2

I know a miserable wretch who has a nice fat rent, who arranges no courtly feasts, and who invites and welcomes nobody into his home. Instead, he conquers his wealth badly, and he spends it even worse, and if you were to give him the town of Bayonne, he would not spend its revenue in the way that Worth would demand.

3

Worth wants men to be hospitable, to spend, and to hand out gifts and presents. She has a companion, Charity, who consents to that. Wherever Worth rides forth, spurred on by Charity, Wickedness is but nothing when she fights with them.

4

There is a man who has a tonsure on his head and who wears white robes whose intentions are as cruel as those of a wolf or a snake, because if anyone robs, betrays, lies, kills, or poisons, the intentions that ripen within him are plain to see.

5

Now they will say that I am expounding my *sirventés* to people as if I spoke Greek, because no one can understand me. Those of understanding shall understand me, and as for the other dishonest people, I will sing to them about the son of Lady Aye and about Bevis of Hampton.

Tornada

As for that great, treacherous know-it-all, I wish someone would summon him who could serve him the same spiced wine that he feeds to others.

2.2.2 Peire Cardenal, 'L'afar del comte Guio' (Lavaud, 18)

This song illustrates the aristocratic habit of plundering monastic houses, and the way that the king of France made use of one such incident to take control of the county of Auvergne. The chronicler Bernard Itier reports: 'This year, Count Guy of Auvergne razed the monastery of Mozac to the ground and took away the body of Saint Austremoine to one of his towns. Because of this, he has endured the prosecution of the king of the Franks.'⁴ Saint Pierre-de-Mozac was a Cluniac abbey in the diocese of Clermont, but it was also a fortress of the counts of Auvergne. As the abbey was under royal protection, King Philip II Augustus of France sent a punitive expedition in the autumn of 1212 led by Guy of Dampierre, seigneur of the neighbouring Bourbonnais. In 1216, Guy of Dampierre was awarded most of the county of Auvergne, and it eventually reverted to the French Crown in 1238.

Here, Peire Cardenal complains that other attacks on monasteries have been ignored. He is concerned about the Benedictine abbey of Saint-Chaffre (Saint Theofred of Orange) at Le Monastier-sur-Gazeilles (Haute-Loire), in the diocese of Le Puy-en-Velay. Like Mozac, the abbey was supposedly founded by Saint Calminius, who was believed to be the

first count of Auvergne. This abbey had a priory in Chamalières-sur-Loire with an attached church dedicated to Saint-Gilles-du-Gard (though the reference here to the pillage of Saint-Gilles might equally refer to the crusaders' attacks on the count of Toulouse). Cardenal avoids naming either the aggressors or the defenders of the two monasteries.

1

That business of Count Guy, the king's war, and the pillage of Mozac: I have heard how it all happened. But I have yet to find out why our senechal, who is so worthy and just, has allowed the monks of Saint-Chaffre to be killed. Now I avoid that place, because Justice finds no shelter there either with the laity or with the clergy, so excited are these people by their lust for gain.

2

Power took the house of Chamalières unjustly and destroyed Le Monastier, which troubles our abbot and the convent too, because a disloyal man is throwing them out of their houses without being able to give a reason. Never, since the death of Saint Theofred, has anyone invaded Le Monastier, nor demolished its walls so grievously. Consider how this might please God!

3

Instead of going in procession they will walk quickly, huddled against one another, bearing weapons both in hot and cold weather, blowing trumpets instead of ringing bells. It is anger that makes me laugh over this, because the royal *knights* should be doing that to stop their martyrdom, and those who do not maintain the rights of the wealthy man shall never protect those of the poor. Justice is never more than wishful thinking when Wealth entangles it.

4

Boots and wide cloaks will be more useful to them than either rough farm implements or the Rule of Saint Benedict. Instead, they will require hauberks and gambesons. Those who used to read the Epistles from their missals shall throw stones as missiles. Where psalters were stored, there shall be clubs and pikes, and the man who has taken the habit should be armed and equipped if he wishes to be a true monk.

5

Soon we shall see a time when the world shall be lawless, when clerks shall go on tournaments and women shall preach, and a man shall have no fish

to fry unless he proves himself disloyal. The treacherous liar shall be lord and master, and when God shall have a friend, he will not know who he can trust. The world will be set out in such a way that forbidden things shall be everywhere.

Tornada

Our clerics used to say that stealing from the houses of others was a mortal sin, and now they have pillaged Saint-Gilles! They say in their sermons that you should love your enemy, but you can learn just by looking that they have quite different intentions.

2.2.3 Peire Cardenal, ‘Un sirventés vuelh far dels auls glotos’ (Lavaud, 37)

1

I want to compose a *sirventés* about the vile gluttons who sell God, who destroy people, and who preach that we should live in sanctity. They conceal their betrayals with a fine appearance: that is why I do not ever want to be someone who hides their vicious deeds. There is Disloyalty in that, because the man who supports the thief is as guilty before God as the thief himself.

2

They are thieves and they reign over us. So we are foolish indeed and we lack judgement, because the man who consents to the actions of a thief is a thief too. So what shall we do if Reason cannot help us? Let us shout about the wickedness that they commit or that they get others to do, so their sins might be recognised, and no one can feel secure if he sees his neighbour or his brother ruined.

3

They are all brothers, but those parts of the possessions of Jesus Christ that they share out are not equal. Ah, True God, who redeemed us with Your blood, look at how Holy Church is venal! For no man can obtain offices or livings without frequent, helpful gifts, unless he is the nephew or son of Your shepherds, or he approves of their disloyal behaviour.

4

They are of criminal deeds and spiritual words, with strong voices and with sorrowful hearts. I think they are the messengers of Antichrist. Beware: all sorts of evil could come from them. But God extracts all-too-lovely fines from these people every day. The higher they have climbed into worldly

honour, the lower they fall into suffering and tears, into the depths of Hell.
And another man collects their income!

5

They seek out rents that they can bequeath to their families, and a lay brother is never such a friend to them that he will not be regarded as a beggar, unless a present he gives them can remind them of his existence.

Tornada

Let those men beware who make crime into justice, because I direct my anger towards them alone.

2.2.4 Peire Cardenal, 'Clergue si fan pastor' (Lavaud, 29)

According to an inquisition deposition concerning the period 1299–1300, a knight of Pamiers called William Saisset recited this *sirventés* to a friend and fellow knight, Bertrand of Taïx, while both of them were standing in the front stalls of the cathedral choir. Guillem was poking fun at his brother, the bishop of Pamiers, who was celebrating mass in front of them. Bertrand of Taïx was notorious for his anticlerical views and he asked William Saisset to teach him the song.⁵ He later taught it to others. The poem thereby becomes one of the few fragments of troubadour poetry to be inserted into an inquisition Register (see also 2.2.6). The poem combines a classroom fable (the hungry wolf Ysengrin disguises himself in sheep's clothing to get close to some sheep) and Scripture: 'Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves,' (Matt. 7:15). A 'False prophet' is the messenger of Antichrist in the Apocalypse (Rev. 13). *Cobla* 5 criticises the papacy for neglecting crusades in the East in favour of waging war on Emperor Frederick II.

1

Clerics make themselves shepherds but they are killers. It all looks very holy to anyone who sees them putting on their vestments, and I find myself remembering that Ysengrin, one day, wanted to get into a sheepfold. Because he was afraid of the dogs, he put on a sheepskin and mocked them with that; then he ate and grabbed everything he liked the look of.

2

Kings and emperors, dukes, counts and *comtors*, and knights along with them, used to rule the world. Now I can see the clerics holding seigneurial control through stealing, betraying and hypocrisy, through force and

through preaching. They think it is unbearable if anyone does not surrender everything [that they own] to them. It shall be so, however late it is getting.

3

The greater they are, the less they are worth; they have more folly, and less true words to say, and more lies to tell. Less friendship; more betrayals; less clerical status. I'll say this about the false clerics: I have never heard of such enemies of God since ancient times.

4

When I am in a refectory, I do not feel honoured, because I can see churls sitting at high table, and they are the first to dip their bread into the broth. Listen to a terrible thing: For they dare to go there and no one pushes them away. But I have never seen some poor beggar churl sitting beside a rich churl. I declare them innocent of that charge before all of you.

5

The *qa'id* (commanders) and Al-Mansour shall have no cause to fear abbots and priors coming to invade or to seize their lands, because it would be too much hard work for them. Instead it is here that they are worrying about making the world their own, and how they could have thrown Sir Frederick out of his shelter. Yet a man attacked him who came to regret it!

Tornada

Clerics! Whoever thought he could see no criminal, iniquitous heart in you, failed in the account he gave, because I never saw a worse people.

2.2.5 Peire Cardenal, 'Ab votz d'angel' (Lavaud, 28, but this translation follows the stanza order and re-edition of S. Vatteroni, 'Le poesie di Peire Cardenal, I', *Studi mediolatini e volgari* 36 (1990), pp. 73–259)

This is an attack on the Order of Preachers, who are called here by the name 'Jacobins', which they acquired in Paris. In 1233, Pope Gregory IX gave the Friars Preacher the task of investigating heresy. They took only one of the three monastic vows, that of obedience. In common with other polemicists of the thirteenth century, Cardenal claims that they disregard the vows of poverty or chastity. The incipit alludes to Saint Paul (I Cor. 13:1): 'If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am only a resounding gong, or a clanging cymbal.'

1

With the voices of angels, an expert tongue that doesn't gabble, with subtle words smoother than English cloth, well combined, well-spoken without repetition, better listened to without coughing than learned, with lamentations and sobbing they show the path of Jesus Christ that everyone should follow, just as He wished to take it for us. They go preaching to us about how we might see God.

2

The first religious Orders were set up by people who didn't want any bother or noise, but after eating, the Jacobins do not stay silent. Instead, they dispute over the wine, establishing which the best is, and they have set up a court to judge cases, and whoever turns them away from that goal is said to be a Waldensian. They want to know the secrets of all men, all the better to make themselves feared.

3

Their poverty is not spiritual: they keep what is theirs and they take what is mine. They prefer soft tunics woven from English wool to the hair shirt, because it is too harsh for them. They do not share their cloth as Saint Martin did, but they want to receive all the alms that used to support the poor.

4

Dressed in light, ample garments, with a woven cape made of camlet in summer and of thick fabric in winter, well shod, with French-style soles when it is very cold, made of Marseilles leather, firmly laced up with a masterful hand (for lacing up badly is a great folly), off they go preaching, with their subtle learning, that we should place our heart and our belongings in God.

5

Let us eat good tripe with them, almond cream so smooth you could drink it, the fatty broth of country hens, or else some fresh verjuice with swiss chard, and the best possible wine, the one that gets Frenchmen drunk the fastest. If it is possible to conquer God by living, dressing, eating and bedding well, then they can truly conquer Him . . .

6

. . . just like those who drink beer, who eat bread made of rye and bran, who find fatty ox broth repugnant, who do not want any seasoning with oil, nor any plump farmed fish, nor gruel, nor fried sauce. This is why I would advise whoever is placing their hope in God to eat their pittance, if he can get some.

7

If I were married I would be very afraid if a man without breeches sat down next to my wife, because they have skirts that are as wide as hers, and a fire can light easily if grease is dropped on it. I'll say nothing to you about the Beguines: one is sterile who can suddenly bear fruit. They work such miracles, that I know: saints can be the heirs of saintly fathers.

2.2.6 Guilhem Figueira, 'Un sirventés farai en est son que m'agensa' (*Guilhem Figueira, ein provenzalischer Troubadour*, ed. Emil Levy (Berlin: Liebrecht, 1880), 2, pp. 35–43)

The other songs of the Toulouse-born Guilhem Figueira show that he was living in Lombardy around 1239. His attack on Rome may well have been intended for an audience either in Provence or Lombardy shortly after the death of Louis VIII in 1226 (see *cobla* 6), certainly after the fall of Damietta ended the Fifth Crusade in 1221 (*cobla* 5). Figuiera's poem parodies the 22-stanza Marian song 'Flors de Paradis', (itself based on the *Ave, maris stella*) which opens every stanza with the word 'Virgin'.⁶ There is no doubt that this poem was viewed as a serious anticlerical work. For a response to Figueira's song, see 2.2.7.

1

I do not wish to hold back from composing a *sirventés* using this melody (which seems suitable to me), nor do I want to prevaricate, and I am sure that I will be badly regarded afterwards because I am making this *sirventés* against those people who are full of deceit, who are from Rome, which is the head of decadence, and the place where all good things fall down.

2

I no longer wonder, Rome, if people are sinning, because you have plunged the secular world into torment and war, and Worth and Mercy are killed and buried at your hands. Deceitful Rome! You are the guide, the tree-top and the root of every form of evil, to the point that the King of England was betrayed by you.

3

Cheating Rome! Greed deceives you because you are shearing too much wool from your ewes. May the Holy Spirit, who took human form, hear my prayer and smash your beak! Rome, there'll be no respite from me because you are lying and malicious with us, just as you are with the Greeks.

4

Rome, you gnaw on the flesh and the bones of weak men, and you lead the blind with you into the ditch; you break the Commandments of God because your cupidity is too vast, for you forgive sins in exchange for coins. Rome, you are loading your back with a heavy burden of evil.

5

Rome, you should know that your bad negotiations and your folly lost us Damietta. You reign badly, Rome. May God strike you down into a fall, because you reign too falsely through money, Rome, you [are] of a bad seed and a bad promise.

6

Rome! Truly, I know for sure that you delivered the army of France into torment through the trick of a false pardon. Far from Paradise – and as for King Louis, Rome, you have killed him because your false preaching lured him away from Paris.

7

Rome! You do not harm the Saracens much, but you send Greeks and Latins to carnage, into the fire of the Pit. Rome, you have made your home in damnation. May God never make me part of that pardon or pilgrimage that you made to Avignon.

8

Rome! You have killed many people without cause, and it does not look good to me, because you are following a twisted path, because, Rome, you are closing the door to salvation. Which is why, in summer and winter, whoever follows in your footsteps has chosen a bad leader, because the Devil takes him into the fires of Hell.

9

Rome! It is so easy to see the bad things that must be said about you, because, in mockery, you make martyrs of Christians. But Rome, in what book do you find the order to kill Christians? May God, (who is the true daily bread) allow me to see the fate that I would like to see befalling the Romans.

10

Rome, it is plain and true that you were too swift in making those treacherous pardons of Toulouse; you have gnawed your hands too much, like a rabid woman. Discordant Rome! But if the courageous count can stay alive for another two years, France will suffer for your lies.

11

Rome! So great is your betrayal of your word that you are throwing God and the saints into oblivion, so badly do you reign. False, criminal Rome! The joy of this world hides within you, wasting away, destroyed, and you are being excessive towards Count Raymond.

12

Rome! May God assist him, and give the count strength and power, for he is shearing and flaying the French; he makes a plank and a bridge of them whenever he confronts them, and that makes me glad. Rome, may God remember your great wrongdoing, and may He snatch the count from you, and from death.

13

Rome! I take comfort in the fact that you will soon reach a bad harbour, provided the skilful emperor manages his fate with skill, and does what he has to do. Rome, I tell you truly that we will see your power fall, Rome, and may the true Saviour let me see this soon.

14

Rome, for the sake of wealth you do many despicable things, many unpleasant things, and you commit many felonies. So much do you want to rule the world that you fear nothing, neither God nor His defences. Instead, I see that you are doing things that are ten times worse than I could ever say.

15

Rome, so tightly do you close your clawed foot that anything held in your grip can escape only with difficulty. If you do not lose [your prey] soon, the world will fall into a bad trap, it will be dead and vanquished, and Worth will be defeated. Rome, that is the *virtú* performed by your pope!

16

Rome, may He who is the light of the world, true life, and true salvation give you a bad destiny. Because you commit so many known crimes that the world cries out, 'Disloyal Rome! Root of all Evil!', you will go into the fires of Hell without fail if you do not change your way of thinking.

17

Rome! You can be reprimanded for the sake of your cardinals, because of the criminal sins that they are said to commit, because they can think of

nothing beside ways of selling on God and His friends, and chastisement is worth nothing to them. Rome, it is most tedious to hear and to understand your preaching.

18

Rome, I am angry because your power is growing, and because great distress confronts us thanks to you. For you are the shelter and the head of trickery, shame and dishonour. Your shepherds are lying traitors, Rome, and anyone who goes near them is a great fool.

19

Rome, the pope is doing bad work when he fights with the emperor over the rights to the crown, when he puts him in the wrong, and forgives those who wage war on him. For such a pardon, based on no argument, Rome, is no good. Indeed, anyone who justifies it shall be left covered in shame.

19

Rome, may the Glorious One who suffered mortal pain on the cross for our sakes send you a bad gift, because you want to carry a full purse every day. Rome of despicable customs, your heart is kept in a treasure chest, so Covetousness leads you to the unending fire.

20

Rome, the bad blood that you keep in your throat produces a sap (from its sweet kernel) that chokes the world to death. That is why the wise man trembles when he recognises the deadly venom and sees where it comes from. Rome, it pours from your heart, and the chests of men are full of it!

21

Rome, it has often been said that your head is getting smaller, which is why you often have it shaved. So I think and believe, Rome, that it might be necessary to remove your brain! For you and Cîteaux both 'wear a bad hat' and you wrought the strangest of slaughters at Béziers.

22

Rome, you set your fishnet with false bait, and you eat many ill-gotten morsels (regardless of who finds it tolerable), for you have lambs with innocent faces who are ravenous wolves within, and crowned serpents who are born of vipers. That is why the Devil protects you as one of His closest advisers.

2.2.7 Gormonda de Montpellier, ‘Greu m’es a durar’ (*Songs of the Women Troubadours*, eds M. Bruckner, L. Shepard and S. White (New York: Garland, 1995), 30, pp. 106–19, with translation into English, and K. Städtler, ‘The *Sirventés* by Gormonda de Monpeslier’ in *The Voice of the Trobairitz: Perspectives on the Women Troubadours*, ed. William D. Paden Jr (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989), pp. 129–55)

The *trobairitz* Na Gormonda of Montpellier responds point by point to the allegations of Guilhem Figueira. The two poems could have been performed as a debate. She refers to the death of Louis VIII in Montpensier (punning on it as ‘the Mountain of the Belly’) (*cobla* 6) and to the defeats in battle of the count of Toulouse and Emperor Frederick II in 1229 (*cobla* 13).

1

I find it hard to bear when I hear such disbelief spoken or sowed, and it neither pleases nor gladdens me, because no one should love someone who dismantles the thing from which all goodness comes and is born, and that is salvation and faith; which is why I shall demonstrate that it grieves me.

2

May no one wonder at my waging war on the false, ill-educated man, who puts all good, courtly deeds beneath his power, prosecutes, and locks them up. He pretends to be brave because he says bad things about Rome, which is the head and guide of all those who have good souls on earth.

3

In Rome all goodness is accomplished, and whoever disagrees has lost his senses because he deceives himself: after his own burial, he will lose his arrogance. May God receive my plea: Let those who use their cruel beaks against the laws of Rome, be they young or old, start to dribble.

4

Rome, I think they are all stupid. I think they are coarse, cross-eyed and blind people who burden their flesh and bones with contemptible deeds that make them fall into the ditch where a stinking, evil fire is laid out for them. So they are not released from carrying the burden of their sins.

5

Rome, now I am displeased that a vile man should be fighting with you. You are at peace with the good men, for everyone is content with you. The folly

of the fools made them lose Damietta. But your intelligence undeniably makes them wretched and unhappy for having turned against you, and for having exercised harsh rule.

6

Rome, I know for certain and I believe with no doubt that you will lure France towards true salvation, yes! Along with others who want to assist you. What Merlin said in his prophecy about good King Louis, that he would die in 'the belly' is now clear.

7

The wicked heretics are worse than Saracens and more deceitful of heart. Anyone who wants to live among them goes into the fire of the abyss, into a fearsome place, into damnation. You brought down the wicked toll demanded by the men of Avignon (I like that, Rome). That was a great mercy.

8

Rome, through your justice you have straightened many twisted things, and opened the door to Salvation, which had a crooked key, for with good government you cast down witless mockery. Anyone who follows your path shall be taken by the angel Michael and preserved from Hell.

9

Rome, someone should read the Book in winter and summer so as not to turn away, and when he sees the scorn that Jesus bore at his martyrdom, he should think about that if he is a good Christian. Anyone who does not worry about the end times and has no concerns about that is silly and empty-headed.

10

Rome, that traitor with his suspect beliefs and his foolish, vile words seems to come from Toulouse, where therefore there must be no shame about open trickery. But the worthy count must set aside all deceitfulness and dubious faith before two years have passed if he is to put right any wrongs.

11

Rome! May the great King who is lord of Righteousness inflict misfortune on the false people of Toulouse who disobey his commandments so outrageously. For everyone conceals it and they are confusing the world. If Count Raymond keeps supporting them, I will not regard him as a good man.

12

Rome, he is defeated and his strength is worthless who grumbles against you, or who builds castles or fortresses, for he will never fortify himself atop a mountain that is high enough for God to forget his pride and his wrongdoing [. . .] from which he will lose all of his skin and die a double death.

13

Rome, it consoles me a great deal that ever since the count and the emperor turned away from you, they have had no success, because their foolish behaviour and their wicked intentions make them fall utterly, according to your will. Even if he is a warrior, his might does him no good.

14

Rome, I hope that your dominion, and that of France, where the wicked path pleases no one, will overturn Pride and Heresy. False, secret heretics who do not respect the proclamations nor believe in the mysteries, so full are they of treachery and of ill intent.

15

Rome, you know that the one who hears their speeches will find it hard to escape, for they set their traps with lying bait so that everyone is snared. They are all deaf and dumb, for it takes away their salvation and that damns every one of them. They have no cape and no cap, and they remain naked.

16

Without fail, they are born hidden yet known, burned and damned by their wicked lives, for they have never done a virtuous deed, nor have we yet heard such a claim be made about them, and if their mortal life were loyal I believe that God would have supported it, but it is not right.

17

Anyone who wishes to be saved should now take the cross in order to defeat and punish the false heresy, for the Heavenly One came here to stretch out His arms entirely for his friends. As He accepted such torture, anyone who does not wish to understand Him or believe in His chastising words is bad.

18

Rome, if you allow those who shame you (along with the Holy Spirit) to hold power, then you will get no honour from those people who are so

witless and low, when they are spoken to about it, that not one of them will confront the truth.

19

Rome, the man who quarrels with you is doing foolish work. I say about the Emperor that if he does not ally himself with you, his crown will come into great dishonour, and rightly so. But through you one can easily find forgiveness by admitting one's sins without anxiety.

20

Rome, may the Glorious One who forgave the Magdalene, and from whom we hope for a good gift, make the rabid fool die who sows such false words, along with his treasure and his wicked heart, and let it be the death of a heretic.

2.2.8 Folquet de Marseille (or Falquet de Romans), 'Vers Dieus, e.l vostre nom e de sancta Maria' (P. Squillacioti, *Le poesie di Folchetto di Marsiglia* (Pisa: Pacini, 1999), p. 442)

This song is sometimes attributed to the troubadour Folquet de Marseille, who became Bishop Fulk of Toulouse (Falquet de Romans was a moralising troubadour of the mid-thirteenth century, so an attribution to him also fits our period). Like a sermon, *cobla* 1 glosses some verses from the Book of Revelation. It is sometimes viewed as a crusade song, but there is a strong sense that it promotes a spiritual or preaching crusade. The Parisian master Robert of Sorbon reports from hearsay that the bishop distanced himself from his worldly past: 'Whenever he heard his songs performed, he would always put himself on a diet of bread and water. One day, while Bishop Fulk was sitting at the table of the king of France, a minstrel began to sing one of his songs. The bishop asked at once for water to be brought to him and until the end of the meal, he consumed only bread and water.'⁷ The Cistercian order seems to have welcomed ageing troubadours and northern French poets: Fulk's fellow Cistercian and lecturer at the new university of Toulouse in 1229, Helinand of Froidmont, had also been a successful secular poet.

1

True God, in Your name and in that of Saint Mary, I shall be awake from now on, because the Morning Star has come into Jerusalem, and shows me that I should say: 'Arise and stand up, my lords who love God!'⁸ For the day has drawn near, and night moves away. May God be praised by us and adored, and let us ask Him to grant us peace for the rest of our lives.

RELIGION

Refrain: *Night goes and day comes, with a clear and serene sky, and the dawn should not delay us because it arrives, beautiful and perfect.*

2

Lord God, you who were born of the Virgin Mary to cure us of death and to restore us to life, to destroy Hell that is ruled by the Devil. You were raised on the cross, crowned with thorns, and watered with bitterness; Lord, this honoured people cry to you for mercy: they ask that your pity might grant them forgiveness for their sins. Amen. God, let it be.

Night goes and day comes . . .

3

If a man does not know how to pray to God then he needs to learn how to do so; and he will hear what I have to say, and will listen, and will understand. God, who is the beginning of all enterprises! I give you thanks and praise [for this] and for the good that you have done me in the past. And I pray, Lord, that you might take great pity on me, and prevent my making mistakes, or wandering from into error, or doing wrong in anything, or being ambushed by the Devil.

Night goes and day comes . . .

4

God, give me knowledge and sense that I might learn about your holy commandments, and I might hear and understand them; and give me your Mercy that you might cure and protect me from this earthly, secular world, that it might not trip me up. Because I adore you and I believe in you, Lord, and I will make an offering to you of myself and of my faith, then so it should be, and so it should stay. That is why I beg for your mercy, and I make amends for my wrongdoing.

Night goes and day comes . . .

5

To that glorious God, who gave His body up for sale in order to save us, I pray that He might extend His Holy Spirit among us, that He might defend us from evil. I pray that He might be one with us, and put us alongside His own, up above, where it would be suitable for Him to place us, and to put us beneath his sheltering tent.

Night goes and day comes . . .

2.2.9 Gavaudan, ‘Crezens, fis, verays et entiers’ (Guida, 3)

This poem is very unusual. It is a mourning song (*planh*) for an unnamed lady, but Gavaudan starts by describing himself as *crezens* (a believer), *fis* (refined), *verays* (true), and *entiers* (whole). A *credens* is the Latin term that was used by inquisitors for the Cathar ‘believer’; *crezens* is a credible Occitan version of that word. Although inquisitors refer to the Cathar *perfectus* and *perfecta* (a noun derived from an adjective meaning ‘the completed person’), the Occitan equivalent *perfech* is very rare indeed before the fifteenth century, and its nearest equivalent for our period is the term *entiers* (‘whole’, ‘complete’). To find *entiers* here is therefore interesting. Gavaudan’s poem seems to say, ‘I have always been a firm believer, refined, true and perfect’. It only reveals in the second line of the song that he is referring to a lady that he has loved. However, the poem is also a powerful description of human grief. Gavaudan wishes to die. Catholic doctrine of the time would have condemned explicit suicidal statements as mortal sin. He hopes that his lady will go directly to heaven to be placed among the virgins. The doctrine of Purgatory was not yet official and it is not uncommon to read Catholic prayers that appear to ignore it. He refers to the Gospel of John. Only one of the two copies that survive of this song refers to the intercession of Jesus for the soul. Is this a unique example of a song in praise of dualist heresy at the moment of its demise?

1

I have always been a believer, refined, true and perfect, my lords, of my lady. And she showed me so much honour that she never denied me her Joy, not a single day. Misadventure (alas!) took her away from me, for it can mock the whole world. False Death, you who separated us, my lady and me! May God save her!

2

It would have been better for me to have died first than to live without joy, in suffering. For I have lost the most beautiful Lady that there was, or ever will be. That is why I feel rage, grief and torment. Death, how could you kill my lady, when the whole world should have enjoyed looking at her beauty and her Joy?

3

Lady, my desire used to give me a taste of Joy for your sake. Now Joy is worth nothing to me, and gives me no help. For Grief puts such a heavy burden on my heart, that when I am standing up, I let myself fall down.

And I can neither wound nor kill myself. Lady, I would rather die with you, with Joy, than be tormented by Grief!

4

My thoughts are so alien. I lament by night and day, I sigh and weep. Wretched, dispossessed of Love. Joyless, sorrowful because I feed on Grief. And it shows on my forehead and my face. Grief makes me turn from young and fair-haired to old and grey! It makes me fall, stand up again, and shudder. It makes me walk like the living dead.

5

Never again shall I appear in public, for I have lost Worth and Valour. Living dishonourably without Joy – May the Lord God not let me live! Each day, I am dwindling and growing more depressed, for I cannot remove Grief from my heart. When I think about Joy in order to cheer myself up, I lose my good sense, and I feel bereft.

6

All other joys are an encumbrance, so full of sadness is my heart. I have lost shame or fear: Drunk I go now, a drunkard. May God now not give me something that would fatten me, nor let me serve Love anymore. I would rather let my heart shrivel with suffering. For all time, I shall be a dove without a partner.

7

Lady, may great Joy, great happiness, put you in the ranks of the highest Heaven, along with the angels that render praises, as Saint John says. For no false slanderers, either dark or grey, will ever be able to say a single thing against you. Nor will I ever know how to describe your good deeds, nor how to recount them.

Tornada 1 (survives only in manuscript R)

May Jesus make you shine in bright Paradise in His service, and crown you among the Virgins.

Tornada 2 (survives only in manuscript C)

For Gavaudan cannot end the lament or the sorrow that make a martyr of him. Nothing can ever console him.

2.2.10 Peire Cardenal, ‘Un sirventés novel vueill comensar’ (Lavaud, 36)

This is a complaint against the division of souls into the damned and the elect at the Last Judgement. His request for fathers and children to be

put in the same place as Saint John may allude to images of the Last Judgement where the Redeemer has the Virgin Mary to his right and Saint John the Baptist, as intercessor to his left, along with the souls of virgins. What Cardenal means is that non-virgins should be put in the place reserved for the virgins.

1

I want to begin a new *sirventés* that I shall perform on the Day of Judgement before the One who formed me from nothing. If He wants to upbraid me for anything, and if He wants to put me into the place of the devils, I shall say to Him: 'Lord, have mercy, let it not be so! For the wicked secular world tormented me throughout my years, so protect me, please, from the tormentors.'

2

I shall make His entire court marvel when they hear my plea, for I contend that He is failing His own if he imagines that He can destroy them or send them to Hell. Because anyone who loses the crop that he could harvest deserves to have famine instead of abundance. For He should be gentle and multiplying in order to keep the dying souls.

3

He should disinherit the devils, then he would have more souls, and more often. Their dispossession would please everyone, and He could forgive Himself, because in my opinion he could destroy every one of them, as we know that He could absolve Himself for that. Good Lord God! Be the disinheritor of the odious, burdensome Enemy!

4

You should never bar Your gate because it is too shameful to Saint Peter, who is its gatekeeper. Have every soul go in smiling that wishes to do so. For no court shall be valid if one man is weeping because of it when another is laughing. Even though you are a sovereign, powerful King, if You do not open that gate to me, You will get a formal complaint.

5

I do not want to despair of You! Instead, I place my good hope in You, that You might assist me at my death. So you should save my soul and my body. I shall offer you a good choice: Either take me back to the place I came from on my first day of life, or forgive me my wrongdoing, because I would never have done any wrong had I not been born.

Tornada 1

I endure Evil down here, and if I had to do so in Hell, it would be wrong and a sin, by my faith. So I can indeed criticise You if for one good deed I end up being repaid with a thousand evils.

Tornada 2

I beg of your mercy, Lady Saint Mary, that you should act as my guarantor before your Son, so that He might take the fathers and the children and put them up there, in the same place as Saint John.

Notes

- 1 Peire Cardenal, 'Tartarassa ni voutor'. Lavaud, no. 74 ; 'Dels quatre caps que a la cros', Lavaud, no. 30.
- 2 *Les Œuvres de Guiot de Provins, poète lyrique et satirique*, ed. J. Orr (Manchester: Presses de l'Université, 1915). E. Siberry, *Criticism of Crusading, 1095–1274* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), p. 8.
- 3 My interpretation. Lavaud's edition changes one line to read 'Bueve d'Antona e lo fil N'Arsen' (and the sons of Lady Arsen), but he is not following the manuscripts. Manuscript *Db* reads 'lo fill naiien' (lo fill N'Aien) in the singular: the son of the epic heroine Aye d'Avignon is Gui de Nanteuil. The two northern French poems are not directly related but both were written around 1200. My grateful thanks to Philip Bennett for his suggestions. *Gui de Nanteuil: chanson de geste*, 2 vols, edited by N. Desgrugillers-Billard (Clermont-Ferrand: Paleo, 2009); *Sir Bevis of Hampton in literary tradition*, edited by J. Fellows and I. Djordjevic (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2008).
- 4 Bernard Itier, *Chronique*, ed. and trans. J.-L. Lemaître (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1998), §133.29.
- 5 *Le Registre d'Inquisition de Jacques Fournier, Evêque de Pamiers (1318–1325)*, ed. J. Duvernoy, 3 vols (Toulouse: Privat, 1965), vol. 3, p. 320.
- 6 Edited by F. J. Oroz Arizcuren in *La lírica religiosa en la literatura provenzal antigua* (Pamplona: Diputación Foral de Navarra – Institución Príncipe de Viana, 1972).
- 7 Schulman, *Where Troubadours were Bishops*, p. 36 n. 124.
- 8 Revelation 22:16–17, 'I, Jesus, have sent my angel to give you this testimony for the churches. I am the Root and the Offspring of David, and the bright Morning Star.'

