

Waldensians in the Inquisition Record of Jacques Fournier

Jack Baigent, BA, MA.

**Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

March 2021

Acknowledgements

I extend warmest thanks to my supervisors, Dr Claire Taylor and Dr Peter Darby, for their advice and counsel throughout the course of this project. Without their enthusiasm and encouragement, this thesis could not have been completed. My gratitude also to every scholar, professional and student, who has discussed this thesis with me over the past four years, your different perspectives have been invaluable.

Finally, I thank my parents, Dave and Fiz, for their patient love and support, and Sophie, for always being there for me.

Abstract

The current study aims to provide a dedicated analysis of the depositions of the four Waldensians that appear in the inquisition record of Jacques Fournier, and use this evidence to increase our understanding of Waldensians in the period, and of clandestine heterodox groups more broadly. This unique and detailed source material has been thus far underutilised in histories of Waldensianism, and this thesis hopes to fill a gap in the literature by placing the source under the lens of modern interpretative techniques. The work will be divided into three sections of two chapters each. Section one will focus on the text itself and its evidence, providing an in-depth analysis of the source which will be used as the basis for later chapters. The first chapter will consider the depositions in terms of their production, by focusing on Fournier and his inquisition, his presuppositions, goals and strategies in producing the final record. After peeling back this layer of inquisitorial discourse, the second chapter will seek to provide as complete an account as possible of the evidence in the Waldensians' depositions. This will cover their strategies for approaching the interrogations, their religious beliefs, and the structure and nature of the movement they were part of. Section two will use this evidence in conjunction with specific interpretative lenses to deepen our understanding of it. Chapter three focuses on gender in the depositions, including a discussion on the potential evidence for Sisters in the Order, and a sketch of the gendered roles which operated within the movement. Chapter four will present an analysis of the spatial components of the testimony, and how the deposition evidence relates to the movements and spatial organisation of underground heterodox groups. Finally, section three will attempt to better place this group of Waldensians in their proper historical context via two comparative analyses. Chapter five will assess the importance of the ideas of Durand of Huesca, a prominent early Waldensian, to later groups operating in the same region. This chapter will demonstrate the existence and importance of cultural memory to Waldensian identity, and that the ideas of Raymond and his companions did not exist in a vacuum. Similarly, chapter six will look into the similarities between these ideas and those of the Spiritual Franciscans, another heterodox group active in the same time and place as the Waldensians. This chapter will investigate their parallel histories and ideas, and show that – although distinctly separate – the two groups were very much part of the same religious culture specific to the region at that time.

Notes on the Text

This study will use the term 'inquisition' as an abbreviated term for the many separate inquisitions into heresy which took place from the late twelfth century onwards. Names of deponents and others who appear in the primary material have been altered where possible to their closest English equivalents, with the Latin being used where no such equivalents exist.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	8
Introduction to the Text	8
<i>Raymond of Costa</i>	9
<i>Huguette of Costa</i>	10
<i>John of Vienne</i>	11
<i>Agnes Franco</i>	12
Literary Review of Fournier's Inquisition Record	12
Early Waldensians – Historical and Geographical Context.....	18
Early Waldensians – an Historiographical Overview.....	25
Inquisition Records and their Interpretation	27
Methodological Approach of the Current Study.....	29
SECTION ONE - ANALYSIS OF THE SOURCE	31
CHAPTER ONE - JACQUES FOURNIER'S INQUISITION	31
1.1. Early Life and pre-Pontifical Works	32
1.2. Fournier as Pope Benedict XII.....	34
1.3. Analysis of Fournier's Character, Aims and Motives	37
1.4. Fournier's Pastoral Care.....	38
1.5. Fournier's Interrogation Strategy.....	42
1.5.a. <i>General Inquisitorial Objectives and Strategy</i>	43
1.5.b. <i>Specific Strategies Employed by Fournier</i>	48
1.5.c. <i>Logical Question Sequences</i>	49
1.5.d. <i>Basic Belief Questions</i>	51
1.5.e. <i>Difficult Questions and Hypothetical Scenarios</i>	53
1.5.f. <i>Opening up Contradictions in the Subject's Statements</i>	55
1.5.g. <i>Specific Approaches to Agnes Franco and John of Vienne</i>	57
1.5.h. <i>Specific Approaches to Huguette of Costa</i>	62
1.6. Conclusions.....	66
CHAPTER TWO - THE EVIDENCE OF THE WALDENSIANS' DEPOSITIONS	68
2.1. Raymond's Interrogation Strategy	68
2.1.a. <i>Demonstration of Orthodoxy</i>	69
2.1.b. <i>Ignorance</i>	72
2.1.c. <i>Diminishment</i>	74
2.1.d. <i>Attacks on the Inquisition</i>	75
2.2. Raymond's Religious Beliefs	78
2.2.a. <i>Scriptural Literalism</i>	78
2.2.b. <i>Oath-taking</i>	80
2.2.c. <i>Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead</i>	81
2.2.d. <i>Killing</i>	82
2.2.e. <i>Relationship with the Roman Church</i>	87
2.3. John of Vienne - Strategy and Beliefs.....	89
2.4. Agnes Franco – Strategy and Beliefs	93
2.5. Huguette of Costa – Strategy and Beliefs	94
2.6. Structure and Composition of Raymond's Order	97
2.6.a. <i>Relationship with the Toulouse Waldensians</i>	97
2.6.b. <i>A Three-tiered System?</i>	100
2.6.c. <i>Recruitment and Initiation</i>	102
2.7. Religiosity of the Order	104
2.7.a. <i>Confession & Mass</i>	105
2.7.b. <i>Preaching</i>	110
2.8. Conclusions.....	111

SECTION TWO - METHODOLOGICAL LENSES.....	114
CHAPTER THREE – WOMEN AND GENDER	114
3.1. Gendered Perspective in the Depositions	116
3.2. Status of Women in Raymond’s Order	121
3.3. Gender Roles in Raymond’s Order	127
3.4. Relationship to the Beguine Model.....	129
3.5. Conclusions.....	130
CHAPTER FOUR – SPATIAL ANALYSIS	132
4.1. Macro-Space: Networking Disparate Communities	132
4.2. Micro-Space: Subverting Social Space in Towns and Cities	137
4.3. Conclusions.....	142
SECTION THREE - SETTING RAYMOND'S COMMUNITY IN HISTORICAL CONTEXT	144
CHAPTER FIVE – DURAND OF HUESCA AND TEXTUAL MEMORY.....	144
5.1. Methodological Considerations.....	145
5.2. Durand of Huesca: Life and Works.....	146
5.3. Waldensians in the Languedoc after Durand’s Death.....	152
5.4. Raymond of Costa and his Community’s Textual Memory	153
5.5. The Liber Antiheresis and Raymond’s Interrogation.....	155
5.5.a. Ecclesiology	156
5.5.b. Sacramental Theology	159
5.5.c. Poverty and Labour	162
5.5.d. Theological Discrepancies	163
5.6. Conclusions.....	165
CHAPTER SIX – WALDENSIANS AND FRANCISCANS: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	167
6.1. Development of Spiritual Franciscan Thought: St. Francis	167
6.2. Development of Spiritual Franciscan Thought: the Thirteenth Century	173
6.3. Peter Olivi: Background and Context	175
6.4. Olivi’s Theology	176
6.5. Waldensians and Franciscans: Direct Evidence of Connection	182
6.6. Franciscan Lay Followers: the Beguins.....	184
6.7. Personal Religious Experience in Waldensian and Franciscan Theology	189
6.8. Olivi’s Philosophy on the Nature and Purpose of the Spiritual Life.....	191
6.9. Case study: Raymond Dejean	195
6.10. Conclusions	198
CONCLUSIONS.....	200
LIST OF WORKS CITED	208
APPENDIX – INTERROGATION SUMMARY OF WALDENSIANS IN FOURNIER’S REGISTER	220

Abbreviations

Bernard Gui, *Sentences* - Bernard Gui, *Le Livre Des Sentences de L'inquisiteur Bernard Gui: 1308-1323*, ed. and trans. Annette Pales-Gobilliard (Paris: CNRS Editions, 2002).

De vita et actibus - Peter Biller, 'Fingering an Anonymous Description of the Waldensians' in Peter Biller and Caterina Bruschi (eds.), *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy* (Woodbridge, 2003), 195-207.

CRC - Jacques Fournier, 'Confessio Raymundi de Costa heretici valdensis et dyaconi in illa secta' in Duvernoy, J. (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (Évêque de Pamiers)* (Toulouse, 1965), 40-120.

CHC - Jacques Fournier, 'Confessio Huguete uxoris Iohannis de Vienna heretice perfecte secte valdencium seu Pauperum de Lugduno, valdenses' in Duvernoy, J. (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (Évêque de Pamiers)*, (Toulouse, 1965), 519-32.

CJV - Jacques Fournier, 'Confessio Iohannis de Vienna heretici valdenses' in Duvernoy, J. (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (Évêque de Pamiers)*, (Toulouse, 1965), 508-18.

CAF - Jacques Fournier, 'Confessio Agnetis uxoris quondam Stephani Franco, heretice seu secte Pauperum de Lugduno, diocesis Viennensis', in Duvernoy, J. (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (Évêque de Pamiers)*, (Toulouse, 1965), 123-7.

PL – *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P. Migne, 217 vols. (Paris: J.P. Migne, 1857-66).

Introduction

In May 1320, the Waldensian cleric Raymond of Costa, alongside his wet-nurse Agnes Francou, were sentenced to be burned at the stake as unrepentant heretics. Just over a year later, two more Waldensians from the same community, Huguette of Costa and her husband John, were similarly executed. This thesis will present a focused study of the lives of these four individuals, whose testimonies are preserved in the inquisition record of Jacques Fournier, bishop of Toulouse and later Pope Benedict XII. This source has been under-represented in the historical literature on Waldensianism, and a dedicated analysis of this group of Waldensians using modern methodological techniques aims to shed significant light on their lives, beliefs, and relationship to the historical context in which they lived. Before beginning the study proper, the introductory material will provide some context to the source itself, and the Waldensian movement as a whole. The methodological approach used by this study will also be addressed, with reference to the historiographical background of the study of inquisition documents in general.

Introduction to the Text

The original copy of the Fournier register is housed in the Vatican Library, manuscript vat. Latin 4030. The most recent full Latin edition was published in three volumes by Jean Duvernoy in 1965, containing the full register in Latin alongside notes in French, and it is this edition which will be used to inform the bulk of this study.¹ Duvernoy has also published several abridged editions of this document, in 1966 and 1986 under the title *Inquisition à Pamiers*, as well as a third publication in 1998 with the alternate heading *Inquisition en Terre Cathare*.² These works include shortened versions of some of the lengthier and more detailed depositions, including Waldensian Raymond of Costa, noblewoman Beatrice of Planissoles, and lecherous priest Peter Clergue. The selected passages have short introductions in French, and are punctuated by italicized paragraphs which briefly summarise sections of the deposition not presented in full. In addition to the Latin versions, Duvernoy has also published two full French translations of the register, first in 1978, followed by a more recent edition in 2006 which includes a preface by *Montaillou* author Emmanuel Le Roy

¹ Jean Duvernoy, (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier, évêque de Pamiers (1318-1325) : Manuscrit n° Vat. Latin 4030 de la Bibliothèque Vaticane* (Toulouse, 1965).

² Duvernoy, (ed.), *Inquisition à Pamiers, interrogatoires de Jacques Fournier, 1318-1325* (Toulouse, 1966); Duvernoy, (ed.), *Inquisition à Pamiers: Cathares, Juifs, Lépreux - devant leurs juges* (Toulouse, 1986); Duvernoy, (ed.), *Inquisition en terre cathare: paroles d'hérétiques devant leurs juges* (Toulouse, 1998).

Ladurie.³ Duvernoy's introduction to the French edition attempts to set the depositions in some context, including a short biography of Fournier and a more detailed overview of his inquisitorial work and the mechanisms of inquisition at that time.⁴ Also included are brief histories of the Cathar and Waldensian heresies central to the register, as well as a discussion of the general atmosphere of superstition and non-belief which Fournier encountered.⁵ No space is given to the difficulties of interpretation or in using the text as evidence to support wider historical theories, and this is a general theme amongst earlier works which use the Fournier register as a source.

The testimonies of the four Waldensians in Fournier's register are lengthy and detailed, especially in comparison to the records of earlier inquisitions. Dozens of interrogation sessions were conducted over a period of several months in late 1319 and early 1320, and the total process from arrest to sentencing took between eight months and two years. For this reason, confusion can often arise in terms of the chronological order of the different interrogations. For clarity, all of the sessions have been formulated in a table in the appendix, which includes the dates of all the deponent's interrogations and a brief summary of their contents. When there is need for precision, specific sessions will be referred to in the text with a letter signifying the deponent followed by the session number as laid out in the appendix. For example, Raymond's first interrogation would be **R1**, while Huguette's tenth would be **H10**. All four interrogations follow a similar format, sessions beginning with the date, location, and list of witnesses present. The questioning is directed by Fournier, with the deponent's responses then recorded in the third person. Again unlike some earlier inquisition texts, these answers are allowed to extend far beyond simple affirmations or denials, and often include considerable detail on the nature of the subjects' beliefs, and their accounts of their dealings with other Waldensians. To aid the more detailed discussions in the first and second chapters, a brief introduction to each of the four deponents will be presented here, providing some general notes on the nature of their processes as well as some biographical details.

Raymond of Costa

Raymond is the only one of the four deponents to be an ordained member of the Waldensian Order, and as such is the spiritual leader of the group. For this reason, Fournier devotes the most amount of time to his interrogation, and it is from Raymond's deposition that we have the best overall picture

³ Duvernoy, (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (évêque de Pamiers), 1318-1325* (Paris, 1978); Duvernoy, (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (évêque de Pamiers), 1318-1325* (Paris, 2006).

⁴ Duvernoy 2006, 1-10.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 10-17.

of Waldensian religiosity in the texts. He was born in La Côte-Saint-André, a village about halfway between the cities of Lyon and Grenoble, in c.1278.⁶ As a young man, Raymond studied grammar for a year in Orange after being ordained deacon. Later, he studied grammar for a further year in Montpellier, during which time he occasionally went to the theology schools of the Friars Minor.⁷ He was involved with the Waldensian movement from at least the late 1290s, and was ordained as a Brother c.1298, after which he spent much time travelling with his fellow Brothers visiting friends of the Order across southern France and northern Italy, before finally being arrested by the inquisition whilst staying in a house at Pamiers in August 1318.

Raymond was thus a well-educated and widely-travelled individual, and this resulted in a deposition of considerable depth and detail. Fournier not only asks him *what* he believes, but also *why* he believes it, and the interrogation spends a lot of time on the theological minutiae of Raymond's positions. Raymond's responses are characterised by their biblical grounding, and rarely does he offer a statement on his religious principles without reference to a scriptural passage in support of it. As well as his beliefs, Raymond's process is also notable for its discussion of the nature and structure of his Waldensian Order, and his testimony is arguably most famous for his claim that Waldensians followed a three-tier hierarchy of *majorals*, priests and deacons.⁸ With a few minor exceptions, Raymond refused to recant any of the errors which the inquisition accused him of, and he was sentenced to death at the stake on April 30th, 1320.

*Huguette of Costa*⁹

Huguette is one of the three lay companions arrested alongside Raymond, and her testimony is the most lengthy and detailed after his. Huguette was the daughter of a baker and also born in La Côte-Saint-André in c.1290, though she grew up in a village called '*Botinqueville*', in the diocese of Vienne.¹⁰ After her father died, she and her mother moved to Arles, where she later married John of Vienne, and the two of them had moved to stay with Raymond in Pamiers around six weeks before

⁶ He claims to have been ordained when he was twenty, and that this occurred around twenty years prior to his process, making him approximately forty in 1318. *CRC*, 49.

⁷ '...in Aurisica per unum annum, et ibi studuit in grammatica, postquam fuit dyaconus ordinatus; in Montepessolano per unum annum vel circa, ubi addiscit grammaticum, et aliquando intrabath scholas Theologie Fratrum Minorum...', *CRC*, 102.

⁸ This claim will be discussed further in chapter two. *CRC*, 55-6.

⁹ Huguette is referred to in the title of her deposition record as 'wife of John of Vienne.' Since she was born in the same village as Raymond, I have here used the same naming convention ('of Costa') for Huguette to better reflect the importance of her testimony.

¹⁰ Huguette refers to an event when she was twelve as happening approximately eighteen years prior to her interrogation, which would make her around thirty at the time. *CHC*, 520-1; Duvernoy identifies *Botinqueville* as the modern-day settlement of Boucin. Duvernoy 1965, iii, 511.

they were arrested. She states that she was introduced to the Waldensians at the age of twelve while living in Arles, by a man named Gerard who visited the house of the man she and her mother were staying with. From that time, Huguette had regular contact with Gerard and other Waldensian Brothers, often traveling considerable distances to visit them. Her deposition spends much time on her relationship with these men, as the inquisition was particularly interested in information on what it believed were heretical leaders. However, it is still evident that Huguette was well-informed about the nature of Waldensian beliefs, and her testimony is characterised by her forthright and unwavering defence of them.¹¹ Huguette's level of knowledge and zeal for Waldensian teachings is perhaps why the inquisition chose to use the term '*perfecta*' to title her deposition, a term usually reserved for those formally inducted into the sect, even though there is no evidence that Huguette could possibly be a full member of the Order as a married woman.¹² Huguette was found guilty of heresy and sentenced to death in the summer of 1321, the delay in her execution perhaps explained by an allusion to her being pregnant at the time of her initial arrest.¹³

John of Vienne

John, husband of Huguette, is the only male lay believer of the group, and the only one not associated with the village of La Côte-Saint-André, having originally come from the city of the Vienne, in the modern department of Isère. John was introduced to the movement by his wife, who told him about the Brothers before they were married. Much of the biographical information we know about John comes from his wife's testimony. He possibly worked for a time on board a merchant ship, but by the time he and Huguette moved to Pamiers he was working as a cooper.¹⁴ John's testimony provides less detail than his wife's possibly because he was less deeply involved in the movement having only been brought in as an adult. Nevertheless, his commitment to the Brothers and their teachings is no less unwavering, though his responses tend to be simpler and less involved than Huguette's. John's deposition covers the usual questions of religious belief, as well as several attempts to uncover the individuals who taught him these beliefs, to which John gives varying information, though again there is a lack of narrative detail in comparison to his wife's

¹¹ At one point she even claims to know better than the Pope on points of doctrine. *CHC*, 525.

¹² Shulamith Shahar *Women in a Heretical Sect: Agnes and Huguette the Waldensians*, trans. Yael Lotan (Woodbridge, 2001), 138, footnote 14.

¹³ Huguette first refuses to swear for the reason that she miscarried the last time she did so, and claims to be currently pregnant. *CHC*, 519.

¹⁴ *CHC*, 520.

testimony. John remained faithful to his wife and the beliefs she introduced him to, and he was sentenced as an unrepentant heretic to burn at the stake alongside her on August 2nd, 1321.

Agnes Franco

The shortest deposition of the four comes to us from Agnes, another female lay believer in the movement. Agnes was an older woman and a widow, and though her exact age is unclear she must have been at least in her late fifties, as she was old enough to have been Raymond's wet-nurse in La Côte-Saint-André when he was an infant. Agnes herself was likely from that region, and her late husband was from Vermelle, a village just to the north of Raymond's birthplace. Agnes's deposition is sparse in detail compared with the other three deponents, and the questioning on her beliefs is kept brief and simple. Nevertheless, she provides some key details on the movements of the group leading up to their stay in Pamiers, and remained unmoved on the issue of swearing an oath. For this reason, she was sentenced to death, and was burned along with Raymond in May 1320.

Literary Review of Fournier's Inquisition Record

The inquisition record of Jacques Fournier is a rich and textured source which has been used to inform numerous studies since the mid-twentieth century, though not without their flaws. Most famous for the detailed social-history *Montaillou*, the deposition has also been used as a source in a wide variety of works on heresy and inquisition in the Late Medieval Period, both general studies and those related more specifically to Cathar or Waldensian heresies. More recent publications have incorporated more up-to-date methodological approaches in their treatment of the source, though a full in-depth study has yet to be completed.

By far the most significant of these studies is Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie's 1975 work *Montaillou*, a popular as well as an academic success.¹⁵ The author uses Fournier's register to perform what is effectively an ethnographic study of the lives of medieval villagers and shepherds. The work is typical of the *Annales* school of social history, Le Roy Ladurie begins with chapters which set his source in its geographical and cultural context, focusing on the *longue durée* elements such as the physical environment and the life of pastoralism he traces all the way back to the Neolithic. The bedrock of cultural life in the village itself is the *domus*, or household, a largely patriarchal system

¹⁵ Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou, village occitan de 1294 à 1324* (Paris, 1975); The work was first translated to English by Barbara Bray in 1978, and has been republished many times since. The edition used here is Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou: the Promised Land of Error* trans. Barbara Bray (New York, 2008).

around which all power-relationships and interactions are intimately linked. The second half of the book attempts to unravel the villagers' *mentalités*, using the information recorded in the depositions to explore the cultural forms present in the Medieval village. In this way the author constructs an almost complete picture of the lives of the inhabitants: their relationships and rivalries, the structure of their households, their understanding of notions of time and space, and even how often they took a bath.¹⁶ Despite solely using an inquisition record to inform the entirety of his study, Le Roy Ladurie gives almost no attention at all to its author, Jacques Fournier. The inquisitor is only mentioned in the introduction, and then only to praise the scholarly and detailed approach he applied to his investigation. Le Roy Ladurie mentions that the interrogation process was an 'unequal dialogue',¹⁷ but no further attention is given as to what this might mean from an interpretative standpoint, as the author merely insists that Fournier was concerned only with uncovering 'the truth', and thus the accuracy of the reports need not be questioned.

Montaillou has understandably been criticised for its methodological approach. Ethnographer Renato Rosaldo has suggested Le Roy Ladurie's portrayal of Fournier is an anachronistic fiction, the inquisitor effectively becoming a fellow modern scholar rather than a medieval bishop looking to discover heresies.¹⁸ Rosaldo goes on to argue that the *Montaillou* author's use of *longue durée* history to connect modern and medieval 'French' culture encourages such casual anachronisms, as well as a teleology which allows the historian to claim to understand historical peasants but also to know better than them.¹⁹ Le Roy Ladurie's use of his inquisition record source is also criticised, the author often assuming that anything which did not appear in these interrogations to be areas of 'cultural silence' in the community.²⁰ This unspoken assumption that the Fournier register offers complete information alongside the presentation of the deponents words in the first person leads to the writing of a fictionalised history in which Le Roy Ladurie's subjects often become romantic caricatures. Thus, for example, the shepherd Peter Maury becomes a freedom-loving, egalitarian democrat who lives a life largely liberated from the chains of oppressive medieval feudalism.²¹ This lifestyle is contrasted in *Montaillou* with the primitive, violent and lascivious townsfolk, who are portrayed as being primarily interested in petty vendettas and love affairs.²²

¹⁶ Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou*, 141-2.

¹⁷ Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou*, xv.

¹⁸ Rosaldo, 'From the Door of his Tent: The Fieldworker and the Inquisitor' in Clifford, J. and Marcus, G. E., (eds.), *Writing Culture: the Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley, 1986), 81.

¹⁹ Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou*, 144; Rosaldo, 'From the Door of his Tent', 84-5.

²⁰ Rosaldo, 'From the Door of his Tent', 82.

²¹ Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou*, 121.

²² Rosaldo, 'From the Door of his Tent', 86-7.

This trope of using Fournier to write a narrative, ethnographic and often fictionalised history can also be found in René Weis's *The Yellow Cross*, which is indebted to *Montaillou* for much of its methodology.²³ Weis covers a longer period than Le Roy Ladurie, charting the history of French Catharism from 1290 to 1329, but his use of the Fournier register is strikingly similar. The treatment of the source is largely uncritical, and Weis likens his project to 'detective work', with the assumption that all the information is neutrally available, and all that remains is to fashion these disparate facts into a coherent framework.²⁴ Fournier is praised for his 'forensic intelligence', and as in *Montaillou* the inquisitor's supposed fastidious investigation skills are taken as reason enough to treat the entire register as an unbiased record of factual statements.²⁵ Weis adopts a narrative structure throughout his work, relating the 'story' of the people of Montaillou from the late thirteenth century. This style necessarily involves some embellishment and results in the author often blurring the lines between history and historical fiction.²⁶

Aside from these dedicated works on the villagers of Montaillou, the Fournier register has also been used as a source to support arguments in wider histories of heresy and the inquisition. It is also important to state, however, that Fournier is notable by his absence in many such works. Henry Charles Lea did not use the text in his grand-scale *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*,²⁷ nor does it appear in Hamilton's similar - albeit much briefer - *The Medieval Inquisition*.²⁸ Edward Peters' *Inquisition* mentions Fournier's inquisition but is more concerned with legal procedures and institutions and does not use the register itself as a primary source for case studies.²⁹ Lambert's history of medieval heresy makes use of Fournier to discuss late Catharism, and owes much to *Montaillou*. The concept of the *domus* is discussed as the central space in which Catharism operated, as opposed to the Church building which was the domain of Catholicism.³⁰ Lambert also includes the Fournier documents in his dedicated history of Catharism, in which he ties the Pamiers inquisition to what he terms the 'Autier revival' in the early fourteenth century, effectively a 'last bastion' of Catharism inspired by charismatic figurehead Peter Autier in the county of Foix.³¹ Due to the relatively late date of the Pamiers inquisition in relation to the broader history of dualist heresy in

²³ Weis, *The Yellow Cross: The Story of the Last Cathars, 1290-1329* (New York, 2001).