Section 3

INQUISITORS' REGISTERS



INTRODUCTION



This section translates documents produced within the first two decades of inquisitorial activity in Languedoc, the 1230s and 1240s. Historians are still unsure whether we should refer to inquisitors' work as 'The Inquisition', i.e. an institution, or to 'an inquisition' as a common noun denoting an activity more specific than simply an 'inquest' – in which case we could also refer to 'inquisitions' – or simply to 'inquisition' as a process. In more recent literature there is a tendency to move away from the former conceptually, because the Dominicans involved in *inquisitio hereticae pravitatis* (inquisition of heretical depravity) were not controlled by a centralised body overseeing operations, but had varying degrees of autonomy and operated in quite diverse situations. In its earliest phase, two parallel inquisitorial processes were taking place. One was undertaken by local bishops essentially at the initiative of Count Raymond VII of Toulouse, and the other was staffed by Dominicans chosen for the task by Pope Gregory IX. The former preceded the latter and the friars were to some extent still beholden to bishops by the end of our period. On the other hand, their activity was initiated and policed by the pope and sometimes conflicted with the local initiatives, as noted in our historical introduction. In 1249, moreover, the Dominicans withdrew from inquisition in the Languedoc in favour of the bishops. As such, for the purposes of this book and its emphasis on the development of southern France in a political and military as well as a heretical context, it makes sense to consider inquisition as an evolving activity within two overlapping but ultimately diverging spheres: as 'comital inquisition' and 'Roman inquisition'. Certainly there was no institution as yet that could be called 'The Inquisition'.

The most accessible English-language introduction to medieval inquisition is still that of Bernard Hamilton. Surprisingly, however, there has been no truly systematic study since H. C. Lea's work of 1888, and in spite of the very good recent studies in relation to Catharism referred to in the general introduction, other Anglophone works dealing with the subject of inquisition in a wider medieval context are quite dated also.

The historian has a variety of sources at her disposal for the study of inquisition. William Pelhisson's chronicle for the period 1229–44 is essential for understanding its early operational context and is an insider's

view. Pelhisson, who died in 1268, was an inquisitor himself, probably from 1234. But only one record from the 1230s survives. It is a copy of a letter of penitence given to a key supporter of heretics, Pons Grimoard, seneschal to Count Raymond VII of Toulouse from 1234. It was designed to be carried by him to the pilgrimage centres he was obliged to visit after he abjured heresy and reconciled himself with the Church in 1236. The letter asks that the clergy of those centres acknowledge his sincere penance, perhaps providing him with a counter-letter noting his visit as proof that he had fulfilled his penance for Brother William Arnold, the inquisitor absolving him of sin. The Dominican's meticulous record keeping allowed the letter of 1236 to be consulted in 1244 by the inquisitor Bernard of Caux. This he needed to do because Pons had done anything *but* disassociate himself from heresy. We have the letter because it was copied into Bernard's own Register, along with two depositions made by Pons in that year, admitting his continued and high-profile involvement with Catharism.

In our Preliminary Section we discuss the Doat manuscripts. The earliest version of the registers of sentences described by William Pelhisson survives in Doat 21. It is that of Peter Seilan, inquisitor in the diocese of Cahors in 1241–2. Extracts of his Register are translated here. Doat 21 also contains the record of an inquest into the lords of Niort begun in 1234, sentences passed by brothers William Arnold and Stephen of Saint-Thibéry in the Toulousain and Lauragais in 1235–41, and sentences passed by Brother Ferrer in the Albigeois and at Fanjeaux.

Along with the copy of Pons Grimoard's letter, much of Doat 22 records the inquests of Bernard of Caux at Agen, Cahors and Toulouse. These are collections of depositions, that is, the evidence given rather than merely sentences passed, and as such contain far more detail. Extracts are translated here, along with two collections of depositions made for specific ends; a *processus* against Peter Garcias of Toulouse, and an inquest into the knights of Lanta.

The records of inquests made by Brother Ferrer between 1243 and 1247 are contained in Doats 22, 23 and 24. From March to May 1244, along with inquisitors Brothers Durant and Pons Gary, he interviewed the survivors of Montségur. Doat 23 also contains the evidence he took from one of the best-known *perfectae*, Arnaude of La Mothe. In 1246–7 Bernard of Caux was at Pamiers, and this record is in Doat 24 also.

One of the few inquisitorial sources to survive in its medieval form is Bibliothèque municipale de Toulouse, MS 609. It contains depositions compiled by the staff of Bernard of Caux and John of Saint-Peter in the Lauragais in 1245–6. MS 609 also includes the deposition of Raymond Adhemar, a knight of Lanta, which Jean Duvernoy suggested should be

considered alongside the deposition of Raymond Unaud, lord of Lanta contained in Doat 22, and so these are translated together here.

The Structure and Content of Depositions

Perhaps paradoxically, for such tricky sources, depositions and sentences are remarkably formulaic, even predictable in their structure and content. Depositions generally begin with the date, identification of the witness, and the statement ‘Required to tell the truth about him/herself and others, living and dead, in the matter of heresy and Waldensianism, the witness having sworn, said . . .’ Sometimes this is merely abbreviated by the scribe.

Most depositions contain extensive and detailed lists of who was present at certain events. While the reader may not be as interested in each and every one of these names as the inquisitor was, she may share the inquisitor’s interest in understanding more generally the extent and scope of adherence to heresy within communities and families, and the way in which communities and families, and the relationships between their individual members, emerge from such detail. Inquisitors were also on the look out for evidence of activities such as the heretication of new converts to the heresy (the *consolamentum*), and the ritual adoration of heretics (the *appareillamentum*).

Depositions do not follow *exactly* the same formulae, however. Each set of depositions made in the same court has its own characteristics, revealing what the inquisitor was trying to understand and establish about heresy and its adherents in specific contexts. From the depositions made in the context of the fall of Montségur, for example, we learn what was said and done during the adoration of heretics. The *credens* genuflected three times in front of the perfect, saying ‘Bless me lord(s). Pray to God for my sins so that he makes me a good Christian and brings me to a good end.’ The heretics responded to each person, ‘God blesses you’ and after the last, ‘so that you become a good Christian and to help you to a good end’ (i.e. to die having received the *consolamentum*). This occurred so frequently in the depositions that the inquisitors’ scribe – or perhaps the Doat scribe – simply notes it by stating that the witness ‘said “Bless me”’, adding to the sense that what is being set down conforms to a formula. Elsewhere in Doat 22 we have detailed accounts of the *consolamentum*, such as that in the deposition of Peter Vinol of Balaguier, who is recorded as saying that when the heretics asked a sick man if he wanted to give himself to God and to the Gospels: ‘He replied yes and promised, at the heretics’ request, no longer to eat meat, eggs or cheese nor any fat except for oil and fish, never to swear nor lie nor to dress luxuriously for the rest of his life, and not to abandon the sect of the heretics through fear of fire,

or water, or any form of death. Then the heretics placed their hands and a book on his head and read from it. After this they made several genuflections in front of him, and prayed, and gave him the peace with the book, then they kissed him twice across the mouth.¹ Finally, in terms of editing, individual 'stories' told within the depositions generally begin with *Item*, to mark where a new account begins. This has not been retained here.

Issues Raised by the Sources and their Translation

What we have in the Doat manuscripts is an early modern transcription of manuscripts including those written by and for Dominicans in the thirteenth-century Languedoc made for the French Crown. Those medieval documents, since lost, were written translations into Latin of oral testimony given in Occitan, turned into the third person. This testimony was, in the first place, given under duress, in that the witness faced imprisonment, exile and even death at the stake if considered guilty of heresy or stubborn loyalty to heretics. Furthermore, only the inquisitor, as both prosecutor and judge, knew what evidence might already have been given against the deponent, and who had done this. The combination of these factors – the far removal of the source we have from its origin and the injustice, to a modern way of thinking, of the way that information was elicited – combine to make this set of documents even more problematic to the historian than trial records are anyway. Certainly we should not translate the sources into modern languages in the first person – there was a late twentieth century tendency to do this – because it asserts that what was recorded was a literal translation of testimony, which it certainly was not. But rendering the scribal record in the third person hardly brings us closer to 'knowing' the witnesses. Add to this that some of the most recent historiography of Catharism tends towards a deconstruction of 'the Cathar' as the product of sources such as these, and you have the emergence over the past decade or so of something of a scholarly dispute. This means that there has never been a more exciting time to study sources for medieval heresy!

Note

1 Doat 22, ff. 250–64.

EXTRACTS FROM SUMMARIES
OF CRIMES AND SENTENCES
PASSED BY BROTHER PETER
SEILAN IN THE DIOCESE OF
CAHORS, 1241–2



The diocese of Cahors, corresponding in the main to the medieval county of Quercy, for which the bishop of Cahors owed homage to the count of Toulouse, was important to the Albigensian Crusade because of its strategic positioning, dominating communications between Toulouse and the lands of the dukes of Aquitaine. The dukes were allies of the counts by the late twelfth century. Cahors was also an important financial centre, and references are often made to its coinage in inquisitorial documents. However, while the diocese was part of Languedoc culturally and linguistically, it had been affected far less by heresy. Its southern towns contained heretical communities only from c.1204, and there is no evidence of its presence in the centre and north of the diocese by the outbreak of the crusade. Lords from these areas were prominently involved in the very early stages of the crusade. Bertrand of Gourdon and his kinsman Ratier of Castelnau-Montratier, Bertrand II of Cardaillac, who was the nephew of the bishop of Cahors, and their Aquitanian neighbour Viscount Raymond III of Turenne campaigned against the heretical Agenais. But within a few years all except the lords of Cardaillac defected to the southern side, beginning with their betrayal of Baldwin of Toulouse in 1214. The rebellion involved another kinsman of the Gourdon family, Bernard of Cazenac.

In contrast, the commercial towns of lower Quercy, far more like the Toulousain in their characteristics, resisted the crusade where they could, although they were occupied by its soldiers much of the war. Heresy at Moissac was targeted by inquisitors as early as 1234. One of its most important lords, Fulk of Saint-Paul (a castle on the Tarn) was a

perfectus. From later records we learn that one of Moissac's officials, the bailiff Othon of Berètges, was at this time forbidding people from accepting punishments on the orders of his master Count Raymond VII of Toulouse, reflecting the tensions between the Roman and comital inquisitions. In early 1236 the inquisitors Peter Seilan and William Arnold arrived at Montauban. They secured the confession of Pons Grimoard.

The extracts in this first section are from Peter Seilan's Register of sentences resulting from inquests throughout Quercy from 1241 and 1242, preserved in Doat 21. Brother Seilan came from an important Toulousain family and was prior of the Dominican convent at Limoges, which he founded, until 1233, and then prior of the convent at Toulouse, 1235–7. His Register consists of summaries of deponents' heretical admissions and crimes and their punishments. Most typically these were pilgrimages to central or southern French sites such as Le Puy-en-Velay, Saint-Martial of Limoges, Saint-Léonard of Noblat or Saint-Gilles-du-Gard; Iberian centres such as Saint-James of Compostela and Saint Saviour of Asturias; Saint-Denis, the Capetian royal shrine just north of Paris; or further afield such as Saint Thomas Becket of Canterbury or even Constantinople or Jerusalem. Punishments also often involved support of paupers and the wearing of cloth crosses on clothing. Some people had not come forward in the Period of Grace and faced harsher sentences.

The sources below are only a small selection from the Register's hundreds of sentences. They give us glimpses into the confessional ambivalence that followed the political rebellion, and introduce some of the most important lords in the region, some of whom would aid Toulouse in the war and be affected by the settlement of 1229. In the 1230s some of these lords both took part in an orthodox peace league called the Confederation of Rocamadour, opposed to unlawful violence and heresy, and simultaneously covered up the presence of both Cathars and Waldensians in their towns.

We also learn from the Register that Waldensian adherents were almost as numerous as Cathars in the diocese of Cahors. At Gourdon we see the inquisitor record details that differentiated Cathars from Waldensians. We encounter leading Cathars such as Vigouroux of La Bacone, Cathar bishop of the neighbouring Agenais, and Peter of les Vals, a Waldensian leader. As well as identifying important *perfecti* and Waldensians, Peter Seilan was also interested in aspects of heretical culture such as ritual practice and literacy. We learn also that debates were held between Cathars and Waldensians, and between heretics and Catholics. We find that the leaders of the minor schism of 1226 within the Cathar church had some support in the region. As well as the major

nobles of the county we meet town leaders, such as the lords of Sapiac at Montauban; Joanna and Guillemasse, leaders of *perfectae* in these towns; and the family of Arnaude of La Mothe.

The very first sentence in the record provided the scribe with a template applied to many other deponents.

3.1.1 Gourdon, 1–24 December 1241 (Doat 21, ff. 185v–213v)

Huguette, wife of Raymond Guiraud, was a receiver of heretics, heard their preaching many times and many times adored them, and gave them things belonging to her. She visited them many times where they were lodging, where she heard them preach frequently. At that time she believed them to be good men, and she assisted at her husband's heretication. She will go to Le Puy, Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, Saint-James of Compostela, Saint Saviour of Asturias, Saint-Martial of Limoges, Saint-Léonard, Saint-Denis and Saint Thomas at Canterbury. And she shall wear two crosses, which are one palm's length long and two fingers wide, on her front for one year, and shall support a pauper for as long as she shall live.

Stephen Galtier was a receiver of heretics, accompanied them, and many times heard their preaching (so many times that he can't remember how many), adored them often, ate with them often also, and gave them things belonging to him. He believed that they were good men. He shall stay at Constantinople and wear crosses the length of a palm on his shoulders. He shall undertake this journey within a year from the first Sunday of Advent.

Stephen Palmier heard the preaching of heretics many times and in many places, and he adored them many times and accompanied them on journeys. (He is punished) as Huguette, except for the pauper.

Adelaide of Laquière had heretics in her home for a long while, at different times, and often heard their preaching, gave them goods, adored them often and regularly went to where they were staying. As Huguette.

Bertrand, knight of Gourdon, saw heretics in his castle and in his actual house. He spoke with them knowing them to be heretics, and he listened to their blasphemies. One day he saw Vigouroux of La Bacone and spoke with him, and let him go. And he said that on one occasion Vigouroux had with him Bartholemew of Carcassonne. But he hadn't heard it said then that he was a heretic. He knew it later, after he had left.

William Ichier once saw the Waldensian Peter of les Vals. He will go to Le Puy.

Raymond Arpe was the host and guide of many heretics over a long period. He heard their preaching and believed them to be good men and that he could be saved through them. He was captured on account of

heresy, and not in the period of grace. He will remain in Constantinople for eight years, and wear a cross and undertake the journey as the others.

William 'the pilgrim' ate with heretics and accepted [blessed] bread and the [Kiss of] Peace from them, spent part of a night in their house, heard their preaching often and in many homes, gave them things of his including two tunics, and adored them often. He will stay in Constantinople for three years and support a priest for as long as he lives. He will wear a cross and make the journey as the others.

Peter 'the pilgrim' adored heretics so many times that he doesn't know how many. And he heard them preach many times, was present at two *appareillementa*, gave them things of his, and accompanied them. He received them in his cow shed and also in his house at Gourdon.

William Bonald said that he believed that heretics were good men and heard them preach many times, and he often read their Gospel *in romano* (i.e. in the vernacular), adored them often . . . and often took other people to them. He ate and drank with heretics, received small presents from them, acquired grain from them, exchanged the Kiss of Peace, was there at *appareillementa* and a heretication, and gave them two loaves. He perjured himself before Brother Bernard of Caux when required under oath to declare whether he had seen heretics. He carried letters to heretics. He twice went to Waldensians and heard their preaching and gave them things of his. He will remain in Constantinople for three years.

Bernard of Lator heard the preaching of heretics many times and in many places. He adored them sometimes and ate with them. He brought a sick woman to the Roques family house for heretication and attended there. He accompanied heretical women for two days or more. He went to heretics in often and in different places.

Bertrand of Lascroa heard the preaching of heretics often and in many places. On Christmas night he called upon heretics and assisted at the heretication of Ralph of Goulème 'the scabby' and that of William Moulinier (who had left the heretics one hundred shillings, which he himself received and gave to En Roques to give to those heretics). He also gave grain to heretics. He still believed that they were good men then. He adored heretics many times and ate with them, and saw Waldensians too and at some time listened to their words. He will stay at Constantinople for three years and support a priest as long as he lives. He will wear a cross and make the journey as the others.

Petronilla, widow of (Ralph) of Goulème, saw heretics many times and heard their preaching.

Peter of Las Oleiras saw heretics many times and in various places. He was present at a heretication. He accompanied heretics that Easter Day¹ and elsewhere. He adored them and listened to their preaching often, often ate with them and gave them things, believed that the heretics were good

men and that if one died in their hands he would be saved, and held money for them. And he led Peter of Les Vals, the Waldensian, and gave him four loaves. He is banished and must remain in Constantinople, taking the cross and leaving with the others.

Guiraudel del Rieu left her husband and had herself made a heretical *perfecta*,² and remained with the heretics for half a year. She will wear two crosses and go to Le Puy, Saint-Gilles-du-Gard and Saint-James of Compostela.

[En] Roques saw heretics many times and in different places and was a receiver and host of heretics for a long time. He believed in them from when he first encountered them. He attended to what they needed. He adored them many times and ate bread blessed by them. Believers in the heretics often assembled at his house to hear their preaching and to adore them, with himself at hand. He ate with them. He was present at three heretications, of which one took place in his home, and he assembled the heretics and received the heretics' bequests, and believed them thus to be messengers sent by God. He received them very many times and likewise ate with them, adored them, heard their preaching. He saw so many men and women with heretics that he could not remember them all. He had cried at the departure of the heretics on Easter Day and had accompanied them (in 1229). And he said that if he had died, he would have wanted to die in their hands. He will remain at Constantinople for three years. He will wear a cross and make the journey as the others.

Fortanier of Gourdon³ heard the preaching of heretics many times, and adored them more times than he can recall. He accompanied them and received for this seven shillings of Cahors. He had heretics in the upper castle at Gourdon and gave them flour and silver, receiving from them shirts and an angel.⁴ He said that whenever he saw heretics he adored them, and believed that they were good men.

Raymonde, widow of William of Goulème, heard the whole Passion preached by heretics in her own home. She was a receiver and hostess of heretics, and often adored them and listened to them preach. She attended the heretication of her husband and believed that they were good men. She also saw the Waldensian Peter of les Vals and asked advice from him concerning her maidservant's illness. She also received heretics in her own home after her husband died. She will go to Le Puy, Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, Saint-James of Compostela, Saint Saviour in Asturias, Saint-Martial, Saint-Léonard, Saint-Denis and Saint Thomas, and shall wear a cross like Huguette.

Bernard Bonald saw the Waldensian Peter of les Vals and heard him preach, and believed at that time that no one should swear oaths. In his own home he received the heretic Touzet of Noguès and debated with him. He himself preferred the Waldensian sect. As above [Raymonde] except for the cross.

Bertrand Auriol listened once to Touzet of Noguès preaching about his sect, and many times heard Peter of Les Vals and believed he was a good man.

Petronilla, wife of Raymond Dejean, led the Waldensian Peter of Les Vals to her home and hosted him for eight days and gave him food and drink, and listened to him there. She also had the Waldensian Geralda in her home for three days. She believed that she was a good woman and gave her things of hers. She saw heretics and listened to them preaching, and sent them bread, wine and nuts. As Huguette, except for the cross, and she shall support a pauper for one year.

3.1.2 Montauban and Moissac, 2–9 May 1241 (Doat 21, ff. 229r–306r)

Arnold of Sapiac senior had hosted the heretics Joan of Avignon and her *socia* for almost a year, and received many things from her. Many heretics came many times to his house whilst Joanna was there, and he was present when many believers of heretics came to his house to see the heretics. He listened to the preaching of heretics and saw other heretics twice. He received a tunic from heretics, and he and his wife sent heretics fruit and other things. He adored heretics once in his house. He received bread and fish sent by heretics. He will stay in Constantinople, and wear a cross and go like the others.

Peter Bacou saw Waldensians many times and gave them alms and listened to Waldensian preaching, loved them and believed that they were good men, and often gave them things. He was present at the Waldensians' supper,⁵ and he consumed bread, wine and fish of the heretics and accepted the [Kiss of] Peace from them. He gave Waldensians food in his home. He attended a debate between heretics and Waldensians and gave them twenty pennies. Le Puy, Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, Saint-James of Compostela, Canterbury, and Saint-Denis.

Cahorsin Cabatier consulted Waldensians concerning his illness, who cured him, and he often heard them preach, gave alms to them many times, saw them many times and in many places and often drank with them. He said that he had been in the company of Waldensians twice, and gave them money, bread and wine. And he believed that they were good men. He saw heretics and heard them preach and paid a heretical woman money for a place he was working and living in. He often saw heretics and often spoke with a heretical woman . . . The same (punishment) as the preceding sentence.⁶

Raymond of La Mothe went to see his mother, the heretic, at Lavour, and there saw her and his two heretical sisters,⁷ and spent one night there with them and ate with them. He saw heretics in many places and listened

to their preaching and adored them. He came to them another time to hear them preach and to adore them and receive the Kiss of Peace from them . . . He saw heretics at Toulouse. He gave heretics money and ate and stayed in the house where some heretics lived, and contributed money towards the work of heretics. He believed that they were good men and that one could be saved through them. He will remain in Constantinople for three years, and take the cross and leave like the others.

Izarn Pontonnier and Bernard the boatman transported three heretics in a boat from Moissac as far as Tonneins, but didn't know them to be heretics until La Point,⁸ but knew thereafter. They will go to Le Puy, aint-Gilles-du-Gard and Saint-James of Compostela.

Raymond of Loc carried a heretic in his boat to Villemur, not knowing him to be a heretic, but he knew later when he received the fare. At another time he carried two heretics as far as Montauban. When they got into the boat he didn't know that they were heretics, but he knew later, in the boat. The same thing happened another time, with other heretics who he took to Tonneins. He will go to Le Puy, Saint-Gilles-du-Gard and Saint-James of Compostela.

Raymond Fulk saw heretics in his father's house,⁹ and ate and drank with them and heard them preach . . . He saw heretics in his father's house many times. He will remain at Constantinople for two years, (wearing) a cross and leaving with the others.

3.1.3 Montcuq, Sauveterre, Beaucaire, Montpezat, Almont and Castelnau-Montratier, 10 February–24 March 1242 (Doat 21, ff. 213v–229r, 306r–312v)

François the priest assisted at a debate between heretics and Waldensians. He led Vigouroux and his heretical *socius* from the manse of La Costa to the manse at Prinhac, and sent to them bread, wine, fruit and a new cooking pot on the instructions of Guillemassa, and he gave food of his own to the same heretics at that manse. He saw heretics in the home of Bernard of Cazelles. He received a certain book from Vigouroux and a sum of money which he took to William of Baussa on the heretic's instruction. He greeted Vigouroux on behalf of a certain lady. He sent a blanket and two linen sheets¹⁰ to the said heretics at the manse at Prinhac. He greeted the heretic for someone whom the heretic had earlier greeted. He saw heretics everywhere and gave them food. He saw Waldensians preaching publicly in the *castrum* of Montcuq. He believed the heretics to be good men. He did not come forward in the Period of Grace.

Durand Vairet received heretics in his house and they were there for one night, and ate and drank and slept there. He lent them four shillings. He saw heretics in other places, and certainly at Martel, and gave them

eight pennies. At Laure, he spent two days in the house of Bartholemew of Carcassonne, and there was a big meal for lots of heretics, about seventy he thinks, and he ate with them. He listened to their preaching and adored them; someone hired¹¹ him on their behalf. He saw heretics in other places and ate with them, accompanied them . . . kissed them . . . greeted them . . . sat down with them . . . and sent them strawberries. He attended someone's heretication. He sought advice about freeing some heretics. He will remain in Constantinople for three years, and depart with the others.

William Barrère, on someone's order, led heretics from Montolieu as far as Toulouse, and made the arrangements for them *en route* just as afterwards in the house where they stayed for two or three days. He adored them often on that journey, and ate, drank and slept, and ate bread blessed by them . . . He received a book of the heretics sent to him by someone, and that was after he had been reconciled in common with Toulouse and the general interdict [was lifted]¹², because he was still involved with the heretics. And after his reconciliation he saw heretics in other places, heard their preaching and adored them. He says that he was uncertain at times about which was better, the Roman faith or that of the heretics, but that he never stopped believing in the Roman faith. (Punishment as Durand Vairet.)

Martha, wife of En Gorses . . . was hereticated during her illness and bequeathed to her aunt Huguette her bed, in the event that she died, and gave to the heretics who made her a heretic ten shillings of Cahors, and five shillings to another heretical woman. She took an eel pie to heretics on behalf of Domergua of Cabanoles, ate and drank with heretics, received male and female heretics in her home, and gave heretics half a measure of flour. She gave her aunt Huguette, the heretic, a well-made cloak, and ate bread blessed by the heretics, and believed them to be good people. She will wear a cross as long as she lives and go to Le Puy, Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, Saint-James of Compostela, Saint-Denis and Canterbury.

Peter of Bruelh said that he saw and spoke with heretics. He saw other heretics on the road to Belfort and could have arrested them, but did not, and let them go. He will go to Le Puy, Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, Santiago and Saint Saviour in Asturias.

Notes

- 1 i.e. the flight of 1229.
- 2 This is unusual in that the Doat registers rarely actually use the noun 'perfect'.
- 3 The son of Bertrand, lord of Gourdon (above).
- 4 'Angelum'. I am grateful to Julia Barrow for the suggestion that this may be a reference to money.

- 5 Waldensians celebrated the Last Supper.
- 6 Which was visiting Le Puy, Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, Saint-James of Compostela and Canterbury.
- 7 i.e. Arnaude and Petronilla of La Mothe.
- 8 Where the rivers Tarn and Garonne meet.
- 9 His father was Fulk of Saint-Paul.
- 10 Duvernoy corrects the scribe's 'luttheamina' with *linteramina*: Duvernoy, *L'inquisition*, p. 102.
- 11 Duvernoy suggests 'employment' for 'conduxit' here: Duvernoy, *L'inquisition*, p. 103 n. 195.
- 12 i.e. in 1229.

EXTRACTS FROM
DEPOSITIONS OF WITNESSES
FROM CASTELSARRASIN
INTERROGATED BY BERNARD
OF CAUX, 1243–5



Brother Bernard of Caux was a native of Languedoc, specifically of the Agenais. He was buried in the Dominican convent at Agen in 1252. When the body had to be moved to make way for building work in 1281, it was found by brothers of the Order not to have decayed. Below are extracts from his inquests concerning the town of Castelsarrasin and other towns in the Toulousain. Assisting him was brother John of Saint-Peter. The evidence was taken at Agen and Cahors from 30 November 1243 to 17 March 1245 and is preserved in Doat 22. Included amongst this evidence is Pons Grimoard's letter of absolution, dated 29 March 1236. In the manuscript it is inserted between the two depositions, relating as it does to material at the end of the first.

One of the concerns of the inquistors was to gain information about the murder of William Arnold and Stephen of Saint-Thibéry at Avignonet in 1242. The finger was pointed at Raymond of Alfaro, governor of Avignonet, son of Hugh of Alfaro, Raymond VII's seneschal for the Agenais and a veteran of the war. We should read the evidence taken from 1242 onwards alongside the activity of royal commissioners following the murders. The later depositions also need to be understood in the context of the siege and fall of Montségur and the extreme vulnerability of Cathars and their supporters at that time.

The earliest recollections of heresy at Castelsarrasin were dated to *c.*1204 by witnesses. The war had toughened the resolve of the town. Its officials openly defended heretics and defied the crusaders. Cathars continued to be protected in the town even during its occupation by a French garrison, from 1212, until it was taken back by the southerners

in 1228 under the leadership of Bernard of Cazenac, who is also recalled by Pons Grimoard as being in the town in c.1226. The Cathar bishop Vigouroux of La Bacone was a frequent visitor during the crusade, and Bernard of La Mothe, Cathar deacon of Villemur was also from a family of Montauban. We also have evidence for the settlement at Corbarieu, just south of Montauban, where many *consolamenta* took place. Cathars did not associate places with holiness in the way that Catholics did. Corbarieu was perhaps simply convenient, but we do know that there was a Catholic church there, and so it was not entirely discreet.

Pons Grimoard, the seneschal for Quercy, and his wife Na Arnaude were the most high-profile citizens of Castelsarrasin. Pons seems a surprising choice as an official of the count's choosing because his family, natives of the town, were immersed in heresy. Pons' dead father Vital and uncle Raymond had lived as *perfecti* since their *consolamenta* at Corbarieu in 1213, and a third brother, also Raymond, was consoled on his death bed. Peter and Raymond Bernard Grimoard were adherents until at least 1218. Several families with which they associated and inter-married also contained *credentes* and *perfecti*.

Pons was one of the first people to be tried by inquisitors, presumably because he had such a high profile. He admitted having associated with heretics and was absolved and given a penance to perform by Brother William Arnold. The letter he was given to take on his pilgrimages with him vaguely outlines the nature of his association with heretics and is in essence a letter of safe conduct. We hear at the end of the second deposition that he had been to Santiago at least.

Other important families included the Faure of Pech-Hermier, of which William gave a substantial deposition in his own right and is often noted in other people's as a particularly fervent *credens*. Some witnesses seem to go out of their way to implicate him. The Berètges were a relatively minor family of Castelsarrasin until Othon of Berètges became Raymond VII's bailiff for Moissac, where the seigneurial family were important *credentes* and where Othon undermined the inquisitors at his master's behest. They were linked by marriage as well as through official structures to the family of Pons Grimoard, because Na Berètges had been married to Peter Grimoard.

John Vital was the son of Vital Ortola, the Doat scribe tells us. His deposition informs us about how the murders at Avignonet were received. The scribe records that John stated that William Audebert crowed about the massacre, '...cogot es escogotatz e pesseiatz' and '...cocula carta es trencada'.¹ We also encounter through John Vital how anticlericalism could be expressed and learn of a belief held about divine order.

In accounts of the lords of Tauriac, Rabastens, Lautrec and Villemur we get a fascinating glimpse of the cultural life of the nobility, of the later stages of the crusade and how it had changed life for the heretics, of the way Cathar teachings were communicated, and of the power of literacy and the reverence with which literate people were regarded. The inquisitors also sought information about nobles including Pelfort of Rabastans, whose mother and two sisters were *perfectae*, and who was married to Orbria, daughter of the count of Foix.

3.2.1 Pons Grimoard and Na Arnaude (Doat 22, ff. 33–42)

Letter of Penitential Absolution for Pons, 29 March 1236.

To all the faithful in Christ who would read this letter, Brother Stephen of the Order of Friars Minor² and Brother William Arnold of the Order of Friars Preacher,³ judges established by venerable father John, by the grace of God archbishop of the holy Church of Vienne, legate of the Apostolic See, to undertake inquisition against heretics throughout the diocese of Toulouse, greetings. We wish to notify all of you that, by the authority of the said legate and of other bishops, and likewise with the desire and consent of the noble man Raymond, by grace of God count of Toulouse, inquisition was made at Toulouse and in the diocese of Toulouse such that whoever presented themselves to the inquisitors within the assigned period, telling the full and plain truth about themselves and others, thus being immune from death, imprisonment or any detention, or their goods being seized, Pons Grimoard, bearer of the letter, coming freely and with devotion, and thus seeming moved inwardly by a remorseful heart, states by his own vow that he spoke the full and plain truth about himself and others and admits that he had seen heretics in many places and to have heard their preaching, and to have adored them many times and given them goods, and for all this requests that he should be given a salutary penance. Whereupon, having consulted diligently, seeing his truly repentant intention, we charged him . . . that he support a pauper for as long as he lives, who will be supported both in his own house or elsewhere, and that he give ten shillings of Morlan for the love of God, which he has by now almost paid. We also ordered him that within two years from last Easter he visit Saint-James of Compostela, Blessed Mary of Rocamadour, Saint-Gilles-du-Gard and Blessed Mary of Le Puy. Accordingly, we commanded that Pons be absolved and we lift the excommunication on account of which he was kept bound, with him now being genuinely and faithfully confessed and after having abjured all heretical depravity, so we believe, and with great devotion promising to carry out the said penance, and entreat your charity, in the Lord, so long as the said Pons is faithful and

WITNESSES FROM CASTELSARRASIN

Catholic, to protect him and his belongings well and have him protected likewise by others.

Given at Castelsarrasin, 29 March 1236.

Pons' First Deposition, 22 January 1244.

On 22 January in the year of the lord 1244, Pons Grimoard of Castelsarrasin, having sworn to give true testimony about himself and others in the matter of heresy, said that about forty years previously he saw the heretic Peter Baudoi and his companion in the house of his uncle Raymond Grimoard, at Castelsarrasin. He didn't recall the circumstances. At around the same time, he also saw heretics at Villemur, in the house where they lived. Also, again in the house of Raymond Grimoard at Castelsarrasin, he saw the heretics Raymond Amalric and his *socius*, and with them he saw the brothers Hugh and John of Cavalsaut, Raymond and Bertrand Faure, who were the brothers of William [Faure] of Pech-Hermier, the brothers Bernard and Peter Audebert, Raymond Grimoard himself, Arnold Faure, Arnold Pagan and Bertrande of Cavelsaut who was wife of Hugh of Cavelsaut, Na Proba, who was the wife of John of Cavelsaut, Vital Grimoard, who was the witness' brother, William of Castillon who was the father of Arnold Grimoard, and Raymond of Bressols, who was the uncle of Amalric of Bressols. The witness and all of the above listened to the preaching of the heretics, and he adored many of the heretics there and genuflected before them, saying 'Bless me', as did all of the others, and not just once but on several different occasions, except for the women. This was about forty years ago also. Also, he believes that he saw the heretics Raymond Amalric and Arnold Arrufat in John of Cavalsaut's house, where he adored⁴ the heretics. That was around the same time. Moreover, he saw them another time in the same house, and he thinks that he adored them.

He saw heretics, whose names he cannot remember, in the house of Arnold Faure, the brother of William Faure of Pech-Hermier. And he saw there with the heretics John of Toulouse. And in the same house he saw heretics two or three times, and adored them each time. That was about thirty years ago.

Also, he saw the heretics Bernard of La Mothe and his *socius* in the home of William Faure of Pech-Hermier . . . He also saw there Amalric of Bressols and Raymond William Berètges, and William Faure himself, and Bernard of Cazenac and Hugh of Cavelsaut. And the witness heard much preaching by these heretics and adored them many times. But the others didn't adore them, as far as he can recollect. That was eighteen years ago, or thereabouts.

In the home of Stephen Sans, he saw the heretics Guiraud of Gourdon⁵ and his *socius*. He saw Raymond William of Berètges there, Stephen Sans

himself and his wife Raymonde, and Stephen's cousin Amalric of Bressols. All of them including the witness adored the said heretics. That was around thirty years ago.

He saw heretics whose names he can't remember in the house of William of Saint-Vim, and there also were Raymond William of Berètges, Na Proba of Cavelsaut, Bertrande of Cavelsaut, the sisters Causida and Esclarmonde of l'Avelle, Bernard Audebert, William of Saint-Vim himself, and Arnold Mazelier. All of those present including himself listened to the said heretics preach, and this was thirty years ago.

He saw William Raymond, physician of the heretics, staying in Arnold Pagan's house. He saw Stephen Mazelier leading the heretics Pons Guilabert and his *socius*. He saw them in the courtyard at the front of his own house, and spoke with them there. That was about twenty years ago. He also saw Raymond of La Serre with heretics in William Faure's house. He ate with heretics, once at the home of Raymond Grimoard, and on another occasion at the home of John of Cavelsaut. He couldn't remember whether he had eaten with any heretics in the home of William Faure of Pech-Hermier, but he did send some money for a meal being prepared for heretics to his house, and he believes that Bernard of La Mothe and his *socius* ate there. That was twenty years ago, or thereabouts. When asked again if he had eaten with heretics there, he said he couldn't recall. In fact he said that he had often sent money to heretics via Rainaud Rauc and William Faure. He thinks he sent thirty shillings of Cahors, altogether.

At Moissac, in the home of Fulk of Saint-Paul, he once saw the heretics Vigouroux of La Bacone and his *socius*, and with them there were William Pelicier, the witness' own cousin, and also, along with Fulk, were Pons Aiz and Peter Auger. He himself adored the heretics and listened to their preaching. That was about thirty years ago . . .

. . . At Toulouse, he saw the heretics Bernard of La Mothe and his *socius* at Alaman of Rouaix's house. With them were Amalric of Bressols, Raymond William of Berètges, and William of Pech-Hermier. The witness and everyone else present listened to those heretics preaching there and adored them. That was about eighteen years ago. And in the home of Macip of Toulouse he saw the heretic William Solier. But no one in the house knew the heretic, as far as he could tell, except himself. Whilst the witness and everyone were eating, the heretic whispered to him.

Whilst he was seneschal to the lord count of Toulouse for the diocese of Cahors, he saw the heretics William of Caussade and his *socius* at Loseler,⁶ in the home of Peter of Belfort. When he was asleep in bed, Peter woke him up and showed him William of Caussade, who was in a tower of the house. He saw there Peter of Belfort and two others whose names he does

not remember. When he asked William of Caussade where he had come from, the heretic said to him that he had been in the tower even before the witness arrived at Peter's house. Asked later whether he had adored the heretic, he said no and neither had he seen anyone else do so. That was about ten years ago.

When asked whether he had accompanied heretics, or had had anyone else lead them, he said he couldn't remember. When asked if he had received heretics in his home or had had anyone else receive them, he said no. When asked whether he praised the heretics' faith, he said that he had done so to Jordan of Berètges, Amalric of Bressols and William Faure of Pech-Hermier.

He said that he went to Corbarieu with his uncle, Raymond Grimoard, when the latter was to be consoled. He himself and William Faure of Pech-Hermier, Bertrand of Saint-André, Hugh and John of Cavelsault and Peter Béraut accompanied Raymond as far as Corbarieu, and they all knew that he was to be consoled there, although the witness did not attend the consolation. That was about thirty years ago.

He said that he listened to errors spoken by heretics: of visible things, that God did not make them; of the sacred host, that it was not the body of Christ; that one could not be saved through marriage; that there was no resurrection of the dead. And he said that he believed these errors. He said that he considered the heretics to be good men and to have a good faith, and that it was forty years since he had first believed in the heretics, but that he finally renounced them eight years or so earlier, when he made his confession concerning heresy to Brother William Arnold, Brother John of Navarre and Master Arnold of Campranha, inquisitors, and had not seen heretics since. He also said that he had helped at neither a *consolamentum* nor the heretics' *appareillementum*.

He said that he had heard it said that Stephen Sans, Hugh of Cavelsaut and Rostahn of Bressols had been consoled, but he hadn't seen it, although he believes it to be true. He heard the same about Arnold Calvière.

Asked later if he had praised the heretics' faith to anyone, he said never. Asked later if he had forbidden anyone from speaking the truth to inquisitors, about himself or others, he said no.

He said that he received a penance from Brothers William and Stephen, and completed it. He also said that when he made his confession to Brother William Arnold and his inquisitor companions,⁷ he told them only and entirely the truth about everything that he remembered.

He abjured heresy and promised to hold to the orders of the Church.

Witnesses: Brothers Pons, prior of the Friars Preacher of Cahors, and Peter Seilan, of that Order, and Bernard of Ladinhac.

Pons' Second Deposition, 25 January 1244.

On 25 January 1244 Pons Grimoard added to his confession, saying that William Raymond the doctor of the heretics mentioned above had the witness in his care during an illness for eight or nine days. The heretic and his *socius* came into a chamber in which the witness lay to visit him. Interrogated as to whether the witness' mother saw the heretics in the house, he said she had not. Asked whether any people had listened to the preaching of the said heretics or adored them in the room where the witness lay, he said they had not. He also said that he got a poultice⁸ from the said doctor of the heretics, and gave the heretics' messenger money. This was about thirty years ago . . .

Questioned further on whether he had kissed heretics, he said yes: Vigouroux of La Bacone, Bernard of La Mothe and Raymond Amalric.

He then said that William of Caussade asked him to have an ass returned to some people that someone in his household had taken from them, so he said 'Raymond William of Berètges has it; ask him for it back.' This he said in Peter of Belfort's house. And he said that he had only seen William of Caussade once in the home of Peter of Belfort, as he said above, where he had slept alone. And he said that Peter of Belfort had not spoken of heretics to him until that time when he showed him William of Caussade, neither had he known then that he was a believer in heretics.

He said that he had never spoken of heretics to his wife, to Peter Grimoard or Stephen Grimoard, his own nephew, nor had he heard them speak about heretics, and nor did he believe that they loved them. But he said that he had seen Vigouroux of La Bacone in Raymond Grimoard's house at Castelsarrasin.

He added that, as it said in the letter of absolution that he had been given by Brother William Arnold and his inquisitorial companion, it had ceased to be the case that he believed as he had in the errors of the heretics about the visible world, marriage and the sacred host, nor did he believe the heretics to be good men and to have a good faith, and with the confession that he made now he recognised that he had believed in the errors of the heretics, but on this point and others he wanted to hold to the orders of the Church . . . (But) asked why he had not said in his other confession that William Raymond the doctor of the heretics had had him in his care as he said above, he replied that he hadn't recalled it. And he recognised that he had done wrong in that, at the time that he had been the seneschal to the count of Toulouse for the diocese of Cahors, after the count had made peace with the Church, he was then bound by his office to seek out heretics and their believers through the nature of the oath he had made . . . (but) saw the heretics William of Caussade and his *socius* in the home of Peter of Belfort and hadn't arrested these heretics, or Peter who was helping

them. And he abjured heresy and swears to hold to the orders of the Church. And he was absolved from excommunication.

Witnesses: Brother Pons prior of the Friars Preacher of Cahors and Brother Peter Seilan and Bernard of Ladin hac. And he is instructed to come before the next Sunday of Easter to Cahors to appear before us and add to his confession anything he wants to and bring the letters of the lord Bishop of Toulouse and Brothers William Arnold and his companion, inquisitors, relating to the accomplishment of his pilgrimage to Saint-James of Compostela.

Deposition of Pons' Wife Na Arnaude, 26 January 1244 (Doat 22, f. 44r).

The said Arnaude, wife of Pons Grimoard, appeared. Asked whether she wanted to defend herself against what had been discovered about her, she said that she wanted to think about it.

3.2.2 Na Berètges and Othon of Berètges

Deposition of Na Berètges, 25 January 1244 (Doat 22, f. 43).

The lady Na Berètges, wife of Peter Grimoard senior, attested that when she saw the heretics Vigouroux of La Bacone and his companions, she saw Othon of Berètges and many other people with the heretic. And she saw many people adoring him, but she didn't adore these heretics there, neither did she see Othon of Berètges, nor Unaude, the wife of Raymond of Berètges, nor lady Arnaude, wife of Pons Grimoard adoring the heretics. But all of the above, as well as the witness herself, listened to the heretics preaching.

Interrogated further as to whether the heretic Vigouroux of La Bacone asked the witness herself and Othon and the others named to adore him, with all the others adoring him, she said not. Pressed on whether she knew whether Brother William Arnold and his companion came to Castelsarrasin to undertake an inquisition, she said yes, and that she made her confession truthfully and fully to the inquisitors, about herself and others whom she saw adoring heretics and listening to their preaching. She said that her confession had not been written down, because the inquisitors had not wanted to write it down. She said also that she neither ate nor drank with heretics in the said house with the heretics . . .

Witnesses: William, priest of Castelmoron and Bernard of Ladin hac.

(On the next day Na Berètges appeared after Na Arnaude, above, and said the same as she about whether to defend herself further. She was assigned a period of a month from Shrove Sunday to consider her position.)

Deposition of Na Berètges' brother Othon, 7 March 1244 (Doat 22, ff. 44–6).

... the witness Othon of Berètges said that he went into the home of William Faure of Pech-Hermier at the latter's invitation and there saw the heretics Vigouroux of La Bacone and Tozet of Noguier. And with them he saw Peter Grimoard senior, Stephen 'the scribe', William Faure himself, and many other people he couldn't remember. Everyone including himself listened to the preaching of the said heretics there, but he didn't adore them, nor did he see anyone else adore them. That was about twenty years ago. He also said that he had gone there with the intention of seeing the heretics ...

He said that he saw Vigouroux of La Bacone and his *socius*, heretics, in the home of Arnold of Bressols, and there he saw Arnaude the wife of Pons Grimoard and Na Berètges, his own sister and up to about ten other people, but he didn't hear their preaching and nor did he adore them there or see other people adoring them. That was around the same time. Asked whether he came across the women with the heretics or whether they went with him to find them, he said that he couldn't recall. But he said that he had not gone there to see heretics but because he wanted to get a horse from Arnold of Bressols.

3.2.3 Deposition of John Vital, 26 January 1244 (Doat 22, ff. 10–12)

... When the deaths of Brother William Arnold and his companions were heard about, William Faure of Pech-Hermier, Pons of Montmirat, William Audebert and William Farguï greatly delighting in the deaths. And when Stephen Mazalier came from Moissac that same day and was at Castelsarrasin, William Audebert said to him. 'Do you want to hear some good *coblas* or *sirventés*?'⁹ Stephen said yes, and then William Audebert said 'Brother William Arnold is brought low with an axe and humiliated', to which Stephen Mazalier replied, 'the charter is torn',¹⁰ ... And one day after the death of Brother William Arnold he heard William Faure of Pech-Hermier say, 'Come here, you other rabid-masked Catholics. We have been blind but now will have our sight back, and we shall have it much longer than you will' ...

... He heard Peter of Quissac say that he gave nothing for all the masses sung at Cahors, and if the inquisitors ordered him to go there,¹¹ he'd go the other way, and that no one cared as much as an egg about excommunication, because the Church's authority was groundless.

... William Audebert said to him, "You want to know the truth about the world below and that above? I tell you that one day when the Lord was preaching to his people in Heaven, a messenger came from Earth and said

to him that if he did not send someone quickly, he would lose the world. So the lord sent Lucibel into the world at once, and accepted him as his brother, and after this Lucibel wanted to have some of what was above and some of what was below for his inheritance, but the lord did not want this. On account of this there was a long war, and it lasts until this day, because of this other fall."

3.2.4 Izarn, Lord of Tauriac and Na Finas, his Wife

Deposition of Izarn, Lord of Tauriac, 15 May 1244 (Doat 22, ff. 62r–64v). . . . Izarn, lord of Tauriac, said that at Villemur in the home of En Guinhe, he saw two heretics whose names he does not know, and with them were Bernard of Seilhols, William Bourd, Senhoret and many others he didn't recognise. He believes that he himself and all the others adored the said heretics. This was about twenty years ago.

Also, he saw the heretics Bernard of La Mothe and Peter Grahl in Bernard Grahl's home, and with them were the said Bernard, Maffré of Paulhac and Arnold Grahl. He himself and all the others adored the heretics. That was about fifteen years ago. He saw Bernard of La Mothe and his *socius*, heretics, on another occasion at around the same time, in the aforementioned Peter Grahl's house. There Bernard Grahl and Izarn of Villemur were seen by him, and they all adored the said heretics. Around that time also, at Tauriac, in the home of En Raygassa, he saw the heretics Pons Guilabert and his *socius*, and he saw his own wife Na Finas and Boson his son. He himself adored the heretics; he believes that the others did, but he can't recall . . . This was also around fifteen years ago.

At Villemur, in the home of William of Montech he saw the heretics Pons Guilabert and his companion and they asked that he release Arnold of Montels of Toulouse, whom he had captured in the war of the count of Toulouse, but he didn't want to release him . . . That was around that same time . . .

One day when he was hunting, William Garcias met him on the way to Malconselh and told him that two men, who were close by, wanted to see him. So he went with William and met two heretics, whose names he does not know, in a house. The heretics asked him if he would call off his hunters and not hunt in the wood, and that if by some chance he should come upon them there, that he would not harm them. He promised that he would do this willingly, although he never spoke to his hunters about this. He says that he did not adore the heretics there. This was about eighteen years earlier. Also, one day when he was leaving Villemur, he met two heretics who asked him likewise about the hunters, that he would ask them not to harm them.

He said that he met about twenty heretics in the Chaulet meadow, and they asked him whether he would grant them safe conduct. So he then said to several young men of Montauban who had accompanied them that if they should by chance come across anyone who wanted to harm them, that they should say that the heretics were under his protection. And that same day Peter Aslan and his companions somehow stole from the heretics some goods and an old horse, but that they later gave it back at his request.

He said that he believed the heretics to be good men, who spoke the truth, and had a good faith. He also said that he had not heard the heretics express their errors about visible things, about the consecrated host, about baptism and or marriage. He said that he had heard from believers in the heretics that the heretics said that it was as great a sin to be with one woman as with another, but he didn't believe these errors. It has been twenty years since he first believed the heretics, and he had renounced this belief ten years ago. He abjures heresy and swears to hold to the commands of the Church and to pursue heretics and hold firm to the Roman Church.

Deposition of Na Finas, Wife of Izarn, 7 September 1244 (Doat 22, ff. 65r-69r).

Na Finas, wife of Izarn of Tauriac, having sworn to tell the truth in the matter of heresy [etc.], said that when she was a girl, she saw her mother Braida and her sister Esclarmonde, both heretics. Her mother lived in her own house, and she herself lived there with her brother Pelfort of Rabastens. But she said that she never adored the said heretics nor saw anyone else do so, as far as she could remember: she never saw Pelfort adore heretics. At that time, she said, heretics lived openly at Rabastens in their houses. This was about forty years ago.

She had stayed at Lautrec, in the diocese of Albi, with her husband Amalric Sicart, and saw there the heretic Boeria, sister of En Frésoul of Lautrec, living publicly. She said that she visited Boeria many times with other noble ladies, but none of them ever adored her, nor any of the heretics who were at Lautrec, and neither had she ever adored her, nor any heretics for as long as she was at Lautrec. This was about thirty years ago . . .

. . . She also saw the heretics William Solier and Bernard of La Mothe at her own house in Villemur, and with them there were Izarn of Saint-Michel and his brother Vital Faure, and Peter Pague, who had brought the heretics. Also there were Izarn's wife Beatrice, and Mathelia of Cos and Guillemette of Pugnieres. All including herself listened to these heretics preach, singing their own praises and speaking ill of the Roman Church and priests. They said that the consecrated host was simply bread, that matrimony and baptism are not enough to save, that the things God has made will not end, and that the dead bodies of men will not rise. She said

this, but did not believe such errors to be true. And she said that everyone including herself adored the heretics and genuflected before them three times, saying 'Bless us, good men, and pray to God for us', and they replied 'God is thus beseeched'.

In En Guinha's home she saw the heretics Pons Guilabert and his companion, and she saw there Na Faïs, wife of the deceased Arnold Helias, and similarly there she saw Mathalia, her niece, and spoke to her. And she saw Na Asmus, lady of house in which the heretics were. None of them adored the heretics or listened to them preaching; they had come to the house to visit Na Asmus, who was ill . . .

. . . She saw Pons Guilabert and his companion . . . The knight Bernard of Paulhac was there, and Hugh Boyer, an educated man whom she brought with her to read books of the heretics and to listen to what they said and determine whether they spoke good or evil. And everyone heard their preaching, although no one adored them or ate with them. She later asked Hugh to return to the heretics but he said that he wouldn't go back to them, because they were evil and said wicked things. And she saw the same heretics in that same place another time. Those present came there because Peter of Turre was ill there. They were her own daughter Arbrissa and Guillemette Faure, but they didn't adore or listen to preaching, but at the request of the sick Peter she sent bread and water to the said heretics.

She said that she saw the heretics Pons Guilabert and his companion in a certain wood, and Bernard of Paulhac and the squire Bos, and Pons of Balbec senior, she thinks that her daughter Bertrande was there too, but they didn't adore the heretics or listen to preaching.

She saw in her own house the heretic William Dalait, and had him make a fire on a terrace. He didn't preach there and neither did she adore him. But the heretic said to her that the count of Toulouse, the father of the one that lives,¹² who was then in Provence, had sent him to Montauban. So she had him led for part of the way by John Olier. And the heretic Pons Touelle came to her house and spoke to her and she sent him to Guillemette Faure's house, but she didn't know him to be a heretic, or know him at all. But when she wanted to send him food, he asked her to send nothing but bread and onions. Then she understood that he was a heretic, but nevertheless sent him the bread and onions.

. . . She confesses that she once believed that heretics were good men, but that for a good fifteen years she hasn't believed them to be good men, nor has she listened to their preaching nor has she given or sent them anything . . . She also says that it has been thirty years since she first believed heretics to be good men and to have a good faith and had listened their errors, and believed what they said. And she abjures heresy and swears to keep to the commands of the Church.

Notes

- 1 These phrases are not straightforward to translate, their cleverness lying in part in their alliterative structure, but see C. Léglu, 'Vernacular poems and inquisitors in Languedoc and Champagne, c.1242–1249', *Viator* 33 (2002), 117–32 (119–21). Her translation is rendered below.
- 2 'Friars Minor' refers to the Franciscans.
- 3 'Friars Preacher' refers to the Dominicans.
- 4 The Doat scribe has record 'vidit' (saw), but it should probably be 'adoravit' (adored), because the witness has already said that he saw them.
- 5 A Cathar deacon, lord of Caraman, not to be confused with the lords of Gourdon above.
- 6 Modern Lauzerte.
- 7 The scribe uses 'socius' here, and as such we can see that it does not only apply to heretical companions.
- 8 The scribe has written that 'he did *not* get a poultice', but this is probably in error, unless Pons was responding to an accusation made by someone else.
- 9 Stanzas and satirical songs.
- 10 Perhaps referring to inquisitorial records that were seized.
- 11 Presumably to be tried for heresy.
- 12 i.e. Raymond VI, his son being Raymond VII.

EXTRACTS FROM DEPOSITIONS AFTER THE SIEGE AND FALL OF MONTSÉGUR (1243–4), 1244

The story of the fall of Montségur in 1244 is one of tragedy and romance. It was the last stand made by the Cathar hierarchy and lords of the county of Foix, in one of the most impregnable fortresses in Languedoc. It had been rebuilt in *c.*1204 for the protection of *perfecti* by its lord Raymond of Péreille, son of William Roger of Mirepoix and Fournière of Péreille. Heretics of Mirepoix-Lavelanet had fled there in 1229. In 1232 he allowed them to establish an overarching capital in the castle. When its two hundred or so heretics were burned in 1244, leading figures amongst them included the Cathar bishop of Toulouse, Bertrand Marty. The inquisitors then turned to interrogating the prisoners and this massive operation yielded depositions that survive in Doat 22, 23 and 24. We know almost nothing about Brother Ferrer, whose court tried many of the *credentes* in question, but he seems to have taken over the responsibilities of William Arnold and Stephen of Saint-Thibéry in the diocese of Toulouse after they were murdered in 1242.

Philippa of Mirepoix was the daughter of Raymond of Péreille, lord of the castle, and wife of Peter Roger of Mirepoix. Her testimony was one of the first to be taken after the castle fell. From it we learn something of the lives of Cathar women, and more immediately about the period leading up to the siege of Montségur, when the castle made preparations for the conflict to come, and the period of the siege itself.

The depositions tell us that inquisitors were concerned primarily to gain information about individuals as part of the heretics' support network. We gain a good deal of information about such socio-political structures and the heretical activity they enabled, but very little about religious belief and teaching. In the case of Berengar of Lavelanet, in the Cathar diocese of Toulouse, the only reference to his belief, after a deposition of 28 folios, is at the very end where it is noted that, 'He said that he had been a believer of heretics for forty years, such that if he died in their hands and in their sect, he believed he would be saved.' Before

this, we learn a good deal about heretical life at Fanjeaux, about the lords of Feste and the circle of Guilabert of Castres. We have included in his deposition an extremely long list of names because it is typical of these documents (we have omitted them in general however). Berengar also describes the *consolamentum* in c.1204 of Esclarmonde of Foix, by then one of the most notorious patronesses of heretics, and the time when the exiled Cathar hierarchy were given asylum in the castle. We also learn of the conflicted religious affinities of other nobles, with some servants of Count Raymond VII of Toulouse first adoring and then arresting heretics at the castle.

Montségur is a focus for regional identity and conspiracy theories today (see our discussion of secondary literature in Further Reading). What is not so often noted is that it was a southern French force that besieged the castle, and so we should understand events as taking place in the society largely transformed in political terms by the crusade.

3.3.1 Deposition of Philippa of Mirepoix, 18 March 1244 (Doat 24, ff. 197–203)

... At Montségur, she saw Bertrand Marty, bishop of the heretics [of Toulouse], preaching often in his house. Present at the teaching were herself, her mother Corba wife of Raymond of Péreille, her sister Orpaïs wife of Guiraud of Rabat, Cecilia wife of Arnold Roger, Adalaïs of Massabrac, Faïs wife of William of Plaigne, Braïda daughter of Arnold Roger, her brother-in-law Guiraud of Rabat . . . Arnold Roger, her father Raymond of Péreille, her husband Peter Roger . . . And everyone there, including herself, men and women, adored the heretics . . . This was until the day when the castle and the heretics fell into the hands of the King and the Church.

She and her sister Orpaïs, wife of Guiraud of Rabat, and her mother Corba and sister Esclarmonde ate very often with female heretics in the house of female heretics with her grandmother Marquèse and other female perfects at the same table, eating bread that they blessed . . .

She often sent, bread, wine, fish, vegetables and other things to eat to Bertrand Marty, Raymond Agulher [Cathar bishop of the Razès] and other great heretics, and to her grandmother Marquèse. (This was) through her servant Raissaga, daughter of Fabrissa of Queille, and through Adelaide Ferrié of Camon, her son Esquieu's wet nurse . . .

She saw Jordan of Mas the elder and his nephew William of Mas (the brother of Jordan of Mas who was killed at the castle of Montségur) come to the castle to reveal that the French wanted to arrest her husband Peter Roger at the siege of the castle of Roquefeuil . . . This was four years ago . . .

She saw William Fort of Pennautier, Raymond Arnold, Raymond of Pennautier, Pelestieu, William Peter Bocalop, Roger of Aragon,¹ and the son of William Fort, whose name she does not know, and other knights who together counted a good fifty riders, coming to the castle of Montségur. Many of them ate and slept at her husband's house. Later, they left the castle and went on their way . . . This was a year last summer.

People of Laroque-d'Olmes, Lavelanet, Montferrier, Massabrac, Villeneuve, Roquefère, Saint-Benoît, Balaguier and Olmes, of the diocese of Toulouse, whose names she does not know, brought flour, wine and other provisions to Montségur, to her husband Peter Roger and father Raymond of Péreille and to other sergeants of the castle and also to the heretics. But they were paid for it . . . This was a year last summer.

At the end of their days, when they were mortally wounded, Jordan of Mas, Bertrand of Bardenac, Bernard of Carcassonne and Sicart of Puivert were consoled and received by the heretics at Montségur. She was not present at the heretication. This was a month and a half ago.

She, her sister Orpaïs . . . , mother Corba, Cecile . . . , Adelaide . . . and Faïs, went together to the house of the heretics and requested of Bertrand Marty and the other heretics, in the event that she and the other women should be in danger of dying, from wounds or other causes, that the heretics would receive them and administer the *consolamentum*, if they found them living but even if they could not speak. And the heretics promised and made the pact with her and the other women, that they would receive them if they were dying from a wound or other cause, even if they did not have the power of speech but were simply alive. After that she and the others adored the heretics. That was three weeks ago . . .

She had believed in the heretics since she reached the age of discernment, such that she believed that if she died in their hands she would be saved.

3.3.2 Deposition of Berengar of Lavelanet, 21 April 1244 (Doat 24, ff. 40–68)

. . . In his youth, at Fanjeaux, he saw in the house of the heretic Gilbert of Castres, Gilbert himself and others preaching, at least three or four times. Present were himself, Izarn Bernard of Fanjeaux, father of the present Izarn Bernard; Raymond Ferrand and his wife Turca; Bec and his wife Rica; Peter of Saint-Michel, uncle of the present one; Roger Peter, father of Peter of Saint-Michel; Feste, father of Bernard Hugh of Feste; Bernard Durfort, father of Raymond Durfort; Guiraud of Feste; Raymond Garcias, father of William Garcias; Vital of Lahille, father of Raymond of Lahille; Raymond Amiel of Le Mortier and his wife Saura and their son Amiel of

Le Mortier; William Durfort; Esclarmonde, mother of Bernard Hugh of Feste; Orbria, mother of Gaillard of Feste and her husband Roger of Feste; William of Feste, brother of Roger of Feste; Hugh of Durfort; Bertrand of Las Fratoas and his brother Othon of Las Fratoas, and Peter Amiel of Bram, brother of that Othon, and Gental, brother of Peter Amiel of Bram; Hugh of Rieu; Bernard of Pomas; William Gout and his brother Gout; Izarn Picarelle; Peter Roger, the father of Peter Roger Picarelle; Augier of Fenouillet, son of Raymond Izarn; William of Prouille; Raymond Sicart of Laserre; Peter Cerdan; William Assalit, brother of Bertrand of Roquetaillade; Raymond of Le Villar, brother of Bertrand of Le Villar, priest at Fanjeaux; Arnold Jubileu and his son William Arnold Jubileu; Peter Maurel; Pons of Pujal; Pons of Arras, the uncle of the present Pons of Arras; Peter Izarn of Montolieu; Peter Raymond of Le Carla. They were all townspeople of Fanjeaux. Also, Clavel of Carla and his brother Roger of Le Carla; William of Brugairolles and his brother Navar, knights of Fanjeaux; Peter Maurel; Raymond Fournier; Raymond Auriol. And all of these men and women including the witness adored these heretics often, each saying three times 'Bless me lords . . .'¹² This was about forty years ago.

He saw at Fanjeaux the heretication of Esclarmonde's sister³ of Raymond Roger count of Foix, grandfather of the present count of Foix, and wife of Jordan of l'Isle; Aude, mother of Izarn Bernard of Fanjeaux; Raymonde, mother of Peter Mir and of Peter of Saint-Michel of Fanjeaux; Faïs, mother of Sicart of Durfort. They were consoled in the home of Guilabert of Castres, *filius major* of the heretical church of Toulouse. Guilabert and other heretics consoled and received these women in the following way. At the request of the heretics these women gave themselves to God and to the Gospel . . . Present at the heretication were himself, Raymond Roger the grandfather of the present count of Foix, and the knights and townspeople mentioned above. And everyone, men and women, adored the heretics, all except for the count of Foix. After the adoration they received the Kiss of Peace from the heretics, who kissed them twice across the mouth and then each other in the same way. That was about forty years ago.

When Peter Roger of Mirepoix was wounded in an attack – the wound from which he died – he was brought to Fanjeaux to the house of Guilabert of Castres and hereticated. The witness was not present at the ceremony, but understood that Izarn of Castres taught him the Lord's Prayer and preached and urged him, and that Peter Roger of Mirepoix took up and observed the rule of the heretics. Some days afterwards Peter Roger was taken from there, and a few days later he died and was taken to Mirepoix. That was around the same time.

Once, he saw Guilabert of Castres, bishop of the heretics, Bernard of La Mothe, *filius major*, John Cambiare, *filius*, Vigouroux⁴ of La Bacone, *filius major* of the heretics of the Agenais, Pons Guilabert, deacon of the heretics of Villemur, and Tento, bishop of the heretics of the Agenais, and many other heretics, come to the castle of Montségur. They implored Raymond of Péreille, then lord of the castle, to receive them in the castle, so that they could make it their seat and so that from there they could send out and defend their preachers. He was present at these discussions, and also the knights Raymond of Roqueville, Arnold of Châteaueverdun, Arnold of Mayreville, and others he cannot remember. Then, after many words and entreaties, Raymond of Peréille consented to the request of these heretics, and gave them a home in the castle and received them there. After having gone into the castle, the witness, Raymond of Peréille, Raymond of Roqueville and Arnold of Châteaueverdun adored the heretics. After this, the said heretics made their ordinations. They ordained John Cambiare as *filius*, Bernard Bonnefous as deacon of Toulouse, Tento as bishop of the Agenais, and Raymond of Montouty (who they call Raymond Donat), deacon. The witness was not present at the ordination himself. This was about twelve years ago . . .

He saw Massip of Gaillac, Castellan of Fanjeaux, and with him Peter Roger Picarelle and Augier of Montolieu come many times to the castle of Montségur in the name of the Count of Toulouse. When they entered the castle they went to the heretics' house to see them, and the witness with them, and also William of Le Congost, Arnold-Roger of Mirepoix and Bertrand of Bardenac. And there everyone adored the heretics, then left. (This was twelve or more years ago.)

He saw Massip with many sergeants, knights and crossbow-men come to the castle of Montségur. They arrested there the *filius* John Cambiare and three other heretics. No one in the castle stopped them, and they took them as prisoners to the count of Toulouse. They were burned. This was around the same time . . .

3.3.3 Deposition of Raymond of Péreille, 30 April 1244 and 9 May 1244 (Doat 22, ff. 214–32)

. . . He saw Guilabert of Castres, bishop of the heretics at that time, openly keeping house in his castle with many other heretics. He preached often, and coming to listen to this heretic's teaching, along with the witness, were William Gout, Gaillard of Fanjeaux, Peter of Saint-Michel, and many others he can't remember because he was just a child . . . and he often ate with Guilabert – in that house and at the same table – bread blessed by the

heretics . . . This was about thirty-five years ago . . . He saw heretics keeping house openly in Lavelanet, with his permission, and often went there to see and adore them. This was around the same time.

He received the heretic Gaucelm publicly at Montségur. Coming to listen to him as well as himself were his wife Corba, Philippa the wife of Peter Roger, Berengar of Lavelanet, Gaillard of Congost and others he can't remember. After the preaching, he and the others would adore the heretics. This was about thirty years ago . . .

He was never present at anyone's heretication, did not make a pact with anyone not to betray them in the matter of heresy, nor stored anything for them. He had nothing to do with Waldensians.

At the request of Raymond of Mirepoix, Raymond Blascou and other heretics, he rebuilt the castle of Montségur, which had been previously destroyed, and then received and sheltered those heretics and many others . . . This was about forty years ago. He also received and sheltered at Montségur Gaucelm, bishop of the heretics of the Toulousain, Guilabert of Castres who succeeded him as bishop, John Cambiare and Bertrand Marty who succeeded him and many other heretics. They preached there often . . .

He saw Genser, wife of Peter of Saint-Michel of Fanjeaux, Vésiada, wife of Izarn Bernard of Fanjeaux, Alice, mother of Peter and Arnold of Mazerolles, Fauressa, wife of Bernard of Villeneuve, and Gaïa, sister of Izarn Bernard of Fanjeaux, staying for a long time at the castle of Montségur. And there those women many times adored Guilabert of Castres and the other heretics. And he himself was there and Bernard del Pech, Peter Aribert, Cathala of En William Assalit, the knight Peter Guiraud Babot of Mirepoix, who adored the said heretics. And he saw William Cat of Arzens, Peter of Saint-Michel, Peter Guiraud of Routier, Peter of Le Villarou d'Aucelle, Raymond Aribert of Arzens and Sicart Pelapol, son of Raymond Ferrand, coming to the castle of Montségur, and there, in the heretics' house, they adored Guilabert of Castres and other heretics. There too were himself, Bernard of Pech, Peter Aribert, Cathala of En William Assalit, and Peter Guiraud Babot of Mirepoix who adored the said heretics there. The said William Cat, Peter of Saint-Michel, Sicart Pelapol, Peter Guiraud of Routier, Peter of Le Villarou d'Aucelle, and Raymond Aribert of Arzens exited the castle of Montségur, and the ladies Genser, Véiada and others certainly went with them. This was (about thirty years ago) . . .