²⁴ Weis, *The Yellow Cross*, xxxi.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 255.

²⁶ Jeffrey S. Hamilton, 'The Yellow Cross: The Story of the Last Cathars, 1290-1329', *Journal of Church and State* 44, no.1 (2002), 153-4.

²⁷ Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (London, 1922).

²⁸ Bernard Hamilton, *The Medieval Inquisition* (London, 1981).

²⁹ Peters, *Inquisition* (Berkeley, 1989), 73.

³⁰ Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 3rd edition (Oxford, 2002), 140-2.

³¹ Lambert, *The Cathars* (Oxford, 1998), 230-71.

Southern France, the Fournier register is often given less attention than those sources which relate to the heresy at its twelfth and thirteenth-century height. Thus the register is used either as a footnote to Cathar history as in Malcolm Barber's *Cathars*,³² or is understandably absent from histories which focus on the period when Catharism was more widespread around the time of the Albigensian Crusade.

Fournier's inquisition has also been used to inform histories of Waldensianism, particularly due to the lengthy and detailed interrogation of Raymond of Costa, a Waldensian 'deacon' who appears to offer great insight into the organisational structure of his movement. In his *The Waldensian Dissent*, Gabriel Audisio generally uses Raymond's deposition to provide an evidential basis for wider claims about the movement as a whole. Audisio takes a straightforward and relatively uncritical view of the source, citing Raymond as evidence of literate Waldensian preachers,³³ and of a three-tiered hierarchical structure within the dissent.³⁴ This places Raymond firmly within a broad, cross-century narrative of Waldensianism, and does not consider his case in isolation, or any interpretive problems associated with using his deposition as evidence for trends within the Waldensian movement as a whole.

Euan Cameron has also used Raymond as a case study to support wider arguments about the long-term history of Waldensianism.³⁵ He concludes that the evidence from Fournier's register suggests that the decline of the movement in Languedoc after the turn of the fourteenth century might be due to its difficulty in adequately differentiating itself from orthodox Catholicism. He supports this theory by citing Raymond, stating that he genuinely believed himself to be a member of the Church who only disagreed on a few minor points.³⁶ Cameron generally takes Raymond's words at face value - pointing out that he would not have died for his beliefs if he did not truly have them - though he is more critical than Audisio in asserting that Raymond's testimony represents an anomaly in the broader corpus of sources concerning Waldensians.³⁷ This approach to the text has been taken further by Grado Merlo, who has used the evidence of Raymond's testimony to highlight the importance of localised belief and practice within Waldensian communities, as part of his wider argument for the existence of 'Waldensianisms' as opposed to a single unified movement.³⁸

³² Barber, *The Cathars: Dualist Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages* (Harlow, 2000), 197-201.

³³ Audisio, *The Waldensian Dissent: Persecution and Survival, c.1170-c.1570* (Cambridge, 1999), 156.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 117.

³⁵ Cameron, *Waldenses: Rejections of Holy Church in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 2000), 87-92.

³⁶ *ibid.*, 95.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 89.

³⁸ Merlo, G., *Valdesi e Valdismi Medievali: Itinerari e Proposte di Ricerca* (Turin, 1984).

A further case-study on the Waldensians in Fournier's register has been performed by Shulamith Shahar, who brings focus onto the two female deponents in the text as part of a history of women in heterodox movements.³⁹ Although Shahar provides an excellent overview of the evidence, both from the inquisition text and on women involved in heresy more broadly, the study lacks important contextualisations that would help ground Agnes and Huguette in a specific place in history. Instead, their testimonies are used as timeless *exempla* for all heterodox women of the Middle Ages. Whilst many such comparisons are undoubtedly valid, it is often difficult to connect the Fournier Waldensians to some of Shahar's discussions. The nature of belief in the Virgin Mary, the heterodoxy of women in the upper classes, and the actions of women in the inquisition of Peter Zwicker are all areas on which Agnes and Huguette are understandably silent.⁴⁰

More recent studies have approached the Fournier deposition with greater methodological rigour, none more so than John Arnold's *Inquisition and Power*, which applies a Foucauldian understanding of discourse to the inquisitorial process, and treats depositions as artificial constructions of confessing subjects created through this discourse. Unlike previous histories of inquisition, Arnold actively uses the Fournier register to provide case studies to supplement his arguments. Unlike Le Roy Ladurie and Weis, Arnold sees Fournier's interrogation style not as the product of a particularly diligent and interested scholar, but as a reflection of a wider shift in inquisitorial discourse which began to focus on individual internal belief rather than merely communal action.⁴¹ Arnold's case studies are intended to show - in different ways - how the 'literate authority' of the inquisitor deconstructed these vernacular beliefs in order to produce a confessing subject which could be understood and processed by the inquisitorial discourse. For example, in the case of Arnaud de Savinhan, Arnold demonstrates how rather complex and vague vernacular belief is gradually formalised into a final official-sounding confession.⁴² In the deposition of Raymond de Laburat the reader is shown how a minor local dispute is incorporated by Fournier into a grand-scale model of heresy.⁴³ Arnold effectively turns the methodology of *Montaillou* on its head by giving almost no agency to the deponents interrogated by Fournier, and he does not attempt to use the record to make any kind of inferences about life in medieval society. Power rests entirely with the inquisitor, and although the interrogated may employ certain tactics - such as in the case of Jean Joufre who chose only to speak using reported stories - ultimately an official confession will

³⁹ Shahar, *Women in a Heretical Sect: Agnes and Huguette the Waldensians*, trans. Yael Lotan (Woodbridge, 2001).

⁴⁰ Marian theology is not a topic which appears in either woman's deposition.

⁴¹ Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia, 2001), 164-5; See section below for further discussion on the historiography of inquisition sources.

⁴² *ibid.*, 167-73.

⁴³ *ibid.*, 180-90.

inevitably be produced out of their testimonies.⁴⁴ Again in contrast to Le Roy Ladurie and Weis, Arnold is very hesitant to say much about the deponents themselves. Indeed, he cautions that the oft-cited life story of Beatrice of Lagleize cannot be viewed as an autobiographical narrative,⁴⁵ and that charges of sodomy against individuals such as Arnold of Verniolles are not evidence of homosexuality in the sense we might understand it today.⁴⁶ Thus Arnold uses Fournier to buttress his arguments about the nature of inquisition sources and his critique of their use in historical inquiry.

Another recent work chiefly concerning Fournier is Irene Bueno's *Defining Heresy*, which deals not only with the register of the Pamiers inquisition, but also the context of the inquisitor's life and an in-depth analysis of his other works. Despite later becoming Pope Benedict XII, Fournier's inquisition of 1318 to 1325 has generally been viewed in isolation, without regard to the bishop's involvement in the theological debates, heresy trials, and his defence of the faith as a member of the Church's elite.⁴⁷ The work is divided into three parts: a study on the mechanisms of the court at Pamiers and the structure of the inquisition, a section on Fournier's contribution to theological debates of the period including an involved analysis of his commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, and finally a discussion of Benedict XII's role as pope in defending the orthodox faith. Bueno follows Arnold in arguing that the shift towards a more detailed, belief-based interrogation style was more due to shifting beliefs amongst Church theologians on what constituted heresy than to Fournier's personality.⁴⁸ The author accepts the inquisitor's role of dominance in the interrogation process, but gives the deponents a certain degree of agency, arguing that defendants 'shaped their confessions based on inquisitorial expectations' rather than simply having confessions artificially imposed upon them.⁴⁹ This allows Bueno to discuss common strategies among the accused and consider them more than just passive objects powerless to oppose inquisitorial discourse.⁵⁰

Finally, there have been some studies which have attempted to use the depth and detail of Fournier's register to tackle issues outside the usual scope of inquisition histories. David Zbiral has used the text to approach the subject of sexual morality in the medieval period, arguing for the existence of moral norms outside of those understood by Fournier and the Church.⁵¹ Lola Sharon

⁴⁴ Arnold, *Inquisition and Power*, 190-7.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 200.

⁴⁶ Arnold, *Inquisition and Power*, 223.

⁴⁷ Bueno, I., *Defining Heresy: Inquisition, Theology, and Papal Policy in the time of Jacques Fournier* trans. Isabella Bolognese, Tony Brophy and Sarah Rolfe Prodan (Leiden, 2015), 8.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 89.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 77-9.

⁵¹ Zbiral, 'The Norm-Deviation Model Reconsidered: Four Cases of 'Alternative' Sexual Morals Judged by the Inquisition', *Journal of Religion in Europe* 3, no.2 (2010), 215-40.

Davidson has revived Le Roy Ladurie's ethnographic slant on the evidence by using modern anthropological techniques to examine social structure in Montañou, and explains the inhabitants' heretical beliefs through the lens of social relationships and social change.⁵²

Fournier's register has been surprisingly underused in historical literature considering its size and unusual level of detail. Perhaps this is in part due to the difficulty of connecting its contents to broader historical themes. To scholars of the Cathar heresy, the Montañou villagers represent the last provincial embers of the heterodoxy's existence, long after its heyday in the twelfth century. Similarly, historians studying the Waldensians have often found Raymond's unusual pattern of beliefs difficult to incorporate into wider histories of the movement. The present study will attempt to build on recent work by approaching the Waldensians in Fournier's register in their specific context, apply modern interpretative techniques to the text, and precisely position the deponents and their community within a broader historical narrative.

Early Waldensians – Historical and Geographical Context

When Raymond of Costa was interrogated by Jacques Fournier as a suspected Waldensian heretic, he was not giving his answers in isolation. Raymond formed part of a rich heritage of dissent with links to past as well as present communities of Waldensians. It is therefore important to understand the historical spread of Waldensian ideas, and the changing locales in which they were based, up to the period under investigation. This will involve a brief history of the movement from its origins in France and subsequent spread across a vast swathe of Europe, through the period of inquisitorial persecution which saw the sect stifled in some areas and driven to new ones, up to the composition and location of Waldensian communities at the time of Fournier's inquisition. Some evidence from the deponents' testimonies will be used to give context on the regions in which they operated, and their potential connections with other Waldensian communities of the time.

The Waldensian movement originated in the city of Lyons in 1173 in east-central France, when a layman named Valdes made the decision to give up his material possessions and live a life of apostolic poverty in pursuit of salvation. Valdes's story is recounted in an anonymous chronicle of that year,⁵³ and is later repeated with additional embellishments by Stephen of Bourbon in the mid-

⁵² Davidson, 'Montañou: Cosmology and Social Structure', *Journal of Religious History* 35, no.4 (2011), 516-31.

⁵³ The anonymous *Chronicon universale anonymi Laudunensis* is preserved in two manuscripts. Berlin State Library, Philipps 1880; Paris, BnF, lat. 5011. An English translation of Valdes's story appears in 'The Origins of the Waldensian Heresy' in Walter Wakefield and Austin Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York, 1969), 200-2.

thirteenth century, who claimed to have first-hand testimony from the scribe employed by Valdes to translate the holy scriptures into the vernacular.⁵⁴ In addition to this, records from a diocesan council held at Lyons in 1180 or 1181 contain a profession of orthodox faith made by Valdes to the clergy.⁵⁵ Thus, unlike with the Cathar heresy, there is little mystery or controversy surrounding the geographic origins of the Waldensian sect.

Valdes's ideas struck a chord with notions of apostolic poverty which had become increasingly popular amongst the laity in the twelfth century,⁵⁶ and he evidently generated quite a large number of followers, including the group who presented themselves before Pope Alexander III at the Third Lateran Council in 1179, and were derided for their ignorance by Walter Map.⁵⁷ The Waldensians' penchant for lay preaching caused them to continually come into conflict with the ecclesiastic authorities during the remainder of the twelfth century, and they were expelled from their home city by the bishop of Lyons in 1181, before being officially excommunicated by the Roman Church in Lucius III's 1184 bull *Ad Abolendam*.⁵⁸ After the movement's expulsion from Lyons, Waldensian ideas spread quickly across a wide geographic area over the next half-century. An anonymous statement possibly written by Ermengaud of Béziers, a figure in the early years of the movement, suggested that by the early thirteenth-century Waldensians were present 'from Catalonia to the sea at Narbonne and thence to the sea at Bordeaux',⁵⁹ and it appears that they quickly attracted believers across Southern France and beyond. This is further attested in legislation passed by Alfonso II of Aragon in 1194 addressed primarily to Waldensians, ordering them to leave his kingdom or face their goods being confiscated by the state. The fact that Alfonso's successor Peter II issued a similar proclamation in 1198, with the harsher penalty of death by burning added to it, suggests that the authorities were not immediately successful in expelling Waldensians from the lands of the crown.⁶⁰ Aragon was also the homeland of Waldensian preacher Durand of Huesca,

⁵⁴ Stephen of Bourbon, *Tractatus de Diversis Materiis Predicabilibus* IV, vii 342; Stephen's *Tractatus* has been published in Esteve de Borbo, Jacques Berlioz and Jean-Luc Eichenlaub (eds.), *Stephani de Borbone Tractatus de Diversis Materiis Predicabilibus*, (Turnhout, 2002-2006), 3 vols.; 'Stephen of Bourbon on the Early Waldenses' in Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 208-10.

⁵⁵ Antoine Dondaine, 'Aux Origines du Valdésisme: Une Profession de Foi de Valdès', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XVI (1946), 231-2; 'A Profession of Faith by Waldes of Lyons' in Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 204-8.

⁵⁶ For a general study on the influence and importance of apostolic poverty in this period see Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 2002).

⁵⁷ Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium* I, xxxi, ed. Montague R. James (Oxford, 1914); 'Walter Map's Account of the Waldenses' in Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 203-4.

⁵⁸ Gordon Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages: the Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent, c. 1250-c. 1450* (Manchester, 1967), 448.

⁵⁹ Antoine Dondaine, 'Durand de Huesca et la Polémique Anti-Cathare', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XXIV (1959), 228-76; 'An Exposure of the Albigensian and Waldensian Heresies' Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 234.

⁶⁰ Damian Smith, *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon: The Limits of Papal Authority* (Aldershot, 2004), 33-4.

whose twelfth century work *Liber Antiheresis* simultaneously attacked heretics whilst defending the tenets of Waldensianism.⁶¹ Durand's beliefs were not anti-clerical and never strayed too far from orthodoxy, allowing him to be reconciled with the Church in 1208.⁶²

Another stronghold of early Waldensianism was along the Po Valley in Lombardy. A 1235 work by Salvo Burci, a nobleman from Piacenza, recorded Waldensian activity in Italy,⁶³ and in the second half of the century Anselm of Alessandria's inquisitor's notebook gives information on Waldensians in the region and how they might be spotted.⁶⁴ Both these sources emphasised the differences between the Lombard Waldensians and the 'ultramontane' or 'Leonist' factions present in France. These differences are quite clearly laid out in a letter detailing the minutes of the 1218 Conference of Bergamo, in which representatives from both France and Italy met to discuss various points of theological dogma.⁶⁵ This meeting could be suggestive of both dissonance and unity between Waldensian groups of differing geographic areas. Dissonance because there were many points on which they did not agree, yet unity in the sense that both sides continued to believe themselves to be part of the same group despite the large distances between them.

The conference of Bergamo has been used as evidence that there was a Waldensian presence in Germany as early as 1218.⁶⁶ However, as Cameron has noted, the letter is merely addressed to 'brothers and sisters, and friends living across the Alps', and is more likely to have been written for the benefit of the French Waldensians.⁶⁷ Caesarius of Heisterbach records the presence of a few Waldensian preachers who caused trouble for the bishop of Metz in 1200,⁶⁸ but there is no other evidence to suggest that these men represented any significant or lasting movement in the area. The first real evidence for a Waldensian presence in the Germanic regions comes from Austria in the 1260s. An inquisitor's compilation recorded that by this time forty parishes had been

⁶¹ Damien Smith, *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition in the Lands of the Crown of Aragon (c. 1167-1276)* (Boston, 2010), 144.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 152-7.

⁶³ Salvo Burci, *Liber Supra Stella*, partial edition and translation in Ilarino da Milano, 'Il "Liber supra stella" del piacentino Salvo Burci contro i Catari e le altre correnti ereticali', *Aevum* XIX (1945), 308-341; 'Salvo Burci on Dissent Among Heretics' in Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 269-74.

⁶⁴ Antoine Dondaine, 'La Hiérarchie Cathare en Italie, II: Le "Tractatus de Hereticis" d'Anselme d'Alexandrie, O.P.; III: Catalogue de la Hiérarchie Cathare d'Italie', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XX (1950), 310-24; 'An Inquisitor's Notebook, by Anselm of Alessandria' in Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 361-73.

⁶⁵ A letter detailing the results of this meeting was first published by Wilhelm Preger; Preger, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Waldesier im Mittelalter', *Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* XIII (1877); 'Council of Bergamo 1218' in Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 279-89.

⁶⁶ Audisio, *The Waldensian Dissent*, 27-8.

⁶⁷ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 98.

⁶⁸ Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus Miraculorum*, ed. Joseph Strange (Cologne, 1851), vol. 2, 296-8.

‘infected’ with the heresy, which he described as having quite extreme Donatist and anti-clerical beliefs.⁶⁹ Pseudo-David of Augsburg confirms this character of Germanic Waldensians when writing of their presence in Bavaria in 1270, claiming that they believed in a biblical literalism which required no interpretation from the Church.⁷⁰ Audisio suggests that the movement was gradually driven eastward due to persecution, and by the early fourteenth century there was a strong presence in Bohemia, in and around cities such as Prague, and elsewhere notable communities in Vienna and Stettin.⁷¹ An inquisitor from 1315 recorded the statement of one captured Waldensian Brother who claimed that although the number of heretics was as high as 80,000 in Austria, the number present in Bohemia and Moravia was ‘infinite’.⁷² Clearly these numbers are highly exaggerated, but this does at least highlight just how concerned the Church authorities were about the threat posed by Waldensianism in the area. The nature of the movement in Germany appears to have been particularly anti-clerical, and this will be an important point of comparison with the Waldensians in Fournier’s register, as Donatism and anti-clericalism are notable by their absence in his interrogations.

By the time Jacques Fournier began his inquisition at Pamiers in 1318, Waldensianism had already been strongly affected by persecution over the previous century. The movement had become decidedly clandestine; gone were the days of public preaching and disputations with Catholics and heretics, which probably ended at the latest in 1230, coinciding with the conclusion of the Albigensian Crusade.⁷³ There is limited evidence that the dissent persisted in Italy or the Iberian Peninsula at this time, largely due to the efforts of inquisitors and local bishops. The clergy of Aragon were particularly zealous in their will to drive out heresy, and played an important role in the development of the inquisitorial method. Raymond of Penyafort, a Spanish Dominican friar, was a theological driving force behind this new practice, and the Council of Tarragona held in 1242 (primarily aimed at Waldensians in the diocese of Barcelona) set out a framework by which different types of heretics should be identified and processed.⁷⁴ The inquisitions of the mid-thirteenth century evidently converted or drove out Waldensians across a wide region between North-East Spain and

⁶⁹ Alexander Patschovsky and Kurt-Victor Selge, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Waldenser*, Texte zur Kirchen- und Theologieggeschichte, Heft 18 (Gütersloh, 1973), 70-103; ‘The Passau Anonymous: On the Origins of Heresy and the Sect of Waldensians’ in Peters, E. (ed.), *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe: Documents in Translation* (Philadelphia, 1980), 150-63.

⁷⁰ Margaret Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions* (Cambridge, 1920), 63; ‘David of Augsburg: On the Waldensians of Bavaria, 1270’ in Edward Peters (ed.), *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe: Documents in Translation* (Philadelphia, 1980) 149-50.

⁷¹ Audisio, *The Waldensian Dissent*, 34-5.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 35.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 29-30.

⁷⁴ Smith, *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition*, 195-8.

Lombardy, and it is feasible that such displaced persons aided the growth of the movement in Germany and further east. Quercy in the Languedoc was a Waldensian stronghold from at least the 1200s, with prominent communities in Montauban and Gourdon, yet their presence seems to have been completely wiped out by the inquisition there in the 1240s.⁷⁵ Despite the presence of Waldensian communities in the inquisition records of the early fourteenth century, it appears these groups were not descended directly from those living around Toulouse and Quercy in the previous century. It is possible to say this because all those interrogated in the later period were either migrants or descendants of migrants from Burgundy, and therefore not native to the region. The Toulouse inquisition of 1310 found many such individuals in and around Auch in Gascony, who had moved there in the 1290s to escape persecution in their homeland.⁷⁶ The early fourteenth century also saw the steady continuation of the movement in rural Germany, which would gradually migrate eastwards over the century from the Danube valley and into Bohemia and Moravia.⁷⁷

One of the most striking things about the Waldensians in the Fournier register is just how well travelled they were.⁷⁸ All of them gave details about various towns and cities they had passed through prior to being arrested, and the extent of these details banishes the notion that this group might represent an insular branch of Waldensianism totally cut off from other communities. As discussed above, Raymond was originally from La Côte-Saint-André, just a few miles south-east of Lyons, the historical home city of his movement. Huguette claimed to have been born in the same village, and Agnes was also local to that area, having being brought in as Raymond's wet nurse. All three seem to have made a similar journey to end up in Pamiers, originating in and around the diocese of Vienne near Lyons, travelling south to the coast, and then west. Raymond claimed to have made the journey the previous year, passing through the papal city of Avignon, spending some time in the coastal town of Agde, before coming to Pamiers.⁷⁹ Agnes told a similar story, stating she fell ill in the diocese of Vienne around a year before, then later travelled through Montpellier and Béziers before spending some time in and around Toulouse and Montauban, meeting Raymond and coming with him to Pamiers.⁸⁰ Huguette was originally based in Arles with her husband, but also claimed to have gone through Montpellier and Béziers, though she described a slightly different route through Narbonne and Carcassonne to reach Pamiers.⁸¹ It is difficult to determine whether these journeys were made separately or as a group. It seems very likely due to their shared place of origin and

⁷⁵ Claire Taylor, *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Medieval Quercy* (York, 2011), 11, 161-4, 234.

⁷⁶ Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1007-29; Cameron, *Waldenses*, 78-80.

⁷⁷ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 111-3.

⁷⁸ For a more detailed analysis of this topic see chapter four.

⁷⁹ *CRC*, 44.

⁸⁰ *CAF*, 124.

⁸¹ *CHC*, 526.

religious beliefs that the group knew each other beforehand, though they may have agreed to travel west separately to avoid suspicion and meet again at a later date. In support of this theory it is worth noting that Agnes, who at first denied but later admitted to having known Raymond since his birth, does not change her story on where she met him recently, reconfirming that they met in Toulouse and then travelled together to Pamiers.⁸²

Raymond's group also reveal important information about other members of their movement, which can aid our understanding of the Waldensian presence in France at this time. Huguette stated she met a John of Lorraine in Arles sixteen years ago, who instructed her in various matters of faith, particularly that to swear was a mortal sin. She went on to have repeated contact with John whilst living in Arles (she also mentioned meeting him in Saint-Gilles-du-Gard, a major pilgrimage centre ten miles west of the city), giving confession to him many times over the years.⁸³ This is the same John that Raymond named as the *majoral* (the highest tier of authority in the Order) who first brought him into the movement he called the 'Poor of Christ'. Raymond claimed to have once travelled with Jean to Italy, where his *majoral* met companions and preached to them. This is important evidence in support of the idea that there was still a Waldensian presence in Italy in the late thirteenth century. Raymond also mentioned a 'Michael the Italian' as one of the Waldensian brothers who instructed him in scripture, though frustratingly Michael is not present in any other sources.⁸⁴ The religious group Raymond was a part of certainly were not insular or restricted to one area. Raymond received instruction from Jean's companions at Vivers in the south-west for two years, studied grammar at Orange for a year, and spent a similar time studying with the Franciscans in Montpellier.⁸⁵ In sum, Raymond paints a picture of a wide-ranging movement that incorporated at least some members with a reasonable degree of formal education.

With such a wide geographic boundary present within the Fournier source itself, it would be highly unlikely that the group had no knowledge or contact with the community of Burgundians interrogated by earlier fourteenth-century inquisitors. Indeed, many of the Waldensian brothers Raymond mentioned - such as John Moran, Gerard of Provence, and John of Cernon - are all also mentioned in the Toulouse inquisition record.⁸⁶ Cameron suggests that Raymond's John of Lorraine may be the same person as the John of Chalon or John of Grandvaux mentioned in earlier

⁸² CAF, 124, 126.

⁸³ 'Interrogata si unquam confessa fuit de peccatis suis dicto Iohanni respondit quod sic, et frequenter.', CHC, 523.

⁸⁴ CRC, 99.

⁸⁵ CRC, 102.

⁸⁶ For an exhaustive list of these references see 'Index of Names of Persons' in Gobilliard's edition of Gui's sentences; Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1729-83.

depositions, and Raymond certainly knew 'Cristianus' (the *majoral* after John) who is mentioned as having heard the confessions of many of the Burgundian group.⁸⁷ The connection does not work both ways, as Raymond and his companions do not appear in any of the earlier inquisition records. However, Raymond is mentioned in one of the later interrogations carried out by Fournier, where he is named by the suspect as an example of the Church's willingness to execute pious men.⁸⁸ It seems more than likely that Raymond and his group were aware of the Burgundian contingent living in Gascony, their shared contacts in high-ranking members of the dissent movement being good circumstantial evidence for this. They also shared some similarities in practice, with an emphasis on confession and repetition of the paternoster common themes amongst both groups.⁸⁹ However, a lot of what is contained in the Fournier register is unique to Raymond and his companions, and the overall sparsity of evidence connecting Raymond to the Burgundians suggests at least some degree of separation, most likely on the basis of their differing places of origin.

As will be shown in the following chapters, the Waldensians of Fournier's register offer many anomalies in the corpus of evidence concerning their movement in the period. However, it is clear that Raymond and his companions fit comfortably into the broader context of Medieval Waldensianism, as a later branch of the French wing of the movement which moved back to reoccupy areas of south-west France in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. There continued to be an observable distinction between Raymond's group and those which were spreading eastwards from Bavaria into Bohemia and Moravia at the time, who appear to have been far more anti-clerical in their beliefs and rural in their organisation.⁹⁰ An investigation of the people and places named in Fournier's register reveal a movement with influence across Southern France, from the Burgundy and Rhône-Alpes regions in the east to Narbonne and Toulouse in the west. Although this range was wide, the number of believers may have been small, and we only have accounts of two different groups in the early fourteenth century period. These groups had similar but distinct sets of beliefs and practices, and shared in common certain individuals of great influence in the movement, such as John of Lorraine. There is limited evidence of direct contact between the two, and though they were almost certainly aware of each other's existence and part of the same larger Order which Raymond speaks of, caution must be taken in assuming Raymond's testimony was entirely representative of the Burgundians.

⁸⁷ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 89.

⁸⁸ Jacques Fournier, 'Confessio Guillaume Autast' in Duvernoy, J. (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier* (1965), 195.

⁸⁹ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 83-4.

⁹⁰ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 102-3.

Early Waldensians – an Historiographical Overview

The history of Waldensianism has its origins in post-Reformation theological debates between Protestant and Catholic writers.⁹¹ The former saw the Waldensians as a means of extending the history of the ‘True Church’ before the time of Martin Luther, and as proto-protestants who had rejected the Roman Church and preserved the spirit of the Apostles. In contrast, Catholic theologians focused on Waldensians as just one part of a fractured tapestry of erroneous beliefs which had risen up against the Church since the time of Christ. They highlighted beliefs that even Protestants condemned, and questioned similarities between Waldensian and Protestant Churches. This debate fuelled the discovery and curation of source documents pertaining to the sect, and led to the publishing of the first general histories of the movement by German historians in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁹² Another German, Herbert Grundmann, was highly influential in laying the foundations for modern scholarship on Waldensians, challenging the traditional confessional accounts of the movement and approaching the texts with a more critical eye.⁹³

The most significant mid-twentieth century scholarship concerning Waldensians was carried out by non-English language authors. The most significant general study of the movement remains Gonnet and Molnár’s *Les Vaudois au Moyen Âge*.⁹⁴ Several other surveys of the sect as a whole have been produced since, including English histories authored by Audisio and Cameron.⁹⁵ Waldensians have also been featured as part of wider histories on heretical movements in the Middle Ages.⁹⁶ In addition to studies of the movement as a whole, there have been multiple influential works on Waldensian groups in specific locales. Christine Thouzellier has written on Waldensians alongside the Cathars in late twelfth and early thirteenth century Languedoc, while Kurt-Victor Selge has authored the definitive work on Durand of Huesca, a prominent early figure in the movement.⁹⁷ More

⁹¹ For an overview of this debate see Cameron, *Waldenses*, 285-96; see also Cameron, *The Reformation of the Heretics: the Waldenses of the Alps, 1480-1580* (Oxford, 1984), ch. 16.

⁹² Karl Müller, *Die Waldenser und ihre einzelnen Gruppen: bis zum Anfang des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Gotha, 1886); Heinrich Böhrer, ‘Waldenser’, in *Realencyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, xx (Leipzig, 1908).

⁹³ Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*, 2nd. Edition (Hildesheim, 1961), esp. Ch. 3; An English translation of this work has been published as Grundmann, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages* trans. Steven Rowan (London, 1995). A selection of Grundmann’s essays has recently been published in English as Grundmann, *Herbert Grundmann (1902-1970): Essays on Heresy, Inquisition, and Literacy*, ed. Jennifer Kolpacoff Deane, trans. Steven Rowan (Woodbridge, 2019).

⁹⁴ Jean Gonnet and Amedeo Molnár, *Les Vaudois au Moyen Âge* (Turin, 1974).

⁹⁵ Augusto Armand Hugon Molnár and Valdo Vinay, *Storia dei Valdesi*, 3 vols (Turin, 1974-80); Merlo, *Valdesi e Valdismi*; Audisio, *The Waldensian Dissent*; Cameron, *Waldenses*.

⁹⁶ Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages*, 452-85; Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus* (London, 1977), esp. 67-91, 151-64; Michael Frassetto, *Heretic Lives: Medieval Heresy from Bogomil and the Cathars to Wyclif and Hus* (London, 2007), 56-74.

⁹⁷ Thouzellier, *Catharisme et Valdésisme en Languedoc à la Fin du XIIe et au Debut du XIII Siècle Politique Pontificale; Controverses* (Paris, 1966); Selge, *Die Ersten Waldenser: mit Edition des Liber Antiheresis des Durandus von Osca* (Berlin, 1967), 2 vols.

recently, an excellent case study on the Waldensians in the inquisition of Peter Zwicker in late fourteenth century Germany has been conducted by Reima Välimäki.⁹⁸ Finally, articles on specific aspects of Waldensian history have helped shed much needed light on the nature of the community. Peter Biller has been highly influential in this area, authoring studies on a diverse range of topics, from the roles of women, history and memory, and the unity of the movement as a whole, to the ritual importance of food, and Waldensian involvement with medieval medicine.⁹⁹ Also worthy of mention is Alexander Patschovsky's work on the literacy of Waldensians up to c.1400, which challenged previously held assumptions that the movement was partially defined by the illiteracy of its lower-class adherents.¹⁰⁰

Waldensianism is a broad topic of historical study and has produced a number of heated debates between specialists.¹⁰¹ Many of these revolve around specific technicalities (such as whether Valdes's community was principally founded on preaching or poverty), and will not be relevant to the scope of the current study. However, more general open questions remain, most notably on the subject of Waldensian identity, and the unity of the movement as a whole. The homogenous nature of the Waldensian order was assumed by confessional historians, and this assumption underpinned the narrative of Waldensian history up until the 1980s. This narrative was first directly questioned by Merlo, who highlighted the specificities and seemingly disparate identities of Waldensian communities over the centuries, and suggested the use of the term 'Waldensianisms'.¹⁰² This approach was also endorsed by Cameron in his history of the movement, which splits the group into distinct phases of activity, and is hesitant to directly link the earlier phases with the later.¹⁰³ The response to this line of thought is best represented in Biller's 2006 article 'Goodbye to Waldensianism?', in which he criticises the rhetorical minimisation of some of the source evidence in the preceding studies, and sets out an argument in favour of continuity.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁸ Välimäki, *Heresy in Late Medieval Germany: the Inquisitor Petrus Zwicker and the Waldensians* (Woodbridge, 2019).

⁹⁹ A collection of the author's earlier articles can be found in Biller, *The Waldenses, 1170-1530: Between a Religious Order and a Church* (Aldershot, 2001). A selection of other significant works on Waldensians include: Biller, 'Fat Christian and Old Peter: Ideals and Compromises among the Medieval Waldensians', in Rosemary and Sarah Rees Jones (eds.), *Pragmatic Utopias: Ideals and Communities, 1200-1630* (Cambridge, 2001); Biller, 'Why no Food? Waldensian Followers in Bernard Gui's *Practica Inquisitionis and Culpe*', in Biller and Caterina Bruschi (eds.), *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy* (York, 2003); Biller, 'Goodbye to Waldensianism?', *Past & Present* 192, no. 1 (2006), 3-33; Biller, 'Medieval Waldensian Followers' Construction of the Past: Jaqueta, Peroneta, the Old One zum Hirtze and Peyronette' in Marina Benedetti and Maria Luisa Betri (eds.), *"Una Strana Gioia di Vivere": a Grado Giovanni Merlo* (Milan, 2010).

¹⁰⁰ Patschovsky, 'The literacy of Waldensianism from Valdes to c. 1400', in Peter Biller and Anne Hudson (eds.), *Heresy and Literacy, 1000-1530* (Cambridge, 1994).

¹⁰¹ Audisio, *Les vaudois des origines à leur fin (XIIe-XVIe Siècles)* (Turin: Meynier, 1990).

¹⁰² Merlo, *Valdesi e valdismi*.

¹⁰³ Cameron, *Waldenses*, esp. 297-303.

¹⁰⁴ Biller, 'Goodbye to Waldensianism?', *Past & Present* 192, no. 1 (2006), 3-33.

Significantly, no historian has attempted to deconstruct the Waldensian order in its entirety, to the point that it would be argued not to exist as an historical entity.¹⁰⁵ This has allowed for a less fractious debate, and the current consensus on this issue favours the existence of a continuous Waldensian community, but also appreciates the existence of diversity in identity and belief as highlighted by Merlo and others.¹⁰⁶ This study hopes to contribute to this conclusion by providing a detailed study into the particularities of one group of Waldensians, whilst also providing an account of how they fit into the broader historical narrative of the movement.

Inquisition Records and their Interpretation

The *inquisitio heretice pravitatis*¹⁰⁷ was a collection of different inquests carried out by various commissioned individuals beginning in the late twelfth century. These inquests produced records of the people under suspicion of heresy and their accusers, and the use of these sources in historical accounts, as well as the historian's understanding of the nature of the inquisition in general, has produced no shortage of debate in the literature.

The first modern history of the inquisition was Henry Charles Lea's *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*.¹⁰⁸ Written from a Protestant perspective, Lea's work emphasised the immorality of the Catholic Church's actions in the period, the power the inquisition wielded, and the fear it induced in the citizenry. As with the history of Waldensianism, Catholic historians had a different perspective on the matter, and a church-approved history by Jean Guiraud challenged Lea's account of cruelty, highlighting the prevalence of acquittals, and the limited usage of the death penalty.¹⁰⁹ Subsequent histories making use of material produced by inquisition often avoided its problematic nature by paying it minimal attention, instead focusing on the evidence of deponents. *Montaillou* is an excellent example of this style of scholarship, in which the inquisition is made almost invisible by a singular attention to the words of the accused.¹¹⁰ Similarly, Gordon Leff's lengthy history of heresy in the period only addresses the inquisition as part of the introduction, focusing on the procedural and legal history of the institution rather than its influence on the texts themselves.¹¹¹ This perspective is echoed in Bernard Hamilton's dedicated history of the medieval

¹⁰⁵ For the debate on the existence of Catharism see the section on inquisition historiography below.

¹⁰⁶ Biller, 'Goodbye to Catharism?', in Antonio Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (Melton, 2016), 274-313.

¹⁰⁷ Literally 'inquisition into heretical depravity'.

¹⁰⁸ Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (London, 1922).

¹⁰⁹ Guiraud, *The Medieval Inquisition*, trans. E. C. Messenger (London, 1929).

¹¹⁰ Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou*.

¹¹¹ Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages*, 34-47.

inquisition, which portrays it as a powerful tool of papal authority, founded in the pontificate of Gregory IX and formally codified at the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215.¹¹²

A more critical approach to the topic was encouraged by Richard Kieckhefer, who first put forward the idea that 'The Inquisition' as a centralised institution did not exist in the Middle Ages, but was rather a collection of individual offices carrying out the same legal procedure.¹¹³ This argument was comprehensively laid out by Edward Peters, who endeavoured to show that the popular understanding of 'The Inquisition' and its power and cruelty was a myth which could be traced back to the persecution of Protestants after the Reformation.¹¹⁴ Some scholars have gone even further, observing that even the uncapitalised form 'inquisition' is an historical inaccuracy, as the Latin phrase *inquisitio* referred to a more general legal procedure not necessarily associated with heresy.¹¹⁵ However, the practical need for a concise collective term to refer to the separate-yet-related anti-heretical activities in the period has resulted in a general consensus in favour of 'medieval inquisition' in more recent studies.

The questioning of the nature of inquisition in the Middle Ages naturally led to more source-critical accounts of the records they produced. James Given's study of the inquisition records in Languedoc gives much attention to the social and political context in which it took place, and interprets it as a result of a conflict between the inquisition and the general populace.¹¹⁶ John Arnold's *Inquisition and Power* has been highly influential in providing a theoretical basis for historians to interpret these documents.¹¹⁷ Building on the philosophical work of Michel Foucault, Arnold introduced the idea of an 'inquisitorial discourse' in which the one-sided power relationship between inquisitor and deponent subsumed the latter's agency beneath multiple layers of inquisitorial bureaucracy and rhetoric.¹¹⁸ This drastically changed previous assumptions on the reliability of the witness testimonies, as they could no longer be viewed as impartial records of speech, but rather a confession actively produced by the machinations of the inquisition. This criticism of the reliability of the source material has been taken to its extreme by Mark Pegg, who has argued that the very existence of the Cathar heresy in Languedoc was artificially produced by an inquisition which expected to find it, and that local customs and traditions were misinterpreted and

¹¹² Hamilton, *The Medieval Inquisition* (London, 1981).

¹¹³ Kieckhefer, *Repression of Heresy in Medieval Germany* (Liverpool, 1979), 3-10.

¹¹⁴ Peters, *Inquisition* (Berkeley, 1989), esp. ch. 5.

¹¹⁵ Henry Ansgar Kelly, 'Inquisition and the Prosecution of Heresy: Misconceptions and Abuses', *Church History* 50, no. 4 (1989), 439-51, esp. 440-2.

¹¹⁶ Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline and Resistance in Languedoc* (Ithaca, 1997).

¹¹⁷ Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia, 2001).

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1-15.

recorded by the inquisitors as evidence of dualist heresy.¹¹⁹ Arguing in a similar but less absolutist fashion, Bob Moore has interpreted the proliferation of evidence for heresy from the twelfth century as chiefly a product of the Church's novel interest in the matter, and that inquisitors were 'finding heretics' in so many places because they were so confident in their assumption that this largely-imagined social menace existed.¹²⁰

Other scholars have been less willing to do away with the idea that inquisitorial records can provide meaningful information about the lives and beliefs of deponents. Caterina Bruschi, whilst accepting Arnold's conclusion that the language and power of inquisitorial discourse is highly influential in the production of a testimony, has argued that the agency of the deponent is not entirely absent from the record, and has described such interrogations as 'a sharp dialectic fight between the parties', and advocates a contextual and individualistic approach to these sources.¹²¹ She cites the ability of deponents to provide resistance to the discourse imposed on them, for example by colluding with others to form a consistent story, or by answering questions in a way that avoided revealing certain information. Arnold's theory has also been recalibrated by Christine Caldwell Ames, who has criticised the overly secular nature of historians' understanding of power and control in relation to the inquisition, and has instead emphasised the importance of interpreting the evidence through the fundamentally religious worldview which inquisitors would have had.¹²² The most recent works using inquisition records all take into account the problematic nature of the source material, and are typically highly contextualised studies which focus on a particular inquisition or region, which allows for a more rigorous interpretative methodology.¹²³

Methodological Approach of the Current Study

With the above considerations in mind, it is impossible to approach a study of this nature using a simple straight reading of the deponents' testimonies. Arnold's notion of inquisitorial discourse is an important one, and undoubtedly the mechanisms of inquisition played a large role in the production of the final confessions. This study will seek to fully elucidate the preconceptions, aims, motives, and

¹¹⁹ Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245-46* (Princeton and Oxford, 2001).

¹²⁰ Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950-1250* (Malden, Mass., 2007).

¹²¹ Bruschi, *The Wandering Heretics of the Languedoc* (Cambridge, 2009).

¹²² Caldwell Ames, 'Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages', *American Historical Review* 110 (2005), 11-37; Caldwell Ames, *Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2009).

¹²³ Derek Hill, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century: the Manuals of Bernard Gui and Nicholas Eymerich* (York, 2019); Jill Moore, *Inquisition and its Organisation in Italy, 1250-1350* (York, 2019); Bueno, *Defining Heresy*.

methods of Fournier and his inquisition before dealing with any statements of the deponents directly. This methodology follows Bruschi, who has suggested that by identifying and discerning between formulaic responses and those which offer unique or unexpected details, the historian is capable of peeling back some of the layers of inquisitorial discourse, and allow for a more nuanced interpretation of the deponents' statements.¹²⁴ The current study will also be indebted to the work of Lucy Sackville, who has produced a comprehensive analysis of the anti-heretical rhetoric of the period, which will provide an invaluable basis for understanding how Fournier approached his captives.¹²⁵ In this way, the study will incorporate the criticisms of Caldwell Ames, in that Fournier's preconceptions on heresy and his methods as an inquisitor will be understood principally through the lens of his religious worldview, particularly as we have a rich body of his writings with which to understand it.¹²⁶ Also of importance is taking a contextual approach to the study of inquisition sources, as each inquisition and each deponent has individual nuances which may affect interpretation. In the case of the four Waldensians, an important point to note is that all four were willing to die for their beliefs. If it were the case that Fournier was burning every heretic he interrogated perhaps this interpretation might be questioned, yet as will be demonstrated in more detail below, the Waldensians were highly unusual in being given this sentence, and were offered multiple genuine opportunities to recant their beliefs and receive a lighter punishment. This fundamental unwillingness to co-operate with the inquisition means that the Waldensians' depositions may be taken as a closer approximation (with all the usual caveats) of truly held belief than would normally be the case. Finally, Fournier's document is unusual in its level of detail. Although we cannot follow *Montaillou* in assuming that deponents are speaking freely through the text, the extensive and detailed nature of the responses recorded by the Waldensians does help in giving them more agency than deponents in other inquisitions, and provides much more material to work with once the layer of inquisitorial discourse has been identified.

¹²⁴ Bruschi, *Wandering Heretics*, 27.

¹²⁵ Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century: the Textual Representations* (York, 2011).

¹²⁶ Bueno, *Defining Heresy*.

Chapter One - Jacques Fournier's Inquisition

In Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie's *Montaillou*, the deponents in Jacques Fournier's register are discussed with almost no reference to the man who interrogated them, or how he did it. For Le Roy Ladurie, it sufficed that Fournier was a thorough, pedantic inquisitor who was 'skilful at worming out the truth', even comparing him to fictional French detective Jules Maigret.¹²⁷ Indeed, it has frequently been the case that subjects' beliefs and stories have been analysed with little to no reference to the mechanisms that produced them,¹²⁸ and the supposed accuracy of the register has often been credited to Fournier's particular interest in or respect for the people he was interviewing.¹²⁹ However, as John Arnold has argued convincingly, any agency of the deponent to produce these 'spontaneous confessions' was inevitably tied up in the concept of an inquisitorial discourse, a complex network of ideas and power-relationships which required the participation of both parties in an interrogation.¹³⁰ Therefore, in order to be able to discuss fully the lives and beliefs of the Waldensians of Languedoc using these sources, one must approach them from the perspective of the inquisitor as well as the deponent. It may seem counter-intuitive to a thesis concerning the Waldensians themselves to begin with a chapter which addresses them only tangentially, but the nature of inquisition sources demands a keen understanding of the mechanisms which produced the evidence, without which a discussion of the lives and beliefs of deponents is incomplete. A chapter has been dedicated to this end rather than be included in the introductory material firstly because of its necessary length, and secondly because it reveals some novel conclusions on Fournier as an inquisitor, the nature of inquisition in the period, and represents an important case study in how testimonies were processed and repurposed.

This chapter will address the totality of Fournier's career, beginning with a section on the inquisitor's life and other works, including during his pontificate as Benedict XII, in order to get a sense of how he viewed the concept of heresy and inquisition in both theoretical and practical terms. Although there is some anachronism involved in studying Fournier's later writings and term as Pope, the aim is to construct a complete historical account of the man and his views, which can be used to inform our understanding of his aims and motives when conducting the inquisition. The chapter will also include a case-study on how Fournier incorporated the 'pastoral care' element of

¹²⁷ Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou*, xiii-xv.

¹²⁸ For example, one of Jean Duvernoy's volumes on the Pamiers register contains a brief biography of Fournier, but the main substance of the work focuses on the deponents; Duvernoy, *Inquisition à Pamiers: interrogatoires de Jacques Fournier, 1318-1325* (Toulouse, 1966); See also Weis, *The Yellow Cross*.

¹²⁹ Jacques Paul, 'Jacques Fournier (1317-1326), un inquisiteur professionnel' in Laurent Albaret, *Les inquisiteurs – portraits de défenseurs de la foi en Languedoc (XIIIe – XVe siècles)* (Toulouse, 2001), 136.

¹³⁰ Arnold, *Inquisition and Power*, 99.

inquisition in his treatment of Raymond of Costa. Following this, the discussion will turn more specifically to his inquisitorial work on the four French Waldensians he interrogated, and will consider the specific ways in which Fournier put his ideas into practice, his objectives in conducting the interrogations, and the various strategies he employed to reach them. By doing so, this chapter hopes to enable a more nuanced analysis of the Waldensian deponents in later sections, which will be capable of further evaluating evidence based on the likelihood of it being influenced (or in certain cases completely constructed) by Fournier's inquisitorial process.

1.1. Early Life and pre-Pontifical Works

Most of what we know of Fournier's early life comes from the (largely anonymous) collection of papal *vitae* written after his death.¹³¹ Although these texts often serve a primarily hagiographical purpose, the basic details of his career in the Church can be readily traced through these documents. Born in Saverdun, in what is today the Ariège department in southwestern France, Fournier was inducted at an early age into the Cistercian monastery of Boulbonne in Haute-Garonne.¹³² Guillemain remarks that the Cistercian order was 'la seule famille qu'il reconnut', and it seems that he maintained his links to them even after becoming Pope, choosing as his papal name the founder of their rule, and continuing to wear their distinctive white habit (gaining him the epithet 'The White Cardinal').¹³³ The order also provided him with an education; he later moved to the Cistercian college of St Bernard in Paris to study theology, where he became a Master and held a chair.¹³⁴ After a position as Abbot of Frontfroide Abbey, he was appointed Bishop of Pamiers in 1317, and remained in the post for the next nine years, during which time he carried out his now famous inquisitorial work in Languedoc. In 1326, he was made Bishop of Mirepoix, and received the red hat a year later, when he was made cardinal of St Prisca.¹³⁵ Between this time and his election as Pope in 1334, he acted as principal theological advisor to John XXII, composing numerous treatises against prominent critics of the pontiff, most notably William of Ockham, as well as polemical attacks against the works of deceased heretical figures such as Joachim of Fiore and Peter Olivi.¹³⁶ He also engaged himself with defending and promulgating John's papal decrees, most notably the bull *Cum inter nonnullos*,

¹³¹ There are nine *vitae* in total, collected in Stephanus Baluzius, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium: hoc est historia pontificum Romanorum qui in Gallia sederunt ab anno Christi MCCV usque ad annum MCCCXCIV*, ed. Guillaume Mollat, vol. 1 (Paris, 1914), 195-240. The complete work is available online at <http://baluze.univ-avignon.fr/> (accessed June 2018).

¹³² 'Prima Vita Benedicti XII' in Baluzius, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium*, 195.

¹³³ Bernard Guillemain, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon : 1309-1376, étude d'une société* (Paris, 1966), 135.

¹³⁴ 'Prima Vita Benedicti XII' in Baluzius, *Vitae Papparum Avenionensium*, 195.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 196.