He saw Guilhabert of Castres, bishop of the heretics, perform ordinations at Montségur and he ordained Tento as bishop of the heretics of Agen and Vigouroux of La Bacone as *filius major* of the heretics of Agen, and John Cambiare *filius major* of the heretics of Toulouse, and other heretics. And present at the ordination were himself, Ath Arnold of Châteauverdun,

Raymond of Roqueville, Estolt of Roqueville, Bernard of Mayreville and Bernard Marty, the witness's bailiff, and others he cannot recall adored the heretics. This was about fifteen years ago.

He saw William Pons of La Garrigue and Arnold Baudouy of Queille staying at the castle of Montségur, and there they often adored heretics. That was three years ago. . . . He saw William Raymond of Moissac-Queille lend his doublet and helmet to William Delpech at the time when the castle of Montségur was finally besieged by the French, in order to protect him from the French army. That was a year ago . . . William Raymond of Moissac-Queille sent two crossbows to Peter Roger of Mirepoix at the castle of Montségur via Raymond John of Las Coumbes, William Mir and the heretic Matthew. That was at Lent . . .

Notes

- 1 Canton of Alzonne, Aude, rather than the Kingdom of Aragon.
- 2 See Introduction to Inquisitors' Registers for the form of words of the *consolamentum*.
- 3 The Doat scribe mistakenly gives *uxor* (wife).
- 4 The scribe gives 'Hugh'.

Part 3.4

EXTRACTS FROM DEPOSITIONS
IN THE *PROCESSUS* AGAINST
PETER GARCIAS, 22 AUGUST–
10 DECEMBER 1247



A *processus* represents the collection of evidence from a number of witnesses that would then inform the inquisitors' approach to questioning a suspect. Peter Garcias was a townsman of Toulouse, specifically of Bourguet-Nau, a new quarter of the town. This *processus* is a collection of testimonies against him, taken in 1247 at Toulouse, recalling witnesses' accounts of Peter Garcias' conversation with the Franciscan Brother William Garcias. The first two are from evesdroppers, listening as the accused condemned himself through things he presumably believed he was telling to Brother William only. The testimonies would have been taken before Peter's own interview, if one indeed took place. In them we hear slightly different versions of what Peter said he believed. The monks make many references to Scripture. We also have references to the later crusades in the south, including against Montségur, and to other heretics of the region, including the assertion that the turncoat Raymond Gros had in fact returned to Catharism before he died.

3.4.1 Deposition of Brother William Cougot, 22 August 1247

... Brother William Cougot of the Order of Friars Minor, when required to tell the full and simple truth about the witness on the matter of heresy, swore that he heard Peter Garcias of Bourguet-Nau in Toulouse, when he was being interrogated by William Garcias of the Order of Friars Minor on whether there were two gods, say that having debated this for six months he still could not be certain. He remembered that the said Peter Garcias and Brother William were in the school of the Friars Minor at Toulouse, and the witness was upstairs between them and the roof in a place where

it was possible to see and hear them. By his side were Brother Doat of Rouergue and Brother Arnold of Ars from Toulouse. That it was this year at Lent.

He said that when Brother William Garcias recited this well-known passage of the Apostles: God who sanctifies circumcision . . . he heard Peter Garcias say that the law of Moses was nothing but shadow and emptiness, and that the god who gave that law was an evil trickster. When the said Brother William Garcias spoke with Peter Garcias on the passage: Nothing is made without him, he said that 'nothing' meant visible things, which were nothing. And Peter also said that man was sin and 'nothing'. Item, when Brother William asked whether He who was put on the cross made visible things, Peter replied no, because He was the most good, and nothing visible was good, therefore He made nothing . . . When Brother William Garcias spoke to him of this passage – In Him were created all things on Earth and in Heaven, visible and invisible – Peter gave this interpretation: visible to the heart, but invisible for carnal eyes . . . When Brother William spoke to Peter about this passage – We preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities . . . – he said that Bertrand of Rouaix was on the sea, that is to say, in prison, and that he had better insight than Brother Willliam, and many people commended Bertrand . . .

He heard Peter Garcias saying that all the angels who had descended from the sky would be saved . . . (and that) Christ and the Blessed Virgin and the blessed John the Evangelist came from the sky and were not of this flesh . . . (but that) John the Baptist was one of the biggest devils that ever was . . .

He heard Peter saying, when Brother William asked him whether flesh had risen again, showing him his hand, he said that flesh no more rose again than a doorpost would, hitting a post with his hand . . . He heard Peter saying that the Lord Jesus could save no one from hell . . . , that matrimony was prostitution and that no one could be saved with his wife, nor he himself with his own wife, also that the fruit forbidden to the first parents was nothing other than the pleasure of carnal union, and that Adam gave that fruit to his wife . . .

He heard Peter say that it was in no way justifiable to condemn anyone to death . . . (and) if officials were to judge any heretic and that heretic was killed as a heretic, the official was a murderer.

He heard him say that no one in the Church celebrated mass before St Sylvester, nor had the Church had property until that time; that the Church would come to an end before twenty years; that our Mass is worthless; that all preachers of the crusade are murderers and that the cross

given by them was nothing but a bit of tape on the shoulder, like the sort of cord with which animal hair is tied . . .

When Peter Garcias was charged by Brother William to respond whether he believed what he had just said, he responded swearing by his faith that he believed as he had said . . . When Peter Garcias was asked whether his mother Willelma Garcias had been made a heretic, he said no, but that she would have been if a certain chaplain of Blessed Mary La Daurade, Nicholas, had not prevented it.¹ That had been this year before Easter.

Asked to say what he believed about Peter Garcias, the witness said that on account of what he had heard, he believed that Peter was a believer in heretics. This deposition was made at Toulouse by Brother William Cougot before brothers Bernard of Caux and John of Saint-Peter, inquisitors. Witnesses: Brother Guiraud warden of the Friars Minor of Toulouse, and Brother Stephen of Lunel of the same Order, and Peter Aribert, public notary, who wrote this down.

3.4.2 Deposition of Brother Doat of Rodez, 22 August 1247

Brother Doat of Rodez of the Order of Friars Minor, instructed to speak the full and simple truth on the matter of heresy, said that he saw and heard Peter Garcias of Bourguet-Nau of Toulouse speaking with Brother William Garcias of the Order of Friars Minor in the school of the brothers of Toulouse, and when William Garcias required Peter to say whether he believed in his faith that there was one benign God who created everything, as it says in Scripture, Peter replied that he did not believe it nor could he believe it; but there was a good god, who created uncorruptible and enduring things, and another god, malign, who created corriptable and transitory things.

(Brother William then corroborates what William Cougot said he had said about the law of Moses; about John 1:3 that he who died on the cross didn't make things; about Col. 1, about Christ and the others descending from heaven and not being flesh; that Jesus saves no one from hell, marriage as prostitution and that it doesn't save. Then he says that he concurs with Brother William about what Peter Garcias had said of Adam and Eve, about condemning to death, about St Sylvester, the Church and Church ending in 20 years, and the crusaders and crusade.)

With Brother William imploring and calling on Peter often to say whether he believed what he had said, Peter responded through his faith that he did. On whether there are two gods and debating it for six months, Doat said the same as William Cougot . . .

At another time, in the same place, he heard Peter say that the person who held up the cross on Good Friday, wailing as he revealed it and saying, 'Behold the wood of the cross!' should instead have said, 'Behold, wood!', because there is nothing there of the cross.² (And) Peter said that those who wailed in Church, singing in an unintelligible voice, cheated the simple people; and that he had at home the Passion written in the vernacular, just as it took place in reality.³ Peter also said that those whom the Church joined as man and wife, just like himself and his wife Ayma, live in prostitution; there is no marriage except between the soul and God; and he called the Roman Church a whore giving a drug and the power to drug to all believing in her. And he said of a certain church pointed out to him, that it was not a church but a house in which falsehoods and deception were spoken.

Peter also said that come Pentecost, it would be two years since he had lain carnally with his wife. When Brother William asked him whether she was of the same faith as he, he said no; she was stupid, just like Brother William.

Peter said of miracles, that no miracle that it was possible to see with the eye mattered, and that neither Blessed St Francis nor anyone else [really] performed miracles. Also, that God did not wish punishment of the kind through which anyone was sentenced to death. He reproached a preacher of the crusade who had recruited a good seven hundred crusaders at Auvillar for this, saying that it was not a good crusade that went against Frederick,⁴ or against the Saracens, or against a castle such as Montségur when it was against the Church, nor against any place where it could end in death.

Peter also commended Raymond Peter Desplas as honest, wise and of good judgement, yet he was locked up out of sight.⁵ He said to Brother William Garcias not to speak about Raymond Desplas except as a sandal-wearer.⁶ He condemned all the monastic Orders, except for Friars Minor, but said that this Order was worthless, because it preached the crusade. He also said that if he could catch the god who made a thousand people and saved one and damned all the others, he would crush him and slash at him with his own nails and teeth as false and treacherous, and would spit in his face, saying 'Die of gout!' Peter also said that angels who fell would be saved, but not all of them – for example not officials and notables – but only the simple sort. This way, out of one thousand only one would be damned.

He also said that there was no purgatory, and that charity performed by the living did not benefit the dead, and that none are saved unless they do penance perfectly before death,⁷ and that the spirit that is not able to do penance in one body, if it would be saved, migrates to another body to complete the penance . . .

3.4.3 Deposition of Brother William Garcias, 22 August 1247

Brother William Garcias of the Order of Friars Minor, required to speak fully and plainly on the crime of heresy, said that when he himself was in the school of the Friars at Toulouse with Peter Garcias, the husband of Ayma, daughter of Bernard of Cauzit, he asked him whether there were two gods. He responded yes, one good and one evil. He said also that the Law of Moses was shadow and vanity, and that the god who gave it was a trickster and evil . . . (*here confirms what William Cougot says above on Romans 3:30*). When the witness raised 'Without him, nothing is made' (John 1:3) he said that visible things were the 'nothing', and that man is sin and nothing. He said also that the god who was put on the cross had not made visible things, asserting that that one was the good god and the other, of visible things, was not good, and He hadn't made them. On the authority, 'In him are all things created . . . visible and invisible (Col. 1:16)' the witness said as Brother William Cougot had. Likewise on 'We preach unto you that you should turn from these vanities' he said the same as William Cougot had.

Peter Garcias also said that angels who fell would be saved, and that all those who were not heretics, the Devil had made them, body and soul; that Christ, the Holy Virgin and John the Evangelist descended from heaven and were not of this flesh; that John the Baptist was one of the biggest devils that ever was. On the resurrection, the witness reported the same as William Cougot had. And Peter said that the Lord Jesus had not drawn anyone into hell . . .

(He then says as William Cougot on the forbidden fruit, justice, and officials who judged heretics.)

Peter said that he had asked William of Rouaix, when he was a consul, to not consent at any price to condemn others to death, and considered that the said William believed what he said to him.

(The witness reports as William Cougot had on the mass, the possessions of the Church, its disappearance, the preaching of the crusade and the Cross.)

Item the witness said that he had many times asked the said Peter Garcias many times to abjure what he had said, and Peter swore by his faith that he believed what he had said.

All this, the witness had heard said by Peter Garcias in the school of the Friars Minor of Toulouse that year in Lent. Questioned about those present, he said that there had only been the two of them in the school, but that

above them, between them and the roof, were Brothers of the Friars Minor William Cougot, Arnold of Ars from Toulouse, and Doat of Rodez. The witness knew that they were there, although he hadn't seen them.

He said the same as Doat about the other time at the school when he heard Peter Garcias speak about he who held up the cross on Good Friday, and those who sing in the church in an unintelligible voice, of the vernacular Passion, of marriage between man and wife, of the prostituted Roman Church; that he had not slept with his wife for some time, and on the miracles of St Francis and the others, and if God wanted justice, and the crusaders at Auvillar, and of the praise for Raymond Peter Desplas, of the condemning of all religious orders, of god who saved one in a thousand souls, on the salvation of the angels who fell, of purgatory, and that no one would be saved if they had not completed penance before death, of the migration of souls, and about those who had taught him that . . .

And he had heard Peter Garcias say 'Drop dead!' to those who believed that spirits which were created newly were created by God.

He heard Peter saying that Brother Raymond Gros died in the heretic's faith, and that he had sent Andrew the Barber as a messenger to Raymond Peter Desplas, but he was not able to come so he went himself to see Raymond. And he heard Peter speak many times recommending the faith of the heretics and reproaching the Roman Church, and saying that he wished neither to live nor die unless in the faith of the heretics.

Peter led him to Raymond Peter Desplas, who disputed with him on law . . . on the creation of visible things, which was not by God, introducing the authority of the Evangelists: 'the good tree cannot produce bad fruit'; and similarly about the 'source', saying that he got that idea from Bernard of La Mothe, heretic, who had greatly disconcerted him by saying it . . .

Notes

- 1 This refers to a death-bed *consolamentum*.
- 2 Duvernoy suggests that the church of La Daurade, near Bourguet-Nau, may have had a relic of the True Cross, see Duvernoy, Bernard of Caux, p. 157 n. 1.
- 3 Duvernoy suggests that it was a Waldensian copy (Duvernoy, Bernard of Caux, p. 157 n. 2). Cathars did have an Occitan translation of a version of the New Testament used by Bogomils.
- 4 A crusade was preached against Emperor Frederick II in 1239.
- 5 Sent to prison on 25 August 1247: Duvernoy, Bernard of Caux, p. 157 n. 5.
- 6 Duvernoy suggests that he was a Waldensian, noting that the sect rejected judicial killing: Duvernoy, Bernard of Caux, p. 157 n. 6.
- 7 i.e. receive the *consolamentum*.

EXTRACTS FROM DEPOSITIONS
RELATING TO THE CIRCLE
OF RAYMOND UNAUD OF
LANTA, 1 AUGUST 1245 AND
8 OCTOBER 1247

Lanta lay south-west of Toulouse and within both the Cathar and Catholic diocese of Toulouse. It was an extremely important centre. Its ruling family, the Unaud, protected Guilbert of Castres, *perfectus* of the Lauragais before he was Cathar bishop of Toulouse. Before the crusade it had its own Cathar deacons. Jean Duvernoy has identified four in our period. From 1215 to 1239 it was Bernard Bonnefous, who took part in the 1229 exodus of *perfecti* from Saint-Paul to Lanta, where its then co-lords Jordan of Lanta and Raymond Unaud took them in. Bernard Bonnefous' successor was Bernard Engilbert (1239–42) and then Pons of Saint-Foy (1242–56), who escaped to Lombardy, crossing over with the diaconate of Bernard Dejean (1243–4).

The Unaud family of Lanta had been a protector of William Solier, the *perfectus* who converted to Catholicism. The chief lord of Lanta in 1237, William Bernard, who had fought in the defence of Toulouse, was arrested for heresy and burnt. His sons Jordan and Guiraud Unaud were involved in the defence of Montségur. One of its noblewomen, Corba, was wife of Raymond of Péreille, lord of Montségur, along with her mother Marquèse, who both died there as *perfectae*.¹ Raymond Unaud himself knew Bernard of La Mothe, because he arbitrated in a dispute between the lord of Lanta and Raymond Berenguer of Cambon. In both the following testimonies we find the deacon of Villemur and other high-ranking *perfecti* involved in arbitrating on another occasion.

Raymond Unaud's deposition was made in Bernard of Caux's court on 8 October 1247. Translated with it is an excerpt from MS 609 that Duvernoy was going to include in publishing Doat 22, the deposition of

Raymond Adhemar, a knight of the castle at Lanta (Toulouse MS 609, ff. 200v–1r).

3.5.1 Deposition of Raymond Unaud, 8 October 1247 (Doat 22, ff. 85v–88r)

In the year of our lord 1247, on 8 October, Raymond Unaud, knight and lord of Lanta and of Varennes, required to speak the truth about himself and others, living and dead, on the matter of heresy or Waldensianism, the sworn witness said that when lady Brulhes, mother of William of Taissonnières, was ill at Beaumont, she sent him a message to bring heretics to her. When he heard this, he spoke to Bec of Roqueville, who gave him two heretics, whose names he doesn't know. And the witness, with Raymond Adhemar, led those heretics to the sick woman and handed them over to the said William of Taissonnières. But himself and Bec of Roqueville didn't go in to the sick woman with the heretics. However, he heard it said that the sick woman was not hereticated, because a priest was watching over her. And the following night, he and Raymond Adhemar took the same heretics to Toulouse, to a hostel the witness had, and they stayed there for a day and the witness gave them food. He and Raymond Adhemar adored the heretics on coming and going, saying 'Bless me, good men. Pray to God for me.' He said that he also saw there with the heretics, the knight Bernard William, Hugh Agenaud, Raymond of Le Fauga and others of his own household, but none of these adored the heretics. This was about sixteen years earlier.

He said that when William of Garnes, his squire, had been caught and detained at the Capitole of Toulouse,² the aforementioned Raymond of Le Fauga asked the witness on William's behalf to send him heretics to hereticate him. And so he and Alaman of Rouaix sent William Solier and Raymond d'Aigremont to William to the gallows outside the Château Narbonnais. They hereticated him there, on his own, before he was hung. The witness was present, and Alaman and Raymond Adhemar, so he believes. When this was done, he and Alaman led the heretics from there, one on the back of each man's palfrey, and they parted with them next to the Château Narbonnais, within the town. And that was around the same time.

At Toulouse, on arriving at the hostel of Jordan of Lanta, when Gardouch, lord of Montgaillard, was fatally wounded, he saw there the heretics mentioned above hereticating Gardouch. But he does not recall who (else) was there. But on recovering, Gardouch ate meat and renounced the sect of heretics. That was around the same time.

Also at Toulouse, at the home of Alaman of Rouaix, he saw the female heretics Navarre of Servian, Guiraude of Camaran and Enfante. With them

he saw Lombarda, wife of Alaman. But he did not adore them or see anyone adore them. That was around the same time.

At Toulouse, in the hostel of Bec of Roqueville, he saw Guilabert of Castres, Bernard of La Mothe, Guiraud of Gourdon and other heretics, who were making the peace between himself and Raymond Unaud,³ now dead, because of a quarrel between them. And he saw there with the heretics Raymond Adhemar, the brothers Gailhard and Arnold Estève, Bec of Roqueville, Gaillard of Sègreville, Bernard William, William of Deyme, all knights, and others he doesn't recall. Everyone including himself adored the heretics.

He said that he had many times adored heretics and heard their preaching and received the Kiss of Peace from them. And he believed them to be good people and truthful and friends of God and to have a good faith, and that it was possible to be saved through them, even though he knew that the Church pursued them. He had believed this for the first time when he adored them, but he had not believed it since being reconciled at Toulouse. He did not recall hearing heretics speak errors. He confessed this to Brother William Arnold and his inquisitor colleague at Toulouse. He concedes that confession to be true, in which he believes he said more.

This was submitted at Toulouse in the presence of brothers Bernard and John, inquisitors. And he abjures heresy and binds himself and his goods etc. . . . as above.

The witnesses are Arnold, priest of Belcastel, Raymond Guilhem, priest of Varennes, and Peter Aribert, the public notary who guarantees the official document.

3.5.2 Deposition of Raymond Adhemar of Lanta, 1 August 1245 (MS 609, ff. 200r–201v)

In the year of our Lord 1245, on 1st August, the knight Raymond Adhemar of Lanta . . . said that in the Roqueville house at Toulouse he saw Guilabert of Castres, Bernard of La Mothe and William Solier, heretics, and he saw there the cousins Raymond Unaud of Lanta and Raymond Unaud son of William Unaud, and Estolt of Rocqueville, Tresémines, brothers Bernard and Raymond of Roqueville, Gailard of Sègreville, Adhemar Saquet, William of Deyme and many other people he does not remember . . . and the said heretics were making peace between Raimund Unaud and his cousin Raymond Unaud, who hated each other. That was about fifteen years ago.

He said that when William of Garnes of Lanta was captive at Toulouse, and was later taken to the fork for them to hang him, the witness and Raymond Unaud the younger and Alaman of Rouaix, led William Solier and Raymond of Aigremont to the fork, and before William was hung, the

heretics hereticated him. This was seen by the witness, by Raymond of Aigremont and Alaman of Rouaix, and all the multitude who were there saw all of this, but did not know that there were heretics there. This was about sixteen years ago.

He said that when Na Brulhes of Beaumont, wife of William of Taissonnières, was ill, himself and Raymond Unaud the younger came to Toulouse to the Roqueville house, and took from there two heretics whose names he does not know, and he and Raymond Unaud led the heretics to Beaumont and sent them into the house of Pons of Arlens. But Pons did not want to see them. And after that when he led the said heretics to the sick woman, she commanded them that she did not want to be hereticated but to become a nun, and so she was made a nun. And the witness and Raymond Unaud led the heretics back to Toulouse and parted with them . . . near the Castle Narbonnais. And that was around the same time (fifteen years or so ago).

Notes

- 1 Marquèse was the wife of another Raymond Unaud of Lanta.
- 2 The 'Capitole of Toulouse' was its administrative seat, the seat of Toulouse's elective civic consulate.
- 3 Duvernoy notes that this elder Raymond Unaud was the son of William Unaud, lord of Fourquevaux. He died in 1223 before being consolated: Duvernoy, Bernard of Caux, p. 148 n. 11.

THEMATIC EXTRACTS



3.6.1 Childhood

In a few documents we gain an impression of how children experienced the heresy differently from adults. Children growing up in the crusade era were involved with heresy in many ways, from running errands for *perfecti*, to being pressed into service by adult *credentes*, to being consoled themselves at a young age. Arnaude of La Mothe, for example, was taken to live with *perfectae* at around 10 years old in c.1206 with her sister Petronilla by their uncle Bernard of La Mothe (who would later be Cathar deacon of Villemur). The sisters lived a hunted life for much of the crusade period, including staying in an underground shelter in woods. Petronilla died there and Arnaude buried her with the help of some *credentes*. Arnaude gave her evidence at Puylaroque to Brother Ferrer. She was already damned by evidence her family had given to Peter Seilan (see 3.1.2]. The extract below outlines the first stage of her heretical career.

First deposition of Arnaude of La Mothe, 13 August 1243 (Doat 23, ff. 2–49).

One day Raymond Amalric, deacon of Villemur, and the heretic Bernard of La Mothe came to Montauban to her mother Austorgue's house. They preached and they were all there – her sister Petronilla, mother Austorgue, and she herself. After that her mother adored the heretics and gave the girls to them . . . They took them from Montauban and brought them to Villemur to the heretic Poncia and her *sociae*, who lived there openly in their house. Petronilla and she stayed there with the heretics . . . (and when they had stayed there for three years) Poncia and her group with whom they lived took them to the deacon Raymond Amalric, who lived openly at Villemur, and there they consoled them . . . After which Poncia and the others brought them back to their house . . . When they had been there for about a year the crusaders came to the land. Through fear, Raymond

Amalric left the *castrum* of Villemur with all the heretics. They spent the first night . . . at Roquemaure at the house of heretics whose name she didn't remember and slept there. The next day they left in haste and came to Giroussens to a house of heretics. From there they went to Lavaur to the home of Adelaide and her *sociae*, and stayed there for about one year . . . [Then] they came to Rabastens to the heretic Orbria. They stayed there with the others for about a year . . . [Then] she and her sister returned to Montauban through great fear of persecution, and abandoned the sect of the heretics and ate meat and were reconciled by the bishop of Cahors.

Deposition of Peter of L'Auque of Condrast, 26 September 1247 (Doat 22, ff. 76r–78r).

Peter of L'Auque, the sworn witness, said that when he was eight years old he had assisted at the preaching of heretics at Condrast, in public on a plain called Pechberlande. But he did not adore them nor did he see adoration. That was thirty two years ago. He saw three heretics whose names he forgets at Puylaurens in the home of Hugh of Blan, which Sicart Bou, whom he himself served at that time, was renting. There he saw Bernard Engilbert, Bernard of Vileta and many others who he didn't recognise. And all except himself adored the heretics with genuflections. And because the witness did not want to adore those heretics Sicart Bou boxed his ears, hard. So, at Sicart's insistence, he genuflected to the heretics, but he did not say 'Bless me'. The next day he slipped away from Sicart, because he didn't want to stay with him after that. That was thirty years ago.

Deposition of Guillemette of Sapiac of Montauban, 2–9 May 1241 (Doat 21, ff. 240r–1v).

Guillemette of Sapiac lived for some years with her aunt, a heretic, who raised her, and saw heretics and adored them more times than she can remember. After she was reconciled by the bishop of Cahors she saw and adored heretics and heard their preaching. And afterwards she saw Peter Abit, the heretic, and his *socius*. She and her husband received the heretics Joan of Avignon and her female heretical associates in her house and adored them often, and received other heretics in her house . . . Heretics received things from her household whenever they wanted. She believed that heretics were good people and believed in their faith, and accepted the Kiss of Peace from female heretics many times. She often ate bread blessed by heretics. And when she was a little girl, she was dressed up like a heretic for two years or more. She will go to Le Puy, Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, Santiago, Saint Saviour in Asturias, Saint-Denis, Canterbury and finally Rome, and wear a cross for seven years.

3.6.2 Belief

Above, particularly in the case of Peter Garcias, the depositions outline pretty straightforwardly what we would expect to encounter in terms of expositions of Cathar beliefs. But not all deponents told the same stories about the nature of the divine and of creation. The account of John Vital of Castelsarrasin, above, reflects a different origin story but it is at the same time reminiscent of Cathar stories recorded elsewhere. These extracts are important in reminding us that heretical doctrine was not necessarily understood and expounded at a popular level any more than the Christianity of the Nicean *Credo*. On the other hand, they very much resemble not only western dualist stories but also those being told by the Bogomils who had implanted the seed of heresy in the West in the first place.

Deposition of Peter of Penne, 10 February–24 March 1242 (Doat 21 f. 217r–v).

Peter of Penne saw heretics many times and in many places, ate and drank with heretics many times, and sent them bread and fruit and other things. He believed that they were good men and that it is possible to be saved in their sect. He ate bread blessed by heretics. He said that the mercenary Loubaix was worth as much in heaven as St Martin of Tours¹, and the same went for the priests who bought wax² in honour of the blessed Martin. He believed that it was not possible to swear oaths or kill without sin. He believed in none of the Church's sacraments and believed that the heretical church was the only church, that no one would be saved in the Roman Church, but that all were saved in the heretical Church. He said that God would not destroy what he had made, and that it would not end. He also said that he loved the heretics, and that he had previously denied this under oath when required to say it. He said that he himself had preached these heresies to other people, many times. He will stay in Constantinople for seven years, and wear a cross and leave with the others.

Deposition of William Féraut, 25 January 1244 (Doat 22, f. 26r–v).

William Féraut said that he heard William Faure of Pech-Hermier saying . . . when William Audebert, the witness's nephew, was ill . . . that when God saw his depleted kingdom on account of the fall, he asked those around him, 'Does anyone want to be my Son, and me to be his Father?' When no one responded, Christ, who was God's steward, replied to God, 'I want to be your Son, and go wherever you send me'. And then God sent his Son into the World to preach in the name of God, and that is how Christ came. William Faure had said this ten years earlier, but no one had heard it except the witness and the ill nephew.

THEMATIC EXTRACTS

Deposition of Raymond of Rodolos, 22 February 1244 (Doat 22, f. 31r–v). Raymond of Rodolos . . . said that he heard Amalric of Na Regina say that God was not born of the Blessed Virgin but disguised himself thus, and that God is not present in the Mass, just cardinals and clerics, out of love for generous offerings.

Deposition of Raymonda of Mazerac, 10 February–24 March 1242 (Doat 21, f. 307r).

Raymonda of Mazerac, prioress of La Lécune, wore the habit of a heretic for four or five years. She asked her nuns whether the Blessed Virgin had really suckled Jesus physically and suffered giving birth like other women. The court looked at its records concerning others who had given evidence against her. She will leave the place and enter a stricter priory.

Notes

1 A Christianised Roman soldier.

2 i.e. candles.

Section 4

**CHRONICLES AND
NARRATIVES**



Part 4.1

EXTRACTS FROM THE SONG OF
THE ALBIGENSIAN CRUSADE BY
WILLIAM OF TUDELA AND THE
ANONYMOUS CONTINUATOR



Introduction

William of Tudela (in Navarre) wrote his epic poem in support of the crusade in 1212–13, using the metre and possibly the melody of an Occitan epic poem about the First Crusade, the *Canso d'Antiocha*. As with all Old French and Occitan epic poetry, the poem is divided into 'chapters' that are called *laissez*. William was a propagandist: he says that he was employed in the household of Baldwin of Toulouse, and that he was rewarded later on by the papal legate with a prebend in the church of Montauban. William's chronicle stops just before the battle of Muret. An unnamed troubadour took up the story some years later (around 1218) and extended the poem by over 6,000 lines. He was probably a member of the household of Baldwin's nephew, Count Raymond VII of Toulouse. He promotes the Toulousains and the Aragonese as the champions of *Paratge*, a virtue that means both 'noble rank' and 'lineage', and that seems to be used exclusively by some (not all) supporters of the Counts of Toulouse. This Anonymous Continuator is sometimes ambivalent: he blurs the events that led to the death of Peter II at Muret, and he depicts Simon of Montfort as a clever but potentially suicidal tactician. There is no evidence that this poem ever circulated in two separate parts. Only one complete manuscript survives (Paris BnF MS Français 25425), produced at the end of the thirteenth century. It makes no break between the two sections, but the illustration on the first folio depicts a scribe at work and two men talking to him. Is there an implicit message that there are two authors, and that the poem presents two points of view? Three prose adaptations were produced for wealthy families of the region of Toulouse in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and these show that the Song was well known.

4.1.1 William of Tudela's Version of the Fall of Béziers, 1209

William encourages his reader to map the massacre of Béziers onto the Trojan War. He also compares Eleanor, the fourth wife of Count Raymond VI and sister of Peter II of Aragon, to Helen of Troy, 'the most beautiful woman in the world'. The conflict is therefore identified with the 10-year war caused by Helen leaving her husband Menelaus for the Trojan youth, Paris. However, the mercenaries who burn down Béziers are likened to the anti-hero of a *chanson de geste*, the rebellious baron Raoul of Cambrai. In the surviving version of that poem, Raoul's mother Aalais curses her son when he accepts an unjust gift of a fief from her brother, the French king. Enraged, Raoul sets fire to a convent. Raoul's friend Bernier witnesses the death of his own mother in the flames. Although Raoul dies in battle a few days later, the feud with Bernier's family lasts for decades. There were grounds for viewing the crusade as a family vendetta: William of Tudela's patron was Baldwin of Toulouse, the unloved brother of Count Raymond VI of Toulouse and nephew of the king of France. Baldwin would be hanged in 1214 in revenge for the death of the king of Aragon, a gesture condemned by some as fratricide.

Laisse 15

The viscount of Béziers worked night and day to strengthen his defences, because he was great-hearted. For as long as the world shall last, there will never have been a better knight, or one who was more worthy, generous, courtly or handsome. He was the nephew of Count Raymond and the son of his sister. This man was Catholic: that much has been proved with reference to the church fathers by many clerks and many of those canons that sit in refectories. But he was too young and he loved everyone, and the men of his lands, whose seigneur he was, neither respected nor feared him. Instead, they played with him as if they were his comrades-in-arms. And all his knights and other vavassors protected the heretics, some in a castle, some in a tower, which is why they were ruined and dishonourably killed. He himself died in enormous sorrow (and that was a sin and a crime) because of his great error. Yet I only saw him once, a long time ago, when the Count of Toulouse married lady Eleanor [of Aragon], the best of queens, the most beautiful woman in the history of the world, across all Christendom, and across the pagan realms up to Spain. So much good could I speak of her and so much praise could I make, yet I could not account fully for her Worth and Valour. Back to my subject! When the viscount of Béziers heard the rumour that the army was past Montpellier, he leapt onto his expensive horse and came into Béziers very early one morning at daybreak.

Laisse 16

The bourgeois of the town, the young and the greybeards, the humble and the powerful, knew that he had arrived. They made their way swiftly to see him. He told them that they should defend themselves with strength and vigour, because they would soon be receiving help. He said, 'I shall set off on the open road towards Carcassonne, because they have been waiting for me for too long.' With these words, he turned and left. The Jews of the town followed him. The rest stayed behind, feeling sorrowful and angry. The bishop of the town, who was a worthy man, came into Béziers and when he had reached the main church (which was a stronghold) he got everyone to assemble, and when they were settled, he told them about the crusaders and how fervent they were. [He told them] that to avoid being taken prisoner, killed or defeated, or losing their money or their possessions, they should surrender. Then that which they had lost would be returned to them. If they did not wish to do so, they would be stripped, and then hacked down by blades of polished steel without further delay.