¹³⁶ Guillaume Mollat, *Les papes d'Avignon, 1305-1378* (Paris, 1966), 70; Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 154-55.

which made heretical the belief that Christ and the Apostles owned nothing at all, even in common.¹³⁷ This latter aim can be seen clearly in Fournier's largest and most ambitious theological work, his commentary on the Gospel of Matthew.

The *Postilla super Matheum*¹³⁸ is an unfinished work – it seems the cardinal's election to the papacy interrupted it around the tenth chapter of Matthew – yet it is extremely lengthy, with the Troyes manuscript running to over 1700 sheets. An excellent and detailed analysis of the document has recently been undertaken by Irene Bueno, so for the purposes of this thesis it will suffice to summarise a few key themes of the text relevant to our discussion.¹³⁹ Most crucially, the *Postilla* gives some insight into the theology underpinning Fournier's views on heretics; who they were, how they could be found, and how they should be treated. In his analysis of the parable of the trees and their fruit (Matt 7:15-20, NIV), he discusses heresy at length, incorporating both traditional polemical tropes as well as more original interpretations. Of the former, the cardinal made particular use of the trope of false appearance, insisting that heretics were 'false prophets' who used a cloak of sanctity to deceive common people, often by making improper use of Scripture. The key traits of the heretic were their falsity, their improbity, and their guile in the art of deception.¹⁴⁰ To combat heresy, therefore, required the existence of well-educated defenders of the faith, capable of elucidating heretical error through competent use of Scriptural authority. In this area, Fournier is clearly drawing on his experience as an inquisitor, as when he states that because heresy is not easily detectable, it often requires a detailed observation of the subject's faith, particularly their belief in the sacraments.¹⁴¹ One of the reasons for the existence of heresy, as outlined in the *Postilla*, was to make sure that Church doctors remained vigilant and capable in their ability to defend true doctrine. To this end, one of the best means of defeating a heretic was to trap them in a theological discussion, exposing the contradictions and errors in their beliefs with an adroit use of Scripture, as heretical error crumbles quickly under examination.¹⁴² This was a key element of the strategy he used in interrogating Raymond of Costa, as will be discussed further below.

Fournier's inquisitorial background is also notable in his discussion of how heretics are to be treated. Undoubtedly, he believed that the primary goal of any interaction with a heretic was to

¹³⁷ Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 160.

¹³⁸ Due to the scale of the work, and relatively little attention it has received, no published edition currently exists. The most complete manuscript copy of the text is Troyes, Médiathèque du Grand-Troyes, 549, vols. I-IV (hereafter: Troyes 549).

¹³⁹ See Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 164-244 and Bueno, 'False Prophets and Ravening Wolves: Biblical Exegesis as a Tool against Heretics in Jacques Fournier's *Postilla* on Matthew', *Speculum* 89, no.1 (2014), 35-65.

¹⁴⁰ Troyes 549, IV, fols.242rb-257ra; Quoted in Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 190-8.

¹⁴¹ Troyes 549, IV, fol. 275ra; Quoted in Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 207-8.

¹⁴² Troyes 549, IV, fols.280va-280vb; Quoted in Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 211.

secure a renouncement of error and conversion back to the Catholic fold. Heretics were to be engaged in a dialogue and addressed as friends, and only when they remain obstinate are harsher measures to be reached for.¹⁴³ Despite his obvious emphasis on pastoral care, the cardinal is also unequivocal about what should happen to those heretics who remain obstinate. His interpretation of the passage wherein ‘bad’ trees are cut down and burned (Matt 7:19, NIV) is quite literal, and it is clear he saw heresy as a prime evil from which an unrepentant individual would not be redeemed, emphasising the need to ‘exterminate’ anyone who fails to be converted.¹⁴⁴ Fournier’s commentary on Matthew sheds some important light on the theological basis for his treatment of heretics, yet a full picture of the man behind the Pamiers inquisition cannot be built without also considering the actions he took after his final promotion - to the head of the Catholic Church.

1.2. Fournier as Pope Benedict XII

According to chronicler Giovanni Villani, the papal conclave that elected Jacques Fournier pope was split into two competing parties, who both voted for a man that neither side thought stood a chance of winning. On hearing of his nomination, Fournier is alleged to have proclaimed ‘You have elected an ass.’¹⁴⁵ This account is highly likely to be apocryphal, and most scholars agree that the White Cardinal was chosen for his theological skill and orthodox zeal, as well as his experience as an inquisitor, at a time when heresy and dissent were seen as the principle threats facing the Catholic Church.¹⁴⁶ Indeed, most of Benedict XII’s actions as pope concerned the attempt to bring various rebellious factions back into obedience to the Papacy. Most notably, he spent much of his pontificate attempting to heal the schism between the papacy and the Holy Roman Emperor, Louis the Bavarian – ultimately to little success.¹⁴⁷ It has been suggested that whilst Benedict was undoubtedly an astute theologian, he had little interest in the art of politics and diplomacy, often simply insisting on a recalcitrant subject’s obedience. To highlight this, Mollat cites the example of his dealings with the rebellious city of Bologna, which had been under papal interdict since 1334. In a 1338 attempt to achieve reconciliation, Benedict wrote that he required an oath of vassalage and direct control over the administration of the city. Despite the Bolognese rejection of these terms,

¹⁴³ ‘Ante eiam primam vel secundam correptionem vel monitionem non est devitandus ut hostis, set docendus et erudiendus ut amicus et domesticus...’, Troyes 549, IV, fols.241rb-242ra; Quoted in Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 188-9.

¹⁴⁴ ‘Si vero verba dura non sufficiant, eiam verbera et carceres sunt adhibenda et tandem, quando nichil omnia supradicta ei proficient ad salute, exterminandus est ne se et alios magis perdat.’, *ibid.*

¹⁴⁵ Villani, *Cronica di Giovanni Villani: a miglior lezione ridotta coll’ ajuto de’ testi a penna*, ed. Ignazio Moutier and Gherardi Dragomanni (Florence, 1844-1845), 59.

¹⁴⁶ Mollat, *Les Papes d’Avignon*, 70.

¹⁴⁷ Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 262-74.

the pope refused to compromise in any way, re-imposing the interdict for a further two years.¹⁴⁸ This lack of diplomatic tact likely also scuppered negotiations with the Emperor, which Benedict unremittingly framed in terms of the former's need to repent his errors and return to unity with the Holy See.¹⁴⁹ He was similarly dogmatic about any prospect of healing the Great Schism with the Eastern Church; not interested in any theological debate, Benedict's policy was that religious representatives should be sent from Constantinople to be educated.¹⁵⁰ Thus, whilst Benedict was undoubtedly theologically orthodox in his beliefs about papal authority, this zeal often became an obstacle when dealing with the practical realities of the political situation in the mid-fourteenth century.

Where the new pope had some more success was in his efforts to reform some of the institutions of the Church. However, this did not mean rolling back any of the promulgations of his controversial predecessor, John XXII. In fact, Benedict's policies can be seen in many ways as a direct continuation of John's, who had widened the scope of heresy to include witchcraft and general disobedience, as well as condemning the Franciscan notion of Christ's absolute poverty.¹⁵¹ In this latter area, Benedict was especially consistent with his predecessor's policy, issuing a 1336 bull *Redemptor noster* which again confirmed that the Franciscan Spirituals and *fraticelli* were heretics, and issued stringent new guidelines for the order, including dress codes and a more closely controlled education system.¹⁵² He also drew up a detailed reform of the Benedictine rule, with seemingly only the Dominican order meeting his approval in their current state.¹⁵³ Renouard argues that his reforms, whilst meticulous and detailed, were rather too complicated to be widely followed, and Mollat agrees that his new constitution for the Benedictines was 'trop compliquées pour être véritablement efficace.'¹⁵⁴ Despite this, Benedict received praise for his reforming spirit, especially his attempts to curb nepotism and various other clerical abuses. One chronicler records him warning a nephew that he would receive no favours in Avignon, as 'The Pope must be like Melchizedek, who had neither father nor mother nor kindred.'¹⁵⁵ Benedict also actively intervened against abuses,

¹⁴⁸ Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon*, 198-9.

¹⁴⁹ "Placeret nobis admodum, si Ludovicus de Bavaria se per viam et modum debitos reduci ad ovile, cuius est pastor eternus dominus Jesus Christus, disponderet, se reincorporari unitati sancte matris ecclesie..."; Sigmund Riezler (ed.), *Vatikanische Akten zur Deutschen Geschichte in der Zeit Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern* (Innsbruck, 1891) 584, no.1719; see also *ibid.*, 583-4, no.1716; Accessed at <https://archive.org/details/vatikanischeakt00vatigoog> (May 2018).

¹⁵⁰ Aloysius Täutu, (ed.), *Acta Benedicti XII (1334-1342)* (Rome, 1958), 92-3.

¹⁵¹ Yves Renouard, *The Avignon Papacy, 1305-1403*, trans. Denis Bethell (London, 1970), 40.

¹⁵² Conrad Eubel and J. H. Sbaralea, (eds.), *Bullarium Franciscanum*, 7 vols. (Rome: Sancta Congregatio de Propaganda Fide [vols. i-iv] and Vaticana [vols. v-vii], 1759-1904), vol. VI, 25-42, no.51.

¹⁵³ Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon*, 79.

¹⁵⁴ Renouard, *The Avignon Papacy*, 39.

¹⁵⁵ Franciscus Pagi, (ed.), *Breviarium historico-chronologico-criticum* (Antwerp, 1717), vol. IV, 117; Quoted in Mollat, *Les Papes d'Avignon*, 72.

instituting a new system of examination before the granting of benefices, and punishing those who tried to exploit the system, as when he stripped inquisitorial notary Menet de Robecourt of his duties for using accusations of heresy for monetary gain.¹⁵⁶ The level of success Benedict enjoyed in his attempts to reform the Church was inconsistent, yet it is clear that he took this part of his role seriously, and that the reining in of abuses within the wider institutions of the Church was a significant priority throughout his pontificate.

A final aspect of Benedict's tenure worth considering is his centralisation of the Church on Avignon, where the papal court resided after Clement V had moved it from Rome in 1309. It has been argued that perhaps the new pope had intended to return to Italy, but that the practical reality of the political situation prevented this.¹⁵⁷ Whatever his original intentions, Benedict XII can be credited with solidifying the papal presence in Avignon, not least due to his commissioning of a new papal palace on the site. The palace has often been presented as a reflection of Benedict's character, austere and undecorated, a monastic building for a monastic pope.¹⁵⁸ Architectural historian Richard Němec has instead argued that the imposing walls of the palace are hardly humble, and rather reflect the need for 'ostentatious display and legitimisation', comparing the structure to the royal palaces of secular rulers.¹⁵⁹ This too may have been part of Benedict's intention, as has already been shown above he strongly believed in the supreme authority of the Holy See, and an impressive building to house its court would only serve to emphasise this fact. Benedict designed the palace so that his private quarters were adjacent to areas of administration,¹⁶⁰ and it appears he tried to emulate this centralisation in some of his policies. Most pertinent to the current discussion was his organisation of the inquisitorial process, which he continued to take great interest in after his election to the papacy. He appointed a trusted friend, William Lombard, to the position of inquisitor general of Avignon, to investigate all manner of heresies in the region. With a permanent local inquisitor, Benedict was able to intervene in certain cases elsewhere, calling the accused and witnesses to Avignon so that the process could be kept under close papal scrutiny.¹⁶¹ Benedict also took a keen interest in the pursuit of heretics in Italy, appointing former papal *nuncio* and current cardinal Bertrand de Déaulx as head of inquisition in the region. Bertrand was given broad powers to intervene with other inquisitors, and reported his findings directly to the Pope.¹⁶² Clearly, Benedict

¹⁵⁶ Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 287-8.

¹⁵⁷ Renouard, *The Avignon Papacy*, 40-1.

¹⁵⁸ Guillemain, *La Cour Pontificale d'Avignon*, 135.

¹⁵⁹ Němec, 'Solitude or Performance? The Papal and Royal-Imperial Residences of Benedict XII and Charles IV in Avignon, Prague and Karlstein', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 170, no.1 (2017), 137.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 134.

¹⁶¹ Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 276-7.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 256.

retained a keen enthusiasm for the repression of heretics, and was not content to delegate this matter to just anyone. His appointment of trusted deputies and active involvement in cases suggest that he considered the elimination of dissent a key part of his role as head of the Church. His centralisation of the inquisition was one part of a broader aim to focus papal power on Avignon, and to directly involve the papal court in a wider range of issues.

1.3. Analysis of Fournier's Character, Aims and Motives

Fournier's actions as cardinal and pope provide a valuable insight into the character, aims and motives of the man responsible for running the Pamiers inquisition. His early life as a Cistercian monk seemed to remain with him throughout his career, evidenced not least by his retention of the Order's distinctive white habit, but also in his interest in reforming the Benedictine rule, and his piously austere personal life. There seems to be little doubt that Fournier was someone who took his role very seriously. His detractors in Germany and Italy accused him of hardness of heart and lack of generosity, but to other contemporaries this demonstrated his austerity, hatred of heresy, and sincere desire to reform the Church.¹⁶³ Fournier's orthodox zeal is self-evident, but his theology very much reflected the time he was living in. From his role as inquisitor to his death as Pope Benedict XII, the cornerstone of Fournier's doctrinal beliefs was the absolute authority of the Roman Church. In this vein, he continued papal policies started by John XXII in his attempts to bring all manner of heretics and schismatics back into obedience. As has been shown above, Fournier was absolutely uncompromising on this point of dogma, and this intransigence precludes his description as a great politician or diplomat. His focus lay more in Church matters, and he seems to have been particularly interested in the process of inquisition, and the uncovering of heretics. This is a constant theme throughout Fournier's career, as he continued to write on heresy after becoming cardinal, and attempted to take more centralised control over the inquisitorial process after becoming pope – even bringing certain cases to his own court so he could deliberate on them. One could also argue that his dealings with the German emperor and rebellious Italian cities was also very much couched in the language of inquisition, with Benedict repeatedly ordering them to renounce their errors and return to unity with the Church.

This theme of heresy and obedience is of course very important for the subject of this thesis, so a further examination of Fournier's aims and methods in this regard is called for. As we have seen,

¹⁶³ For an example of a less charitable description of Benedict, see Peter of Herenthal, '*Septima Vita Benedicti XII*' in Baluzius, *Vitae Paparum Avenionensium*, 233-34; This can be contrasted with the overtly positive anonymously authored *Prima vita*; *ibid.*, 195-209.

as pope he very much followed the lead of John XXII in his policies on heresy, widening the circle of possible subjects by confirming its direct association with disobedience. Benedict's pontificate is characterised by his struggle against heretics and schismatics, and it seems obvious he believed that one of the principal roles of the Holy See was to maintain the unity of the Church. This can be seen not only in his communications with disobedient subjects and his centralisation of the inquisition, but also in his desire for reform – his new education system for the Franciscans was probably designed with the aim of preventing the development of future heretics. We also have access to some of his theoretical propositions regarding the treatment of heretics. In his *Postilla* on Matthew, he emphasises that the goal of any interaction with a heretic is to return them to unity with the Catholic Church, but equally that if unsuccessful in this aim, the heretic is to be 'exterminated' ruthlessly.¹⁶⁴ The overall impression one gets from Fournier's career is that in many respects he never left his position as inquisitor. Through all his roles in the Church he maintained a focus on the authority of the papacy and the need to root out heresy. Though his other duties as pope precluded him from constant personal involvement, it appears his strategy was to allow himself to directly control inquisitorial activity as much as possible, by appointing trusted deputies that reported directly to him, and by bringing certain high profile cases to the papal curia.

The goal of the preceding discussion has been to analyse Fournier's life and works in order to provide background and depth to the subsequent section on his role as the architect of the interrogation processes in his register. The most salient points to highlight in this regard are his genuine interest in the inquisitorial process, his emphasis and uncompromising position on the subject of Church authority, and his Cistercian theological background which allowed him to engage Raymond in a concerted effort to bring him back to the fold. This last point is an important one to establish, as it would colour the entire process differently if Fournier was not interested in securing a renunciation, but only a complete confession of guilt. Therefore, it is worth looking first at the pastoral activity recorded as part of Raymond's process before approaching the interrogation itself.

1.4. Fournier's Pastoral Care

As set out in his commentary on Matthew as a cardinal, Fournier believed that engagement with heretics' beliefs – that is, by using authorities to demonstrate their errors – was one of the principal duties of an inquisitor. Manselli has argued that, unlike other inquisitors such as Bernard Gui who were more concerned with guilt and punishment, Fournier saw bringing the accused to recant as a

¹⁶⁴ Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 188-9; See footnote 14 above.

principal aim of the process.¹⁶⁵ At the end of Raymond's interrogation, after the full list of his errors has been presented, it is recorded that Fournier made a concerted effort to convince his captive to renounce the beliefs of which he had been accused. By looking at the authorities cited a clearer picture can be built of the extent to which Fournier carried out his pastoral duties, and how he approached convincing Raymond he was in the wrong. This analysis will also be useful when later discussing Raymond's personal beliefs, as it will shed light on the type of arguments and propositions he ultimately rejected. Interestingly, only in three areas of Raymond's purported error are details recorded on what was read to him: oath-taking, purgatory, and a single authority on the validity of the Church. The list of Raymond's errors also included additional items, for example on the sacraments of baptism, marriage and confirmation.¹⁶⁶ These however, it appears he was willing to renounce,¹⁶⁷ and it is possible that any authorities read to him on these subjects were simply not recorded, as the purpose of the ones that do appear was likely to demonstrate due diligence in the areas where he remained obstinate.

The first of these areas was the legitimacy of oath-taking, on which Raymond was accused of believing that all oaths were fundamentally sinful. The first work presented on this subject is Augustine's *Contra Faustum*.¹⁶⁸ Augustine appears to have been a principal authority for Fournier, being the most cited, both here and in his later commentary on Matthew.¹⁶⁹ The chapters read to Raymond directly attack his interpretation of Matthew, in which he believes Christ tells his followers that to swear is sinful:

“Again, you have heard that it was said to the people long ago, ‘Do not break your oath, but fulfil to the Lord the vows you have made.’ But I tell you, do not swear an oath at all: either by heaven, for it is God's throne; or by the earth, for it is his footstool; or by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the Great King. And do not swear by your head, for you cannot make even one hair white or black. All you need to say is simply ‘Yes’ or ‘No’; anything beyond this comes from the evil one.” (Matthew 5:33-35, NIV)

¹⁶⁵ Raoul Manselli, ‘Bernard Gui face aux Spirituels et aux Apostoliques’, in *Bernard Gui set son Monde. Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 16 (1981), 265-7.

¹⁶⁶ The full list of Raymond's errors can be found in *CRC*, 107-12.

¹⁶⁷ It is recorded that Raymond voluntarily retracted his views on these points, though it seems likely there was more pressure from his inquisitor than is written down, as this takes place after he is read authorities on other errors; *CRC*, 114-5.

¹⁶⁸ Augustine of Hippo, *Contra Faustum libri tringinta tres* in Zycha, J., (ed.), *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Prague, 1972), vol. XXV.

¹⁶⁹ Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 174.

Augustine argues that this was advice to avoid casually falling into the sin of perjury, rather than a statement that the act of swearing itself was sinful.¹⁷⁰ For this reason, he continues, Paul did not swear while speaking, but was able to do so in his writings, where he could take more care with his thoughts and words.¹⁷¹ Raymond was also read a passage from Augustine's *De mendacio*, in which he clarifies that the phrase 'at all' in Christ's words was an admonition not to desire or indulge in idle oaths, or begin taking them habitually, as the frailty of the human condition could easily push such actions towards sin.¹⁷² Finally, the same author's *De sermone Domini in monte* is cited, in which Augustine makes the distinction that Christ is not affirming that saying more than 'Yes' or 'No' would be evil, but rather that it comes from evil – which he identifies as the 'infirmitate' of the person who necessitates the swearing of an oath.¹⁷³ Additionally, he interprets the passage as a reminder that no matter what one swears by, he is not free from responsibility to God, as he is present in all things, and all things are reliant on his power.¹⁷⁴ Although apparently unsuccessful in his aim to convince Raymond of his error, the authorities cited by Fournier here appear to be tailored directly to where he believes Raymond to be in error, specifically his literal interpretation of the Gospels.

This tactic is repeated for the other main error that Raymond refuses to renounce; that purgatory does not exist and that consequently prayers and alms for the dead are useless. Raymond's main argument here is that there is no Scriptural basis for the existence of such a place.¹⁷⁵ To counter this proposition, Fournier refers his subject to the *Dialogues* of Gregory the Great.¹⁷⁶ In Book IV, Gregory argues for a purgatory that corrects 'quibusdam levibus culpis', citing Matthew 12:32 in support of his claim. Matthew states that the sin of blasphemy will not be forgiven 'in this world or the world to come', which Gregory suggests must logically mean that some sins may be forgiven in the world to come. He also makes reference to Paul in First Corinthians 3:11-15, who concurs that some small sins may be purged after death.¹⁷⁷ Fournier also returns to Augustine, citing both his *Civitate Dei*¹⁷⁸ – in which the author affirms the existence of temporary post-mortem punishments and the validity of prayers for the dead – and the *Enchiridion*.¹⁷⁹ Although presented

¹⁷⁰ Augustine of Hippo, *Contra Faustum*, 521-2.

¹⁷¹ Augustine of Hippo, *Contra Faustum*, 521-2.

¹⁷² Augustine of Hippo, *De Mendacio*, in Zycha, (ed.), *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. XXXXI, 448.

¹⁷³ Augustine of Hippo, *De sermone Domini in monte libros duos*, ed. Almut Mutzenbecher, *Corpus Christianorum series Latina* 35 (Turnhout, 1967), 59.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 59-60.

¹⁷⁵ '...dicens se nescire scripturam aliquam divinam que loquatur de purgatorio...', *CRC*, 42.

¹⁷⁶ Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé and Paul Antin (Paris, 1980), Book IV, Ch. XVI, 148.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁸ Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, in Zycha, (ed.), *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. XXXX, 542-43, 559.

¹⁷⁹ Here Augustine proposes a 'purgatorial fire' for some believers; Augustine, *Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et caritate*, ed. E. Evans, *Corpus Christianorum series latina* 46 (Turnhout, 1969), ch.69.

with a difficult problem (in that the Scriptural basis for purgatory is hardly explicit), Fournier attempts to directly tackle Raymond's objection using Gregory's interpretation of Matthew. Again, Fournier's effort in his attempts to secure a renunciation seem more than perfunctory, and this is further illustrated by the amount of time he gives Raymond to ruminate on these matters.

The readings discussed above took place on January 19th, 1320, which was recorded as 'the day before the day assigned to Raymond to convert to the faith and unity of the Church.'¹⁸⁰ This deadline was evidently extended several times, as the next session is dated January 23rd. Here we are given less detail on the precise nature of Fournier's approach, but he 'exhorted him by diverse authorities and passages of Scripture'¹⁸¹ and offered to give Raymond more time to deliberate, and to answer any additional questions or objections he had.¹⁸² Again, this appears to be more than a formality. Raymond responds that he does not choose to believe anyone on these points besides Christ, Peter and Paul.¹⁸³ Fournier then attempts to counter this specific objection by pointing out the times when Paul swore an oath in his epistles, and when Jesus did so in the Gospels, as well as emphasizing that the passage on purgatory glossed by Gregory (surely discussed in great detail already) was spoken by Christ himself. Additionally, he warns against a literal reading of Scripture, again citing Augustine in saying that there will always be some doubt concerning interpretation.¹⁸⁴ Raymond is evidently given some time to ruminate on these matters, as no further meetings are recorded until April 24th. Here he is given one last chance to renounce his errors before his official 'trial' the following Sunday. The judicial proceeding itself also consists of exhorting Raymond to return to unity with Catholic faith, but it is notable that the language used here seems far more generic and rhetorical than when Fournier was attempting to convince Raymond earlier:

"...the said lords Bishop and inquisitor warned and prayed the said Raymond again one time, two times, three times for charity, and attempted to persuade him by reason, authorities and finally by ordering him to revoke the errors contained in these articles, which he had amended and corrected..."¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁰ '...videlicet ante assignationem diei predicte ad hoc ut dictus Raymundus converteretur ad fidem et unitatem romane Ecclesie...', *CRC*, 112.

¹⁸¹ '...diversas auctoritates et scripturas...' *CRC*, 114.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*

¹⁸³ '...nec super hoc crederet cuicumque nisi solum doctrine Christi et apostolorum eius Petri et Pauli.', *CRC*, 114.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁵ '...dicti domini episcopus et inquisitor iterum semel, secundo et tertio et caritative monuerunt, rogaverunt dictum Raymundum et etiam ei persuaserunt rationibus, auctoritatibus et etiam eidem preceperunt quod dictos errores in dictis articulis contentos per eum emendatos et correctos revocaret...', *CRC*, 117.