Laisse 17

When the bishop had said his piece, he asked them to strike an agreement with the clerics and the crusaders before they went under the cutting edge of the sword. But you must hear that this did not please the people, and instead they said that they would rather be drowned in the salty sea, that his words were produced for the sake of others. The crusaders would get nothing from them, not a penny, and they would not change the rulers of the city. They did not imagine that the army would last long; they thought that in less than a fortnight everything would be over, because it could not manage a league without spilling into roads and paths. Those who were in the episcopal quarter believed that it was so strong, so enclosed and locked by its walls, that it would take them a month to break in. As Solomon said to the wise Queen: 'What the fool believes shall soon fall apart.'¹

When the bishop knew that the crusade had been contested, and that they would not give a peeled apple for his sermon, he climbed onto his mule (for he had brought it with him) and he headed towards the army that was drawing near. Those people who went with him stayed alive and those who stayed behind paid dearly. As soon as he could, he told everything to the abbot of Cîteaux and the other barons, who listened hard. They decided that these people were idiots and insane. They knew that death would be their lot, along with suffering and grief.

Laisse 18

It was on the feast day that is called the Magdalene that the abbot of Cîteaux led his great army to encircle Béziers, and to set up camp on the

riverbank. This worsened the suffering and distress of those who were inside, for the army of Menelaus (from whom Paris took Helen) did not pitch as many tents at the gates of Mycenae, nor did it set up such rich pavilions by night and at dusk, as did the French. With the exception of the count of Brienne, there was no baron of France who was not doing his forty days' service there.

(Laissez 19–20 describe how a regiment of arlotz (lowborn mercenaries) led by their 'king' spread confusion among the crusaders and the townspeople. The population panicked and sought refuge in the main church, sounding the bells as if they were about to sing a mass for the burial of the dead.)

Laisse 21

The regiment of France and from the region of Paris, the clergy and laity, the princes and marquises, had all agreed that at every castle reached by the army that did not surrender until the army took it by force, the people should be put to the sword and killed. Then they would find no one who would hold out against them, because of the terror that they would feel, and because of what they would have seen. They took Montréal and Fanjeaux and its region. I promise you that if it had not been so, these places would never have been taken by force. That is why they destroyed and ruined Béziers, for they killed everybody. They could do no worse. They killed all the people who had gone into the church; the cross, the altar and the crucifix could not protect them. The clerks were killed by the crazed, vicious *ribautz*, along with the women and children. I believe not one escaped. May God receive their souls in Heaven, if it pleases Him to do so! I believe that never has such a massacre been committed or permitted since the time of the Saracens. The churls went into the houses that they had taken and found them to be full of money and stacked with goods. But the French, when they saw this, went into a fury. They chased them out with big sticks as if they were dogs and they stabled their horses and nags in the houses. Surely, it is force that mows the meadow!

Laisse 22

The 'king' and his ruffians had thought that they would enjoy the money that they had taken, that they would be rich for ever! When the French had confiscated everything, they all shouted, 'Fire, fire!'; those vile, stinking wretches! So they brought torches that were as big as stakes for a pyre. The *cité* caught alight and a great commotion started. The town burned completely, from top to bottom and one end to the other. So Raoul of Cambrai burned and ruined a great city near Douai, and his mother Aalais reprimanded him for it, and he nearly hit her in the face for that. When

they felt the fire, every man drew back, so they burned the houses and the palaces. Many pieces of armour burned there, many helmets and many padded jackets that had been made in Chartres, Blaye or Edessa, and many good clothes that should have been spared. The whole of the church that Master Gervase had built was alight. The heat cracked it in two and both sides collapsed.

Laisse 23

My lords, the booty was incredible that the French and the Normans would have got from Béziers! They could have become richer than ever before, had it not been for the 'king' *ribaut* along with those thieving wretches who burned the town, the wives, the children, the young and the old, as well as the mass-singing clergy who were dressed in their vestments inside that church.

4.1.2 William of Tudela's Version of the Fall of Lavaur, 1211

Lavaur was a bolt-hole for Cathars fleeing the crusade, but its siege of 1211 was also Simon of Montfort's revenge for the treachery of Amalric of Montréal and the massacre of crusaders at Montgey not long before. Its course is fascinating in terms of military tactics, and politically, because of the involvement of various parties at Toulouse, including the Black and White confraternities (religious organisations of lay people). The brutality of its outcome (the execution of knights by hanging, and stabbing when the gallows collapsed, the burning of hundreds of heretics, and the execution of the noble siblings Amalric of Montréal and Guiraud of Laurac in the manner of commoners) can be explained by its symbolic as much as strategic importance, although burying alive and stoning to death were not unheard of forms of execution in the south. William of Tudela recounts the massacre at Lavaur on 3 May 1211, the feast of the Invention of the Cross, a day that marked the start of the summer. He assures his audience that the men and women who died at Lavaur would suffer a second death at the Last Judgement, because their souls would be cast into Hell.

Laisse 68

Lavaur was as strong a town as ever existed in any kingdom. Nobody ever saw a better fortified place in a flat region, or one that had stronger ramparts or deeper ditches. Inside it there were many well-armed knights. Guiraud's brother Sir Amalric was there. She was the lady of the town. He had left the Count of Montfort without taking his leave of him. The crusaders had taken Montréal, Laurac and all his other lands from him, so he had grown angry. They had diminished his fief by two hundred knights.

There was no richer knight in Toulouse or in that county; nor was there one who was more generous with money or a better knight in action. A pity that he ever saw the heretics and the Waldensians, for I do not believe that a greater baron of all Christendom has ever been hanged, with so many knights hanged at his side, than him. For a cleric told me that on that day he counted more than eighty knights alone. The townspeople were taken to a meadow. About four hundred of them were burned to death. Moreover, Lady Guiraude was thrown down a well and they covered her with stones. That was both sorrowful and a sin, as no man of the secular world (know this for a fact) would ever have left her company without having had something to eat.

It was on the feast day of Holy Cross in May (which is summer time), that Lavaur was destroyed, as I have told you. The besiegers set up the cat in a gap near the walls, at the bottom of the ditch, and in that way they dug into it to the point that the besieged surrendered, because they found themselves trapped and imprisoned. Thereupon a great massacre was committed, so great that I think it shall still be spoken about at the end of the world. My lords, I do think they deserved to be punished because (as I saw and heard) they were all too negligent, because they did not do what the clergy and the crusaders told them to do. They shall get their just deserts at the end, for they shall be stripped of their possessions, and they shall be pardoned neither by God nor by this world.

Laisse 71

Count Peter of Auxerre, the one of Courtenay, and the Count of Montfort, because they could do no more, and because they saw the Count of Foix was fleeing and going away, returned to Lavaur, where their army was. The town had been taken, as the book tells us. They burned a good four hundred heretics, a lineage of whores, in a fire and they made a great furnace of them. Amalric was hanged and of the many knights who were there, they hanged a good eighty, treating them like thieves, and they put them on the gallows, over here and over there. Na Guiraude was taken, screaming, weeping and shouting, they threw her, lying flat, into a well, that I know well. They pelted and covered her with stones, it dismayed many people. As for the other ladies, a courtly and cheerful Frenchman had them all freed – how admirable and true. In the town, they took many dun and bay warhorses, many pieces of iron armour that fell into their hands, along with much corn, wine and cloth and fine clothing. That made them happy.

Laisse 72

Raymond of Salvanhac, a rich merchant from Cahors, a wealthy and noble bourgeois, was owed a vast amount of money by Montfort. He financed the

crusade by lending it money, and then he accepted to be repaid with cloth, wine and corn. He was granted all the wealth of Lavaur. After they took the town, in the space of a year, they conquered the region up to Montferrand.

Count Baldwin was there, who was brave and valiant; in battle, his heart was the equal of Oliver or Roland, and if he had had more lands (as much as other princes have), he would have conquered enough during his lifetime. Count Raymond, his brother, set him up in Montferrand as seigneur. If that stronghold had been as substantial as its name, neither the French nor the Germans would have held their lives dear. Fourteen knights and I don't know how many others were with Count Baldwin as he awaited the siege of the arrogant French.

4.1.3 The Anonymous Continuator's Version of the Battle of Muret, 1213

Laisse 137

Never was the entire World worth so little (know this for sure) because *Paratge* was destroyed and ruined, and the whole of Christendom was shamed and diminished. Now, my lords: hear what happened, and listen.

The good King of Aragon had set up camp at Muret, along with the Count of Saint-Gilles and the whole of his army, the burghers and the commune of Toulouse. They built the catapults and set them up, then battered Muret from all sides, to the point that everyone there took refuge in the new town. The French who were also there were harried, for they climbed up into the keep. Then a messenger went to the king and said: 'My lord King of Aragon, know truly that the men of Toulouse are at such an advantage that they have taken the town (provided you grant them that opportunity), they have demolished its houses and pulled down buildings. They have pursued the French to the point that they have all gathered in the keep.'

When the king heard that, he felt unsure. He went straight to the consuls of Toulouse and admonished them; he ordered them to leave the men of Muret in peace, 'Because it would be foolish of us to capture them, for I have received letters and sealed messages that say that Simon of Montfort will come fully-armed tomorrow. When they have arrived and locked themselves in there, when my cousin Nuno has landed, we shall besiege the town on all sides, and we shall capture the French and the crusaders, so that the damage we do to them shall never be repaired. Then shall *Paratge* shine over everything. If we seize those who are surrounded now, Simon will flee into other counties; if we follow him, then our tiredness will double. That is why it would be better if we all agreed to let them go in quickly. Then we shall hold the dice in our hand and we will not let them go until the game has been played out. Say it.'

(The consuls tell the Toulousain troops to withdraw to their encampment, where they eat their dinner. They watch Simon of Montfort and his troops ride into the town and obtain victuals. The following day, Peter assembles his council and says that he wants to storm the town. The Count of Toulouse suggests an alternative: to surround the besiegers' camp with a pallisade and then to lure the French out of the besieged town and into that trap. An Aragonese baron calls him a coward and urges them all to attack.)

Laisse 139

... With that they shouted 'To arms!' and went to put on their armour. They spurred on their horses to the gates that the French had already locked. They thrust lances between the doors, so fighting took place both inside and outside the gates. Spears and lances were thrown, great blows were struck. Blood was made to flow on both sides until the whole gate turned vermillion. When the men from outside failed to get in, they returned to their tents and all sat down to dine. But Simon of Montfort had orders shouted throughout Muret's houses to saddle the horses, to throw saddle pads over the horses' backs, so they might see if they could defeat the men from the outside. He made them all go to the Salles gate and when they were out there, he made a speech: 'My lords, barons of France, I can give you no advice except to say that we have all come here to risk our lives. I spent the whole of last night thinking it over. I could neither close nor rest my eyes. I have found and established that we should take this path that leads straight to their tents, as if we were intending to do battle with them. If they come out to attack us, and if we do not draw them far enough away from their tents, then all we can do is run straight to Auvillar.'

Count Baldwin said, 'Let us try it. If they come out, then let's enjoy the thought of the carnage, for an honourable death is better than living as beggars.' Then Bishop Fulk made the sign of the cross over them and William of Barres took command and made the army ride out in three companies, with all the banners in the front line. And they made straight for the tents.

Laisse 140

They all rode to the tents near the marshes, their banners unfurled and their pennons outstretched. The whole place glittered with their shields and helmets, decorated with beaten gold, as well as their hauberks and swords. When the King of Aragon spotted them, he had but few companions to assemble against them. The men of Toulouse ran in his direction; neither the count nor the king could make themselves understood. They did not understand a thing until the French reached them and headed straight to where the king was known to be. He shouted, 'I am the king!' but no one

heard him, and he was smitten and cruelly injured, so that his blood soaked the earth and there he fell down dead, his limbs outstretched.

When they saw this happen, the others felt that they had all been deceived. One ran here, one ran there. Not one defended himself. The French made after them and destroyed them utterly; they harried them to the point that the man who escaped with his life counted himself lucky. The carnage was taken up to the riverbank and the men of Toulouse who stayed at the tents all realised they had been abandoned. En Dalmas of Creixell was struggling in the water and yelled, 'God help us! Evil has befallen us, because the good king of Aragon is dead and abandoned, and so many other barons are dead and defeated. Such terrible damage shall never be undone!' Eventually, he climbed out of the waters of the Garonne. The people of Toulouse, both great and humble, ran to the water's edge and those who could do so crossed over, but many were left behind. That robbing water drowned and lost them. All that was left in the encampment was their baggage train.

The destruction was spoken about the world over, because many men were left there lying dead. Such great destruction!

4.1.4 The Anonymous Continuator's Versions of Reinforcements for the Besieged town of Toulouse and of the Death of Simon of Montfort, 1218

The Anonymous Continuator uses the propaganda image of the Raymondines as the 'light of the world' (*rai-mon*) in this description of the arrival of reinforcements at the siege. *Paratge* appears to represent both the city and the entourage of the counts of Toulouse. The Anonymous Continuator then gives a detailed account of the death of Simon of Montfort. This section opens with the end of a long speech by a Toulousain clerk called Master Bernard who is trying to inspire the two parts of the city, the Bourg and the Cité, to work together. Bernard compares the situation of the besieged nobles of Toulouse to that of the crusaders at Acre in 1189–91. As Laisse 205 opens, he urges them to set fire to the besieging army's siege engine, the cat (see also Raimon Escrivan's poem, 2.1.11). This passage treats *Paratge* as a quality that is specific to the city of Toulouse.

Laisse 199 (extract)

... Then, look! A resplendent light shines throughout the town, for it defends it, recovers its strength, and makes it regain its colour. En Bernard of Cazenac has returned to the holy place with good companions-at-arms and a stout heart to help the town, and to defend it. I never saw (and rightly so because of his nobility), more skilled a knight, more accomplished in

deserving praise; for he has good sense, generosity and an emperor's heart. He governs *Paratge* and he leads Valour. To restore Right and to break down Suffering has he come to the aid of Toulouse and its count, out of love. With him are his kinsman Raymond of Vaux and a brave vavassour, Vezian of Lomagne. They came into the town with great joy, accompanied by their men of Brabant. The barons of the Capitoulat (the ones who govern), and the barons of Toulouse as well as the humble population came up to receive them with joy and rejoicing. Shouting, banners, horn- and trumpet-blowing rang throughout the town and brightened the gloom. When he heard the noise, the Count of Montfort crossed the river in its direction, with a small company of men, left them posted in the hospital and the tower, then returned to the siege and spoke to his men: 'My lords,' said the count. 'Your worst enemies are losing the river, the town, the bridge and their valour. I have heard such a darkness in their midst that you should know that they want to leave – or have a friend come to their aid.' Then came a messenger who told him the truth: 'My lord Count, a force has come into Toulouse, five hundred knights with En Bernard of Cazenac who shall defend the town and fight against you.' 'My friend,' answered the count, 'they have done a foolish thing, for as soon as I go in, those traitors shall go out, and never, as long as I live, shall dispossessed wandering men frighten either me or the Church.'

Laisse 205

. . . 'We shall start with the cat, because we must do that, and together you and we shall capture it side by side, and Toulouse and *Paratge* shall forever be joined together.' Their ardour grew throughout the night, and at day-break Arnold of Villemur went around the houses, because he was rough and warlike, and got the best knights equipped and recruited, along with the good companies and the brave mercenaries. They set up the ditches, the pits and the terraces with crossbows and reliable bows, with bolts, arrows and clothworkers' combs. En Estolt of Linars, who was patient and hard working, had ladders placed from one end to the other of the left side, and had paths guarded there, along with passages, lanes and crossings. When they were all assembled, there was an agreement reached between the barons of the Bourg and the Capitoulat to capture the cat together.

En Bernard of Cazenac, a good and eloquent man, told them what they needed to do, and he said to them bluntly, 'You barons of Toulouse, look at those men confronting you, who have murdered your sons and brothers and given you so much grief. If you could kill them, how much better off you would be! I know the customs of those conceited Frenchmen; they have lined their upper bodies carefully with double-layered cloth, but below that, right down their legs, they are only wearing hose. If you strike

them in the calf-muscles and injure them repeatedly, only meat will be left at the end of the *mêlée*.' They all replied to him, 'May you be rewarded for that!' Then one said to the other, 'We have worthy companions!' Hugh of La Mothe said, 'There aren't too many of us, but we will equal them in taking and giving blows.' With that they scrambled down the ladders, went into the open, occupied the level ground and shouted, 'Toulouse! Light up your fire, death to them! Death to them! Not one of them must remain whole.' And over there the French and the Berrichons received them, shouting, 'Montfort! Montfort! Now you will be shown to be liars!'

And the place where they met was complete carnage. They struck at each other and fought with swords, lances, and steel blades crashing onto Bavarian helms. But En Arnold of Lomagne gave them two proverbs to remember: 'Strike, sweet band of men, remember your deliverance, for today *Paratge* shall shake off the power of its enemies.' They replied to him, 'May you have told the truth.' The assault resumed, with yelling and slaughter, by the burghers of the Bourg and the Capitouls. There was En Raymond of Lasbordes, valiant and energetic, Bernard of Saint-Martin, vicious and swift, William Peter of Montlaur, a battling combatant, En Peter of L'Isle, tenacious and energetic, En Bernard of Comminges, courageous and well-mannered. There was the unflinching William Bernard of Luzenac, and there were En Gaudin and En Ferrand, both of them courageous and swift, as well as Godfrey, En Arbois, En Henri Campanier and the barons of the town, who all lashed out keenly. En Raymond Izarn shouted, 'Let's throw them to the innkeepers! Knights, to arms! Remember those words of advice!' With swords, lances and thick crossbow bolts they resumed their warfare, their torment and their slaughter. But the townsmen forged ahead so that they found themselves clashing inside the fences, and they struck down the glassware and ornaments from their helmets. Those crusaders who were outside the palisades were so unnerved that they could no longer endure the peril, and they fled their shelters. But once they were on horseback their torment began again, such a slaughter that feet, fists and arms flew off in pieces, and the ground was red with brains and blood.

(. . . *Simon of Montfort prays either to win the battle or to die. He leads his men into combat.*)

. . . But from the left parapet, an archer shot and struck the head of Count Guy's warhorse. Half the bolt went into the horse's brains. When the horse turned, another crossbowman with a well-wound bow shot him in the side, and struck Guy in the left side of the groin, so the steel stayed inside the naked flesh, and his flank and breeches streamed with blood. The count went up to his brother, whom he liked; he fell to the ground and he spoke

terrible words, 'Fair brother,' said the count, 'God has cast my companions and me to the ground, and He has given assistance to the routiers. This injury will make a Hospitaller of me!'

As En Guy was making his point and beginning to complain, there was a mangonel within the walls, made by a carpenter. The mangonel and its platform were dragged from Saint-Sernin by the ladies, girls and wives. The stone went straight where it needed to be, and it struck the count on his helmet of steel, so that his eyes, his brains, his back teeth, his forehead and his jaw were shattered to bits. The count fell to the ground dead, bleeding and blackened. Gosselin and En Amalric spurred their horses towards him and made haste to cover him gently with a blue cloak, but the panic grew. You would have heard so many knightly barons lamenting, weeping beneath their helms and saying these memorable words out loud, yelling, 'God! You are not just, because you are allowing the death of the count, and this defeat. Anyone who serves or who prays to you on Sundays is a fool indeed, because the count, who was benevolent and adventurous, has been killed by a stone as if he were a criminal. If you treat your own in this murderous, cruel fashion, we shall have no more business in this land!' With these words they bore the count's body to the missal-reading clerics. The Cardinal, the Abbot and Bishop Fulk received it with grief, with the Cross and with incense. And inside Toulouse a messenger entered and told them the news. There was such joy that people ran from across the town into the churches where they lit wax candles in all the candlesticks, crying out, 'Joy! God is merciful and *Paratge* is ablaze, and it shall be victorious forever, for the count, who was malign and murderous, has died unshriven because he slaughtered many.'

Horns, trumpets, communal rejoicing, chimes, clanging and peals of bells in the belfries, tabors, drums and little flutes made the town and its squares resound. Thereupon the siege was lifted, and the men left all the paths that were beyond the river and the banksides. They abandoned a lot of wealth, packhorses, pavilions, tents, equipment and cash, and the townsmen took many prisoners, but they had lost one man whom they sorely needed: the young, courtly and likeable En Amalric. That was a loss, a grief and an upsetting thing for everyone in the town.

Note

- 1 The Book of Proverbs was believed to have been written by King Solomon, but this line may be an echo of Matthew 7:26, 'But everyone who hears these words of mine and does not put them into practice is like a foolish man who built his house on sand.'

Part 4.2

EXTRACTS FROM THE
CHRONICLE OF PETER OF
LES-VAUX-DE-CERNAY

Introduction

Contemporary chronicles such as that written by Peter of the abbey of Les-Vaux-de-Cernay are crucial for understanding the papacy's authorisation of crusades against heretics in the Central Middle Ages. Peter's work, the *Historia Albigensis*, is one of the principal sources for its origins and first years. Peter had access to the immediate circle of Simon of Montfort through the involvement in the crusade of Guy, his uncle and abbot of the same house. He was with the army for major engagements and was fascinated by the technology of warfare, such as siege engines.

Peter was 19 years old at the start of the crusade and wrote in stages between 1212 and 1218, his narrative ending with the death of Simon of Montfort. It is the most detailed contemporary chronicle which we possess for the crusade up to 1216. It includes detailed descriptions of the attacks on important southern French towns such as Béziers, Carcassonne and the various sieges of Toulouse. For the events of the summer of 1216 and subsequent years the account is both less impressive and less useful in quality and quantity. Other sources take over in terms of accurately depicting events, for example the siege of Beaucaire and subsequent military action. Possibly this was because Peter died before he could complete the last third of the work. After a description of the death of Simon of Montfort in June 1218, it ends with a short account of the events of the winter of 1218–19.

The chronicle was finished by or before 1220. Peter was a Cistercian monk who accompanied his uncle Guy, abbot of Les-Vaux-de-Cernay and later bishop of Carcassonne, on his travels in the south of France, and he seems to have written the work in his twenties. The work is invaluable because, although Peter was not in the south of France for the whole period about which he writes, he was not only an eyewitness to major events which took place during the crusade, but also knew many of the

protagonists, including the crusade leader Simon of Montfort, whom he takes every opportunity to praise to the skies.

Peter is very concerned to show himself a true and loyal son of the Catholic Church. His work begins with a dedication to Pope Innocent III, showing his appreciation of the crucial role this pope played in authorising the Albigensian Crusade. Indeed, throughout the narrative he gives detailed information regarding diplomatic relations between Innocent III, the clergy of the south of France, major players in the crusade such as Peter II of Aragon and Raymond VI of Toulouse, and the decisions of Church councils which often took place at the pope's direction. He also meticulously records the activities of papal legates, who were always inextricably involved with the politics surrounding calls for crusades, were charged with carrying out the directives of the particular pope by whom they were appointed, and played a central role in confirming these pronouncements and ensuring they were enacted.

4.2.1 On Cathars

After the dedication to Pope Innocent III, who called for the crusade, Peter gives his readers what he regards as important information about the heretics who he claims are to be found living in the south of France and who were to become the target of the crusaders. We are given details not only about Peter's understanding of the nature of the Cathar heresy itself, but also about the beliefs, practices and habits of those who espoused it. In the following passage Peter emphasises that there is an important hierarchy within the heresy, dividing the heretics into two groups whom he calls 'perfected' (*perfecti*) and 'believers' (*credentes*). He claims that the former led lives of great asceticism, but that the latter were not expected to embrace this austere way of life, continuing instead to lead ordinary, secular lives. Indeed, according to Peter, the 'believers' went out of their way to indulge in worldly and promiscuous living. In this passage Peter also refers to the 'laying on of hands', or 'consolamentum'.¹ He states that the heretics believed that, if correctly administered at the end of life, this rite would ensure the only true means of salvation. It seems that the question-and-answer form of this ceremony and the content of the ritual were a deliberate parody of the Christian rite of baptism, from which it was probably derived and took its inspiration. Here Peter details the formal questions which he claims would be posed by the 'perfected' Cathar and the answers which the convert was supposed to give in reply before he could be initiated into the religion. The initiation ceremony was a clear and utter rejection of the sacrament of Christian baptism, and therefore of the Catholic Church, and an acceptance, instead, of the tenets of the Cathar faith.²

On the Sects of the Heretics

But it should be understood that certain of the heretics were called 'perfected' or 'good men', others 'believers of the heretics'. Those who were called 'perfected' wore black attire, falsely claimed that they kept themselves chaste, and altogether abhorred the eating of meat, eggs and cheese. They wanted to appear not to be liars, although they themselves lied most particularly about God almost continuously! They even said that they ought never for any reason to swear oaths. On the other hand the 'believers' among the heretics were said to be those living secular lives who were permitted not to attempt to imitate the life of the 'perfected'. However, they hoped that they would be saved by the faith of those men – since they were separated in their manner of living, but in belief (or rather unbelief!) they were one. Those among the heretics who were called 'believers' were dedicated to usury, robbery, murder and illicit carnal desires, perjuries and all manner of perversities. Indeed they sinned the more securely and unrestrainedly because they believed that they could be saved without restitution of the things which they had stolen and without confession and penitence, provided that in the final moment of death they were able to say the 'Our Father' and to guarantee a 'laying on of hands' from their masters.³

The Manner of Conversion, Indeed of Perversion of the Heretics.

When someone delivers himself over to the heretics, the man who receives him says to him, 'Friend, if you want to be one of us it is fitting that you renounce all the beliefs which the Roman Church holds.' He replies: 'I renounce it.' 'Therefore receive the Spirit from the good men', and then he breathes on him seven times in the mouth. Again he says to him: 'Do you renounce that sign of the cross which in baptism the priest made for you with oil and chrism on the breast and on the shoulders and on the head?' He replies: 'I renounce it.' 'Do you believe that that water of baptism works for your salvation?' He replies: 'I do not believe it.' 'Do you renounce that veil which the priest placed on your head when you were baptised?' He replies: 'I renounce it.' Thus the man receives the baptism of the heretics and rejects the baptism of the Church. Then all put their hands on his head and kiss him and clothe him with a black vestment; and from that hour onwards he is reckoned as one of them.

4.2.2 The Siege and Fall of Lavaur, 1211

Chapter 215

Lavaur was a very remarkable and sprawling *castrum* on the river Agout, five leagues from Toulouse. Amongst its defenders were Amalric, previously lord of Montréal, and eighty knights, enemies of the cross. They had come

to the town to resist us there. The lady of the town was a widow, Guiraude, an utter heretic and Amalric's sister.

Chapter 216

On their arrival at the *castrum* our army laid siege to just one side, because it was not strong enough to surround all parts of it. After some days siege engines were constructed and we began attacking the place as usual. The enemy defended with all they had. They had in the town a large, well-armed force, such that the defenders were more numerous than the besiegers . . . Although we were besieging only one side, our forces were split into two camps, which could not help the other safely without difficulty. But soon the bishops of Lisieux and Bayeux and the count of Auxerre arrived from the north of France with many other crusaders. The town was then extended to besiege the town on another side. Then we built a wooden bridge over the Agout and we crossed the river and entirely surrounded the *castrum*.

Chapter 222

. . . The enemies defended themselves with arrogance. I should say that one day they rode along their walls, mounted and in full armour, to mock us and show the strength and solidity of their walls. Oh, the conceitedness!

Chapter 223

A notable incident:

Our side had made a wooden tower close to the rampart, at the top of which the knights of Christ set a cross. The enemies aimed their machines at the cross until they broke one of its arms. Then these dogs without shame cheered and bellowed with laughter loudly, as if this was a great victory. But He who sanctified the cross avenged this insult in a visible and marvellous way, in that soon afterwards, on the feast of the Cross (3 May), it is joyful to tell that those mutilating it were taken prisoner; so the Cross avenged the injuries it had received.

Chapter 224

During this, our army constructed a machine called a 'cat', in the common tongue. When it was ready they dragged it to the town's ditches. Then, with great effort, they carried bits of wood and branches which they made into bundles and threw them into the ditch to fill it up. But ingeniously the enemy dug a tunnel which came out close to our machine. They came out at night through the tunnel and took away the bundles we had thrown in the ditch and took them into the town. Furthermore, some got so close to the cat that with iron hooks they tried underhandedly and treacherously to harpoon our men who were ceaselessly filling in the ditch under cover of

the machine. Furthermore, coming out of their tunnel one night the enemies penetrated the ditch and tried to set fire to our machine, firing at it continuously flaming darts, tow, fat and other combustible things. Two German counts who were with the army mounted a guard that night close to the machine. The alarm was immediately sounded in the camp, people leapt to arms, and our engine was saved.

Chapter 225

... Meanwhile some of us began to despair of ever taking the town, because whatever they threw into the ditch by day, was removed at night by the enemies and taken within the ramparts. Whilst some on our side worried, a few with more subtle imaginations found a solution to the enemy's activity. In front of the tunnel through which the besieged were coming out, they set fire to green wood and small branches. Then they burned dry twigs, fat, tow and other combustibles at the exit. Onto this they then threw wood, green corn and lots of grass. The fire produced so much smoke that it filled the tunnel and prevented our enemies from coming through it. This smoke could not escape upwards because of the coverage of the wood and corn blocking it so, as we have said, it filled the passage's whole length. When they noticed this result, our men were able to fill in the ditch in more peace than before. With the ditch being full, our knights and sergeants-at-arms rolled the cat, with great effort, up to the ramparts and the sappers began work . . .

Chapter 226

(William tells us that while the walls were being breached through undermining, the clergy sang 'Veni Creator Spiritus' so fervently that it struck fear into the hearts of the besieged.)

... so we entered the town. The enemies, incapable of resisting, surrendered. That is how Lavaur was taken, the day of the feast of the Invention of the Holy Cross, by the will of God who mercifully aided us.

Chapter 227

Soon Amalric, originally lord of Montréal, of whom we have spoken, and his eighty knights came out. The noble count Simon of Montfort was count of Toulouse by this time] decided that they should be hanged. They began with Amalric, who was a bit taller than the others, but the gibbet fell over. It had not been fixed firmly enough to the ground. Our count, seeing the resultant hold up, ordered the rest to be put to death. The crusaders seized them enthusiastically and slew them on the spot in less time than it takes

to say it [i.e. with blades]. The lady of the town, Guiraude, utter heretic and sister of Amalric, was thrown down a well and our count ordered that her body be covered with stones. Finally, our crusaders burnt innumerable heretics, with extreme joy.

4.2.3 The Battle of Muret, 1213

In these passages, Peter describes the famous battle of Muret, which occurred in 1213 between Peter II of Aragon and the southern French on the one hand and the crusaders on the other. In comparison to his very brief description of the death of Peter of Aragon, the champion of the southern French, during the battle, Peter gives a long description of the courage and bravery of Simon of Montfort, the leader of the crusade. He details how the bishop of Toulouse tried to persuade the citizens of Toulouse, who were suspected of heresy and of supporting heretics, to surrender themselves to God and the crusaders – but to no avail. Peter next recounts how Muret was a great victory for the crusading army and how the southern French were completely vanquished, before illustrating Simon of Montfort's true nobility of spirit in paying tribute to the body of his fallen enemy. Here Peter makes a deliberate comparison to David who mourned the death of his enemy Saul in the Old Testament (2 Samuel).⁴ He may also have had in mind the story of Aeneas who grieved over the body of his enemy Lausus in Virgil's *Aeneid*.⁵

At once our first battle line leapt boldly on the enemy and threw itself into the midst of their troops; soon a second followed hard on and penetrated the enemy, just like the first. In this engagement the king of Aragon fell and many Aragonese with him. For that man, since he was most arrogant, had positioned himself in the second battle line, although kings are always accustomed to stand in the rear. Moreover, he had changed his armour and had put on another's armour. Our count, seeing that his two battle lines were submerged in the midst of the enemy, and were almost invisible, rushed from the left against the enemy, who were opposite in countless numbers. Indeed they were standing drawn up for battle, next to a certain ditch, which was between them and our count. At once the count, rushing on the aforementioned enemy and seeing no other way by which he could reach them, nevertheless found a very small path in the ditch (prepared, at that time, as we believe, by Divine Providence), crossing through which, he launched himself on the enemy and, as a most brave soldier of Christ, penetrated their lines most bravely.⁶ Nor should one pass over that, when the count wanted to make an attack on them, they themselves struck him with their swords with such a blow from the right hand side, that his left

stirrup was broken from the excessive pressure of blows. Indeed the noble count wanted to fix the spur of his left foot in the blanket of his horse, but the spur itself, broken, slipped away from his foot. However, that most brave soldier did not fall down, but struck back at his enemies most valiantly. Indeed one of the enemies of our count struck him violently on the head, but the noble man struck the said soldier with his fist under the chin and made him fall from his horse. Seeing this, the allies of the said soldier, who were a great crowd, and also all the rest of our adversaries, having been swiftly defeated and confused, sought safety in flight. Our men – namely those who were in the first and second line – seeing this, immediately followed the fugitives and harried them most severely. For, falling on the hindmost, they killed many thousands of them. Indeed our count, and those who were with him, followed after our pursuing forces at a slow pace, on purpose, so that if by chance the enemy should re-group themselves and recover the spirit to resist, our men, who, separated one from another, were following the fleeing enemy, could have a retreat back to the count. Nor should one pass over the fact that the most noble count did not think it fitting in battle to strike anyone whom he saw fleeing and turning his back on him.

While these things were being enacted, the citizens of Toulouse, who in their multitudes had remained in the muster and were prepared for battle, strove with all their strength to make an assault on the town. Seeing this, the bishop of Toulouse, who was in the town, a good and gentle man, compassionate on them in their misery, sent to them a certain priest to warn and counsel them that now, finally, they should be converted to their Lord God and should put down their weapons in order that he himself might snatch them from imminent death. As a testimony of his promise, he sent them his monk's cowl: indeed he was a monk. Yet those men, since they were obstinate and blinded by the Divine Will, replied that the king of Aragon had conquered all our army, but that the bishop wished to deliver them to death, not save them. And for this reason, seizing the cowl from the aforementioned messenger, they struck him gravely with their lances. Meanwhile our soldiers, returning from the slaughter with a glorious victory, and coming to the aforementioned citizens of Toulouse, killed many thousands of them.

After these events, the count ordered certain of his own men to lead him to the place where the king of Aragon had been killed. Indeed he was completely ignorant of the place and the hour of that man's death. Therefore the count, coming to the place, found the body of the king of Aragon prostrate and naked in the middle of the field, since our foot-soldiers had in fact stripped him. Having seen the victory, they had come out from the city and had slain those whom they had been able to find still lying alive. But the

most pious count, seeing the king lying prostrate, got down from his horse and wept over the body of the deceased, like a second David over a second Saul.

Notes

- 1 Peter of Les-Vaux-de-Cernay, *The History of the Albigensian Crusade*, trans. W. A. and M. D. Sibly (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998), pp. xxxiii–xxxiv.
- 2 For details of the *Consolamentum* see, for example, M. Barber, *The Cathars: Dualist Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), pp. 76–81.
- 3 The ‘Our Father’ was The Lord’s Prayer.
- 4 2 *Samuel*: 11–12, in *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, 2 vols, 2nd edn, ed. R. Weber (Stuttgart, 1975).
- 5 *The Aeneid of Virgil*, ed. R. D. Williams (Basingstoke and London: St Martin’s Press, 1973), Book 10, lines 821–32, pp. 101–2.
- 6 A ‘miles Christi’ is a euphemistic term for a crusader.

Part 4.3

EXTRACTS FROM THE
CHRONICLE OF WILLIAM
OF PUYLAURENS

Introduction

William of Puylaurens wrote long after the crusade had ended, possibly around 1273, but he had plenty of contact with eyewitnesses of the crusade. He was educated in Toulouse and spent part of his youth in the entourage of Bishop Fulk. He was rector of the church of Puylaurens in the Lauragais (1237–40), notary to the next bishop of Toulouse, Raymond of Falgar (1240–2), and chaplain to Raymond VII until the count's death in 1249. It is possible that he worked as a notary to the inquisition tribunal of Toulouse in his later years.

4.3.1 The Battle of Muret, 1213 (Extract from Chapter 20)

William's version of the battle of Muret is partly based on the personal reminiscences of Raymond VII. Here, William cites another source to give an idea of what was happening among the crusaders shortly before the battle (compare 2.1.5).

Now, at the same time, the king of Aragon, who had been fortunate against the Saracens, wanted to try his chance against the Christians. He came to Toulouse in late summer, took counsel from the counts, the nobles and the burghers of Toulouse, set out with a large army and besieged the castle of Muret, where Count Simon had posted a garrison that was doing a lot of damage to Toulouse. Many people joined the army from surrounding regions.

When the count of Montfort heard about this, he rushed to assist his men. I myself heard many years later from my lord Maury, abbot of Pamiers, a trustworthy and very respectable man, that he had been placed in charge as sacrist of the *castrum* of Pamiers, and travelled to Boulbonne to see the count, who was on his way there [to Muret]. When he learned that he was travelling to assist his besieged men and that he might run into the

besiegers if they were waiting in the open countryside, the sacrist said to him, 'You have few companions compared to your adversaries, among whom there is the king of Aragon, an experienced warrior who has proven his mettle. He has the counts and a great army with him. It is not fair to pit yourself against a king and such a multitude with so few men.'

On hearing his words, the count pulled a letter from his purse, saying, 'Read this letter'. The sacrist discovered as he read it that the king of Aragon was sending greetings to a lady, the wife of a nobleman of the diocese of Toulouse, and telling her that he was coming to chase the French out of the region out of love for her, and other flattering words. So, having read this, the sacrist replied, 'What are you trying to say with this?' He replied, 'What am I trying to say? God help me! I am not afraid of a man who has set out to attack the "business of God" for the sake of a whore!' Then he put the letter carefully back into his purse. Either a servant or the secretary of that lady might have made a copy of the letter, on the assumption that it was worth taking note of it, and the count carried it as evidence against the king that was destined for the eyes of God, because, as he put his faith in God, he did not fear that a man whom he thought of as effeminate could stand up to him.

4.3.2 The Murders at Avignonet (1242) (Extract from Chapter 43)

The murder at Avignonet of senior inquisitorial staff was associated with Raymond VII by some, and it is interesting that William of Puylaurens reflects this in spite of being in the count's service. The scandal polarised the region again.

At this time Brother William Arnold and Brother Stephen his colleague, of the orders of inquisitors Preachers and Minors, and the brothers in their entourage and the archdeacon of Lézat and the prior of Avignonet, undertaking the business of the faith against heretics, were savagely killed in the court of the count of Toulouse himself on the night of the feast of the Ascension of the Lord, by enemies of God and faith. And because of this atrocity some of those who had wanted to wage war against the king drew back from it.

4.3.3 The Siege and Fall of Montségur (1243–4) (Extract from Chapter 44)

William's brief account of the lengthy siege of Montségur reflects his distance from the event itself, and as such contrasts strikingly with the very immediate recollections of participants such as Philippa of Mirepoix.

During this time, the venerable father lord Peter Amiel, archbishop of Narbonne, and lord Durand, bishop of Albi, and the seneschal of Carcassonne besieged the castle of Montségur, in the diocese of Toulouse, which was held by two magnates, Peter-Roger of Mirepoix and Raymond of Péreille. It was a public refuge of certain evil-doers and heretics – like a synagogue of Satan – on account of the strength of the castle, situated on the highest rock and seeming unassailable.

They were there for a long time and made little progress, but in the event some lightly armed men were sent at night with locals who knew the place and managed to arrange a horrifyingly steep ascent; this brought them to a fortification in a nook of the mountain, which they reached with the Lord guiding them. Surprising the watch, they killed the guards with swords and bravely isolated the fortification. As day broke, because they were at much the same height as the defenders in the main castle, they started to attack. Seeing with a shock the terrible route they had taken by night, they would in no way have dared to begin it by day. But because they had secured the upper part, an easier ascent could be found for the rest of the army.

And so the conquered people inside had no respite day or night. Nor were the infidels able to bear the onslaught by the faithful. So they agreed that their lives would be spared, and abandoned the castle and the robbed heretics they found inside, who were about two hundred men and women, to those attacking them. Amongst those inside was Bertrand Marty, whom they had made their bishop. Conversion, to which they were invited, was refused by them. They were locked in an enclosure of stakes and logs, set on fire and burned, and crossed over to the fire of Tartarus. And the castle was restored to the marshal of Mirepoix, whose it was before.¹

Note

- 1 Guy of Lévis, son of one of the original crusaders of the same name.

Part 4.4

EXTRACTS FROM THE
CHRONICLE OF WILLIAM
PELHISSON

Introduction

William Pelhisson was an inquisitor engaged in Languedoc in the early stages of inquisition. His very brief chronicle deals with events of the period 1229–44. There are known to be a few inaccuracies in his work in terms of chronology – he is rather vague about when some events took place – but his evidence is important because we do not have inquisitors’ registers for most of this period, although we know they were made; William makes a note of telling us that the many confessions made in various locations were recorded in books. William died in 1268.

4.4.1 After the Peace of Paris

After the peace made at Paris made in Holy Week in the year of our Lord 1229, between the lord king of France and the Church on the one side, and the noble lord Count Raymond and his followers on the other, I shall faithfully recount some of what happened. With the Church believing that there was peace in this land, the heretics and their believers readied themselves with more and more attempts and guile against Her and against Catholics, making more evil at Toulouse and in these lands than they made in the time of war. When they saw this, the brothers of the Order of Preachers and the Catholics lamented. Many masters and scholars of Paris, and students, were sent to establish a university so that the faith would be taught, and the liberal sciences. But this was not effective in eliminating heresy; on the contrary, those heretical men derided them and flourished against the adversity.

The Friars Preacher remained in the Church of Holy Rome in Toulouse, which Bishop Fulk of Toulouse, of good memory, had given them. But because this church was small and it was impossible to extend it . . . a garden was bought from Bernard Raymond in 1229. On 23 December 1230

the brothers moved in. This garden next to the Cité¹ and another next to the town were bought by lord Pons of Capdenier and given to them.

In the time when Brother John of La Johannie was prior of the convent, and the provincial prior was Brother Raymond of Le Fauga of Miremont, who after a short time became bishop of Toulouse, and who had received the donation of that place, the brothers built a very modest chapter house, small and humble, on account of the fact that they had little space and almost no money. And our Brothers remained there, holding steadfastly to a life of poverty in food and clothing, for a long time, with cheerfulness and devotion, conducting themselves in the name of Christ and the establishment of faith.

... But one day, when one of our Brothers was preaching, he said in his sermon that heretics remained in the town and held their meetings disseminating heresy. The people of the town hearing this were greatly perturbed and agitated, whereupon the town consuls called the prior to the town hall, ordering him to say to the brothers finally that they should no longer allow the heretics to preach like that and that they considered it very bad of the brothers to say that there were heretics there, if none amongst them proved it. This and similar threatening things they said. Then Master Roland,² having heard this from the prior, replied and he said 'Certainly it is now necessary that we preach increasingly against the heretics and their believers.' That he did, and others too, with bravery and potency.

At that time Arnold Peyre, oblate of Saint-Sernin-de-Toulouse, died in the town of Toulouse and was made a canon and interred in the cloister. He had been a heretic at his death, unknown to the canons; thus heard Master Roland, who went to the brothers and the priests and had them exhume the body, set it alight and burn it.

... [In 1232] the lord legate made Peter Seilan, who was from Toulouse, and William Arnold inquisitors against heretics in the dioceses of Toulouse and Cahors. He also made brother Arnold Cathala, who was of the convent of Toulouse, inquisitor against heretics in the diocese of Albi, where he preached bravely and undauntedly against heretics, and was thus better able to undertake inquisition. Nevertheless, the believers of heretics wanted to say almost nothing at that time, always conspiring to admit nothing.

Arnold Cathala nevertheless condemned two living heretics: Peter of Pech-Perdu and Peter of Bomassip. Both were burnt, at different times. He then condemned others who were dead, and had them dragged up and burned. So the people of Albi rose up and wanted to drown him into the River Tarn, but at the insistence of some he was let go, beaten, his clothes torn, his face bloodied. But when they seized him he said, 'Let Jesus Christ be praised'. Then, at this unfortunate time, the inquisitor Brother Ferrer arrived and captured and imprisoned many of them, and also had them burned . . .

... But at this time Catholics were oppressed in the region, and the persecutors of heretics were killed in many places, even though the lord Raymond had promised in the Peace that for five years he would give two silver marks to anyone catching a heretic, male or female, and after five years just one mark. That happened many times, but the great lords of the land, the leading knights and townspeople and others, defended heretics and concealed them, and struck, wounded and killed their persecutors, because the count's counsel was notably corrupted in matters of the faith, and so much evil was done against the Church and the faithful of the region.

... The inquisitors undertook their investigation in Toulouse and summoned many ... amongst them someone from the suburb called John Weaver. He had many of the most important townspeople, heretical supporters, to defend him. This evil John said to all of them, 'Lords, listen to me. I am not a heretic, because I have a wife and I have sex with her, and have sons, and eat meat. And I lie and I swear. I am a good Christian! ...' ... Then the town was very much against the brothers, and there was much talk and threats against them, and many heretical supporters incited the people to throw stones at them and tear down their houses because, as they put it, good, married people were being unjustly accused of heresy ...

... the inquisitors Brother Peter Seilan and Brother William Arnold undertook their inquest against heretics at Cahors, and there condemned some dead people, who were dug up in the town and burnt. They also condemned the deceased Humbert of Castelnau, but his son stole his body from the cemetery and it wasn't found. An important *credens*, Raymond of Brouelles, fled to Rome and drowned himself in the Tiber. Then the brothers undertook an inquest at Moissac and condemned John of La Garde. He fled to Montségur and was made a heretic, and later was burned with two hundred and ten other heretics.³ They summoned also Fulk of Moissac⁴ who, through fear, became a monk at the abbey of Belleperche.⁵ They nonetheless proceeded against him. When he heard of this, he fled to Lombardy. John Cristofals, a lawyer at Moissac, likewise fled to Lombardy when summonsed. The inquisitors condemned them as heretics anyway, and this caused great fear amongst the heretics and *credentes* of the region.

... In the year of our Lord 1236 ... on a certain morning there came to our house at Toulouse Raymond Gros of Toulouse, who had been a heretical perfect in this region for twenty-two years or thereabouts. He surrendered himself to the brothers devoutly and humbly, having spontaneously converted from heresy, neither called nor summonsed. And at the command of the inquisitors Brother William Arnold and Brother Stephen, [the clergy present] received his confession of heresy, and they wrote for many days, to the ruination of many heretics; many then confessed the

truth, and the inquisition was put clearly in the picture. Many heretications that had taken place of powerful dead people of Toulouse, and others now dead, and of other places, were revealed by Raymond Gros, and the inquisition of heretics was run entirely by him, with the help and will of God. Thus were great townspeople, noble lords and others condemned by sentences. From the cemeteries of the town they were exhumed and ignominiously ejected by the brothers, in the presence of the city governor and the people, and their bones and bodies, rotting corpses, hauled through the town, named and loudly proclaimed, the cryer saying: 'Qui aytal fara, aytal perira'.⁶ And then they were burned at Pré du Comte.

(William then lists many people thus exhumed and burned, and also the burning of the living and condemning of some who had taken refuge at Montségur, with extracts such as)

. . . They condemned also Raymond of Peréille, lord of Montségur, and his wife Corba; Arnold-Roger, brother of the said Raymond; and Peter-Roger of Mirepoix, lords of Montségur . . . and Raymond Unaud, lord of Lanta. William-Bernard Unaud, father of Jordan, who was a perfected heretic, was burned at Toulouse . . . Many others were condemned by those brother inquisitors and by their successors. Their names are not inscribed in the Book of Life, and their bodies burn and their souls are tortured in hell.

Notes

- 1 The fortified citadel at Toulouse. The Cité was the seat of the counts and the bishop, centred on the cathedral of Saint Stephen. Its walls separated it from the Bourg, which was centred on the basilica of Saint-Sernin.
- 2 Master Roland of Cremona, one of the theologians of Paris mentioned: See Duvernoy, *Guillaume Pelhisson*, p. 40 and n. 11.
- 3 i.e. when the castle fell in 1244.
- 4 Fulk of Saint-Paul.
- 5 This Cistercian abbey lies between the Quercy and Toulouse on the river Garonne.
- 6 'Who shall act thus shall perish thus'.

Part 4.5

EXTRACTS FROM *THE
TALE OF THE HERETIC*
(*LAS NOVAS DEL HERETJE*)

(Paul Meyer, ‘Le débat d’Izarn et de Sicart de Figueiras’, *Annuaire-bulletin de la Société de l’Histoire de France*, 16 (1879) 233–85; re-edited by P. T. Ricketts, *Contributions à l’étude de l’ancien occitan: Textes lyriques et non-lyriques en vers* (Birmingham: University of Birmingham and Publications de l’AIEO, 2000))

Introduction

This is a propaganda poem in Occitan that was produced under the patronage of Dominican inquisitors. It has been edited and studied before under the title ‘Debate of Izarn and Sicart’, but there are no grounds for reading it as a debate, and it is clearly a work of fiction. The scenario is dramatic: some heretics have been condemned to be burned, and a man who works with the inquisitors, Izarn, achieves the last-minute conversion of the Cathar bishop Sicart of Figueiras. Izarn presents nine arguments or *quaestiones* to refute Catharism. Sicart speaks only at the end to say that he will convert and will begin to collaborate with the inquisitors.

Izarn praises Dominican inquisitors of the Toulouse tribunal who were active in the 1240s. Bernard of Caux and his colleague John of Saint-Peter investigated the rural Lauragais between 1245 and 1248; they were succeeded by a Catalan inquisitor, Brother Ferrer (named here in *Laisse* 10). Izarn also honours the memory of William Arnold and his officers, who were massacred at Avignonet in 1242 (*Laisse* 7). These men were not solely representatives of the church, because Bernard of Caux and those officers who made up his ‘secular arm’ were employed after 1242 by Count Raymond VII of Toulouse.

Izarn is clearly a fictional character but Sicart is identifiable as Sicart of Figueiras. Sicart, Bertrand of Lagarde and Peter Capella (all three are named in this poem) are cited in an inquisition deposition made in 1245

(Doat, 23, ff. 209–17). The deponent was later interrogated repeatedly by Bernard of Caux between 1244 and 1246. Another deponent says that Peter Capella (the Cathar deacon of Hautpoul) was active along with a certain Sicart of Lunel as ‘deacons of the heretics’ in 1239. Sicart of Lunel eventually abjured heresy (in 1255), made a deposition of his own in which he incriminated at least 550 people, and worked with the inquisitors until the 1280s. It is not thought that he and Sicart of Figueiras were the same man.

In Laisse 9, Izarn narrates the popular and orthodox story of the fall of the rebel angels. The version told here is compatible with the beliefs of the moderate dualists. However, Izarn presents Sicart’s faith in Laisses 1–3 as absolute dualism.

4.5.1 *The Tale of the Heretic*

Laisse 3 (extract) Izarn is speaking.

... Now let us propose, as you said before, that the Devil made you from your head to your toes: your flesh, bones, limbs, all around and about. You lied, and I will tell you how. We do not find it written in the works of Solomon, [and] the prophets and apostles do not say anywhere that the Devil’s work gives salvation. Nor was the Holy Spirit so vulgar as to ever set up his home in the Devil’s vessel. You are no better a container than a hambone, and then you save your companion by laying your hands upon him!

You do not wish to display your preaching eloquence in a church or a town square, nor do you wish to make a sermon anywhere except among the bushes, the woods and the forests, with Na Domergua, with Rainald or Bernardon, Garson or [Na] Peironela, who are spinning their distaffs as they comment on the Gospels: ‘So it goes, so it was ...’ One weaves and the other spins, another preaches about how the Devil made every thing that has been created. No household has ever been found that was so ignorant of grammar or Latin, and that imagined it could deprive God of His possessions. Here, the Emperor of Glory need not fear losing the price of one button from His rightful claim. We have good witnesses, those that are useful to us, that prove that He made the sky and the earth all around and about, and He calls the sun, the moon and the stars therein his sons and brothers, according to His creation. The holy prophet David, with good reason, speaks about this achievement in preaching terms (Psalms 128/127: 3): ‘Your wife will be like a fruitful vine within your house. Your sons will be like olive shoots around your table.’

Now heretic, see that you are committing treason, for you call the man who was Son of God a bastard, and you give Him another father, one who

was not His. You have lied in order to deceive, like a thief, because you are a thief of souls, and that displeases God. Now I shall defeat you with another *quaestio*: If the Devil made man, according to your false sermon, then he made God, the One who was on the cross, because He called himself a man at the Passion.

Laisse 7 (extracts)

Before I say farewell to you and let you go into the flames, I would like to hold a disputation with you about the resurrection, because according to your beliefs, your anxious thoughts, and your false Order that has led you to reject all the things that should save you, you do not believe that a man or a woman could be resurrected from the dust or the earth from which they were made, nor might they come to plead at the Judgement at which we must all appear. No one should believe that the word of God could be reversed, that it should not be accomplished. If a man's head were over there, in the Holy Land, one of his feet was in Alexandria and the other one on Mount Calvary, one of his hands was in France and the other one in Auvillar,¹ and his body was in Spain and he had had himself taken there once he had been burnt to ashes to the point that a gust of wind could have blown him away, then on Judgement Day he would have to be assembled into the same shape that he had on the day he was baptised. You can find it in Holy Scripture: (Job 19: 26) 'And in my flesh shall I see God. I myself will see Him with my own eyes'; [Nicene Creed:] '[I believe] in the resurrection of the body.'

...

And heretic, you say something that cannot happen, that cannot appear in the future, and that cannot be accomplished. You say that a new flesh will come to renew the spirits of those people in whom they must be saved. This is a great lie that no one should listen to. If Peter Capella, or John of the Colet, or a man of your persuasion could demonstrate to me that he could take on any other kind of flesh, or capture the goodness that God orders us to construct or to give, if through any Scripture or through any testimony you could demonstrate this to me, then I shall decide to join you. I shall become a heretic if you can prove your claims! Who would ever strive to torment their body, do good works, give alms or fast on Fridays if they lost their investment at the point when they should be rewarded with it? What would the just man do who persevered in hope of earning the joy of Paradise for all time (as God has promised it to him, and must give it to him), if a new, foreign flesh that could never have said or done anything that is good pushed him out and died in his place? This cannot be. That which God has promised cannot be reversed.

...

All the worldly sins that can be spoken or committed by the mouth or the hand must march against the deed of heresy and present themselves for judgement, which is why the Preachers do not want to stop. Nor did the learned [William] Arnold ever want to spare himself. That is why the heretics had him decapitated. Brother Bernard of Caux wants to emulate him.² Whoever is not afraid of justice should do the same. They [the inquisitor friars] have agreed that whoever wishes to confess, to return to the faith and to be reconciled shall be kept safe by all men from being burned or immured, for there will be nothing that can be proved against him, and they will give him a penance that he will bear lightly, without losing his wealth. . . . The Lord Pope who appoints them, and who does not ever want to change them from that position, will not let them be if he sees them handling the *negotium Christi* badly. Instead, he will move them on, and put others in their place. . . .

Laisse 8 (extracts)

. . . Even if the Catholics were five times or one third more [numerous] than the heretics, everything would have been ruined had God had not sent these Preachers here, because of a lack of wise men. Because no matter who spoke and no matter who preached, the faith was corrupted, and all the things we have been hearing about took root. There would never have been a *credens*, a heretic or a Waldensian if a good pastor had been there to contradict them. People with weak hearts who do not know about Latin, Scripture or the Commandments find it easy to change when no one is at their side. For if someone had been nearby then, as they are now, they would have set aside evil and learned about good. And because of this, my lords, we need the mercy and mercifulness of the Universal Lord, that He might make them come down to the place where they are needed. If anyone does not believe that he is a heretic, and is not a heretic, may he be set a penance that seems appropriate, matching the sin to the punishment. Whoever has committed a crime or an action once should not be punished for two or three, because he can easily lose whatever he has easily gained. Whoever repents and weeps well should be shown mercy. That is the medicine that ensures a good welcome from the love of God, when a sincere heart is involved. . . .

Laisse 9

. . . Where do you find it written, and from where have you learned that this spirit of yours, which you received, could be one of those that rained down here from the skies? . . . Heretic, you would indeed have deceived me wickedly if this spirit of mine, which has sustained my heart, were among the first to be cast down. This happened a good five thousand years ago.

I am not yet seventy (and that was achieved at a cost), and I can only remember what I have experienced in my lifetime. If [my spirit] had known God from that time and committed every conceivable sin, and I remember nothing about it, and it has all been forgotten, how could I become mindful of it, as I have lost the appreciation of it? I do not know if God has harvested or discarded me, nor do I know if I have been deserving of Hell or of Glory. For I remember a thousand things that I have seen and known in the world, and if they were good or bad. If either my spirit or my soul had indeed experienced so much from that moment to this one, it would be worth nothing for me to have been so sincere, and to have been remembered here, because I remembered neither a little nor too much of whatever I had experienced.

...

Tell me, in what school did you learn that the spirit of a man, when it has lost its body, places itself in an ox, an ass or a horned sheep, in a pig or a hen (the first animal that it sees), and goes from one body to the next until it is born in the body of a man or a woman?

Laisse 10. Izarn finishes his sermon, and Sicart answers him.

... 'If you do not confess now, the fire has been lit and the horn is being sounded throughout the town, the populace have gathered to see justice be done, for now you shall be burned.'

'Izarn,' said the heretic, 'If you can promise me, and make sure that I am assured by others that I will not be burned, walled-in or destroyed, I shall endure all other torments in peace as long as you keep me from those. ... I will tell you, because I want it to be well-known that I have saved five hundred men with these hands, and put them in Paradise. I was made a bishop. If I had taken my leave of them and abandoned them, I would have "unsaved" every one of those five hundred and delivered them fallen and damned to the devils to do their will, for never will any of them be saved. ... our dearest friends and our most devoted vassals have abandoned us, and turned into our opponents and our enemies, for they capture us and tie us to posts, however much they have greeted us in the past. So they think themselves acquitted, and us damned. So they imagine they can remit their own sins through us.

...

'I have a number of rich, powerful friends, and there is not a single one who thinks that he has been repaid if he has coins or silver, until he has had them given to me. I am well provided with money and stores, for I keep all our *credentes* well-equipped – you will hardly find one that is poor or struggling financially. I am abundantly furnished with clothing, with shirts, hose as well as laundered sheets, blankets and covers for the use of my personal

friends when I have invited them to visit. If I fast often, please do not feel pity for me, because I often eat my fill from well-prepared dishes with clove sauces, or good pies. Fish is better than poor-quality meat, and good clove-infused drink is the equal of wine from a barrel. Bread made from sifted flour is preferable to the loaves of the cloister. And sometimes it isn't good to go out when it is wet, for while you spend the night in the wind and the rain, and you arrive covered in muck, I stay under my blanket, pleasantly and at peace with our confrères. I am ready, for I cleanse myself of lice and I scratch myself whenever it pleases me to do so. And sometimes when I feel the desire for it, if there is a male or female cousin around, the sin doesn't cost a thing, because I absolve myself when I have fallen down a bit. There is no miscreant belief here, nor any mortal sin, regardless of who says or commits it, that might not be saved if someone goes to us (you understand?) either to me or to the deacon who shall be at my side. See the pleasant situation in which I am placed? Now that I want to leave it, for I know that it is sinful, and take the faith of Rome, I want you to thank me for that, and I want you to receive me as an honourable man.

...

'Thanks to your words, I wish to be baptised and returned to the faith that you have preached to me about, you and Brother Ferrer, to whom the power is given to bind and to unbind, whatever the sin might be of the heretic, the Waldensian, or the clog-wearer.'³

Notes

- 1 The town of Auvillar fell under the scrutiny of Bernard of Caux between 1243 and 1247.
- 2 Bernard of Caux desires to become a martyr for the faith, like William Arnold, who was murdered at Avignonet in 1242. The poem might be composed after the canonisation within 12 months of his murder of the inquisitor St Peter Martyr (Peter of Verona) in 1253. The 'martyrs' of Avignonet have never been canonised. See C. Caldwell, 'Peter Martyr: The Inquisitor as Saint', *Comitatus* 31.1 (2000) 137–4.
- 3 The 'power to bind and to unbind' was associated with the papal power of the keys (Matthew 16: 19).

FURTHER READING

The survey given here is a selection of studies and also intended to be of use to scholars and general readers. It informs our Historical Introduction. It is by no means meant to be exhaustive, but to give the reader an idea of the state of scholarship and some key works, mostly, but not only, in English. Usually the original edition has been cited, although the popularity of some works means that there have frequently been later editions and reprints.

Heresy, Culture and Society

Secondary literature concerned with different aspects of the thirteenth-century Cathar heresy against which the Albigensian Crusade was organised is vast. Seminal works in the area include those of Arno Borst, *Die Katharer* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1952), Christopher Brooke, 'Heresy and Religious Sentiment: 1000–1250', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 41 (1968), 115–31, Milan Loos, *Dualist Heresy in the Middle Ages*, trans. I. Levitová (Prague: Academia; The Hague: distributed by Nijhoff, 1974), Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977).¹

Francophone classics include Jean Duvernoy's *Le Catharisme*, 2 vols (Toulouse: Privat, 1976–9), *Cathares, Vaudois et Béguins, dissidents du pays d'Oc* (Toulouse: Privat, 1994), and *Albigéisme ou catharisme?* (Toulouse: Cahiers du Sud, 53, 1966). Michel Roquebert's *L'Épopée cathare*, 4 vols (Toulouse: Privat, 1970–89) and *Les Cathares: de la chute de Montségur aux derniers bûchers, 1244–1329* (Paris: Perrin, 1998) are important works.

R. I. Moore, *The Origins of European Dissent* (London: Allen Lane, 1977), *The Formation of a Persecuting Society. Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987),² *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World, c.650–c.1450*, ed. and trans. Janet and Bernard Hamilton (New York: Manchester University Press, 1998), and Bernard Hamilton's 'The Cathar Council of Saint Félix Reconsidered', in his *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades (900–1300)* (London: Variorum, 1979), pp. 23–53.

More recently, important books have included Malcolm Lambert, *The Cathars* (Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), Michael Costen, *The Cathars and the Albigensian Crusade* (Manchester, UK; New York: Manchester University Press, 1997) and Malcolm Barber, *The Cathars: Dualist Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages* (Harlow: Longman, 2000). Also crucial to any reading list is John H. Arnold's *Belief and Unbelief in Medieval Europe* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530*, eds P. Biller and A. Hudson (Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994), *The Medieval Church: Universities, Heresy and the Religious Life*, eds P. Biller and B. Dobson (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1999), *Heresy and Society; on the Political Function of Heresy in the Medieval World*, eds C. Bruschi and P. Biller (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2003), Andrew Roach, *The Devil's World: Heresy and Society 1100–1320* (Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2005), Caterina Bruschi, *The Wandering Heretics of Languedoc* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), and Lucy Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century: The Textual Representations* (Woodbridge: York Medieval, 2011).

For a sceptical and challenging approach to the phenomenon called Catharism, see Monique Zerner *et al.*, *L'histoire du Catharisme en discussion: Le 'concile' de Saint-Félix (1167)* (Nice: Centre d'Études Médiévales; Diffusion Libr. Archéologique, 2001), Mark G. Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245–1246* (Princeton, NJ; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), Jean-Louis Biget, *Hérésie et inquisition dans le midi de la France* (Paris: Picard, 2007), and most recently R. I. Moore, *The War against Heresy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press/London: Profile Books, 2012).

Works on southern French society in the period of the growth of Catharism include John Hine Mundy, *Society and Government at Toulouse in the Age of the Cathars* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1997), *Men and Women at Toulouse in the Age of the Cathars* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1990), *Liberty and Political Power in Toulouse 1050–1250* (New York: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1954), *Studies in the Ecclesiastical and Social History of Toulouse in the Age of the Cathars* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), Malcolm Barber, 'Women and Catharism', *Reading Medieval Studies* 3 (1977), 45–62 and 'Catharism and the Occitan Nobility: The Lordships of Cabaret, Minerve and Termes', in *The Ideals and Practice of Medieval Knighthood*, iii, eds C. Harper-Bill and Ruth Harvey (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1990), pp. 1–18, Elaine Graham-Leigh, *The Southern French Nobility and the Albigensian Crusade* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), Laurent Macé, *Les Comtes de Toulouse et leur entourage, XIIe–XIIIe siècles: Rivalités, alliances, et jeux de pouvoir* (Toulouse:

Privat, 2000), Claire Taylor, *Heresy in Medieval France: Dualism in Aquitaine and the Agenais, c.1000–c.1250* (London/Woodbridge: Royal Historical Society/Boydell and Brewer, 2005) and *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Medieval Quercy* (York/Woodbridge: York Medieval Press/Boydell and Brewer, 2011); Anne Brenon, ‘Catharism in the Family in Languedoc in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries: An Investigation based on Inquisition Sources’, in *Urban and Rural Communities in Medieval France*, eds K. Reyerson and J. Drendel (Leiden, 1998), pp. 291–304. Since the 1960s the series *Cahiers de Fanjeaux* (Toulouse: Privat) has published articles on all aspects of the religious life in high-medieval Languedoc – orthodox and heretical.

At a more populist level, René Weis’s *The Yellow Cross: The Story of the Last Cathars, 1290–1329* (London: Viking, 2000) was a fresh version of the famous, ground-breaking work by Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou*. The latter has been re-issued many times, including B. Bray’s translation (London: Penguin Books, 1978). Stephen O’ Shea’s *The Perfect Heresy: The Life and Death of the Cathars* (London: Profile, 2000) has also found a wide audience. Novels written with the heretics in mind include Kate Mosse’s *Labyrinth* (London: Orion, 2005). But it should be noted that the Cathar heresy has been the stuff of conspiracy theories and ‘bad’ history for a long time and most recently since it was included in the narrative of supposedly suppressed historical secrets set out in Michael Baigent, Richard Leigh and Henry Lincoln’s a-historical pot boiler *Holy Blood and Holy Grail* (London: Corgi, 1982), central themes of which were developed in Dan Brown’s best-selling ‘historical’ novel *The Da Vinci Code* (London: Corgi, 2003).

There is also a huge corpus of material on the other major group of heretics in southern France in the Central Middle Ages – the Waldensians. Early works include Emilio Comba, *Waldo and the Waldensians before the Reformation*, trans. E. Comba (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1880), Enrico Sartorio, *A Brief History of the Waldensians* (New York: Published by the American Waldensian Aid Society, 1921) and Isabel Whittier, *The Waldensians* (Brunswick, ME, 1957). More recent works are Gabriel Audisio, *The Waldensian Dissent: Persecution and Survival c.1170–c.1570*, trans. C. Davison (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), Euan Cameron, *The Waldenses: Rejections of Holy Church in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), Shulamith Shahar, *Women in a Medieval Heretical Sect: Agnes and Huguette the Waldensians*, trans. Y. Lotan (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2001) and Peter Biller, *The Waldenses, 1170–1530: Between a Religious Order and a Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001) and ‘Goodbye to Waldensianism?’, *Past and Present* 192 (2006), 3–33.