This reads much more as a formal phraseology to be used against any unrepentant heretic, as any reference to Raymond's specific objections has vanished.

An analysis of pastoral care in Raymond's interrogation demonstrates how seriously Fournier took this aspect of the inquisitorial process. The attempt to bring Raymond back to the faith was not a generic formality, but was specifically tailored to the content of Raymond's errors. He was read several authorities which dealt with his objections in detail, and when this failed Fournier even attempted a different tactic, appealing to Raymond's literal reading of Scripture and reliance on the authority of Christ and the Apostles. Fournier's strategy here seems to be consistent with his discussion of heretics in his commentary on Matthew, where he also emphasised the need to intellectually engage with heretics' errors and convince them that they were wrong. Overall, we can conclude that a genuine desire to help his subject avoid damnation was a principal motivation behind Fournier's treatment of Raymond. This may also help to explain the immense detail in which Fournier investigated his captive's beliefs; a full confession was necessary to achieve a full conversion. This was not his only motivation – gathering information on Raymond's sect and his companions was also important – but an awareness of his later emphasis on pastoral care will aid a discussion of Fournier's strategy and aims during the main interrogation.

1.5. Fournier's Interrogation Strategy

The subject of inquisitorial interrogation strategy has been discussed extensively by historians, particularly the way in which it changed from the first half of the thirteenth century up to the early fourteenth. This change may be characterised by a vast increase in level of detail, but alongside a corresponding decrease in the number of suspects investigated. For example, compared to Bernard of Caux's Toulouse inquisition of 1245-46, which Hamilton estimates involved 8000-10000 interrogations, Fournier's ninety-eight across six years seems negligible in comparison.¹⁸⁶ However, inquisitors made up for the lower quantity with increasing levels of detail from each individual deponent, moving from simple lists of questions concerning actions (did the subject eat with the heretics, did they give them gifts, etc.) to revealing more involved descriptions of subjects' involvement with heresy, as well as far more interest in their own personal beliefs.¹⁸⁷ The reasons for this shift are tangential to our purposes here,¹⁸⁸ but its consequences were that by the time of

¹⁸⁶ Hamilton, *The Medieval Inquisition*, 42.

¹⁸⁷ Arnold, *Inquisition and Power*, 99.

¹⁸⁸ For a full discussion of this see Arnold, *Inquisition and Power*, 98-102.

Fournier's inquisition the type of information required from deponents, and consequently the methods used to extract that information, had developed some considerable complexity.

This complexity is reflected in Bernard Gui's famous inquisitorial handbook of 1321, the *Practica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis*, in which he outlines the various methods one might approach interrogating heretics depending on their sect, as well as the character of the ideal inquisitor who should perform the task.¹⁸⁹ Arnold has argued that the increased individuality generated by performing such detailed interrogations may have contributed to the proliferation of new heretical beliefs 'uncovered' by the inquisitors, who had previously not concerned themselves with the inner minds of the *illitterati*.¹⁹⁰ This in turn led to the suspicion - aided by the already extant topos of the 'deceitful heretic' discussed above - that deponents would seek to deceive the inquisition process by using clever wording in their answers, or by only revealing a small portion of the full truth.¹⁹¹ Therefore, an inquisition interrogation could only be conducted by an educated professional, capable of cutting through a subject's rhetorical defences and revealing the 'truth' of their confessions through a complex interrogation procedure. Jacques Fournier was certainly such an individual, as Jacques Paul puts it in his brief summary of the bishop's inquisitorial activity, he '[did] not let himself be impressed by the most vehement denials of the accused.'¹⁹² What follows will be an examination of the way in which Fournier conducted his interrogations, from his overall objectives to the detailed individual strategies he employed against his Waldensian deponents.

1.5.a. General Inquisitorial Objectives and Strategy

Aside from the aforementioned goal of saving souls, Fournier's inquisition had two other main objectives when interrogating suspected heretics. Firstly, the construction of a complete confession for each deponent, which would precisely record the full extent of the subject's erroneous beliefs. The final product of this process would be an itemised list of heretical errors, which the inquisitor could demonstrate that the individual had admitted to. The list often appears to have been made as exhaustive as possible, citing several distinct errors whenever possible instead of grouping them

¹⁸⁹ For example, in his discussion on Cathar heretics, he suggests their leaders only be tackled by a true expert on matters of faith. Bernard Gui, *Practica Inquisitionis heretice pravitatis*, ed. Célestin Douais (Paris: Picard, 1886), 237-9; <https://archive.org/details/practicainquisi00douagoog> (Accessed June 2018).

¹⁹⁰ Arnold, *Inquisition and Power*, 101-2.

¹⁹¹ See for example Gui's sections on interrogating Waldensians, including their 'sophistry and duplicity'; Gui, *Practica*, 252-257.

¹⁹² Paul, 'Jacques Fournier (1317-1326), un Inquisiteur Professionnel', 138.

under broader categories.¹⁹³ This process of extensive information extraction and recording reflected the state of the inquisitorial process as it had developed by the early fourteenth century, with vast amounts of material hoarded for future reference and crosschecking in other investigations.¹⁹⁴ The second objective also serves this purpose, as it concerns collecting as much information as possible on the people and places involved with heresy, and the nature and structure of the heretical sect the suspect was involved with. Again, this material could have potentially been useful to other inquisitors conducting future interrogations, and was seen as an important part of their mission to combat heresy.

These two overall objectives certainly informed Jacques Fournier's interrogation methodology. He also makes use of some general strategies which he applied to all four deponents. However, the direction and nature of his questioning of the four Waldensians differs by individual. This is likely reflective of his assumptions about their relative level of theological understanding, and the nature of their involvement with heresy. It is therefore worth considering each interrogation individually to best elucidate how Fournier steers the investigation to achieve his inquisitorial goals. It should be noted that in the following section the use of the word 'error' will refer to the perspective of the inquisitor looking for heretical beliefs, and does not necessarily represent the beliefs which were actually held by the Waldensian deponents.

Before discussing the interrogations of individual deponents, it is worth noting some of the more general inquisitorial strategies used by Fournier against all of his subjects. The most significant of these was the use of imprisonment, which was by this time standard procedure against any suspected heretic.¹⁹⁵ All of Fournier's suspects were held at his *château épiscopal* at Allemans, in the modern-day commune of La Tour-du-Crieu, a suburb of Pamiers.¹⁹⁶ The prison building itself has not survived, and it is difficult to gauge the severity of the conditions in which suspects were held. In other inquisition proceedings we have evidence of varying treatment of prisoners, from harsh solitary confinement to relatively relaxed house arrest.¹⁹⁷ It is worth noting that it was during Jacques Fournier's inquisition that Bernard Clergue of Montailou was apparently able to plot against his enemies and attempt to force other prisoners to commit perjury in his favour from within the

¹⁹³ For example, in Raymond de la Côte's confession, his unbelief in prayers and alms for the dead is split in three. The first confirms his disavowal of the principle, and the following two list specific examples of almsgiving and prayers he has rejected; *CRC*, 110-1.

¹⁹⁴ Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society*, 25-52.

¹⁹⁵ Hamilton, *The Medieval Inquisition*, 46.

¹⁹⁶ Shahar, *Women in a Medieval Heretical Sect*, 133.

¹⁹⁷ Lea., *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, vol.I, 418-9; Peters, *Inquisition*, 66-7.

episcopal gaol.¹⁹⁸ However, we cannot assume that Bernard's case was wholly representative of imprisonment at Allemans, and it is likely that conditions would have varied depending on the nature of the suspected heretic and the progress of the interrogation.

There can be no doubt that imprisonment was used by Fournier not only as a convenient method of keeping his suspects in one place, but also as a tool for extracting a confession and abjuration. All four of the Waldensians were captured in August of 1319, and after an initial interrogation were subsequently sent to the gaol for a lengthy period before their next interrogation session. Raymond of Costa was held for at least four months between August and December, whilst John of Vienne was not brought before the inquisition again for almost six months, appearing again in the record on March 9th 1320. As will be shown in more detail in a subsequent chapter, this treatment certainly had an impact on the deponents' approaches to the interrogation, and seems to have been a tactic used by Fournier against those he suspected of not revealing the whole truth in the initial round of questioning.¹⁹⁹ These longer periods of imprisonment were a carefully considered part of the inquisitorial process, which was perfectly capable of carrying out regular interrogation sessions (Raymond was interviewed almost every day between December 31st and January 16th). Extended periods of imprisonment were also used after the main interrogation of the suspect had been completed, and their full 'confession' recorded. Once this was completed, the remainder of the subjects' depositions is made up of weeks or months of imprisonment, punctuated by short sessions in which they are ordered to abjure their beliefs. Again, this appears to have been a deliberate strategy employed to 'encourage' co-operation with the inquisition, perhaps used alongside the threat of further punishment or the promise of release.²⁰⁰

A second general strategy which encompassed all four of the Waldensian deponents was the cross-checking of information between their individual depositions. As with imprisonment, this approach was not unique to Fournier's investigation but was well-established procedure, and one of the main drivers behind the development of fastidious record-keeping as a characteristic feature of inquisitorial proceedings.²⁰¹ One of the main purposes of this was to be able to check suspects' testimony against past records as a way of checking if they were telling the truth. Cross-checking

¹⁹⁸ Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou: The Promised Land of Error*, 269-71. For Bernard's full deposition see Jacques Fournier, 'Confessio Bernardo Clerici' in Duvernoy, (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (Évêque de Pamiers)* (Toulouse, 1965), vol. II, 268-304.

¹⁹⁹ This is explicitly cited as the reason for Fabrisa den Riba of Montaillou's seven week stay at Allemans between her first and second interrogation; Jacques Fournier, 'Confessio et deposicio Fabrisse den Riba de Monte Alionis' in Duvernoy, J.(ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (Évêque de Pamiers)* (Toulouse, 1965), vol. I, 326-7.

²⁰⁰ For further discussion of threats and bargaining, see the subsection 'Agnes Francou and John of Vienne' below.

²⁰¹ Arnold, *Inquisition and Power*, 86-90.

could also be carried out between testimonies of individuals captured as a group or believed to be connected, and this latter method was used by Fournier in his interrogation of the Waldensians.

One purpose of cross-checking was to open up new avenues of questioning for the inquisitor. A prominent example of this taking place during Fournier's investigation is the bishop's interest in the claim made by Raymond of Costa about a three-tiered hierarchical structure in his Order. This information on a heretical sect was new to the inquisition (it does not appear in the literature on Waldensians until Bernard Gui's *practica*, which uses Raymond's testimony as its source),²⁰² and Fournier was clearly interested in gathering more evidence for it. Both Huguette and her husband John of Vienne – interrogated after Raymond's process is over – are asked whether they had heard of a three-tiered structure in the Waldensian order, though they claim to be ignorant of it. Similarly, Fournier interrogated Huguette on whether she knew anything about how the Waldensians celebrated mass, a question which clearly originated in Raymond's interrogation on the same topic.²⁰³

Fournier did not only use information from deponents to inform his lines of questioning, but also to gauge the reliability of his subjects' evidence. This is most apparent in Huguette's deposition, in which the names she gives for other members of the sect are proven to be false by information garnered from the other three deponents.²⁰⁴ In other places, Fournier finds consistency among the testimonies. John of Lorraine, the Waldensian spiritual leader Raymond calls his 'majoral', is mentioned by all of the deponents except Agnes. The manner in which the depositions were recorded makes it seem as though he was freely named by the deponents' own initiative, but there is good reason to suspect that John's name appears at the prompting of the inquisitor.²⁰⁵ Similarly, Fournier is clearly interested in who else Raymond was living with in Pamiers at the time of his arrest. The bishop asks this question of Raymond, Agnes and Huguette, and individual names given are all recorded as part of their deposition. Although there are some inconsistencies in the

²⁰² Gui, *Practica*, 248-251.

²⁰³ The celebration of the Eucharist was one of the points in Raymond's process on which the Waldensians appeared to differ from Church orthodoxy (see e.g. *CRC*, 53). The fact that Huguette is asked about masses immediately after being questioned on the three-tiered structure of the Order is also further evidence of a connection to Raymond's interrogation here.

²⁰⁴ The most blatant attempts were her claim that Raymond's name was 'Pierre' and her husband's 'Jean Marinerus', names which were found only in her testimony; Jacques Fournier, *CHC*, 519-20.

²⁰⁵ Aside from Raymond, who is interrogated first, all the deponents initially name another party as being responsible for teaching them their beliefs. The sudden admissions that John of Lorraine was in fact responsible seems to suggest that this name was suggested to them by Fournier, who was using information from Raymond's testimony. Agnes specifically names Raymond himself as her tutor, which may explain why Jean does not appear in her deposition.

deponents' answers, several names appear repeatedly, which would have proved useful for future inquisition proceedings were any of the named individuals themselves arrested.²⁰⁶

In other instances, Fournier appears to have been looking for further information on items that came up during the interrogations. In Agnes's first session on August 10th 1319, she mentions that she had met with Raymond of Costa at Castelsarrasin, before moving on to the town of Beaumont de Lomagne.²⁰⁷ Raymond's first interrogation took place the following day, and he is questioned on whether he had ever visited the aforementioned places.²⁰⁸ Although Raymond claimed he had not, this is among the clearest evidence for the interlinking of the depositions. A similar example concerns Raymond's account of his movements whilst he was staying at Pamiers. In session **R22** he states that he left the town on at least two occasions, giving as a reason that he needed to collect money that was owed to him in Vienne.²⁰⁹ Fournier was understandably interested in his movements as a suspected heretical preacher, but the information that Raymond had left Pamiers on several occasions during his stay there originates in the testimony of Agnes, who claimed that he 'left the town from time to time and then returned'.²¹⁰ The inquisitor also interrogates Huguette on this same subject, asking her why he left and for how long. Huguette's testimony is inconsistent with Raymond's, as she claims he left to 'do something at the papal court' and to 'arrange the marriage of his sister'.²¹¹ This inconsistency would likely have been interpreted as an example of deception, and heightened the inquisition's suspicions that Raymond had been involved in heretical preaching during his travels away from Pamiers.²¹²

Both imprisonment and the cross-checking of testimonies were established inquisitorial techniques by the time of Jacques Fournier's investigation, and both were used in the inquisition of the Waldensians in his register. The use of prison-time, and the threat of further punishment, was used as a way of loosening subjects' tongues and 'convincing' them to co-operate with the process. Additionally, the four interrogations were not separate but interlinking, with Fournier using information from one deponent to open up avenues of discussion with another, or to expose

²⁰⁶ A discussion of other Waldensians named by the deponents forms part of the following chapter. Most of the names of living persons are vague, but the existence of John of Vienne's sister Petronille, Raymond's sister Jeanne, as well as at least one close associate named Stephen, are examples of figures which appear in multiple depositions.

²⁰⁷ Jacques Fournier, *CAF*, 124.

²⁰⁸ Jacques Fournier, *CRC*, 44.

²⁰⁹ Jacques Fournier, *CRC*, 101.

²¹⁰ '...aliquando dictus Raymundus se absentabat et postea revertebatur.', *CAF*, 124.

²¹¹ '...dixit eis quod ipse habebat aliqua facere in curia romana ... dixit eis quod maritaverat Iohannam sororem suam...', *CHC*, 521.

²¹² As has been shown above, Fournier would have expected this kind of behaviour from heretics. Catching Raymond and Huguette in this act of deception was therefore effectively evidence of their guilt.

inconsistencies, deceptions, or outright lies within their testimonies. However, despite the existence of these general approaches, the four individuals were handled quite differently. Raymond of Costa, as a literate, theologically educated preacher, was interrogated in a starkly differing manner to Agnes and John of Vienne, who seemed to have a less complex understanding of their faith. Huguette stands as an interesting mix of the two approaches, as despite being a woman and not expected to have a high degree of understanding, she demonstrates an involved grasp of theology and high degree of religious zeal. We should therefore consider Fournier's approach to the four Waldensian deponents separately in order to fully explore his objectives and strategies in carrying out the investigation.

1.5.b. Specific Strategies Employed by Fournier

This interrogation is by far the longest and most detailed of the four Waldensians Fournier investigates. Raymond's level of theological training and role as a spiritual teacher designated him as an educated heretical leader in the eyes of the inquisition, and the construction of his complete confession therefore only became more important due to him being a source of dissemination of heretical ideas and practices. For this reason, Fournier spends far more time discussing the intricacies of theological belief with Raymond than he does with the latter's companions. Due to the level of detail involved in the interrogation, Raymond's process represents the best example of the way in which Fournier directs his questioning to reveal the full extent of his subject's hidden beliefs.

It is important to note at this point that the way Fournier extracted beliefs from an inquisition deponent was very different from how information might be acquired in a modern interrogation of a suspected criminal. The process was not about discovering new information from the subject, though such information could be fruitfully used. As has been shown above, the rhetorical polemic on heresy which Fournier subscribed to left little room for doubt on the nature of their errors. A principal error of the heretic was their disobedience to the Church and to God, and the other errors that flowed from this could be neatly categorized according to the type of heresy to which they belonged.²¹³ Fournier already knew the broad extent of his subjects' beliefs, so his goal was not to discover them but to reveal them, thereby counteracting that other trope applied to heretics in the polemical literature – the concealment of their true beliefs. With this in mind, it can be demonstrated how Fournier used his powers as inquisitor to reveal Raymond's theological errors. His methodology can be divided into four interlinking strategies: (5c) the use of logical question

²¹³ For example the splitting of heretical groups into factions based on peculiarities of belief in polemics; Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics*, 184-6.

sequences to demonstrate errors, (5d) asking lists of yes or no belief questions to look for unorthodox responses, (5e) the use of hypothetical scenarios and difficult questions in an attempt to make the subject slip up, and (5f) using statements from the subject to highlight contradictions in their beliefs.

1.5.c. Logical Question Sequences

Fournier's principal strategy, and the one he uses most often with his interrogation of Raymond, involves the demonstration of errors that are logically consequential to those already admitted. This strategy aims to achieve one of the main objectives of the process – a detailed confession with an extensive list of erroneous beliefs – by multiplying the number of problematic beliefs the subject holds without needing a direct admission. Fournier is able to use this strategy from the very beginning of his interrogation of Raymond, due to the fact that his subject refuses to swear an oath to tell the truth from the outset. This admission represents an opening for Fournier and allows him to demonstrate additional errors that must be attached to this seemingly isolated belief. Once it has been established that Raymond believes swearing an oath to be sinful, Fournier asks whether, consequently, someone who orders another to swear also sins. Because giving an order to sin must logically be sinful in itself, he then extends this concept to the Church as a whole:

“Asked if, as someone who gives an order to swear to tell the truth sins mortally, and the Roman Church ordains the taking of oaths to tell the truth and for many other reasons, whether he believes that the entire Roman Church sins mortally...”²¹⁴

These questions are effectively rhetorical, and merely serve the purpose of showing that Raymond must believe that the Catholic Church – which regularly orders people to swear – is sinning. Raymond's response here is irrelevant to his final confession, as the answer has already been logically demonstrated by his inquisitor in the way the question was phrased. By using this style of questioning, Fournier was able to set the foundations for constructing a complete confession.²¹⁵ By

²¹⁴ ‘Interrogatus si, ex quo ille qui precipit iurare alicui pro veritate dicenda peccat mortaliter, cum Ecclesia romana precipit iuramentum pro veritate dicenda et pro multis aliis causis, utrum credat ipsam totam Ecclesiam mortaliter peccare...’, *CRC*, 52.

²¹⁵ This belief that the Church is in mortal sin due to oath-taking is listed as the fourth of Raymond's errors at the end of his process: ‘Item dixit quod tota Ecclesia romana que precipit iurare et cogit etiam aliquos ad iurandum peccat mortaliter.’, *CRC*, 107.

establishing that Raymond believed that the Church sinned, Fournier opens up the possibility of all manner of additional errors.

This same technique is used numerous times throughout Raymond's process. Later on in the same session, Fournier uses a similar tactic again to reveal further what he assumes to be his subject's true, concealed opinion of the Church. He further builds on the previously established point, asking whether one should owe any obedience to a Church that is in error on something proscribed by God.²¹⁶ Here, Raymond is forced to accept the logical conclusion that this is not so; answering affirmative would simply be taken as an admission that he was willing to obey a sinful Church that was in error on doctrine. Therefore, Fournier concludes, Raymond does not consider himself bound to obey the Church and willfully disregards its precepts:

"Asked, since the church errs truly in saying that it is permitted to swear in certain cases (since the Lord said "I myself tell you not to swear at all") or errs according to Raymond, is he obliged to obey the church..."²¹⁷

Fournier spends a good deal of time going over this point of obedience to the Church, and later expands it to include obedience to the Pope. He asks Raymond whether he would be bound to obey the Pope who prescribes oath-taking, or his own majoral (John of Lorraine) who believes it is sinful.²¹⁸ This is effectively the same logic that was earlier applied to the Church as a whole, but by specifically introducing the Pope to the question, Fournier is able to add disobedience to him to the final list of errors.²¹⁹

Finally, Fournier expands on the earlier conclusion that Raymond believes the Church to be in sin, to also include the belief that it is not the true Church of Christ. He begins by asking whether a Church that is in error on a point of Scripture could be considered the true Church, or whether such a gathering could be called a Church of heretics or infidels. Again, Raymond can only agree with Fournier that the latter is the case, as to disagree would itself be deemed heretical. The inquisitor then demonstrates that it logically follows that such a Church would not be able to successfully administer the sacraments, as this power is only available to the Church chosen by Christ. From here, Fournier points out that Raymond believes the Church is in error (by this point in the interrogation

²¹⁶ CRC, 53.

²¹⁷ 'Interrogatus, cum Ecclesia, vel erret verasciter dicendo quod licitum est iurare pro aliquibus causis, Domino dicendo : "Ego amen dico vobis non iurare omnino", vel erret secundum ipsum Raymundum, utrum ipse debeat ei obedire...' Ibid.

²¹⁸ CRC, 75.

²¹⁹ CRC, 108.

several other examples alongside oath-taking are included)²²⁰, and that therefore Raymond believes that the Roman Church is illegitimate and that its sacraments have no value.²²¹ Raymond does not accept this conclusion, and argues that he does not believe this at all. Yet his responses at this point are extraneous to Fournier's investigation, as he has already logically proven Raymond's errors, and these are added to the final list he is accused of.²²²

In summary, Fournier's technique of constructing errors through logical deduction is very much a one-way process, and a prime example of the inquisitorial discourse in action. From a simple refusal to swear an oath, he is able to extract multiple errors on the legitimacy of the Church and Raymond's obedience to it. In these examples Raymond's answers to the questions are irrelevant – no new information from him is used or needed to establish these conclusions. In certain cases Fournier is able to demonstrate error from the mere *a priori* assumption that Raymond is a heretic. In one section of the interrogation he asks if anyone on Earth holds the keys to the kingdom of heaven. The only orthodox response to this is the Pope, and Raymond states as much. Following up on this question, Fournier states that this means the Pope must be able to excommunicate, and asks whether Raymond believes his own Order's excommunication is valid.²²³ To say yes would admit to being part of a heretical sect, but to deny this would be a clear case of disobedience to the Catholic pontiff. The result of such logical traps is that the list of errors later ascribed to Raymond by the inquisition included points he never directly admitted to during the interrogation, but were rather produced solely by the logic of his inquisitor.

1.5.d. Basic Belief Questions

Some of the strategies employed by Fournier in his interrogation did rely on acquiring new information from his subject. The simplest of these was asking sequences of basic questions on Raymond's belief in the hope of discovering an unorthodox reply. These questions would typically take the form of 'Do you believe...' followed by a point of Catholic orthodoxy.²²⁴ In certain cases, his subject freely admitted to holding an unorthodox belief, such as on oath-taking and purgatory. In others, Raymond gives slightly more ambiguous or confused answers, such as when he is asked if he

²²⁰ The errors explicitly mentioned by Fournier here are on purgatory, the sacrament of orders, and preaching without license, though he also makes vague reference to other areas of contradictory interpretation of Scripture and the sacraments; *CRC*, 84.

²²¹ *CRC*, 83-4.

²²² *CRC*, 108.

²²³ *CRC*, 79.

²²⁴ For example, '[Do you believe] that the Roman Church can grant indulgences...', '[Do you believe] someone can complete penance after death...', *CRC*, 64.

believes that the secular authorities should be able to kill criminals.²²⁵ Fournier is then able to use these lapses – whether real or apparent – to pursue his aforementioned strategy of demonstrating other errors Raymond must hold. For example, in questioning Raymond on what elements of Scripture he accepts as true, the deponent mentions he rejects certain parts of II Maccabees as the book is non-canonical.²²⁶ From here, it was a simple matter to show that Raymond must also reject the authority of the Pope – who has approved this Book – to canonize texts.