The Albigensian Crusade

Early studies which made an important contribution to the field include Achille Luchaire's, *Innocent III: vol. 3: La Croisade des Albigeois* (Paris: Hachette et Cie, 1905). Zoe Oldenbourg, *Massacre at Montségur: A History of the Albigensian Crusade*, ed. P. Green (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1961) is still a scholarly best-seller. Key introductions include Joseph Strayer, *The Albigensian Crusades* (New York: Dial Press, 1971), Walter Wakefield, *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Southern France, 1100–1250* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974), Jonathan Sumption, *The Albigensian Crusade* (London/Boston: Faber, 1978), Michael Costen, *The Cathars and the Albigensian Crusade* (Manchester, UK; New York: Manchester University Press, 1997), and Bernard Hamilton, *The Albigensian Crusade* (London: Historical Association, 1974), 'The Albigensian Crusade', in his *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades (900–1300)* (London, 1979), pp. 1–40, and see his *Crusaders, Cathars and the Holy Places* (Aldershot/Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1999). The major recent studies are Malcolm Barber, *Crusaders and Heretics, Twelfth to Fourteenth Centuries* (Aldershot/Brookfield, VT: Variorum, 1995), Laurence Marvin, *The Occitan War: A Military and Political History of the Albigensian Crusade, 1209–1218* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), and Bernard Hamilton, 'The Albigensian Crusade and Heresy', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 5, c.1198–c.1300, ed. D. Abulafia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 164–81. See also Martin Alvira Cabrer, *El Jueves de Muret: 12 de Septiembre de 1213* (Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, 2002) and the important collection *La Croisade Albigeoise*, eds M. Roquebert *et al.* (Carcassonne: Centre d'études cathares, 2004).

More general books on crusading history also include invaluable material on the Albigensian Crusade, in particular *The Atlas of the Crusades*, ed. J. Riley-Smith (London: Times Books, 1991), Jonathan Riley-Smith, *The Crusades. A Short History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987), *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades*, ed. J. Riley-Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995) and Christopher Tyerman's, *God's War: A New History of the Crusades* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006).

Papal Activity in Relation to Heresy

There is a wealth of secondary literature concerned with papal activity in relation to heresy in the south of France and only a fraction of it can be mentioned here. Seminal books on the papacy which include discussion

of heresy and the Albigensian Crusade include Geoffrey Barraclough, *The Medieval Papacy* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1968), Walter Ullmann, *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1972), Colin Morris, *The Papal Monarchy. The Western Church from 1050–1250* (Oxford: Oxford Clarendon University Press, 1989), Ian Stuart Robinson, *The Papacy 1073–1198: Continuity and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), and Eamon Duffy, *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press in association with S4C, 1997).

In particular monographs about Pope Innocent III which contain valuable insights into the papacy's reaction to heresy include biographies such as Helene Tillmann, *Pope Innocent III*, trans. W. Sax (Amsterdam; New York: North-Holland; New York, NY: distributed by Elsevier North-Holland, 1980) and Jane Sayers, *Innocent III: Leader of Europe, 1198–1216* (London: Longman, 1994), while there have also been a number of more recent books such as *Pope Innocent III and his World*, eds J. C. Moore, B. Bolton *et al.* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1999) and John Moore, *Pope Innocent III (1160/61–1216): To Root up and to Plant* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003).

There is excellent discussion of the production of the workings of the papal chancery and the production of papal letters at the curia in works such as Werner Maleczek, *Papst und Kardinalskolleg von 1191 bis 1216: die Kardinale unter Coelestin III. und Innocenz III.* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984), in Patrick Zutshi's articles, 'Innocent III and the Reform of the Papal Chancery', in *Innocenzo III: Urbs et Orbis*, ed. A. Sommerlechner (Rome: Società romana di storia patria: istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, 2003), pp. 84–111 and 'The Personal Role of the Popes in the Production of Papal Letters in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries' in *Vom Nutzen des Schreibens: Soziales Gedächtnis, Herrschaft und Besitz im Mittelalter*, eds W. Pohl and P. Herold (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2002), pp. 225–36, and recently in Rebecca Rist, *The Papacy and Crusading in Europe, 1198–1216* (London: Continuum, 2009). By contrast to the wealth of material on the Albigensian Crusade, there have been fewer recent studies of papal calls for crusades to be launched against heretics in other parts of Europe. A book which focuses specifically on thirteenth-century anti-heretical crusades is Christoph Maier's *Preaching the Crusades: Mendicant Friars and the Cross in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994). There is also the well-known article by Norman Housley, 'Politics and Heresy in Italy: Anti-heretical Crusades, Orders and Confraternities, 1200–1500', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33

(1982), 193–208, and again see Rist, *The Papacy and Crusading in Europe*, cited above.

Troubadour Poetry about Heresy and Crusade

The most important recent book-length studies of political troubadour poetry in context are by Martin Aurell, *La vielle et l'épée: troubadours et politique en France au XIIIe siècle* (Paris: Aubier, 1989), Eliza Miruna Ghil, *L'Age de Parage: Essai sur le poétique et le politique en Occitanie au treizième siècle* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), and Sergio Vatteroni, *Falsa clercia: la poesia anticlericale dei trovatori* (Alessandria: Edizioni dell' Orso, 1999). Vatteroni's new edition of the poems of Peire Cardenal (forthcoming with Brepols) complements and supersedes the edition by René Lavaud, *Les poésies complètes du troubadour Peire Cardenal* (Toulouse: Privat, 1957). Lavaud and Vatteroni's notes to their editions are invaluable resources. The two careers of Bishop Fulk are analysed by N. M. Schulman, *Where Troubadours were Bishops: The Occitania of Folc de Marseilles (1150–1231)* (New York and London: Routledge, 2001). On the intriguing question of why so many poets of the late twelfth century joined the Cistercian Order, see William D. Paden Jr, 'De monachis rithmos facientibus: Hélinant de Froidmont, Bertran de Born, and the Cistercian General Chapter of 1199', *Speculum* 55 (1980), 669–85. On the patronage of the counts of Toulouse, see Laurent Macé, *Les Comtes de Toulouse et leur entourage, XIIe–XIIIe siècles: Rivalités, alliances, et jeux de pouvoir* (Toulouse: Privat, 2000), and the articles in *Les Troubadours et l'état toulousain avant la croisade (1209): Actes du colloque de Toulouse, 9 et 10 décembre 1988*, ed. Arno Krispin (Bordeaux: CELO, 1994). For crusading and poetry, see Jaye Puckett, '“Reconmenciez novele estoire”: The Troubadours and the Rhetoric of the Later Crusades', *Modern Language Notes* 116 (2001), 844–89. The poem *Las Novas del heretje* was first edited and translated by Paul Meyer, 'Le débat d'Izarn et de Sicart de Figueiras', *Annuaire-bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France* 16 (1879), 233–85. It has been studied recently by Catherine Léglu, 'Vernacular Poems and Inquisitors in Languedoc and Champagne, c.1242–1249', *Viator (Journal of the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies at UCLA)* 33 (2002), 117–32, and Karen Sullivan, 'Disputations, Literary and Inquisitorial: The Conversion of the Heretic Sicart de Figueiras', *Medium Ævum* 78 (2009), 58–79. Finally, it has been argued that the Albigensian Crusade had only a negligible impact on troubadour poetry and its patronage networks, see Maria Luisa Meneghetti, *Il pubblico dei trovatori* (Modena: STEM Mucchi, 1989), and William D.

Paden, 'The Troubadours and the Albigensian Crusade: A Long View', *Romance Philology* 49 (1995), 168–91.

Inquisition

Early works on inquisition include G. G. Coulton, *The Inquisition* (New York: E. Benn, 1929); J. Guiraud, *The Mediaeval Inquisition* (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd, 1929), a translation by E. C. Messenger from the French *L'Inquisition médiévale* (Paris: Librairie Jules Tallandier 1928, reprinted 1978); A. S. Turberville, *Medieval Heresy and the Inquisition* (London: Crosby Lockwood, 1920); E. Vacandard, *The Inquisition: A Critical Historical Study of the Coercive Power of the Church*, trans. B. L. Conway (London: Longmans Green, 1908). Still very influential are Henry Charles Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, Richard Emery, *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne* (New York: AMS Press, 1967), Jörg Feuchter, *Ketzer, Konsuln und Büsser: die städtischen Eliten von Montauban vor dem Inquisitor Petrus Cellani (1236–1241)* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), Rosalind Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars* (London: G. Allen and Unwin/New York: Barnes and Noble, 1975), and Richard Kieckhefer, *The Repression of Heresy in Medieval Germany* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979). See also Kieckhefer's 'The Office of Inquisition and Medieval Heresy: The Transition from Personal to Institutional Jurisdiction', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (1995), 1–16. Several important francophone works give valuable insight into the depositions of the papal inquisition. See especially those above by Jean Duvernoy and Michel Roquebert. On the inquisitor Bernard of Caux see Yves Dossat, 'L'inquisiteur Bernard de Caux et l'Agenais', in his *Église et hérésie en France au xiii siècle* (London, 1982), pp. 75–79, and 'Une figure d'inquisiteur: Bernard de Caux', in *ibid.*, pp. 47–52.

There was great interest in the English-speaking world in the 1980s and 90s. See Bernard Hamilton, *The Medieval Inquisition* (London: Edward Arnold, 1981), Albert Shannon, *The Popes and Heresy in the Thirteenth Century* (New York: AMS Press, 1980) and *The Medieval Inquisition* (Washington, DC: Augustinian College Press, 1983), Edward Peters, *The Inquisition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), Clifford Hugh Lawrence, *The Friars. The Impact of the Early Mendicant Movement on Western Society* (London: Longman, 1994) and James Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline and Resistance in Languedoc* (Ithaca, NY/London: Cornell University Press, 1997). The most recent studies of the papal inquisition in Languedoc in English include those of John Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the*

FURTHER READING

Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), Mark Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245–1246* (Princeton, NJ/Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), Christine Caldwell Ames, *Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), Caterina Bruschi, “‘*Magna diligentia est habenda per inquisitorem*’: Precautions before Reading Doat 21–26’, in eds C. Bruschi and P. Biller, *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2003), pp. 81–111 and *The Wandering Heretics of Languedoc* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), Andrew Roach, ‘Penance and the Making of the Inquisition in Languedoc’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 52 (2001), 409–33, R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250*, 2nd edn (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007).

Notes

- 1 3rd edition with revised title, Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy. Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002).
- 2 2nd edition, with revised title, R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society. Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007).

INDEX OF PERSONS



- Aalais, mother of Raoul of Cambrai 182, 184
 Adelaide, heretic 175
 Adelaide Ferrié of Camon 158
 Adelaide of Laquière 137, 175
 Adelaide of Massabrac 158
 Adhemar of Poitiers, count of Valentinois
 13, 99
 Adhemar Saquet 172
 Aimeric de Pegulhan 76, 80
 Alaman of Rouaix 148, 171, 172, 173
 Albertet 76
 Alexander IV, pope (1254–1261) 68, 72
 Alfonso II, count of Provence (1174–1209)
 2, 10, 96
 Alfonso VIII king of Castile (reigned
 1155–1214) 80
 Alice of Mazerolles 162
 Alphonse of Poitiers 14, 15
 Amalric of Bressols 147, 148, 149
 Amalric of Montfort 13, 14, 57
 Amalric of Montréal-Lavaur 9, 10, 15, 185,
 195, 197
 Amicie of Montfort 11
 Amiel of Le Mortier 159, 160
 Andrew ‘the barber’ 169
 Anonymous Continuator xv, xvi, 11, 96,
 181, 187, 189
 Arbois 191
 Arbrissa of Tauriac 155
 Arnaude, wife of Pons Grimoard 145, 146,
 151, 152
 Arnaude of La Mothe, heretic 3, 132, 137,
 143, 145, 146, 151, 152
 Arnaut Romieu 76
 Arnold, priest of Belcastel 172
 Arnold Amalric, papal legate 9, 10, 12, 41,
 42, 47, 85, 108
 Arnold Arrufat, heretic 147
 Arnold Baudouy of Queille 163
 Arnold Catalan 17
 Arnold Calvière 149
 Arnold Cathala 16, 162, 205
 Arnold Estève 172
 Arnold Faure 147
 Arnold Grahl 153
 Arnold Grimoard 147
 Arnold Helias 155
 Arnaud Jubileu 160
 Arnold of Ars 165, 169
 Arnold of Bressols 152
 Arnold of Campranha 149
 Arnold of Châteaueverdun 161, 162
 Arnold of Lomagne 191
 Arnold of Mayreville 161
 Arnold of Mazerolles 162
 Arnold of Montels 153
 Arnold of Sapiac snr. 140
 Arnold of Villemur 190
 Arnold Pagan 147, 148
 Arnold Peyre 205
 Arnold Roger 158, 207
 Arnold Roger of Mirepoix 161
 Asmus, wife of En Guinha 155
 Ath Arnold of Châteaueverdun 162
 Aude, mother of Isarn Bernard of Fanjeaux
 160
 Audiart 83, 90, 92
 Augier of Fenouillet 160
 Augier of Montolieu 161
 Austorgue of La Mothe 174
 Ayma, wife of Peter Garcias 167, 168
 Baldwin of Toulouse 9, 12, 92, 135, 181, 182
 Bartholemew of Carcassonne, heretic 6, 137,
 142
 Beatrice, wife of Isarn of Saint-Michel 154
 Bec 159, 171
 Bec of Roqueville 172
 Berengar of Lavelanet 157, 158, 159, 162
 Berètges, Na 145, 151
 Bernard, Master 189
 Bernard Audebert, 148
 Bernard Bonald 139
 Bernard Bonnefous 161, 170
 Bernard Dejean 170
 Bernard del Pech 162

INDEX OF PERSONS

- Bernard Durfort 159
- Bernard Engilbert 174
- Bernard Grahl 153
- Bernard Guilabert 46, 49
- Bernard Hugh of Feste 159, 160
- Bernard Itier 109, 127
- Bernard Itier, of Saint-Martial of Limoges 136, 137, 139
- Bernard Marty 163
- Bernard of Cazelles 141
- Bernard of Caux, inquisitor xx, xxi, 18, 132, 138, 144, 166, 169, 170, 173, 208, 209, 211, 213, 221
- Bernard of Cauzit 168
- Bernard of Cazenac 12, 13, 135, 145, 147, 189, 190
- Bernard of Comminges 191
- Bernard of La Mothe 3, 6, 145, 147, 148, 150, 153, 154, 161, 169, 170, 172, 174
- Bernard of Ladin hac 149, 151
- Bernard of Lator 138
- Bernard of Paul hac 155
- Bernard of Pom as 160
- Bernard of Roqueville 161, 163
- Bernard of Saint-Martin 191
- Bernard of Seilhols 153
- Bertrand of Taix 112
- Bernard of Vileta 175
- Bernard of Villeneuve 162
- Bernard Raymond 204
- Bernard Raymond, bishop of Carcassonne (1209–1231) 3
- Bernard ‘the boatman’ 159, 160, 162
- Bernard William 171
- Bernardon 209
- Bernart de la Barta 102
- Bernart Falcon 97
- Bernart Sicart de Marvéjols 103
- Bernier 182
- Bertrand II of Cardaillac 135
- Bertrand Auriol 140
- Bertrand Faure 147
- Bertrand of Bardenac 159, 161
- Bertrand of Gourdon 135, 137, 142
- Bertrand of Las Fratoas 160
- Bertrand of Lascroa 138
- Bertrand of Lagarde 208
- Bertrande of Le Villar 160
- Bertrande of Roquetaillade 160
- Bertrand Marty, Cathar bishop 15, 157, 158, 159, 162, 203
- Bertrand of Saint-André 149
- Bertrand d’Avignon 97
- Bertrande of Cavelsaut 147, 148
- Beuve of Haumtone 108
- Boeria, sister of En Frésoul of Lautrec 154
- Bos, squire 155
- Boson, son of En Raygassa 153
- Braida, mother of Na Finas of Tauriac 154
- Braïda, daughter of Arnold Roger 158
- Brulhes, mother of William of Taissonières 171
- Brulhes of Beaumont 173
- Cahorsin Cabatier 140
- Cathala of En William Assalit, 162
- Causida of L’Avelle 148
- Cecila, wife of Arnold Roger 158, 159
- Clavel of Carla 160
- Colombus 44, 49
- Conrad of Urach, papal legate 61, 101
- Constance, mother of Raymond VI 2
- Corba, wife of Raymond of Péreille 158, 159, 162, 170, 207
- Dalfin of Auvergne (1150–1234) 81, 82
- Dalmas of Creixell 189
- Diego of Osma 8
- Doat of Rodez 165, 166
- Domergua 209
- Domergua of Cabanoles, supporter of heretics 142
- Dominic Guzmán (Saint Dominic, founder of the Order of Preachers) 8
- Durand, inquisitor 16
- Durand, bishop of Albi 203
- Durand Vairet 141, 142
- Duvernoy, Jean (historian) xv, xix, xx, xxi, 127, 132, 143, 169, 170, 173, 207, 215, 221
- Eleanor of Aragon 89, 90, 182
- Elias Fonsalada 76
- Enfante 171
- Esclarmonde, mother of Bernard Hugh of Feste 160
- Esclarmonde, sister of Na Finas of Tauric 154
- Esclarmonde of Foix 3, 158, 160
- Esclarmonde of L’Avelle 148
- Esquieu, son of Philippa of Mirepoix 158
- Estolt of Roqueville 163
- Estolt of Linars 190

INDEX OF PERSONS

- Fabrissa of Queille 158
 Faïs, mother of Sicard of Durfort 160
 Faïs, wife of Arnold Helias 155
 Faïs, wife of William of Plaigne 158, 159
 Falquet de Romans 122
 Fauressa, wife of Bernard of Villeneuve 162
 Ferrand 191
 Ferrer, inquisitor xx, 16, 17, 132, 157, 174, 205, 208, 213
 Feste, father of Bernard Hugh of Fest 159, 160
 Finas, wife of Isarn of Tauric 153, 154
 Folquet de Marseille (troubadour) xiv, 75, 81, 122
 Fulk of Toulouse (bishop) xiv, 10, 17, 44, 85, 122, 188, 192, 201, 204, 220
 Fonsalada 76
 Fortanier of Gourdon 139
 Fournière 157
 François 'the priest' 141
 Frederick II Hohenstaufen (reigned 1220–1250) 13, 14, 25, 80, 87, 99, 101, 112, 113, 119, 167, 169
 Frésoul of Lautrec 154
 Fulk of Saint-Paul (Moissac) 135, 148, 206
- Gaïa, sister of Isarn Bernard of Fanjeaux 162
 Gaillard Estève 172
 Gaillard of Sègreville 172
 Gaillard of Congost 162
 Gaillard of Fanjeaux 161
 Gaillard of Feste 160
 Gardouch of Montgaillard 171
 Garson 209
 Gaucelm, heretic 162
 Gaudin, En 191
 Gavaudan 85, 124, 125
 Genser, wife of Peter of Saint-Michel of Fanjeaux 162
 Gentil, brother of Peter Amiel of Bram 160
 Geralda, Waldensian 140
 Gervase, Master 185
 Godfrey, defender of Toulouse 191
 Gormonda de Montpellier 119
 Gosselin 192
 Gregory IX, pope (1227–1241) xi, xvii, xx, 1, 14, 15, 16, 19, 24, 25, 27, 30, 64–67, 113, 131
 Gualabet 76
 Gui de Cavaillon 13, 75, 96, 97
 Gui de Nanteuil 108, 127
 Guilabert of Castres, Cathar bishop 15, 158, 160, 161, 162, 170, 172
 Guilhem Augier Novella 83
 Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie 104
 Guillem de Berguedan 80
 Guilhem Figueira 107, 115, 119
 Guilhem Rainol d'Apt 94
 Guillemassa, supporter of heretics 137
 Guillemette Faure 155
 Guillemette of Pugnères 154
 Guillemette of Sapiac 175
 Guinhe, En 153
 Guiot de Provins 107, 108, 127
 Guiraud, warden 166
 Guiraud of Feste 159
 Guiraud of Gourdon 147, 172
 Guiraud of Pépieux 9, 10, 15
 Guiraud of Rabat 158
 Guiraud del Rieu 139
 Guirade of Camaran 171
 Guirade of Laurac, see Guirade of Lavar
 Guirade of Lavar 10, 185
 Guy, abbot of Les Vaux-de-Cernay 9, 193
 Guy, Brother 32, 33
 Guy, count of Auvergne 109, 110, 191, 192
 Guy of Dampierre 37, 109
 Guy of Lévis 203
 Guy of Montfort 14
- Hamilton, Bernard (historian) 16, 131, 215, 218, 221
 Helen of Troy 182, 184
 Henry III, king of England (reigned 1216–1272) 60, 101
 Henry Campanier 191
 Henry of Marcy, papal legate and abbot of Cîteaux 8
 Honorius III, pope (1216–1227) xvii, xx, 1, 12, 13, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 48, 50–63, 64, 66
 Hugh, bishop of Riez 41
 Hugh Agenaud 171
 Hugh of Alfaro 10, 13, 144
 Hugh Boyer 155
 Hugh of Blan 175
 Hugh of Cavalsaut 147, 149
 Hugh of Durfort 160
 Hugh of La Mothe 13, 191
 Hugh of Payens 58
 Hugh of Rieu 160

INDEX OF PERSONS

- Huguette, supporter of heretics 137, 139, 140, 217
- Huguette, aunt of Martha 142
- Humbert of Castelnau 206
- Innocent III, pope (1198–1216) xi, xii, xvi, xvii, xx, 1, 3, 8, 11, 12, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32–49, 50, 57, 58, 62, 64, 105, 194, 218, 219
- Innocent IV, pope (1243–1254) 17, 18, 19, 27, 68–72
- Innocent VI, pope (1352–1362) 29
- Izarn 208, 209, 212, 220
- Izarn of Castres 160
- Izarn of Saint-Michel 154
- Izarn of Tauriac 153, 154
- Izarn of Villemur 153
- Izarn Bernard of Fanjeaux jnr 159, 160, 162
- Izarn Bernard of Fanjeaux snr. 159
- Izarn Picarelle 160
- Izarn Pontonnier 141
- James I, king of Aragon (reigned 1238–1276) 11, 13, 14, 80, 103
- James Fournier, inquisitor 20, 127
- Jean de Doat (archivist) xix
- Joan, daughter of Raymond VII of Toulouse 14
- Joan, mother of Raymond VI 15
- Joan of Avignon, heretic 140, 175
- John, bishop of Vienne 146
- John Cambiare, heretic 161, 162
- John of Cavalsaut 147
- John of La Garde 206
- John of La Johannie 205
- John of Saint-Peter xxi, 18, 132, 144, 208
- John of the Colet 210
- John of Toulouse 147
- John of Navarre 149
- John Olier 155
- John the Baptist 53, 88, 125–27, 165
- John the Evangelist 34, 35, 124, 125, 165, 166, 168
- John Weaver 206
- John Vital 145, 152, 176
- Jordan of Berèges 149
- Jordan of Lanta 170, 171
- Jordan of L'Isle 160
- Jordan of Mas 158, 159
- Jordan Unaud 207
- Lambert of Monteil 81, 82
- Laure 142
- Lea, Henry Charles (historian) xix, 19, 131, 221
- Lothar of Segni, see Innocent III 23, 104, 105
- Loubaix, mercenary 176
- Louis VIII, prince and king of France (reigned 1223–1226) 14, 24, 30, 35, 52, 54, 55, 60, 61, 63, 99, 100, 101, 105, 115, 116, 119, 120
- Louis IX, king of France (reigned 1226–1270) 14, 66, 103
- Louis XIV, king of France (reigned 1643–1715) xix
- Lucius III, pope (1181–1185) 16
- Macip of Toulouse 148
- Maffré of Paulhac 153
- Marie of Montpellier 96
- Marquèse, grandmother of Philippa of Lanta 158, 170, 173
- Mary Magdalene 183, 122
- Martha, supporter of heretics 142
- Massip of Gaillac 161
- Mathelia of Cos 154
- Matthew, heretic 163
- Maury, abbot of Pamiers 201
- Menclaus 182, 184
- Merlin 120
- Migne, L'Abbé (historian) xvi, 28, 30
- Milo, papal legate 9
- Miquel de la Tor 80
- Moore, R. I. (historian) xii, xx, 16, 215, 216, 222
- Navar of Brugairolles 160
- Navarre of Servian 171
- Nicholas, chaplain of La Daurade 166
- Nuno of Aragon 187
- Oliver 187
- Orbria, mother of Gaillard of Feste 160
- Orbria, heretic 175
- Orbria of Foix 146
- Orpaïs of Mirepoix 158, 159
- Othon of Berèges, *bailli* 17, 18, 19, 136, 145, 151, 152
- Othon of Las Fratoas 160
- Otto IV of Brunswick, emperor (reigned 1209–1218) 13, 25, 87

INDEX OF PERSONS

- Palaizi, also Palaizinus 75, 94, 95, 101
 Papa Nicetas, Bogomil 6
 Paris 182, 184
 Pelestieu 159
 Perdigon 76, 81, 82
 Pelfort of Rabastens 146, 154
 Peire Cardenal xiv, 75, 77, 79, 80, 82, 92,
 93, 99, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113,
 125, 127, 220
 Peire Vidal 76
 Peironela 209
 Pelardit 76
 Peter II, king of Aragon (reigned
 1196–1213) 2, 10, 11, 14, 42, 43,
 81, 87, 88, 89, 96, 103, 181, 182,
 187, 188, 194, 198
 Peter Abit 175
 Peter Amiel of Bram 160, 203
 Peter Aribert 162, 166, 172
 Peter Aslan 154
 Peter Audebert 147
 Peter Auger 148
 Peter Autier 19, 20
 Peter Bacou 140
 Peter Baudoi 147
 Peter Béraut 149
 Peter Capella 208, 209, 210
 Peter Cerdan 160
 Peter Garcias xix, xx, 4, 19, 132, 164, 165,
 166, 167, 168, 169, 176
 Peter Grahl 153
 Peter Grimoard snr. 145, 150, 151, 152
 Peter Guilard 46
 Peter Guiraud Babot of Mirepoix 162
 Peter Guiraud of Routier 162
 Peter Isarn of Montolieu 160
 Peter Maurel 160
 Peter Mir 160
 Peter of Auxerre 186
 Peter of Belfort 148, 149, 150
 Peter of Benevento, papal legate 12, 46, 48
 Peter of Bomassip 205
 Peter of Bruelh 142
 Peter of Castelnaud, papal legate 8, 23, 24,
 34, 37, 38, 39
 Peter of Las Oleiras 138
 Peter of L'Isle 191
 Peter of L'Auque of Condrast 175
 Peter of Pech-Perdu 205
 Peter of Penne 176
 Peter of Turre 155
 Peter of Le Villarou d'Aucelle 162
 Peter of Les Vals, Waldensian 7, 136, 137,
 139, 140
 Peter of Les Vaux-de-Cernay, chronicler
 xiii, xv, xvii, xx, 7, 9, 75, 106, 108,
 193–200
 Peter of Mazerolles 162
 Peter of Saint-Michel, nephew 159, 160,
 161, 162
 Peter of Saint-Michel, uncle 159
 Peter of Quissac 152
 Peter Pague 154
 Peter Roger of Mirepoix 14, 157, 158, 159,
 160, 162, 163, 203, 207
 Peter Roger of Picarelle jnr. 160
 Peter Roger of Picarelle snr. 160, 161
 Peter Raymond of Le Carla 160
 Peter 'the pilgrim' 138
 Peter Vinol of Balaguier 133
 Petronilla, supporter of heretics 138
 Petronilla, wife of Raymond Dejean 140
 Petronilla of La Mothe, heretic 143, 174
 Philip II Augustus, king of France (reigned
 1180–1223) 2, 23, 34, 36, 50, 51, 52,
 60, 61, 93, 109
 Philippa of Mirepoix 157, 158, 162, 202
 Peter Seilan, inquisitor 16, 17, 19, 135, 136,
 137, 149, 151, 174, 205, 206
 Poncia, heretic 174
 Pons, abbot of Saint-Gilles 49
 Pons, prior of Cahors 149, 151
 Pons Aiz 148
 Pons de Capduelh 87
 Pons Guilabert 148, 153, 155, 161
 Pons Grimoard, seneschal xx, 132, 136, 144,
 145, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 156
 Pons of Arlens 173
 Pons of Arras jnr. 160
 Pons of Arras snr. 160
 Pons of Balbec 155
 Pons of Capdenier 205
 Pons of Montmirat 152
 Pons of Pujal 160
 Pons of Saint-Foy 170
 Pons Touelle 155
 Pontius de Capitolio 87
 Proba of Cavelsaut 147, 148
 Ralph, papal legate 34, 35
 Ralph of Goulème 'the scabby', heretic 138
 Rainald 209
 Rainald Rauc 148
 Rainier, Brother 32, 33, 34

INDEX OF PERSONS

- Raissaga, daughter of Fabrisa of Queille, 158
 Raimon de Miraval 75, 88–92
 Raimon Escrivan 98, 189
 Raoul of Cambrai 182, 184
 Ratier of Castelnau Montratrier 135
 Raygassa En 153
 Raymond III, Viscount of Turenne 135
 Raymond V, count of Toulouse
 (1148–1194) 2
 Raymond VI, count of Toulouse (1194–1222)
 1–2, 8–10, 12–14, 23, 37, 43, 50, 85,
 89–90, 92–94, 96, 156, 182, 194
 Raymond VII, count of Toulouse (1222–49)
 12–15, 17, 66, 90, 94, 96, 97, 99, 100,
 131, 132, 136, 144–5, 158, 156, 181,
 201, 202, 208
 Raymond Adhemar xxi, 132, 171, 172
 Raymond Agulher, Cathar bishop 158
 Raymond Amalric, Cathar deacon 147, 150,
 174–5
 Raymond Amiel of Le Mortier 159
 Raymond Aribert of Arzens 162
 Raymond Arpe 137
 Raymond Arnold 159
 Raymond Auriol 160
 Raymond Berenguer of Cambon 170
 Raymond Berenguer V, count of Provence
 11, 13
 Raymond Bernard Grimoard 145
 Raymond Blascou 162
 Raymond Dejean 140
 Raymond Donat 161
 Raymond Durfort 159
 Raymond Faure 147
 Raymond Ferrand 159, 162
 Raymond Fournier 160
 Raymond Fulk 141
 Raymond Garcias 159
 Raymond Grimoard, heretic 147, 148, 149,
 150
 Raymond Gros 164, 169, 206–7
 Raymond Guilhem, priest 172
 Raymond Guiraud 137
 Raymond John of Las Coumbes 163
 Raymond Izarn 159
 Raymond of Alfaro, *bailli* 14, 144
 Raymond of Aigremont 171, 172, 173
 Raymond of Brouelles 206
 Raymond of Bressols 147
 Raymond of Falgar, bishop of Toulouse
 (1232–70) 17, 201
 Raymond of La Mothe 140
 Raymond of La Serre 148
 Raymond of Lahille 159
 Raymond of Lasbordes 191
 Raymond of Le Fauga of Miremont 171, 205
 Raymond of Le Villar 160
 Raymond of Loc 141
 Raymond of Montouty, see Raymond Donat
 Raymond of Penafort xx
 Raymond of Pennautier 159
 Raymond of Péreille 14, 157, 158, 159, 161,
 170, 203, 207
 Raymond of Rodolos 177
 Raymond of Roqueville 161, 163, 172
 Raymond of Salvanhac 186
 Raymond of Vaux 190
 Raymond Peter Desplas 167, 169
 Raymond Roger, count of Foix (1188–1223)
 2, 160, 186
 Raymond Roger Trencavel, viscount of
 Béziers (1194–1209) 2, 8, 9, 84
 Raymond Unaud of Lanta xxi, 133, 170,
 171–2, 172, 173, 207
 Raymond Unaud of Lanta, cousin of
 Raymond Unaude of Lanta, 172, 173
 Raymond William of Berètges 147, 148, 150
 Raymonde, mother of Peter Mir 160
 Raymonde, widow of William of Goulème
 139
 Raymonde of Mazerac 177
 Reforzat 98
 Richard III, king of England (ruled
 1189–99) 2
 Robert of Sorbon 122
 Roger IV, count of Foix (1241–1265) 3,
 160
 Roger of Aragon 159
 Roger of Feste 156, 160
 Roger of Le Carla 160
 Roger Peter 159
 Roland 86, 106, 187
 Roland of Cremona 205, 207
 Romanus of Saint Angelo, papal legate 12,
 58, 62, 64, 66
 Roques, En 138, 139
 Rostahn of Bressols 149

 Sancia (Sanchia), sister of King James of
 Aragon 14
 Sancho, regent of King James of Aragon 13
 Saura, wife of Raymond Amiel 159
 Senhoret, supporter of heretics 153
 Sicart Bou, 175

INDEX OF PERSONS

- Sicart of Durfort 160
 Sicart of Figueiras 208, 209
 Sicart Pelapol 162
 Sicart of Lunel 209
 Simon of Montfort, crusade leader 9, 10, 11,
 12, 13, 30, 40, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 51,
 52, 57, 81, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 108,
 181, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190,
 191, 192, 193, 194, 197, 198, 201.
 Solomon 183, 192, 209
 St Dominic, see Dominic Guzman
 St John, See John the Baptist and John the
 Evangelist
 St Martin of Tours 114, 176
 St Matthew 34, 55, 192, 213
 St Paul 113
 St Theofred 109
 Stephen Galtier 137
 Stephen Grimoard 150
 Stephen of Lunel 166
 Stephen of Saint-Thibéry 132, 144, 157
 Stephen Mazalier 152
 Stephen Palmier 137
 Stephen Sans 147
 Stephen 'the scribe' 152

 Tento, Cathar bishop 161, 162
 Tomier and Palaizi, 75, 95, 101
 Touzet of Noguès, heretic 139, 140
 Tresémines, supporter of heretics 172
 Turca, wife of Raymond Ferrand 159

 Uc de Lescura 76
 Unaude, wife of Raymond of Berèrges,
 151

 Valdes of Lyon 7
 Véiada, suspect 162
 Vésiada, wife of Izarn Bernard 162
 Vezian of Lomagne 190
 Vigouroux de la Bacone, Cathar bishop 6,
 136, 137, 141, 145, 148, 150, 151,
 152, 161, 162
 Vital Faure 154
 Vital Grimoard, heretic 145, 147
 Vital of Lahille 159
 Vital Ortola 145
 Virgin Mary 4, 115, 123, 126, 165, 168,
 177

 William, bishop of Châlons 49, 55, 56
 William II, bishop of Agen 18

 William Arnold Jubileu 160
 William Audebert 145, 152, 176
 William Arnold, inquisitor xx, 16, 17, 132,
 136, 144, 145, 146, 149, 150, 151,
 152, 157, 172, 202, 205, 206, 208,
 211, 213
 William Assalit 160
 William Autier 19
 William Barrère 142
 William Bernard of Luzenac 191
 William Bernard Unaud 207
 William Bonald 138
 William Bourd 153
 William Cougot 164, 166, 168, 169
 William Dalait 155
 William Durfort 160
 William Farguicé 152
 William Faure of Pech-Hermier 147, 148,
 149, 152, 176
 William Féraut 176
 William Fort of Pennautier 159
 William Garcias 159, 164, 165, 166, 167,
 168–9
 William Gout 160, 161
 William Ichier 137
 William Mir 163
 William Moulinier, heretic 138
 William of Baux 81, 82
 William of Barres 188
 William of Baussa 141
 William of Brugairolles 160
 William of Castillon 147
 William of Caussade 148–9, 150
 William of Deyme 172
 William of Feste 160
 William of Garnes of Lanta 171, 172
 William of Le Congost 161
 William of Mas 158
 William of Montech 153
 William of Pech-Hermier, see William Faure
 of Pech-Hermier
 William of Plaigne 158
 William of Prouille 160
 William of Puylaurens (chronicler) xv, xix,
 15, 89, 92, 201, 202
 William of Saint-Vim 148
 William of Taissonnières 171
 William of Tudela xiii, xiv, xv, xvi, 9, 11, 75,
 181, 182, 185
 William Pelhisson, inquisitor and chronicler
 xix, xx, 7, 131–2, 132, 204
 William Pelicier 148

INDEX OF PERSONS

- | | |
|--|--|
| William Peter of Bocalop 159 | William Solier, heretic 16, 148, 154, 170, |
| William Peter of Montlaur 191 | 171, 172 |
| William Pons of La Garrigue 163 | William ‘the pilgrim’ 138 |
| William Raymond 148, 150 | William Unaud or Fourquevaux 172 |
| William Raymond of Moissac-Quielle 163 | Wilma Garcias |
| William Roger of Mirepoix 157 | |
| William Saisset 112 | Ysengrin 112 |

GENERAL INDEX



place-names are given with their modern departments.

- absolution 54, 144, 146, 150
- Ad abolendam* (1184) 7, 16
- Ad extirpanda* (1252) 17, 19, 30, 68
- Acre 189
- Agen (Lot-et-Garonne) xx, 2, 6, 10, 15, 17, 18, 132, 144, 162
- Agenais, county of (part of department of Lot-et-Garonne) 9, 10, 104, 135, 136, 144, 161
- Agout, river 195, 196
- Aix-en-Provence (Bouces-du-Rhône) 81
- Aix-en-Provence, archdiocese and archbishop of 32, 38, 52, 54, 64
- Al-Mansour 113
- Albertet 76
- Albi (Tarn) 17, 57, 84; diocese of 16, 154, 203, 205; Cathar bishop of 6
- Albigensians 56, 61, 64, 66, 106
- Albigeois 90, 132
- Alexandria 210
- Ancona 69
- Anduze, lords of 103, 106
- Annals 28, 29
- Antichrist 40, 111, 112
- Apocalypse 112
- Aquitaine 77; dukes of 1, 2, 135
- Aragon, kingdom of 13, 15, 42, 75, 79, 89, 94, 96, 101, 163, 181; kings of 1, 2, 11, 13, 14, 90, 182, 187, 188, 189, 189, 199, 201–2. See also Peter II, James I
- Argence (now Sainte Geneviève-sur-Argence, Aveyron) 90, 102
- Arles (Bouches-du-Rhône) 49, 54, 63, 64, 100
- Arles, kingdom of 13; archbishops of 34, 38, 52, 64, 94
- Auch, archdiocese of 52, 53
- Auch (Gers) 54; archbishops of 34, 41, 64
- Auvergne, counts of 9, 10, 109, 110; county of 10, 77, 109
- Auvergne, Dalphin of 81, 82, 87
- Auvillar (Tarn-et-Garonne) 167, 169, 188, 210, 213
- Auxerre, counts of 186, 196
- Avignon (Vaucluse) 13, 14, 61, 97, 100, 101, 102, 116, 120, 175
- Avignonet (Isère) 14, 144, 145, 202, 208, 213; priors of 202
- Balaguier (Aveyron) 159
- Balearic Islands 11
- Barcelona 2; counts of 2, 13
- Baux (Bouches-du-Rhône/Les Baux-de-Provence) lords of 13, 81
- Bayeux (Calvados) 196
- Beaucaire (Gard) 13, 90, 92, 94, 95, 101, 102, 103; siege of 95
- Beaucaire (Tarn-et-Garonne) 141
- Beaumont-du-Périgord (Dordogne) 171, 173
- Béarn, county (Pyrénées-Atlantiques) xix, 11
- Beguines 115
- Belief 1, 3–4, 5, 6, 7, 16, 17, 20, 24, 28, 41, 85, 108, 119, 120, 145, 154, 157, 176–7, 194, 195, 209, 210, 213
- Belleperche, abbey (Tarn-et-Garonne) 206
- Belfort (Tarn-et-Garonne) 142
- Berrichons, men of the Berry (now in départements of Cher, Indre, Vienne) 191
- Besançon, archdiocese of 63, 64
- Berèges, family 145
- Béziers (Hérault) 9, 11, 16, 40, 57, 90, 104, 118, 182–5, 193; bishops of 8; viscounts of 81, 84, 89, 90
- Bible Guiot* 107
- Bibliothèque nationale de France xviii, xix
- Bibliothèque municipale de Toulouse MS 609 xxi, 132
- biographies xviii, 28, 77, 219
- Biron (Dordogne) 10, 92
- Biterrois, region, now in department of Hérault 81

GENERAL INDEX

- Blaye (Gironde) 185
 Bogomilism 5
 Bogomils 6, 169, 176
 Book of Revelation 122, 126
 Bordeaux, archbishops of 9, 52, 64
 Boulbonne (Haute-Garonne) abbey 201
 Bourbonnais 109
 bourg 189, 190, 191, 207
 Bourges, archbishops of 52, 64
 Bourget-Nau (Toulouse) 164, 166, 169
 Bouvines, battle (1214) 13
 Brabant 190
 Bram (Aude) 9, 160
 Brienne, counts of 184
 Brittany 101
 Bulgaria 5
bullatores 26
 Burgundy, duke of 37
 Burgundian troops 98
 burning 10, 15, 19, 56, 185, 207
 Byzantine Empire 5

 Cabrières (Hérault) 48
 Cahors (Lot) xix, xx, 2, 16, 132, 135, 139,
 142, 144, 148, 149, 151, 152, 175,
 186, 206; bishops of 3, 135, 175;
 diocese of 132, 135, 136, 148, 150,
 205
 Canon Law 23, 24, 25
Canso d'Antiocha 181
 cansos 77, 80, 90
 Canterbury 136, 137, 140, 142, 143, 175
 Canzo de la Crotzada, see Song of the
 Albigensian Crusade
 Capetian kings of France 14, 136
 Capitole, the (Toulouse) 171, 173
 Carcassès, region, corresponds to modern
 département of Aude 88, 90, 104
 Carcassonne (Aude) xiii, 2, 9, 17, 20, 40,
 48, 90, 92, 183, 193; bishops of 6,
 193; seneschals of 203; viscounts of 84
 Cardaillac (Lot), lords of 135
 Carpentras (Vaucluse) 100
 Carthusian Order 60
 Casseneuil (Lot-et-Garonne) 11
 Castelnau-Montratrier (Lot) 141
 Castelnau-dary (Aude) 10, 13, 97, 98
 Castelsarrasin (Tarn-et-Garonne) 10,
 144–55, 176
 Castile 75, 76; kings of 80
 Castilian language 1
castrum (plural: *castra*) 3, 6, 10, 11, 16

 Catalans xx, 76, 96, 101, 208
 Catalonia xvii, 75, 76, 80
 Cathars 1, 3, 4, 5–6, 7, 8, 79, 124, 134,
 136, 144, 145, 169, 185, 194–5;
 beliefs 176; believers 124 (see also
 credens); bishops 6, 15, 136, 145, 157,
 158, 170, 208; church 6, 14, 19, 136;
 councils 6; deacons 3, 145, 156, 170,
 174, 208, 209; dioceses 136, 157, 170;
 elect 7; faith 6; families 3; heresy xv, 32,
 215, 217; hierarchy 157, 158; stories
 176; teachings 146; women 3, 157
 Catharism 1, 8, 10, 16, 19, 20, 80, 131,
 132, 134, 164, 208, 216
 Cavaillon (Vaucluse) 100; 'viscount' of 96
 Châlons-en-Champagne, bishops of 49, 55,
 56
 Chamalières-sur-Loire (Haute-Loire) 110
chanson de geste 106, 127, 182
 Chansonniers xvii, xviii, 77, 79
 Chartres (Eure-et-Loir) 185
 Château-Narbonnais, the (Toulouse)
 13, 171
 childhood 174–5
 Christ 176, 196, 198, 205, 211
 Christianity 176
 Christian baptism 194
 Christian rites 194
 Christians 177, 201, 206
 chronicles xv, 28, 29, 76, 193
 clergy 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 16, 24, 27, 43, 48,
 59, 62, 64, 88, 95, 97, 100, 104, 106,
 107, 108, 110, 132, 184, 185, 186,
 194, 197, 206
 clergymen 68, 80
 Cistercians, abbeys 49, 81, 82, 207; abbots
 35, 41, 53, 54; Order 11, 12, 85, 122,
 220; monks xv, 8, 23, 32, 34, 37, 47,
 49, 108, 122, 191; robes 85, 108
 Cîteaux, abbey (Côte-d'Or) 118; abbots of
 8, 9, 81, 85, 108, 183
 Clermont (now Clermont-Ferrand,
 department of Puy-de-Dôme) 109
 Comminges, counts of 12, 191; county
 (now southern part of département
 of Haute-Garonne) 11
 'common letters' 25, 26
 communes 13, 68, 69, 71, 187
Compilatio quinta 24
 Condrast (not identified) 175
 Constantinople 5, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140,
 141, 142, 176

GENERAL INDEX

- Corbarieu (Tarn-et-Garonne) 145, 149
correctors 26, 27
correspondence, papal xvi, xvii, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 58, 62
Courtenay, count of 186
credens (Plural: *credentes*) 6, 18, 124, 133, 145, 157, 174, 194, 206, 211, 212.
See also Cathar believers
crusade, indulgences 11, 36, 61; leaders 30, 40, 50, 57, 76, 194, 198; policies 25; preachers 165, 167; songs 87, 107, 122; vows 50
crusaders xvi, 9, 10, 11, 15, 25, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 53, 55, 57, 64, 65, 66, 83, 88, 89, 94, 105, 106, 110, 144, 166, 167, 169, 174, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 189, 191, 194, 196, 197, 198, 200, 201, 203; taxation 30, 52, 59
crusades xx, 8, 12, 23, 24, 25, 38, 41, 42, 112, 164, 167, 169, 193, 219
crusade of Louis VIII (1226) 14, 24, 30, 35, 52, 54, 55, 60–1, 61, 63, 99–100, 101, 105, 115, 116, 119
‘curial letters’ 25
cursus honorum 24
Cyprus 76

Damietta 59, 115, 116, 120
De miseria condicionis humane 105
‘Debate of Izarn and Sicart’ 208
deponents xiii, 18, 134, 136, 137, 176, 209
depositions xix, xx, xxi, 107, 112, 132, 134, 144, 145, 157, 158, 166, 170, 176, 209, 221
Devil, the 38, 98, 116, 118, 123, 148, 168, 209, 210,
Die (Drôme) 100
Doat manuscripts xix, xx, xxi, 132, 133, 134, 136, 142, 144, 145, 156, 157, 163, 170, 209. See also Bibliothèque nationale de France
Dominicans, convents 136, 144; inquisitors xx, 17, 18, 208; Order 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 25, 69, 71, 72, 113, 131, 132, 134, 146, 149, 151, 156, 204
Donatist heresy 7
Douai, Célestin (historian) xix
Douai (Nord-Pas-de-Calais) 184
Drôme, department 100
dualism 5, 6, 7, 107, 124, 174, 209
dualists 4, 5, 6, 20, 209

Easter (1210) 40–1; (1229) 14, 138, 139; (1235) 146; (1244) 151; (1247) 166
Edessa 185
Embrun, archbishops of 34, 38, 64; archdioceses of 52, 54, 63
En xiv, 76, 80, 97, 98
England 8, 15, 52, 54, 55, 60, 104; kings of 1, 2, 60, 61, 101, 115
English, translating into xiii, xiv, 30, 119, 131, 215
engrossment 26, 29
Évreux, counts of 9
Excommunicamus (1229) 19
excommunication 10, 33, 34, 43, 52, 54, 69, 101, 146, 151, 152

Fanjeaux (Aude) 132, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 184
Feste, lords of 158
Faure family, lords of Pech-Hermier (Tarn-et-Garonne) 145, 147
filius major 6, 161, 162
filius minor 6
Fifth Crusade 11, 24, 25, 41, 50, 52, 55, 59, 63, 115
First Crusade 12
Foix, county (now mostly in the department of Ariège) xix, 14, 19, 157; counts of 2, 9, 10, 12, 14, 146, 160, 186
Fontfroide, abbey (Aude) 34, 35
Fontrevault, abbey 15
Forcalquier, county of (in Alpes-de-Haute-Provence) 2
Fourth Crusade 12, 181
Fourth Lateran Council (1215) 7, 12, 16, 36, 40, 47, 50, 57, 82
foxes 33, 36, 38, 42
France xvii, xx, 1, 2, 5, 10, 15, 19, 23, 36, 37, 52, 53, 54, 55, 59, 61, 62, 66, 78, 95, 105, 116, 120, 121, 196, 210; archbishops of 50; barons of 184, 188; kings of 2, 8, 10, 12, 23, 24, 34, 60, 108, 109, 112, 182, 204; people of 101. See also France, south of
France, south of xii, xviii, xix, 1, 4, 8, 11, 12, 19, 24, 25, 27, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 46, 48, 50, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 63, 66, 68, 131, 193, 194, 217, 218
Franciscans, Order of 15, 25, 70, 71, 146, 164–69

GENERAL INDEX

- Friars 70, 211. See also Friars Preacher,
Friars Minor
Friars Minor, see also Franciscans
Friars Preacher, see Dominicans
- Gab*, 76
Garonne, river, 143, 189
Gévaudan (Lozère and part of the Ardèche)
1, 2, 81, 85, 103, 106
Giroussens (Tarn) 175
'good men and women' 3, 5, 7, 35, 78, 79,
80, 106, 119, 137–41, 149–50,
154–55, 171, 176, 195
Gourdon (Lot) 136, 137–39, 142, 156
Guyenne, dukes of xix, 1
- Hautpoul (Tarn) 209
Heresy, definitions of 3–7, 124, 194–95;
studies of xv–xvi, xx, 215–22; and
children 174–75; legislation against
23–25; and anticlericalism 107–08;
abjuration of 132, 146, 149, 151, 154,
155, 168, 172, 209, 213
Holy Land 12, 34, 35, 36, 37, 41, 42, 50, 51,
52–59, 63, 87, 100, 122, 136, 185, 210
Holy Sepulchre 12, 101, 102, 136
Holy Roman Empire 1, 12, 13, 14, 25, 87,
99–100, 101, 112, 117, 118, 119, 121,
122, 169
Hungary 76
Humiliati 23
- Incipit, as summary of a letter xvii
Incipit, as first line of a poem 107, 113
Indulgences, papal xi, 11, 23, 25, 32, 34, 35,
36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 50,
51, 54, 59, 60, 61, 64–65, 67
inquisition, definition and history 15–19, 25,
30, 66, 131–33, 221–22
inquisitors, comital 17, 136
inquisitors' registers xiii, xix–xxi, 17, 112,
132, 136, 142, 145, n.1, 163, 204
interdict 32, 33, 43, 69, 142
Israel 50
- Jerusalem 12, 122, 136
Jews 4, 48, 64–66, 183
*joglar*s (minstrels) 75, 79, 80, 81, 83, 88,
122
- Knights of Saint John, Order of 12, see also
Knights Hospitaller
Knights Hospitaller, Order of 12, 59, 192
Knights Templar, Order of 12, 58–59
- La Rochelle (Charente-Maritime) 14
La Costa (house, or *manse*) 141
La Daurade, priory in Toulouse 166, 169
Lai (lyric genre) 92
Languedoc, region xxii, xix, 1–3, 5, 6, 7, 8,
10, 12, 14, 15–17, 19–20, 77, 131,
134, 135, 144, 157, 204
Lanta (Haute-Garonne) 19, 132–33,
170–73, 207
Laroque-d'Olmes (Ariège) 159
Last Judgement 87, 105–06, 125–27,
185
Lateran Council 7, 8, 12, 16, 36, 47, 50,
57, 82
Lateran Palace 40, 41, 42, 45, 47, 49, 52,
54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 66
Lauragais (corresponds to parts of Haute-
Garonne, Ariège and Tarn) xxi, 18,
132, 170, 201, 208
Lautrec (Tarn) 146, 154
Lavaur (Tarn) 8, 10, 11, 140, 175, 185–87,
195–98; Council of 43
Lavelanet (Ariège) 157, 159, 162
Le Monastier-sur-Gazeille (Haute-Loire)
109
Le Puy-en-Velay (Haute-Loire) 16, 80, 109,
136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143,
146, 175
legates, papal 8, 9, 11, 12, 23–25, 32, 34,
35, 37–40, 41–42, 44, 45, 46–49, 51,
54–55, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 66, 85,
101, 146, 181, 194, 205
Lérida (Lleida), Catalonia 89
Lespéron (Ardèche) 81
letters, papal xiii, xvi–xvii, xx, 8, 23–72; sent
by secular lords 96, 99, 187; sent to
heretics 138; intercepted 89, 201–02;
of absolution 144, 146–47, 150; of
penitence xx, 132, 145, 151
Lézat-sur-Lèze (Ariège) 202
Liber extra decretalium 25
Lisieux, bishops of 196
Loire, river 79
Lombardy 19–20, 69, 75, 76, 77, 80–81,
100, 115, 170, 171–72, 206
Lucibel 153. See also Devil
Lyons, archdiocese of 34, 52, 64; Poor Men
of 7
lyric poetry 75–78, 83, 115, 181

GENERAL INDEX

- Malconseil* (Templar domain at Mauconseil, near Cabaret, département of Vaucluse) 153
- Manuscripts xiv, xvii–xviii, 30, 77–78, 127, 132–33, 134
- Marmande (Lot-et-Garonne) 13
- Marseilles (Bouches-du-Rhône) 13, 100, 114
- Martel 141
- Mass 4, 5, 12, 39, 112, 152, 165, 168, 177, 184, 185
- Massabrac (Haute-Garonne) 159
- Mauguio (Hérault) 2
- Maurand family 3
- Meaux (Seine-et-Marne), treaty of (1229) 14; bishop of 53, 54
- Mende, diocese of (Lozère) 16, 103, 106
- mercenaries 2, 182, 184, 190
- Militia of Jesus Christ 12, 58–59. See also crusaders
- Millau (Aveyron) 2, 15
- Minerve (Hérault) 10, 216
- Miraval (Var) 89–90, 92
- Mirepoix (Ariège) 157, 160 ; marshals of 203
- Moissac (Tarn-et-Garonne) 3, 17, 75, 108, 135–36, 140–42, 145, 148, 152, 206; abbot of Saint-Pierre-de-Moissac 3, 108
- Monastier-sur-Gazeilles (Haute-Loire) 109
- Montauban (Tarn-et-Garonne) 9, 57, 136–37, 140–41, 145, 154, 155, 174, 175, 181, 221
- Montégut (Tarn-et-Garonne) 48, 91
- Montferrand (Aude) 187
- Montferrier (Ariège) 159
- Montolieu (Aude) 6, 142, 160
- Montpellier (Hérault) 1, 12, 182; lords of 11, 13, 96
- Montpensier (Puy-de-Dôme) 119
- Montcuq (Lot) 17, 141–42
- Montréal (Aude), 9, 10, 15
- Montségur (Ariège) xix, 14, 19, 132, 133, 144, 157, 158, 159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 167, 170, 202, 203, 206, 207
- Mount of Calvary 210
- Mozac, abbey of Saint-Pierre-de-Mozac (Puy-de-Dôme) 109–10
- Muret, battle of (Haute-Garonne) 11, 12, 81, 87–92, 181, 187–92, 198–200, 201–02, 218
- Muslims (see also: Saracens) 4, 42, 55, 58, 87, 92
- Mycenae 184
- Narbonne (Aude), duchy of 2, 47–49, 85, 221; archdiocese of 2, 10, 12, 16, 17, 34, 38, 41, 42, 45, 47, 52, 53, 54, 58, 62, 64, 108–09, 203; Council of 19
- Narrative poems, see: *novas*
- Navarre xiii, xix, 181
- Nicene Creed 4, 176
- Nîmes (Gard) 2, 49, 80, 95
- Normandy 94, 104–05, 185
- Noyon (Oise), bishop of 53, 54
- Notaries xiii, 18, 26–28, 70, 71, 79, 166, 201
- novas* 83, 208–13, 220
- Occitan language 15, 75–78, 124, 134, 169, 181
- Order of Calatrava 12
- Ordinance of Villers-Cotterêts (1539), 15
- Pamiers (Ariège) 10, 20, 112, 132, 201
- Papacy, as institution xvi, 12, 13, 19, 24, 25, 28, 34, 57, 68, 105, 112, 193, 218–20
- Papal chancery 23, 25–28, 29, 219
- Paratge* 80, 83, 89, 104, 181, 187, 189, 190, 191, 192
- Paris, city and surrounding region 110, 184, 204; schools 15, 24, 25, 113, 122, 204, 207; seat of king of France 116, 136
- Paris, Trojan hero 182, 184
- Patrologia Latina* xvi, 28, 30
- paupers, support of 19, 136, 137, 140, 146
- Peace of Paris 1, 14, 16, 24, 25, 66, 96, 102–06, 204
- pech*, toponym 3
- Pechberlande* (or Pugberlanda, a vanished hamlet near Dourgne in the département of Tarn) 175
- Pech-Hermier (Tarn-et-Garonne) 145, 147–49, 152, 176, 205
- Pech Merle (Lot) 3
- Penne-d'Agenais (Lot-et-Garonne) 10
- perfect (Cathar elect) 5–6, 7, 10, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 79, 124, 132, 133, 135–36, 137, 139, 145, 146, 157–58, 194–95, 206–07
- ‘perfect’ as adjective or noun 94, 123, 124, 142, 167, 170, 174, 194, 195
- ‘Period of grace’ 18, 136, 138, 141
- Perugia (Italy) 67, 71
- pilgrimage 32, 49; as crusade, 65, 116; as punishment 19, 132, 136–43, 145, 151
- Pipet (now Saint-Baudille-et-Pipet, Isère) 100

GENERAL INDEX

- Plantagenets 15, 92
- Podestà 68–72
- Poitiers, counts of 1, 14, 15
- Popelicans* 5, 105
- Poor Men of Lyon, see: Waldensians
- poverty, apostolic 7, 113, 114, 205
- Power of the keys 213
- publicani* 5
- Puy, toponym 3
- Pré du Comte (Toulouse) 207
- Prinhac, hamlet (Quercy) 141
- Provence, county (title held by house of Aragon) 10, 11, 12–13, 14, 77, 95, 96, 104; marquisate (title held by Counts of Toulouse) 2, 9, 12–13, 77, 85, 95, 104; name for South-Eastern French regions 11, 115, 155
- Puy-laroque (Tarn-et-Garonne) 174
- Puy-laurens (Tarn) 3, 175
- Pyrenees, region 2, 10, 11

- Quercy, county of (Lot, Lot-et-Garonne, and Tarn-et-Garonne) xii, xix, 2, 9, 10, 12, 15, 81, 135, 136, 145, 207, 217
- Quia maior* (1213) 11

- Rabastens (Tarn) 146, 154, 175
- razos* 77, 78, 80, 89, 92
- rectors 68–72
- Rheims (Champagne-Ardenne) 50, 59–60, 64
- Rhineland 5
- Rhône, river 9, 12, 14, 17, 39, 94
- ribautz* 184
- Rocamadour (Lot) Confederation of 16, 136; pilgrimage destination 146
- Rodez, diocese of (Aveyron) 16
- Roquefeuil, castrum (Aude) 158
- Roquemaure (Gard) 175
- Roqueville, family 161, 163, 171–73
- Romagna, Italy 69
- Roman law 79
- Rome, criticism of 105–06, 107–08, 115–22, 213; as metonym for Christianity 213; as papal seat xx, 8, 16, 17, 24, 27, 29, 34, 37, 47, 81, 105–06, 107; as pilgrimage destination 32, 49, 175, 206
- Rouaix, family 170–73
- Rouen, archdiocese of 52, 60, 64
- Routiers*, see mercenaries
- Roquefère (Aude) 159
- Roques, family 138–39

- Rule of St Benedict 110
- ‘Rule’ of the heretics 160

- sacraments 5, 7, 70, 103, 176, 194
- Saint Austremonie, relics (Haute-Loire) 109
- Saint-Benoît (Aude) 159
- Saint Calminius 109
- Saint-Chaffre, abbey 109, 110
- Saint-Denis, basilica (Seine-Saint-Denis) 136, 137, 139, 140, 142, 175
- Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, abbey (Gard) 110, 175, 111, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 146, 175; counts of (title of counts of Toulouse) 2, 39, 90, 110, 111, 187; town 39, 49, 90, 110, 111
- Saint-James of Compostela, Spain 32, 49, 136, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143
- Saint Julien-Chapteuil (Haute-Loire) 87
- Saint Léonard-de-Noblat (Haute-Vienne) 136, 137, 139
- Saint-Marcel, castrum 48
- Saint-Martial of Limoges, abbey (Haute-Vienne) 109, 127
- Saint-Martin-Lalande (Aude) 10
- Saint Martin (saint) 114
- Saint-Paul, *castrum* on the river Tarn 135, 143, 170
- Saint-Sernin of Toulouse, basilica 192, 205, 207
- Saint Saviour in Asturias, Spain 136, 137, 139
- Saint Theofred of Orange 109, 110
- Saint Thomas of Canterbury (shrine of Saint Thomas Becket) 136, 137, 139
- Santiago de Compostelle, see Saint-James of Compostela
- salvation xi, 5, 33, 65, 93, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 169, 194, 195, 209
- Sapiac (Tarn-et-Garonne) 137, 140, 175
- Sant’ Agata de’ Goti, bishop of (Italy) 54
- Saracens 42, 68, 88, 116, 120, 167, 184, 201
- Sardinia 75
- Satan 33, 38, 39, 72, 98, 116, 118, 123, 126, 165, 168, 203, 209, 210, 212. See also Devil
- school 15, 38, 122, 164–69, 204, 212
- scribes 26–27, 29, 75, 79, 80, 98, 133, 137, 145, 152, 156, 163, 181
- Scripture 7, 30, 88, 103, 112, 164, 166, 210, 211; heretical 7, 210
- ‘secular arm’ 16, 18, 35, 208

GENERAL INDEX

- Segorbe, bishop of Valencia 44
 Sens (Yonne), archdiocese of 36, 52, 64
 sentences, in grammar 30
 sentences, passed by inquisitors xix–xx,
 17–19, 132, 133, 135–43, 207;
 passed by pope 33–34; passed by
 secular officer 71
Sermo generalis 18
 sermons, antiheretical and crusading
 (see also: preaching) 11, 23, 24–25,
 32, 33, 54, 79, 80, 85, 86, 111,
 113–14, 116, 118, 122, 168, 205,
 219; Cathar 137–42, 146, 147–51,
 155, 158, 159, 162, 168, 172,
 175, 183, 205, 209–10, 212;
 Waldensian 7
 Sicily, kingdom of 13, 87
 Silvabela (unidentified toponym, see
 Silvacane) 81–82
 Silvacane (Cistercian monastery at La Roque
 d'Anthéron, Bouches-du-Rhône) 81
 Simony, 88, 104, 115
sirventès 77, 79, 80, 83 (definition) 88, 92,
 101, 103, 107–08, 109, 111, 112, 115,
 119, 125, 126, 152
 sheep 35, 103, 112–113, 115
socius/socia 6, 141, 147, 148–50, 152, 153,
 156
Song of the Albigensian Crusade xv–xvi, 9,
 11, 75, 181–92
Song of Roland 86, 106
stilus curiae Romanae 26
 ‘Synagogue of Satan’ 33, 48, 56, 203
 Syria 100

 Tarascon (also now known as Tarascon-sur-
 Rhône, Bouches-du-Rhône) 13, 94–96,
 101–02
 Tarn, river 135, 143
 Tarragona, archdiocese of (Catalonia) 34
 Tauriac (Lot) 146, 153–54
 tax 24, 26, 30, 52, 55, 59
tenso 77
 Tiber, river 206
 Tonneins (Lot-et-Garonne) 141
 torture 19, 62, 68, 121, 207
 Toulouse and *Paratge* 83
 Toulouse(Haute-Garonne), Cathar bishop
 and diocese of 6, 15, 157–59, 160,
 161, 162, 170, 205; city of xiii, 4,
 10, 13, 14, 15, 36, 43–44, 46, 53, 76,
 80, 96, 107–08, 115, 116, 119, 120,
 164–69, 170, 181, 185, 186, 187,
 195; consulate 49, 171, 187 counts
 of xvi, 1–2, 3, 8, 9, 11–12, 13, 15, 23,
 37–38, 43, 50, 54, 57, 66, 76, 79, 81,
 85–87, 88, 89, 90, 93, 96–97, 100–01,
 103–04, 110, 119, 120, 131–32, 135,
 136, 146, 153, 155, 158, 161, 181–82,
 194, 197, 202, 220. See also: Raymond
 VI, Raymond VII, Simon of Montfort,
 Amalric of Montfort; county of xvi, 10,
 14, 15, 186, 188; diocese and bishop of
 xiv, 14, 44, 46, 75, 81, 108, 122, 151,
 170, 198–200, 201; heresy in 141–42,
 147, 148–49, 153, 164–69, 170–73;
 Franciscan house in 15, 164–69; people
 of 43–45, 51, 52, 53, 90, 108, 119,
 120, 153, 186–90, 198–200, 201–02,
 204–07; repression of heresy in xix–xxi,
 16–17, 20, 43–44 (interdict), 46–47,
 51–53, 80, 120, 131–32, 146–51, 158,
 161, 164–69, 170–73, 185, 204–07,
 208, 216; sieges of 10, 57, 98–99,
 189–92, 193; university of 15
 Tours, archdiocese of 52, 64, 176
 (see: Saint-Martin-of-Tours)
 towns 76, 80, 97–98, 101, 135–37,
 144, 183–85, 189, 192, 193,
 206–07
 townspeople 160, 184, 186, 206–7
 Tarentaise, archdiocese of 63, 64
Trobairitz xi, 75, 119–22
 Troubadours, biographies see: *vidas*;
 manuscripts xvii–xviii, 77, 79; and
 heresy 80–81; and music 76, 83,
 115, 181
 Troyes, county of 37
 Troy 184
 Turkey 94, 100

Ut negotium (1256) 68, 72
 Usson (castrum, commune of Rouze, Ariège)
 97–98

 Valence (Drôme) 100
 Varennes-sur-Allier (Allier) 171, 172
vavassors 182
 Venaissin, county, also known as the Comtat
 Venaissin 96
 Ventignac, castle (Dordogne) 48
 Vermandois, county of 37
Vergentis in senium (1199) 23
Vers 77

GENERAL INDEX

- vidas* (short biographies of troubadours)
75–81, 87, 89, 95
- Vienne (Isère), archdiocese of 34, 38, 52,
54, 63, 64, 146; city 100
- Villemur (Haute-Garonne) 3, 141, 145–47,
153–54, 161, 170, 174–75, 190
- Villeneuve 159, 162
- vineyards 33, 35, 36, 38, 42
- Vivaraïs, county of (Ardèche) 99, 100
- Waldensians 7, 8, 79, 114, 133, 136–141,
143, 162, 169, 171, 186, 211, 213, 217
- White confraternity 10, 85, 185
- witness, in court 9, 18, 53, 71, 84, 96; to
marriage 133–34, 144–56, 160–63,
164–69, 171–73, 175–76, 182, 209
- wolves 34, 35, 93, 112, 118
- yellow crosses 18–19, 217

BERSERKER

BOOKS