Counterintuitively, one of the best examples of Fournier’s use of this strategy comes towards the end of the interrogation. At this point, most of Raymond’s errors have been revealed, and it appears that the inquisitor is attempting to be thorough in uncovering any additional beliefs he might have missed. To achieve this, Fournier questions Raymond on each of the seven articles of faith and each of the seven sacraments in turn. For each article and sacrament, Fournier asks a series of basic belief questions on their correct interpretation. In the majority of cases, Raymond is able to answer orthodoxly, but in a few instances (in which he is little more than technically incorrect) his replies are interpreted as errors and used to build his final confession.

What is particularly interesting about this section is that Fournier intersperses questions to which the orthodox reply is affirmative, with those to which the correct response is negative. In the discussion on baptism, Raymond is first asked if he believes a man who dies just after being baptized will be saved, and then if he believes unbaptized infants would be.²²⁷ The orthodox answer to the former is yes, whilst the latter is no. This shows that the process was more involved than simply reading off a list of orthodox statements and asking if the deponent accepted them. Fournier required his subject to think about the answer to each question in turn, and this made it far more difficult to avoid potential slips into heresy. In this instance, Raymond trips up on the subsequent question, when asked if anyone can be saved without being baptized.²²⁸ He replies that this is not possible, though since the technically correct answer allows for those who are martyred or who are legitimately prevented from being baptized to be saved, this is recorded as one of his errors.²²⁹

²²⁵ *CRC*, 75-6.

²²⁶ The mention of this text is possibly at the unrecorded prompting of Fournier, as the book had come up earlier in the interrogation as an authority on prayers and alms for the dead; *CRC*, 102.

²²⁷ *CRC*, 90.

²²⁸ *CRC*, 91.

²²⁹ *CRC*, 112.

1.5.e. Difficult Questions and Hypothetical Scenarios

This theme of putting the interrogation subject under pressure with difficult questions links to the third of Fournier's principal methods. His use of complex theological problems and hypothetical scenarios also seems to have been designed to 'reveal' Raymond's errors, and such 'question-traps' have been noted as typical of Fournier's interrogation strategy.²³⁰ These questions were often used to extend discussion of particular topics to ensure they had been covered thoroughly. For example, on the subject of corporal punishment and the death penalty, Raymond is first asked whether he believes it is licit for secular powers to use the death penalty. Since he answers that this is permitted, Fournier presses him further on the topic using hypothetical scenarios. He asks whether Raymond would be comfortable himself in accusing a criminal who would receive the death penalty, whether he would kill an obstinate heretic if he had the chance, and even whether he would physically impede someone trying to rob him.²³¹ These personal conundrums seem a lot more difficult for Raymond to respond to, and Fournier is able to demonstrate in this way that his subject's 'true' concealed belief is that he rejects all forms of physical punishment. Similarly, on the subject of where Raymond's order derives its authority to preach, Fournier is able to elucidate Raymond's error further using the same tactics. At this point, Raymond had admitted he owed obedience to his superior (which he called the *majoral*) and that this superior could grant authority to preach, but stated that as a deacon Raymond himself did not preach nor have the right to. Fournier uses hypothetical questions to steer his subject towards admitting errors. He asks if Raymond were to be made a priest by his *majoral*, would he then accept the power to preach:

"Asked, if he was ordained priest by the command of his *majoral*, did he believe he would do well in receiving the power to preach from this *majoral*, and would he preach on his order..."²³²

Fournier also establishes that a refusal to preach in this scenario be tantamount to the sin of disobedience. Finally, he asks that since the Pope had ordered that anyone who is compelled to preach by such a man should disobey, would Raymond then obey the Pope or his *majoral* in this matter. By using this methodology, Fournier is able to open up Raymond's defense on a subject (in this case that he himself doesn't preach) by personally involving him in the matter using hypothetical

²³⁰ Paul, 'Jacques Fournier (1317-1326), un Inquisiteur Professionnel', 136.

²³¹ *CRC*, 75-6.

²³² 'Interrogatus si ipse Raymundus esset ordinatus in presbiterum per dictum maiorem suum, crederet bene se facere si acciperet potestatem predicandi ab ipso maiore et si predicaret ad mandatum eius...', *CRC*, 78.

questions. Therefore, even though Raymond does not admit to having preached without a license, Fournier is able to show an ‘inner intent’ to do so, which could again be added to the sum total of his subject’s errors.

A related tactic used by Fournier was simply to make some of his questions theologically complex and difficult to answer. This strategy was likely employed on Raymond specifically because he had demonstrated that he was literate and had some theological training, therefore his errors would have been seen as more complex and involved.²³³ In some cases, Raymond is able to field these questions in an orthodox manner. On the sacrament of marriage, Fournier attempts to set a trap for his subject after Raymond has rejected the idea of a bishop or priest being able to get married:

“When told that the Apostle says, “It is necessary that the bishop be the husband of just one woman and likewise the deacons...” (I Timothy 3:2)”²³⁴

This appears to have been quite a cynical attempt to trick Raymond into making a mistake, by appealing to the authority of New Testament Scripture which Fournier knew his subject based his faith on. However, this particular attempt fails as Raymond correctly interprets the woman in this passage to be a reference to the Church.

In other cases, Raymond is less sure in his answers. On the sacrament of confirmation, which he had incorrectly referred to as the ‘imposition of hands’ and confused with the sacrament of ordination, Fournier finds a weak point he is able to exploit. After questioning Raymond on the mechanics of this sacrament, he asks why his subject has stated that it is necessary to make the sign of the cross with chrism on the forehead, even though this is not prescribed in the New Testament. Raymond replies that this is not a necessary part of the sacrament itself, but merely marks the solemnity of the occasion.²³⁵ This is technically incorrect, and is recorded as an error against the sacrament of confirmation.²³⁶ Again, Fournier appears to be using Raymond’s biblically literalist position against him, asking complex theological questions which might be difficult to answer without knowing more than just direct quotes from Scripture. He follows up this question by

²³³ See Fournier’s theoretical treatment of the literate heretic in his *Postilla* on Matthew, quoted in Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 207-211.

²³⁴ ‘Et cum ei diceretur quod Apostolus dicit: « re Oportet episcopus esse unius uxoris virum... similiter et dyacones »’ *CRC*, 77.

²³⁵ *CRC*, 96.

²³⁶ *CRC*, 112.

pointing out that in Acts, the Samaritans were baptized but did not receive the Holy Spirit until the imposition of hands by the Apostles, and asks how it could then be the case that the Holy Spirit is received in baptism.²³⁷ Here, Raymond – possibly after being corrected on the previous question – decides to plead ignorance, replying that ‘he did not know why this was said, but he believed that it was good.’²³⁸

1.5.f. Opening up Contradictions in the Subject’s Statements

The use of involved theological questioning, then, also incorporated an element of using Raymond’s beliefs and principles against him. This strategy of using the subject’s stated beliefs to open up contradictions and problems with their testimony was used extensively by Fournier in his interrogation. In this way, he was able to demonstrate the unsound and self-contradictory beliefs of the heretic, and reveal the errors hidden behind what he saw as Raymond’s false veil of piety. As Arnold has noted, finding contradictions from subjects’ past assertions was one of the main ways that the inquisition was able to find ‘truth’, as simply by deceiving the inquisition one is tacitly admitting to heresy.²³⁹ One of the key points he attacks in this interrogation concerns the organisation and structure of Raymond’s order, which he questions him on extensively. Fournier attempts to show that this order is invalid, as his subject had stated that they were ordained without bishops. He also questions how the majoral could be considered superior to the priests, as Raymond had described how this leader was selected and ordained by them.²⁴⁰ As in many places in the interrogation, these are more statements or conclusions than questions, and Fournier is merely demonstrating here how Raymond’s order compares poorly with the structure and organisation of the true Church.

In other places, the inquisitor is able to show that his subject’s own statements of faith are contradictory. After interrogating Raymond on how his superior performs the sacrament of confession, he asks whether Raymond believes that the nature of the office of priest and bishop allows them to remit sins. After the deponent affirms he does believe this, Fournier responds:

²³⁷ CRC, 97.

²³⁸ ‘nescit cur hoc dictum sit, licet credit quod bonum sit.’, CRC, 97.

²³⁹ Arnold, *Inquisition and Power*, 96.

²⁴⁰ CRC, 60.

“Asked, [if he believes the above], why does his majoral or the priest not say, when they absolve their penitent: ‘I absolve you of your sins’, but rather ‘May God remit your sins.’”²⁴¹

Here, Fournier is able to demonstrate that his subject is concealing his true belief by making reference to some of his earlier testimony. Again, this is the inquisitor’s conclusion rather than Raymond’s direct confession – the only reply recorded was that Raymond ‘did not know’.²⁴² In another case, Raymond states that no widowed men could join his order, but also that widowers might not remarry if they were able to live chastely. Fournier subsequently combines these two pieces of information in one of his questions, asking why a chaste widower could not then join Raymond’s order.²⁴³ Similarly, he is able to question the veracity of Raymond’s belief that the Catholic Church could perform the sacraments, by referencing his subject’s earlier statements on some of the Church’s errors in the faith. How, he asks, can Raymond believe that the Church is in error, yet can still defend the faith and perform the sacraments?²⁴⁴ There was no room for nuanced responses on these points, as has been shown the contradictions Fournier presented were an end in themselves, demonstrating his subject’s errors and the falsity of his faith.

The inquisitor was also able to use his subject’s statements of faith in a similar fashion, turning them on their head and making them into a part of the final confession. In certain sections of the interrogation, Raymond appears to warn his inquisitor against persecuting a true Christian, quoting several passages of Scripture. In one instance, he cites Mark 13:13, claiming that he and his order were ‘an object of scorn before all men in the name of Christ.’ Fournier is able to use this defence against him, first establishing that Raymond believes himself to be an ‘object of scorn’ due to his belief in the Gospel, before concluding that he must also believe those that hate and persecute him must also hate and persecute the Gospel.²⁴⁵ Similarly, when Raymond quotes John 16:23 and 15:20, Fournier uses the opportunity to ask whether Raymond believes that he and his order were suffering the same persecution that Christ and the Apostles faced.²⁴⁶ In both examples, Raymond’s attempts to warn his inquisitor about persecuting true Christians are turned around by Fournier for the purposes of demonstrating that the deponent believed the Church was in grave error on points of doctrine, and that it persecuted good men.

²⁴¹ *CRC*, 70.

²⁴² ‘Interrogatus ... maioralis vel presbiter eorum non dicunt quando absolvunt confitentem eis : « Ego te absolvo a peccatis tuis », sed dicunt : « Deus tua peccata tibi dimittat »’, *CRC*, 70.

²⁴³ *CRC*, 77.

²⁴⁴ *CRC*, 85-6.

²⁴⁵ *CRC*, 92.

²⁴⁶ *CRC*, 96.

In summary, the strategies pursued by Fournier throughout his interrogation of Raymond primarily fulfilled the purpose of revealing or demonstrating the subject's concealed errors. In many cases, this required minimal input from Raymond beyond a few belief statements. Fournier was able to form conclusions on Raymond's beliefs by demonstrating them through a series of logical questions, or by highlighting contradictions in the deponent's statements which revealed his 'true' beliefs. His interrogation style was clearly based on his theoretical understanding of an educated heretic discussed above. Fournier expected Raymond to present a false front of piety that could be broken down by forcing him to confront true Catholic doctrine. This expectation informs his use of an extensive examination of Raymond's belief in the sacraments and articles of faith, and his posing of complex questions and hypothetical scenarios designed to force his subject to admit some error or contradiction that could be later used against him. The ultimate goal of the process was creating Raymond's final 'confession', the exhaustive list of errors recorded towards the end of his ordeal. By using all of the overlapping strategies discussed in this section, Fournier was able to construct this confession, often without ever needing his subject to admit directly to any particular error.

1.5.g. *Specific Approaches to Agnes Franco and John of Vienne*

Fournier's treatment of Raymond can be fruitfully contrasted with his approach to two of Raymond's companions, Agnes Franco and John of Vienne. The inquisitor establishes from an early stage that these individuals were not spiritual leaders in their group (if this information had not already been gleaned from their anonymous accusers).²⁴⁷ They are therefore categorized by Fournier as *credens*, 'believers' of the heretical error of others rather than the ultimate source of that error. As they were also very likely to be illiterate and uneducated,²⁴⁸ the level of understanding expected of them was drastically lower than in the case of Raymond.²⁴⁹ This difference in level of expected knowledge is reflected in the different approach Fournier takes to these interrogations in comparison to the one previously discussed.

The most obvious difference is simply the amount of material recorded. Raymond was subjected to at least twenty-five sessions of questioning, with each interview often filling up several pages of manuscript evidence. Agnes and Jean had a combined total of just fifteen sessions, many of

²⁴⁷ This form of public rumour from anonymous sources was the typical way in which individuals were brought to the attention of the inquisition; Hamilton, *Inquisition*, 40-8.

²⁴⁸ Agnes stated that she could not read, though this information comes to us in the form of a question referring to a previous statement, which was not itself recorded; CAF, 126.

²⁴⁹ For medieval intellectuals' opinions on the faith of the 'masses', see Biller, 'Intellectuals and the Masses: Oxen and She-asses in the Medieval Church' in John Arnold, (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Christianity* (Oxford, 2014), 323-36.

which resulted in little more than a paragraph of record. Thus the overall detail of the final ‘confession’ and list of the subjects’ errors is much less than in the case of Raymond. This would suggest that, although constructing a complete confession was still a primary goal of the process, Fournier did not think it was worth examining Agnes and Jean’s beliefs in the same manner as he had approached Raymond. When examining belief in these interrogations, the bishop was content to establish basic departures from orthodoxy, without exploring these areas further. Typically, this would take the form of basic belief questions which could be answered with a simple ‘yes’ or ‘no’.²⁵⁰ This appears to be a curtailed form of the strategy Fournier employed against Raymond, which searches for unorthodox statements without attempting to explore the individual areas further, and which keeps the questions relatively simple and understandable.²⁵¹

Another reason for the comparative lack of time spent on establishing belief was that Fournier saw Raymond as the ‘source of error’ amongst the group. To Fournier’s understanding, and following an idea well-established in anti-heretical polemics, simple believers were illiterate and did not come up with their errors independently, but had to learn them from an educated heretical leader.²⁵² Therefore, if the inquisitor could establish the full extent of Raymond’s beliefs, and show that he had regular contact with his companions, the errors of these companions would naturally be more or less the same (though perhaps understood on a more basic level). That Fournier took this approach is evidenced by the timing of his interrogations. Raymond’s sessions were carried out first, and the full extent of his beliefs was established to the satisfaction of the inquisition by January 16th, 1320. Aside from the solitary session for each member of the group that took place in August of the previous year, all the interrogations of the other deponents took place after this date.²⁵³ The basic outline of the beliefs of Agnes and Jean were therefore already established even before their interrogation had begun, due to their association with Raymond.

This relationship with Raymond, as well as with other members of their sect, consequently took up a much larger proportion of Agnes and Jean’s depositions. Fournier was principally concerned with establishing their connection to Raymond and other leaders of their group, both as a means of proving their error, and for the purposes of gathering as much information as possible on the heresy. In the case of Agnes, it appears as though Fournier had good reason to believe she had a

²⁵⁰ For example she is asked in sequence if Fournier might absolve her sins (yes), if someone who is not a priest could celebrate mass (no), and if she believes Purgatory exists (yes); *CAF*, 124.

²⁵¹ For example, on the imposition of the death penalty by secular rulers, Jean is simply asked whether he believes it is sinful, without any additional complexities; *CJV*, 509.

²⁵² Peter Biller, ‘Northern Cathars and Higher Learning’, in Peter Biller and Barrie Dobson, (eds.), *The Medieval Church* (Woodbridge, 1999), 48-9; Cited in Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics*, 20.

²⁵³ Agnes’s second session was on January 18th, Huguettes on January 21st, and Jean’s was not until March 9th.

close relationship with Raymond before her interrogation began.²⁵⁴ The very first thing Fournier asks her (after the brief digression caused by her refusal to swear an oath to tell the truth) concerns what her relationship with Raymond is, as well as where and when she met him.²⁵⁵ After several months of imprisonment, she is again asked about Raymond, where he stayed, and who visited him during this time.²⁵⁶ Fournier's questions on belief are comparatively brief and straightforward, and Agnes's deposition is the only one for which there is no surviving list of errors she is accused of.²⁵⁷

Jean de Vienne's process similarly focuses far more on his relationship to other members of the group than to the content of his beliefs. After a brief sequence of yes or no belief questions, Fournier turns his attention to who taught Jean these beliefs, how often he had met them, when and where they had lived, and so on. There are less questions which directly concern Raymond, though Jean admits to seeing him at least once in Montpellier.²⁵⁸ This is perhaps because the connection between Jean and Raymond was already established to the satisfaction of the inquisition. The text of Jean's sentence, preserved in the records of Bernard Gui, suggests this was the case:

"Since he had been captured with Raymond of Costa, judged to be a heretic of the Waldensian sect, in this inquiry he was known to have seen the said Raymond in many places, spoken to him and shared his company."²⁵⁹

Jean's connection to Raymond in the theoretical framework of the inquisition is further attested by the list of errors recorded towards the end of his process. This is effectively a highly truncated version of the one that appears in the confession of Raymond. In that list, each main error is accompanied by a sub-list of associated errors, for a grand total of fifty-three separate items. Jean's list by comparison only names seven errors, with only the most basic information recorded.²⁶⁰ None of Jean's errors are unique to his deposition, and largely follow the ordering found in Raymond's confession (the only exception being a few errors against the sacraments, which were withdrawn by

²⁵⁴ Again, this source of information was most likely the anonymous accuser(s) of the four Waldensians.

²⁵⁵ *CAF*, 123-4.

²⁵⁶ *CAF*, 125.

²⁵⁷ This list was probably recorded in her official sentence, which does not survive. In the cases of Jean and Huguette, Bernard Gui was present for their sentencing and so a list of errors is preserved in both their depositions and the sentence. See Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1264-74.

²⁵⁸ *CJV*, 513.

²⁵⁹ 'Cumque fuisset captus cum Ramundo de la Costa, heretico de secta Valdensium per sententiam declarato, requisitus, recognovit se predictum Ramundum in multis locis vidisse et cum eo fuisse locutum et participasse.' Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1266.

²⁶⁰ *CJV*, 514.

Raymond and not discussed with Jean). By this we can clearly see that detail of belief was established through Raymond, and that his interrogation was used as the basis for constructing the list of errors amongst other members of the group.

Since Agnes and Jean's relationship to Raymond (and by extension their beliefs) had for all intents and purposes been established before his interrogation had even begun, their depositions are far shorter. Not including sessions in which the deponent was simply entreated to return to the faith and no questions were asked of them, Jean's record consists of four official dates of interrogation. Agnes was given even less attention, with just two sessions of substance, and a third in which she was asked a single question on purgatory. As both individuals were simple 'believers', the requirements of the complete confession that Fournier needed to construct had changed. The inquisitor had dealt with the details of belief when interrogating Raymond, so all that was required from Jean and Agnes was a simple admission of error, an abjuration or an establishment of their obstinacy if they refused to co-operate, and a record of who and what they knew regarding their sect.

As both Jean and Agnes admitted to holding several unorthodox beliefs, Fournier needed to spend very little time in demonstrating their guilt. Thus, a greater amount of their depositions is actually spent establishing their obstinacy rather than the nature of their error. This is most clearly represented in the sessions found towards the end of their processes. In these appearances before Fournier, the deponents are asked no questions, and no great detail on what was said has been recorded. For each, a repetitive and formulaic script is written down as a record of the inquisitor attempting to convince his subject to return to the Catholic faith. There are some minor differences in wording, but a typical example of such a session reads as follows:

"...these errors which he claimed to believe were once again explained to him intelligibly in the vulgar tongue and the lord bishop told him that these articles and errors were heretical; then he was warned to leave behind these errors and heresies and to abjure them with an oath. He responded that he would not retract or abjure any of these articles. And when the bishop told him that if he persisted and persevered in these errors he would be judged by the Church to be an obstinate and impenitent heretic, he replied that he would not leave behind these errors for any reason."²⁶¹

²⁶¹ '...fuerunt ei iterum dicti errores quos dixerat se credidisse in vulgari et intelligibiliter explanati et fuit ei dictum per dictum dominum episcopum quod dicti articuli et errores erant hereticales; deinde fuit monitus quod a dictis erroribus et heresibus resiliret et cum iuramento dictas hereses abiuraret; qui respondit quod nullum dictorum articulorum revocaret nec abiuraret dictos articulos hereticales. Et cum ei dictum fuisset per dictum episcopum quod si in dictis erroribus vellet persistere et perseverare quod sicut hereticus obstinatus

For each deponent this formula was repeated on several occasions, three times for Agnes and five for Jean. There is no detail on any of the arguments or authorities used by the inquisitor in his attempt to convince them to abjure, so it appears that the purpose of these records was to establish the obstinacy of the deponents, which would be important in deciding on their ultimate punishment.

Although the details of these sessions are missing, it is possible to get some sense of the strategies employed by Fournier in this area, most significantly his use of threats and bargaining. As is apparent in the preceding extract, it was made increasingly clear to the deponents what the consequences of their actions would be. We know from examples in both Raymond and Huguette's processes that Fournier would explicitly threaten his subjects with the death penalty,²⁶² and it seems likely that this punishment was used as a tool to encourage co-operation and attempt to secure an abjuration of heresy. One can also detect a veiled threat in the phrasing of some of Fournier's questions, as when he asks Jean whether, having been put to death for his beliefs, he thinks he would be saved.²⁶³ Furthermore, questions on the involvement of higher authorities in the case (both the Pope and secular powers are frequently mentioned) seem to impart a sense of gravity to the situation which might encourage the deponent to co-operate. Questions on the death penalty, for instance, do not simply ask whether it is licit, but specifically whether secular powers putting to death heretics is licit.²⁶⁴ Similarly, a common question used by Fournier concerns whether the deponent would swear if ordered to do so by the Pope, invoking the highest possible ecclesiastical authority in an attempt to put pressure on his subjects.²⁶⁵

Interestingly, Agnes is alone in not being subjected to threatening discussion of the death penalty or the involvement of the Pope. Instead, it appears that Fournier adopted a softer approach, by effectively bargaining with his subject. When Agnes refuses to swear, one of the reasons she gives for not doing so is that she had promised that she wouldn't. Fournier offers to use his episcopal powers to release her from this promise and absolve her of any sin. Agnes indicates she believes he has the power to do so, but persists in her refusal to swear.²⁶⁶ Later in the same session, Fournier tried a similar tactic, asking whether she would swear if he promised to release her from prison.²⁶⁷ The way

et impenitens iudicaretur per Ecclesiam, respondit quod non propter hoc desisteret a predictis erroribus.', *CJV*, 517.

²⁶² *CRC*, 75; *CHC*, 526.

²⁶³ *CJV*, 511.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁶⁵ A variation of this question is asked to Raymond, Jean and Huguette.; *CRC*, 75; *CJV*, 513; *CHC*, 525.

²⁶⁶ *CAF*, 125.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

this question is worded suggests it is more theoretical than a genuine offer, yet the implication is certainly clear that the inquisitor is offering gentler treatment in return for co-operation. It is impossible to say why Fournier adopted this bargaining approach with Agnes alone – perhaps he felt it more suitable for what he saw as a simple old woman – but these examples are further evidence of the bishop’s flexible approach to the inquisition process, which he could adjust according to his aims and the nature of the subject he was interrogating.

Fournier’s approach to interrogating Jean and Agnes differs significantly from his treatment of Raymond. The most apparent contrast is the level of interest he has in extracting the subject’s beliefs. Whereas Raymond, who as an educated man could fulfil the role of archetypal heretic and source of heretical error, was interrogated in excruciating detail on the nature of his beliefs, Jean and Agnes receive only passing interest in this regard. Fournier’s assumption that Raymond must have been responsible for the content of their beliefs, and that neither Jean nor Agnes were educated enough to understand theological complexities, allowed him to construct a confession and list of errors using only a few simple yes or no questions. Therefore, the interrogations of Jean and Agnes contain a much greater proportion of questions on who was a member of their group and where they might be found. Their lack of theological understanding also allowed Fournier to shift the main objective of their process away from discovering the full extent of their beliefs and towards either securing their abjuration, or failing this demonstrating their obstinacy. However, Fournier’s choice of interrogation strategy was not simply a binary choice depending on the literacy of the deponent, but was nuanced by the particular context of the subject. This is best demonstrated by considering the case of Huguette, the last of the four Waldensians Fournier investigated.

1.5.h. *Specific Approaches to Huguette of Costa*

When Fournier began his interrogation of Huguette, it is obvious that he considered her to be a simple ‘believer’ in the same manner as her husband Jean and her companion Agnes. Yet at the end of her deposition we find a surprisingly detailed list of twenty-one distinct errors; not quite as exhaustive as Raymond’s fifty-three, but clearly more involved than the list of seven that survives for Jean or the complete absence of such a list in the case of Agnes. She is also the only one of the three non-members of the Order who is given the title of *perfecta* in the final inquisition register.²⁶⁸ This discrepancy can be explained by the level of theological understanding demonstrated by Huguette in comparison to

²⁶⁸ This is particularly notable as typically only Cathar heretics were labelled *perfecti*. The reasons why the inquisition may have chosen to do so here will be discussed further in the following chapter.

her companions, which caused her inquisitor to change tack mid-way through her interrogation, and begin using some of the tactics applied on Raymond of Costa.

At the beginning of her process, Fournier approaches Huguette in much the same way as he had with Agnes and Jean. In her initial sessions she was asked a few basic belief questions on oath-taking and purgatory, but the bulk of the material consists of questions about other people she knew in the Order, rather than addressing her own faith.²⁶⁹ As with the previous two cases, Fournier attempts to establish her connection to Raymond, and find out who else might have instructed her in matters of religion. She is asked what her relationship to Raymond is, for what reason she was staying with him, and for how long she had done so.²⁷⁰ She also names John of Lorraine, the *majoral* mentioned by Raymond, and that she met him on several occasions.²⁷¹ As a heretical leader, Fournier was particularly interested in this character, and a substantial portion of Huguette's deposition concerns what she knew of him.

Questions on Jean ranged from when and where she met with him, to what he taught her, whether she exchanged gifts with him, where he was buried, whether he followed a vow of poverty, what sacraments he performed, and so on.²⁷² Interestingly, at this stage we can begin to see subtle hints that the inquisitor is more concerned about building a detailed list of heretical errors for Huguette than he had been with John of Vienne or Agnes, with whom he was content to use a shortened version of Raymond de la Côte's list. When considering the sacrament of penance, Fournier does not simply ask whether she confessed to John of Lorraine, but also whether she thought he was a Roman Catholic priest when she did so.²⁷³ This additional question added an extra layer of complexity to her potential heresy, as if she knew he was not a priest this would have been a greater error than if she had done so in ignorance. Similarly, the bishop adds a sub-question which follows after Huguette is asked if she knows where Jean is buried: Does she believe he is now in Paradise?²⁷⁴ Again, Fournier is pursuing a dual-purpose strategy here; gaining information about a notorious heretic, whilst at the same time building up the number of heretical errors of which his subject can be accused. Similarly, when Huguette is asked about her meetings with members of the Order, she is not only questioned on where and with whom they took place, but also if she knew they were heretics before she went and how often she returned.²⁷⁵ This approach of combining practical information on

²⁶⁹ *CHC*, 519-27.

²⁷⁰ *CHC*, 519.

²⁷¹ *CHC*, 522-3.

²⁷² *CHC*, 523-7.

²⁷³ *CHC*, 523.

²⁷⁴ *CHC*, 525.

²⁷⁵ *CHC*, 523.

heretics with establishing the full extent of the subject's guilt is unique to Huguette's deposition,²⁷⁶ and demonstrates that Fournier was capable of adjusting his approach based on the type of individual he encountered.

We cannot be certain as to why the inquisitor began to develop more of an interest in establishing the full scope of Huguette's beliefs, as the totality of their interaction and its character is lost in the transition to an inquisitorial register. However, it seems certain that Huguette must have demonstrated a far more involved understanding of Waldensian beliefs and faith, as in the second half of her deposition Fournier begins to use some of the tactics he employed against the theologically educated Raymond of Costa. From session 34-H, the bishop changes the main focus of the interrogation from John of Lorraine to the beliefs of Huguette herself. He uses logical question sequences to demonstrate her error in exactly the same manner he did with Raymond. After establishing her rejection of several key tenets of orthodoxy, he asks whether she believes herself to be subject to the authority of the Pope. Despite Huguette's response that she is subject to him on matters of faith, Fournier is able to 'prove' that she rejects papal authority by asking a further question:

"Asked if the Lord Pope told her that it was permitted to swear an oath to tell the truth in matters of faith, that purgatory exists, that the prayers of the Church help those in purgatory, that it is licit to kill malefactors, ..., whether she would believe him and feel obliged to believe these things..."²⁷⁷

As was the case in Raymond's deposition, questions such as these posed a logical trap from which the deponent could not escape without co-operating with the inquisitorial discourse. Either Huguette would have to abjure all her previously admitted errors, or the additional error of disobedience to the Pope would be added to her final sentence.

Huguette is also asked some more involved theological questions than was the case for Agnes and John of Vienne. Although her interrogation is not close to as detailed as Raymond de la Côte's, the questions asked of her go beyond simple yes or no answers. Further to the aforementioned discussion on confession and penance, she is asked not only whether she confessed to someone who was not a priest, but how that person was able to perform the sacrament and

²⁷⁶ Of the four Waldensians being considered here.

²⁷⁷ 'Interrogata si dominus Papa diceret ei quod licitum est iurare pro veritate dicenda in causa fidei, quod purgatorium est, quod orationes Ecclesie valent existentibus in purgatorio, quod licitum est interficere malefactors, ..., an ipsa crederet ei et an se reputaret obligatam ad credendum predicta...', *CHC*, 525.

absolve sins without being ordained.²⁷⁸ She is also subjected to some of the hypothetical questions and scenarios Fournier used with Raymond, specifically on the subject of the death penalty. Huguette is not simply asked whether she believes it is permitted to put criminals to death, and it appears her inquisitor attempted to involve her personally in the question:

“Asked if she believed that sentencing malefactors to death or to life imprisonment was a sin, she replied that if she sentenced any man to death or to life imprisonment she would be committing a sin ... She said that she did not wish to judge any person, because if she did this, she would be going against a precept of the Lord.”²⁷⁹

This more extensive discussion of topics typifies Huguette’s deposition and sets it apart from the other two Waldensian ‘believers’.

Huguette’s case is particularly interesting as it appears to stand as a ‘hybrid’ approach by Fournier, mixing the interrogation strategies used against Raymond on the one hand, and Agnes and Jean on the other. The chronology of the interrogation suggests that this strategy was not pre-planned, but was a result of an adaption in the face of the unexpected level of understanding that Huguette demonstrated during her process. Fournier began expecting a similar character to Agnes, and asked basic questions on who Huguette knew and what these characters did, yet by the end of the interrogation he began using logical question traps and complex questions usually reserved for fully-fledged heretics such as Raymond. A conclusion which may be drawn from this is that inquisitors did not always know precisely how to proceed, but had to adapt their approaches as the interrogation unfolded. Arnold has highlighted the importance of the conceptual divide between the *litteratus* and *illitteratus* in inquisitorial discourse, and that the two categories of people would be interrogated differently.²⁸⁰ Yet here it appears Fournier had difficulty placing his subject in the correct group, and ended up with an inconsistent approach which seems to straddle the two. The term *perfecta* is used to title Huguette’s deposition, which is highly unusual for inquisition records concerning Waldensians. This seems to be in response to a need for Huguette to be placed in a ‘higher’ category of heretic than her husband Jean (who is merely a ‘*hereticus*’), which would reflect her religious zeal and understanding of the theology behind her beliefs. The use of the term *perfectus* to describe a ‘fully-

²⁷⁸ *CHC*, 523.

²⁷⁹ ‘Interrogata si credebat quod iudicantes malefactores ad mortem vel ad carcerem perpetuum peccent, respondit quod si ipsa iudicaret aliquem hominem ad mortem vel ad carcerem perpetuum crederet peccare ... dixit quod nullum hominem volebat iudicare ipsa, quia si hoc faceret, faceret contra Domini preceptum.’ Fournier, *CHC*, 527.

²⁸⁰ Arnold, *Inquisition and Power* 78.

fledged' heretic from any sect was proposed by Bernard Gui in his inquisitor's manual.²⁸¹ He also put this into practice, referring to the *Valdensis perfectus* in his sentences.²⁸² We know that Gui was present for the trial of Huguette and involved in her sentencing, so it may be his influence that resulted in this word-choice. This explanation would also help resolve the discrepancy with Raymond de la Côte's process. Raymond was never called a *perfectus*, despite being an educated preacher and deacon in the Order, but Gui was not involved in his interrogation and Raymond does not appear in his *Sentences*.

1.6. Conclusions

Although perhaps not quite the dispassionate detective Le Roy Ladurie portrays him, Jacques Fournier was certainly very serious about his role as inquisitor. Indeed, the extirpation of heresy from the Catholic Church seemed to define his career, from Bishop of Pamiers to Pope Benedict XII. In both words and actions, his involvement with inquisitorial activity extended far beyond his investigation in Languedoc, and his desire for conformity and absolute obedience to the Roman Church bordered on the obsessive. Although he promoted the goal of reconciliation of heretics, in his *Postilla* on Matthew he is equally clear that an unrepentant heretic should be treated in the harshest of manners. Fournier's character can be seen throughout his interrogations of the four Waldensians, from his emphasis on the topic of obedience to authority in all the depositions, to his attempts to secure an abjuration, to the final punishment of burning at the stake.

One can also detect him applying theory in practice; his descriptions of heretics in his *Postilla* are couched in the language of hiddenness and deception, and therefore a heretic's beliefs need to be 'uncovered' by a well-educated member of the clergy who can expose the errors and contradictions. This is exactly the manner in which Fournier approached Raymond de la Côte's interrogation. The inquisitor was rarely attempting to 'find out' what Raymond believed, the majority of his questioning instead aimed to reveal the errors Fournier already knew were there. The goal of the interrogation was therefore to 'uncover' fastidiously all such errors so that they could be documented, a full reconciliation attempted, and an appropriate punishment handed out. In addition to the theoretical and theological side, the inquisition was also interested in more practical information about heresy, its members, meeting places, and so on. This kind of material was present in Raymond's process, but

²⁸¹ Biller, 'Goodbye to Catharism?', 305; Bernard Gui, *Practica*, 218.

²⁸² It is notable, however, that he generally used this term to refer to preachers more akin to Raymond de la Côte and John of Lorraine than members such as Huguette. For example, the *Valdensis perfectus* Hugoninus Pifaudi is named as a cleric and regular taker of confessions; Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1046.

formed the bulk of the other three depositions. It appears that Fournier viewed Agnes, Jean, and Huguette as *illitterati*, simple believers who did not have complex errors that needed to be uncovered. Consequently, his approach to them was far simpler, and their depositions a great deal shorter. However, in the case of Huguette it has been shown that this initial assumption proved to be incorrect, and that the resulting interrogation approach seemed to mix in some of the strategies usually reserved for the 'fully-fledged' heretic such as Raymond.

This analysis of Fournier's inquisition and the various strategies and approaches he employed has important consequences for any analysis of the Waldensians in his register. Most prominently, it has been demonstrated why the list of errors at the end of subjects' depositions cannot be taken at face value. Many of the 'beliefs' stated by Raymond, for instance his complete rejection of Church authority, do not originate with him but are instead products of his inquisitor's logic. However, the way in which Fournier believed heretics should be approached did actively require at least some of the reasons *why* the deponent believed what they did, in order that they might be refuted. Thus, there is better reason to believe that the reasons Raymond gives for holding particular beliefs (usually coming in the form of a biblical quotation) are genuine. Additionally, Fournier's adoption of nuanced individual strategies for approaching each deponent suggest that the process was not an entirely top-down situation. Fournier adapted his approach depending on the nature of the subject and the responses they gave, doing so quite markedly in the case of Huguette, which suggests that the deponents – although quite clearly the subordinate party in the interaction – were inescapably caught up in an active contribution to the creation of their own confessions.²⁸³

²⁸³ Arnold, *Inquisition and Power* 74-110.

Chapter Two - The Evidence of the Waldensians' Depositions

Having critically examined the production of the confession text from the perspective of the inquisition in the previous chapter, it becomes possible to examine more effectively the source's evidence concerning the Waldensians themselves. By keeping in mind the nature of inquisitorial aims and motives, specifically those of Fournier himself, this chapter seeks to focus on elements of the text that derive at least in the larger part from the agency of the deponent in formulating their responses. This will therefore preclude evidence stemming from such rhetorical traps and presuppositions discussed above. To achieve this, the first section will comprise an examination of the strategies used by the deponent in facing the ordeal of inquisition. Following this is an analysis of the beliefs presented in these responses, discussing the overall picture of the religiosity of the deponent that Fournier's document provides. This process will be repeated for each of the four Waldensians in turn, beginning with Raymond's process. Finally, this evidence will be used to place Raymond and his followers within the wider context of Waldensian history, discussing the nature and structure of their Order as presented in the text, and discussing their connection to other contemporary Waldensian communities.

2.1. Raymond's Interrogation Strategy

As has been shown in the previous chapter, Fournier applied a discernible strategy in his inquisition of Raymond, often using rhetorical trickery and logical traps to extract the confession he wanted. Despite the balance of power in this context heavily favouring the inquisitor, Raymond did retain some agency over his responses, and a close analysis of these reveal several deliberate strategies that he followed consistently throughout the process.

On his first arrest and interrogation on August 9th, 1319, and the subsequent session on August 11th, Raymond adopts a rather straightforward strategy of denials and even co-operation. This is exemplified in his story about falling ill after having sworn an oath to tell the truth.²⁸⁴ By offering an areligious explanation for his refusal to swear, he hoped to avoid this tricky issue and move the inquisitor's attention elsewhere. Raymond offers other similarly dubious statements in these sessions, claiming that he had just happened to find the suspicious writings in his possession 'on the road', and that his companions in Pamiers he kept there simply 'for the company'.²⁸⁵ In addition, Raymond even attempts co-operation with the inquisitorial procedure in his second

²⁸⁴ CRC, 42.

²⁸⁵ CRC, 41, 44-5.

session, claiming he was wrong about his previous statements on oath-taking, purgatory and prayers for the dead, effectively attempting to ‘take back’ the beliefs he had professed two days earlier:

“If he had deposed and confessed that day to have been in error for a certain period of time, he now withdrew it, saying he had never held such a belief.”²⁸⁶

Unsurprisingly, this dramatic reversal in Raymond’s beliefs was viewed with suspicion by Fournier, and it appears he was subsequently confined to the inquisitorial gaol for approximately four months.²⁸⁷ During this period of incarceration, it must have become clear to Raymond that he was not going to be released simply by stating the beliefs his inquisitor wanted to hear. We can infer this from the fact that after the above session **R2**, Raymond never again attempts to conceal his core religious beliefs, nor deny that he was an enthusiastic member of the Waldensian Order. Instead, he adopted an entirely different strategy which rejected co-operation in favour of a bold defense of his Order’s orthodoxy. This, in combination with several attacks on the injustice of the inquisition, and a consistent silence on the whereabouts of other members of the Order, would inform Raymond’s responses for the remainder of the process.

2.1.a. Demonstration of Orthodoxy

By far the most significant strategy adopted by Raymond during his interrogations was his attempt to demonstrate that both he and his Order were scripturally orthodox, devout Christians. This was certainly an active choice, as it is recorded at the beginning of session **R3** on December 17th that Raymond:

“...begged [the inquisitors] to listen and to examine him on the Catholic faith and the articles of faith, and he said that he was ready to say what he believed [concerning them]...”²⁸⁸

²⁸⁶ ‘Item cum deposuisset et confessus fuisset dicta die de certis temporibus credencie sue erronee, nunc revocavit, dicens se nullo tempore in dicta credencia fuisse.’, *CRC*, 44.

²⁸⁷ There were no sessions recorded between August 11th and December 20th 1319.

²⁸⁸ ‘...supplicavit eisdem ut super fide catholica et articulis fidei audirent et examinarent eum, dicens se paratum dicere illud quod de fide catholica, articulis et sacramentis fidei sentit...’, *CRC*, 45.

Following this, the seven articles of faith and seven sacraments that Raymond professes to believe in are recorded. Interestingly, these professions do not appear to derive from the inquisition or even direct rote memory of the wider Catholic tradition, but are distinctly Waldensian formulations produced by Raymond himself. His articles of faith can be summarised as follows:²⁸⁹

- 1) A belief in the Triune God.
- 2) That this God created the physical world.
- 3) That the Old Testament (Law of Moses) is true and binding.
- 4) That Jesus was incarnated as a fully human being.
- 5) That Christ chose the Church that would preserve the faith.
- 6) That all men would rise again for the Last Judgement.
- 7) That Judgement would fall on both the good and evil, with each rewarded appropriately.

The articles bear a great deal of resemblance in their nature and ordering to the profession of faith offered by Valdes in 1180/81,²⁹⁰ enough to ascertain that this was definitely a source for Raymond's formulation. Raymond follows Valdes in his rejection of beliefs associated with dualist heretics, yet diverges from that text on article 5. Valdes affirms specifically the *Catholic* Church as the only true Church, yet Raymond only refers to the Church as it was at the time of the Apostles.²⁹¹ Raymond also omits statements on sin, the Devil, and marriage, includes articles on the resurrection and Judgement, but is silent on the question of alms for the dead and poverty which conclude Valdes' profession. Raymond's version also differs in that he refers to at least one specific biblical passage to support each of his articles (for example 1 John 5:7 for article one), whereas there are no such references in Valdes' statement. The articles can be described as culturally Waldensian, partially devised from both the Nicæan Creed and the Apostles' Creed, but without following the exact formulations of any orthodox Catholic theology, and which are far more explicit in their biblical origins. Thomas Aquinas delineated fourteen articles in total, seven for the Godhead and seven for Christ, but did not include anything related to the Church or the Old Testament Law.²⁹² Indeed, Raymond is later questioned as to why he did not repeat the Creeds *verbatim*, to which he responds that he has drawn his statements directly from holy Scripture.²⁹³

²⁸⁹ CRC, 45-6.

²⁹⁰ Antoine Dondaine, 'Aux Origines du Valdésisme : Une profession de foi de Valdès', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XVI (1946), 231-2; An English translation appears in Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 206-8.

²⁹¹ '...dixit credere quod Dominus Ihesus Christus elegit sibi gloriosam Ecclesiam de qua dicit Apostolus ad Ephesios...', CRC, 45; 'Unam ecclesiam catholicam, sanctam, apostolicam et immaculatam, extra quam neminem salvare, credimus.', Dondaine, 'Une profession de foi de Valdès', 231.

²⁹² Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 2a2æ. 1, 8, ed. and trans. James J. Cunningham (London, 1975).

²⁹³ CRC, 49.

Raymond's definitions of the sacraments also betray a sense of originality, in that they do not follow the standard formulations of orthodox Catholicism. Most notably in this regard, Raymond replaces the sacrament of confirmation with a sacrament he refers to as 'imposition of hands'.²⁹⁴ Again, this discrepancy is picked up on by the inquisition, and is later included in the list of heretical errors attributed to Raymond.²⁹⁵ Both the articles of faith and definition of the sacraments given by Raymond attest his ability to have some agency over the direction of the inquisition proceedings. These are not statements that are forced upon him, but are instead derived from his own learning, incorporating not only his knowledge of Scripture but memory of a specifically Waldensian literary and cultural tradition.²⁹⁶ Raymond's insistence on demonstrating his orthodoxy to his inquisitors sets the tone for the rest of the process, as his strategy of portraying himself and his Order as nothing less than the most devout Christians informs his responses throughout the remainder of the interrogations.

Examples of this kind of response are too numerous to list exhaustively, but it is worth noting a few of the different ways this strategy manifests itself in the record. When explaining how Brothers are ordained into his sect, Raymond goes to great lengths in emphasising their strict imitation of the Apostles, supported by passages quoted from the New Testament.²⁹⁷ He states that only the most pious and morally righteous individuals are admitted to the group, and that candidates are instructed in Scripture and judged on their conduct for at least five years before becoming a Brother.²⁹⁸ The *majoral* (head of the Order) was not just a good man but a 'good Catholic'.²⁹⁹ In their preaching, the Brothers were ordered to encourage their followers to attend church and receive sacraments from Roman priests.³⁰⁰ In these instances Raymond appears to be anticipating some of the Church's potential criticisms of his Order – that Brothers were impious and worked against the Church – and trying to construct a narrative which showed the opposite. Similarly, when asked if he believed that Catholic priests could consecrate the body of Christ, Raymond answered that they could, but also added a statement against Donatism without being explicitly prompted.³⁰¹ This suggests that the Waldensian certainly had a solid understanding of some of the errors that the Church authorities would likely accuse him of.

²⁹⁴ CRC, 47. See section below for a detailed analysis of Raymond's belief in the sacraments.

²⁹⁵ CRC, 112.

²⁹⁶ For a full discussion of this idea, see chapter five below.

²⁹⁷ CRC, 55-7.

²⁹⁸ CRC, 59.

²⁹⁹ '...ipsum esse bonum catholicum...', CRC, 55.

³⁰⁰ CRC, 80-1.

³⁰¹ '...et credit quod quantumcumque sint magni peccatores, possint conficere et conficiant corpus Christi...', CRC, 70.

In other instances, Raymond has difficulty in pursuing his strategy due to shortcomings in his own knowledge. However, he still attempts to give a response which will indicate his orthodoxy. When questioned on his ordination as a deacon, he was asked what vestments he wore for the occasion. Clearly unsure as to what the orthodox response should be, Raymond nevertheless comes up with a solution, responding that he ‘had the vestments a deacon should have when he is ordained.’³⁰² This style of answer can also be seen in his reply to questions on his belief in the Nicæan and Athanasian Creeds, which he ‘believed in his heart more than he was able to express with his mouth.’³⁰³ Raymond’s uncertainty in these extra-biblical areas may reflect his focus on Scripture as the ultimate source of his religious understanding, which will be discussed further below. Even so, his responses can still be seen to follow his overall strategy, as there was nothing in the preceding examples he necessarily disagreed with. A more significant challenge was presented when his inquisitor moved the discussion to actual points of contention between the Church and the Waldensian Order, at which point Raymond was forced to adapt his tactics.

2.1.b. Ignorance

If Raymond had wished to avoid any conflict whatsoever with his inquisitors, he would have persisted in his original strategy of revoking all the errors he was accused of. However, as has been shown Raymond either could not or would not do this, instead mounting a defense of the orthodoxy of himself and his Order. This inevitably involved intransigence on several points of doctrine, most notably concerning oath-taking and purgatory.³⁰⁴ In these cases, Raymond could not simply present his beliefs as traditionally orthodox, but claiming that his inquisitor and the Church were in error on these points was unlikely to cast himself or his Order in the best light. Instead, he adopted a strategy which attempted to avoid or ameliorate these discrepancies, in an often unsuccessful attempt to channel the interrogation towards areas where he and the Church agreed.

Raymond first sets out an appeal to his ignorance in session **R5**, the interrogation following the one in which he professed his belief in the articles of faith and the sacraments. Here he interjects a catch-all addendum to his other statements, in an attempt to smooth over any theological differences:

³⁰² ‘...habebat illas vestes quas debent habere dyaconi qui ordinantur...’, *CRC*, 49.

³⁰³ ‘...magis credit corde quam ore possit confiteri...’, *Ibid*.

³⁰⁴ Raymond’s beliefs will be discussed in detail in the following section.

“He added that if in the faith confessed above, he professed anything he should not have professed, or had said anything was an article of faith that could not be one, he revoked it. He said it out of his own ignorance and simplicity, and he held and firmly believed in the faith of the holy Apostle Peter.”³⁰⁵

Here Raymond is setting a precedent for the rest of the process; that if there is some technical theological point he is incorrect on, it is due to his own lack of learning rather than an active belief in the error. The Waldensian makes appeals to ignorance throughout his process, the text being peppered with the phrase ‘*dixit se nescire*’.³⁰⁶ These responses may be genuine, as when Raymond cannot explain away the examples of Apostles swearing in the Bible, or on the ultimate fate of a sinner who dies before they complete their penance.³⁰⁷ However, they may also be interpreted as attempts to shut down certain lines of questioning that led in an uncomfortable direction, such as when he refuses to respond to questioning concerning his Order’s use of the sacraments.³⁰⁸ In this case, it is likely he did know what sacraments were performed and why, but perhaps felt this would be a difficult topic on which to defend his sect’s orthodoxy.

The strategy of pleading ignorance could only ever have been marginally successful for Raymond. Although it allowed him to skirt around certain technical discrepancies, as demonstrated above Fournier did not need Raymond to say anything at all in order to satisfactorily demonstrate his guilt. Additionally, as a literate man with a reasonable degree of education, ignorance would have simply been no excuse. To someone like Fournier society was strictly divided between the *litterati* and *illiterati*, there was just no room for the partially or self-educated individual who might read but not have a near-perfect understanding of Christian theology.³⁰⁹ A provincial peasant may have been excused for holding some erroneous religious beliefs (so long as they accepted that they needed correction), but for an educated person any appeal to ignorance would have been interpreted through the anti-heretical *topos* of deception and false appearance.³¹⁰ Perhaps it was for this reason that Raymond did attempt to engage with some difficult inquisitorial questions rather than pleading ignorance in every case.

³⁰⁵ “...addens quod si in fide quam supra confessus est aliquid posuit quod ponere non deberet, vel dixit esse articulum aliquem fidei qui esse non potest articulus, illud revocat, dicens quod hoc propter ignorantiam et simplicitatem suam dixit, tenens et credens firmiter fidem sancti Petri apostoli.”, *CRC*, 49.

³⁰⁶ E.g. *CRC*, 50-1, 63, 65, 76, 93-4, 104.

³⁰⁷ *CRC*, 51, 92-3.

³⁰⁸ *CRC*, 63.

³⁰⁹ On this idea see Peter Biller, ‘Intellectuals and the Masses: Oxen and She-asses in the Medieval Church’ in *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Christianity*, ed. John Arnold (Oxford, 2014).

³¹⁰ Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics*, 38-9, 84-7, 161-71.

2.1.c. Diminishment

The second strategy Raymond used in tackling these areas of disagreement involved a diminishment of the seriousness of these points alongside a moderation of his language which kept his tone polite and compromising. When pressed by Fournier on the fact that he must believe the Church to be in error on some points of doctrine, Raymond accepts that it must sin, but ‘not too gravely’.³¹¹ When led by his inquisitor to admit that ordering someone to swear must be sinful by his own admission, Raymond agrees that it must be, but adds the caveat that ‘there are many sins more serious’.³¹² There is some element of self-contradiction here, as when he describes the Church sinning ‘mortally, but not too gravely’,³¹³ but it is clearly apparent that Raymond is attempting to moderate his language and play down areas where his Order and the Church differ. Similarly, he maintains a polite tone when discussing the Pope and his persecution by the inquisition. Raymond says that he ‘did not wish to dishonour’ the Pope, but merely disagrees with him on a small issue of Scriptural interpretation.³¹⁴ His persecutors do not ‘hate the Gospel’ but are instead ‘not preserving the truth of the Gospels’.³¹⁵ On prayers for the dead, he ‘did not wish to so greatly insult the Roman Church to the point of saying it is in error’ on the composition of such a prayer, but personally prefers a prayer that is formulated differently.³¹⁶

This latter example also reflects Raymond’s desire to decrease the severity of any errors of which he had been accused. In several instances he attempts to keep the discussion to his own personal opinions rather than presenting them as universal truths. In session **R7** he tries to reduce the damage done by Fournier’s rhetorical traps in the previous interrogation, stating that he ‘did not believe ... that anyone else besides himself was in sin or error concerning faith or morals’ but that he only believed that he himself would sin if he were to swear (albeit not too seriously).³¹⁷ Similarly, he reduces the severity of the sin of ordering someone to swear by pointing out that it would be much less significant if the person doing the ordering did not know that swearing was sinful.³¹⁸ Finally, Raymond’s statement that ‘all Christians should obey the Church fully in matters that accord with Divine law’ can be interpreted as an attempt to diminish the significance of the matters being

³¹¹ ‘non multum graviter’, *CRC*, 52.

³¹² ‘...licet gravius posset peccare.’, *CRC*, 52.

³¹³ ‘...peccat mortaliter, licet non multum graviter.’, *CRC*, 52.

³¹⁴ ‘...respondit quod in hoc non vult inhonorare dominum Papam.’, *CRC*, 85.

³¹⁵ Fournier asks whether Raymond’s persecutors must ‘hate the truth of the Gospels’ (*‘hodiunt [sic] veritatem Evangelii’*). Raymond’s response moderates the language by changing the verb *hodiunt* (hate) to *non tenent* (not preserve). *CRC*, 92.

³¹⁶ ‘...non vult tantum de vituperio dicere romane Ecclesie, quod dicat eam errantem...’, *CRC*, 94.

³¹⁷ ‘...nec credit ... quod alii ab ipso peccent, errent in fide vel moribus...’, *CRC*, 52.

³¹⁸ ‘...dixit quod quilibet Christianus debet in omnibus et per omnia hoberedire [sic] Ecclesiae romane in hiis que non sunt contra Dei preceptum...’, *CRC*, 54.

discussed, and highlighting the much more numerous areas in which he and the Church were in full accord.³¹⁹ These tactics may ultimately have had little significance on Raymond's final sentence, as with his appeals to ignorance there was little room for nuance of belief within inquisitorial discourse.³²⁰ However, it is important to note the manner in which Raymond chose to defend his faith, as it was one of the few areas of the process that he did have some control over, and this will be an important consideration to bear in mind during any analysis of his religious beliefs.

2.1.d. Attacks on the Inquisition

Thus far, all of Raymond's strategies that have been described could be considered defensive in nature. His professions of orthodox faith as a true Christian, and the avoidance or diminishment of troublesome issues of disagreement, are all in response to questioning by the inquisition which attacked the beliefs of Raymond's Order. However, the process is punctuated by several moments in which Raymond appears to go on the offensive himself, questioning the inquisitors' right to persecute him and even issuing thinly veiled threats about the consequences of doing so.

The first instance of this kind of language appears in session **R5**, during an interrogation on the subject of capital punishment. Raymond is asked whether he believes that it would be as sinful for another Christian to kill him as it would be to kill a martyr. Although he does not go as far as to call himself a martyr, Raymond does intimate that such a person's soul would be in grave peril, stating that 'they would sin more than if they were to kill a brigand or another man who was not a malefactor'.³²¹ This type of threat did not only come at the prompting of the inquisition. More usually, they appear at the beginning of certain sessions, before any questions are recorded as having been asked. Therefore, they appear to be prepared statements that Raymond wished to be put on record as part of his defence.

The first such instance occurs in session **R8**. Here, Raymond explicitly defends the idea that he need not obey the Church if it orders something that is against a biblical precept, and that any excommunication on such grounds could not be valid. In addition to this defence, he goes on the attack, arguing that if he were to be killed on these grounds his persecutors would be committing a

³¹⁹ *CRC*, 54.

³²⁰ On the construction of inquisitorial discourse and the rigid categorisation of heretical belief, see John Arnold, *Inquisition and Power*, 19-47.

³²¹ '...et plus peccarent quam ut si interficerent unum latronem vel alium hominem non malefactorem..', *CRC*, 50-1.

‘double sin’, not only going against the command ‘Thou shalt not kill’ but also ‘You shall not kill the just and innocent’.³²²

This strategy of beginning a session with an attack or warnings against the inquisition is repeated a number of times throughout the process, and seems to increase in frequency as the interrogation progresses. At the start of session **R13**, Raymond makes explicit the connection between himself and the martyrs that he had alluded to before:

“...he said that he had the faith and doctrine of those that Saul persecuted before his conversion. He also said that anyone who persecutes him or delivers him to death on the basis of the faith and doctrine he had confessed, would be the friend and accomplice of those who stoned the first martyr Saint Stephen, and that ‘there would come upon him all the blood that has been spilled on the earth since the blood of Abel the just until the son of Zachariah the son of Barachus, whom you have assassinated between the temple and the altar’
(Matthew 23:35).”³²³

There is certainly an explicit element of warning or threat in Raymond’s language. This is confirmed later on in session **R19**, in which it is recorded that he was quoting the Bible specifically in order to ‘warn the Lord Bishop’, in reference to John 15:20, which promises retribution for persecutors.³²⁴ However, there may have been an additional purpose to these statements that was perhaps more significant. Session **R18** opens with another unprompted statement by Raymond, but takes on a slightly different tone:

“...he said that he and those in his Order were ‘an object of scorn before all men for the name of Christ; but those who sustain [the faith] until the end will be saved.’ (Mark 13:13)”³²⁵

³²² ‘...duplicis peccati reus esset, quia faceret primo contra Domini preceptum : <<innocentem et iustum non interficies>> et secundo contra preceptum : <<non occides>>.’, *CRC*, 54.

³²³ ‘...dixit quod ipse est eiusdem fidei et doctrine quorum erant illi quos persequatur Saulus antequam fuisset conversus. Dixit etiam quod quicumque eum persequutus fuerit vel morti tradiderit propter precedentem fidem et doctrinam quam confessus est, erit socius et particeps eorum qui lapidaverant beatum Stephanum protomartirem, et <<Veniet super eum omnis sanguis iustus qui effusus est super terram a sanguine Habel iusti usque ad sanguinem Zacharie filii Barachie quem occidistis inter templum et altare>>.’, *CRC*, 72.

³²⁴ *CRC*, 96.

³²⁵ ‘...dixit quod ipse et illi qui sunt de statu suo sunt hodie omnibus hominibus propter nomen Christi ; qui autem sustinuerit usque in finem, hic salvus erit.’, *CRC*, 92.

This passage does not explicitly attack his inquisitor beyond the implication that he is persecuting a just Christian. Instead, this statement can be interpreted as an attempt by Raymond to instill some confidence and self-assurance in his own beliefs, in the face of continued persecution.

In summation, Raymond's strategy of interjecting pre-prepared statements into the record of his inquisition can be interpreted as fulfilling three related purposes. Firstly, they offered a means by which Raymond could take some agency over proceedings by adding statements that were entirely of his own devising. This even offered some small influence over the direction of questioning, as when Fournier responded to his statement at the beginning of session **R13** with further questions about Raymond's ideas on persecution.³²⁶ Secondly, they represented a means by which Raymond could go on the offensive, briefly turning the table on his inquisitors by questioning their righteousness and their prospects of salvation. Lastly, and perhaps most significantly, they provided Raymond a means to assert his beliefs on his own terms, and in doing so sustain him in his faith through what must have been an incredibly difficult ordeal to live through. His comparisons to Saint Stephen and threats about persecuting good Christians were perhaps not primarily aimed at his inquisitor, but more a reassuring reminder to himself that he was on the right side of the argument, in the face of multiple authoritative voices telling him he was not over the course of several months.

Raymond's strategy for dealing with the inquisition process may appear relatively straightforward on first reading, but was in fact multifaceted and considered. The foundational principle of his approach (after the initial sessions in which he attempts to comply in order to gain a quick release) was to demonstrate to his inquisitor that he and his Order only held orthodox Christian views, that were derived directly from holy Scripture. When this assumption faced a challenge, such as a point of doctrine on which his Order and the Church did disagree, Raymond adopted a double-strategy of claiming ignorance and diminishing the significance of the point raised. Finally, he also attempted to attack his inquisitor's very right to carry out the process, making use of thinly-veiled threats of eternal damnation, and comparing his plight to those of biblical martyrs.

That these strategies can be clearly discerned from Raymond's deposition suggests that, despite the inquisitorial discourse largely dictating the direction of discussing and the final outcome of the process, the Waldensian did have some significant agency over how his responses were formulated, and the manner in which his religiosity was represented in the record. This in turn

³²⁶ CRC, 72-3.

allows for an analysis of Raymond's beliefs which, whilst not directly his own words, can be isolated from inquisitorial rhetoric and analysed in much greater detail than most other similar sources allow.

2.2. Raymond's Religious Beliefs

Raymond expresses his opinion on a great number of theological points throughout his ordeal, and a thorough investigation of his belief will be vital to any study of Waldensianism in the period. As has been noted by Cameron, Raymond's testimony has generally been understood as genuine, due to his unwillingness to compromise on several points despite the looming threat of the death penalty, as well as its overall consistency and detail.³²⁷ This may be broadly true, but it is important to examine the evidence carefully. As has been shown above, both the inquisitor and his subject had strategies for approaching the interrogations, and neither necessarily held the aim of uncovering objective truth in this area. We should not mistake Fournier's logical traps and polemical assumptions for Raymond's truly held beliefs, nor should we accept the Waldensian's portrayal of his own orthodoxy at face value. This section will investigate Raymond's religiosity, beginning with the fundamental principles of Scriptural learning and imitation of the Apostles, before examining his statements on oath-taking, capital punishment, purgatory, and his relationship with the Church.

2.2.a. Scriptural Literalism

Before an examination of any specific points of doctrine, it is important to note the common theme that will act as the foundation stone of Raymond's religiosity – his belief in the primacy of a literal reading of holy Scripture. Raymond's testimony is littered with passages from the Bible that he quotes to support his responses. In total, there are approximately sixty-six passages quoted throughout the entire process, most commonly from the New Testament.³²⁸ There is little doubt that Raymond's personal study of the Bible was the lynchpin of his faith, and the precept from which all other parts of his religiosity was derived. When he is first arrested, he claims to have discovered the beliefs he had stated by 'reading the Scriptures and meditating on it', though he admits that Burgundian Pierre Clergue also played a role instructing him.³²⁹ This response may have served a double purpose, also relieving him of the need to name any compatriots that might have instructed him, yet it becomes clear from the rest of his testimony that there was more than a little truth to

³²⁷ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 91.

³²⁸ My own count; see also chapter five.

³²⁹ '...dixit quod hoc habuit ex se legendo scripturam et cogitando, et etiam sic instruxit eum quidam qui vocatur Petrus lo Clergue, burgundus...', *CRC*, 43.

this statement. Later on in the process (session **R8**), he is again asked where he learned his religious principles, and this time Raymond admits he was taught by the *majoral* who ordained him, but mentions that this was done by showing him a specific passage in the Bible which promoted the idea.³³⁰ This principle of a personal relationship with Scripture, and the importance of learning it for oneself rather than simply being told it, seems very important to Raymond's religious life. He stresses the importance that any prospective *majoral* must be 'very learned in holy Scripture', and that an education in the Scriptures is vital to anyone wishing to join his Order.³³¹ Again, this played into Raymond's strategy of presenting his Order as orthodox and pious, yet the knowledge he demonstrates in the rest of the text indicates this was true for Raymond himself at the very least.

As will be shown in more detail in the relevant sub-sections, Raymond's basis for his beliefs on point of doctrine come down to his personal interpretation of the Scriptural support for them. He accepts without issue the miraculous and intercessory power of Saints and their relics (a belief Waldensians were often accused of rejecting)³³² due to the fact he knows Scriptural passages which support this idea to his satisfaction.³³³ Similarly, he defends his definitions of the sacraments on the basis of Scripture, arguing that the words he suggested should be pronounced during baptism were based on a direct repetition of those said by Jesus in the Gospels. Conversely, he did not consider any words to be of significance during the sacrament of ordination, as there were no specific words mentioned in the relevant passages of Scripture.³³⁴ Raymond's presentation of his *majoral's* ritual of initiation is also biblical, supporting his explanation with several quotations.³³⁵ He also defends the concept of electing a *majoral* when no-one is present who ranks higher than a priest, making reference to the biblical precedent of Aaron as described in Leviticus.³³⁶ The primacy of Scripture in Raymond's religiosity is encapsulated by the passage he quoted to his inquisitor in session **R7**, 'it is better to obey God than men' (Acts 5:29).³³⁷ Later, Raymond explicitly applies this precept to his current situation, explaining that he believes the words of Scripture overrule the Pope on certain points of faith, and that he fears he would be offending God if he were to accept them.³³⁸ This

³³⁰ CRC, 55.

³³¹ 'multum literatus in scriptura divina', CRC, 56.

³³² 'The Passau Anonymous: On the Origins of Heresy and the Sect of the Waldensians', in *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe* ed. Edward Peters (Philadelphia, 1980), 162; A Latin edition has been published in Alexander Patschovsky and Kurt-Victor Selge, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Waldenser, Texte zur Kirchen-und Theologieggeschichte*, Heft 18 (Gütersloh, 1973).

³³³ CRC, 66.

³³⁴ CRC, 91. On the theological origins of the sacrament of confirmation see chapter five, subsection 'Sacramental Theology'.

³³⁵ CRC, 57.

³³⁶ CRC, 60.

³³⁷ 'magis oportet obedire Deo quam hominibus', CRC, 53.

³³⁸ CRC, 85.

principle permeates Raymond's defence of his religious beliefs, and nowhere more so than on the subject of oath-taking, his most significant and uncompromising disagreement with the Church.

2.2.b. Oath-taking

Raymond's complete refusal to take an oath of any kind throughout the inquisition process marks it out as an important part of his religiosity. Unlike some other points of doctrine that will be analysed later, Raymond was unwilling to compromise in any way on this issue, and never demonstrated any doubt that he was in the right on this point. Rejection of oath-taking was one of the most typical errors that the Church associated with the Waldensian heresy, and the importance Raymond places on this belief represents one of the key indicators that he and his group belonged to this branch of dissent. Ranier Sacconi names it as one of only two errors he attributes to the Poor of Lyons, alongside a rejection of the death penalty.³³⁹ The Passau anonymous places a similar degree of importance to this point of the doctrine, contending that Waldensians would take great care in their everyday speech to avoid saying anything which might be interpreted as an oath, such as 'truly' or 'certainly'.³⁴⁰ Unlike in the polemical sources, Raymond's testimony presents a better opportunity to understand this principle of belief from the point of view of someone who actually held it.

Raymond's basis for this belief can be found in the New Testament, in which Jesus tells his disciples 'I say to you not to swear by anything...'.³⁴¹ In this passage, which Raymond quotes in full during session R3, it is implied that swearing used to be or was thought permissible, but that Jesus was giving a new command on this issue. Raymond clarifies that he shares this interpretation later in the same session, explaining that the Saints of the Old Testament were able to swear, but since Christ gave this new commandment, no-one could swear without sinning.³⁴² Although Raymond demonstrated a strong knowledge of this particular passage of Scripture, there appear to have been limits to his knowledge on this point of doctrine. His inquisitor offers numerous examples of individuals swearing in the New Testament without being corrected, but Raymond could offer no explanation for this besides his conviction that they could not have sinned when doing so.³⁴³ This represents an intriguing gap in Raymond's theology, as it is somewhat surprising that he did not have a more convincing counterpoint to this seemingly obvious objection to his belief. This marks

³³⁹ Rainier Sacconi, *Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno*, ed. F. Sanjek, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XLIV (1974), 31-60; Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 345.

³⁴⁰ 'The Passau Anonymous', 153.

³⁴¹ CRC, 50.

³⁴² CRC, 50.

³⁴³ CRC, 51.

the first instance of several moments in which Raymond is unable to satisfactorily defend his position against his inquisitor, and may be an indication of the type of learning and education he and others in his Order went through. Although Raymond has a very detailed knowledge of certain biblical passages which support his beliefs, these beliefs are relatively straightforward and one-dimensional, with any technical objections to them merely being dismissed as incorrect. This rather rigid simplicity to Raymond's theology will be another continuing theme in the analysis of his religiosity.

2.2.c. Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead

A similar pattern emerges when considering Raymond's beliefs on the concept of purgatory. The existence of a third post-mortem destination beyond Heaven or Hell was a relatively novel concept in the early fourteenth century, having only been officially defined for the first time at the Second Council of Lyon in 1274.³⁴⁴ As we have seen already, Raymond's tendency to rely almost solely on the Bible for his religious views meant novel ideas and Catholic traditions were always going to be difficult for him to accept. Aside from the single botched attempt at co-operation in session **R2**, Raymond consistently holds to the position that purgatory does not exist, explaining that he does not know of any passage in Holy Scripture which speaks of such a place.³⁴⁵ It follows that he rejected the practice of prayers for the dead (also included in the same Church Council's definitions), which he describes as 'only profitable for the living'.³⁴⁶

Although Raymond is quite certain in his view that purgatory does not exist, he once again lacks the ability to fully defend his position theologically. When asked if a man who confesses his sins but dies before being able to do sufficient penance for them goes to paradise or hell, Raymond attempts a rather unconvincing defence of a two-destination system:

"...he responded that in as much as the remission of his sins was uncertain, so his salvation was uncertain, and he did not know if he would be damned or saved. However, he said, he himself more greatly believed this man would be saved rather than damned, or else the sacrament of penance would have no efficacy. Nevertheless, he said, if this man is saved, he would not satisfy his sins in purgatory, because there is no purgatory, but immediately after death his soul would enter paradise."³⁴⁷

³⁴⁴ Heinrich Denzinger and Adolphus Schönmetzer, (eds.), *Enchiridion symbolorum: definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, 35th edition (Barcinone, 1974), 276, no.856.

³⁴⁵ *CRC*, 42.

³⁴⁶ 'talía solum prosunt vivis', *CRC*, 42.

³⁴⁷ '...respondit quod credit quod sicut incerta est remissio peccatorum eius, ita incerta est eius salvatio, et ita nescit si talis est salvatus vel dampnatus. Tamen, ut dixit, magis credit talem esse salvandum quam

Raymond clearly did not have a rehearsed alternative cosmology with which to reject the purgatory system, instead somewhat vaguely suggesting that God would send individuals to the place they most justly deserved. This is an indication not only of his reliance on scriptural literalism, but also the narrowness and even simplicity of his religiosity. Later in the process, Fournier appeals to the existence of purgatory through the writings of the Church Fathers, particularly Augustine and Gregory the Great. In rejecting these authorities, Raymond frames the problem as a simplistic dichotomy between believing the words of the Fathers or the words of Jesus, whom he points out did not say to the thief on the cross “You will be in purgatory for some time”.³⁴⁸

As with oath-taking, the rejection of purgatory appears to be a core belief for Raymond, which he brings up on multiple occasions as an example of something the Church or Pope is in error on,³⁴⁹ and on which he uncompromisingly and consistently refuses to give any ground whatsoever. However, this kind of absolute certainty does not typify Raymond’s deposition, as there are many sections in which his answers seem far less convinced, and he is more willing to give concessions. One of the most important of these subjects to our analysis concerns the legitimacy of the death penalty and corporal punishment

2.2.d. Killing

As was the case with swearing oaths and purgatory, the rejection of all forms of killing was another belief commonly attributed to the Waldensian sect by polemicists. This began with the writings of Alan of Lille in the late twelfth century, who set out the concept that Waldensians rejected all forms of killing, be they criminal punishments, burning of heretics, or deaths caused by holy wars.³⁵⁰ Inquisitor Moneta of Cremona built on Alan’s work around half a century later (c.1241), explaining in his treatise that Waldensians believed all killing was sinful and that the entirety of the Church were murderers due to their promotion of holy wars.³⁵¹ Considering this polemical atmosphere, it is

dampnandum, alias sacramentum penitencie evacuaretur; tamen, ut dixit, si talis salvaretur, non satisfaceret de suis peccatis in purgatorio, quia purgatorium non est, sed inmediate post mortem intraret eius anima paradisum.’, *CRC*, 92-3.

³⁴⁸ *CRC*, 103.

³⁴⁹ e.g. *CRC*, 42, 64-66, 80, 82, 84.

³⁵⁰ Alan of Lille, *De fide catholica*, II.xx-xxiii, in *PL* 210, 394-9.

³⁵¹ Moneta of Cremona, in Thomas A. Ricchini (ed.), *Venerabilis patris Monetae Cremonensis ordinis praedicatorum S.P. dominico aequalis Adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque : quos ex manuscriptis codd. Vaticano, Bononiensi, ac Neapolitano* (Rome, 1743); Moneta’s account of Waldensian belief on killing described here is summarised by the editor: XLI, no.7. His full defense of the legitimacy of secular punishment

unsurprising that Fournier chose to question Raymond on this matter, and that his subject held views which could be considered broadly similar to what we find in the anti-heretical texts. However, unlike the two beliefs covered above, Raymond is recorded as being far less sure of himself concerning the legitimacy of killing. Whereas he consistently and firmly refused to take an oath, and denied that purgatory could exist under any circumstance, there appear to be moments of indecision and uncertainty regarding killing, and consequently a murkier picture of what Raymond actually believed on this subject.

In his essay on the Waldensian abhorrence of killing, Peter Biller argues that Raymond's ambiguous statements on killing can be safely ignored, as his concessions and prevarications on the subject were a result of 'giving ground under pressure' to his inquisitor, and that he ultimately chose to die 'on a set of doctrines which included the utter illicitness of all killing, of criminals or in any war, stated simply and without discussion.'³⁵² He also points out that Huguette, who was also taught by *majoral* John of Lorraine, held a much more absolute belief in the rejection of killing. However, there are reasons to suggest Raymond's evidence may warrant further analysis. Firstly, in the final list of errors that is presented to Raymond on January 16th, 1320, the errors against putting criminals to death are listed as follows:

"He said that if he were to accuse someone before secular judges in a case for which they could be killed or mutilated, he believes he would be sinning.

He said that if he had the power to put an obstinate heretic to death, he would in no way do so, nor cause their life to be shortened, because he believes he would be sinning. He would have the same matter of conscience concerning denouncing a heretic or believer.

He said that those who persecute them do so because [the Waldensian Brothers] are preserving the truth of the Gospel."³⁵³

These articles in themselves hardly read as a comprehensive rejection of all forms of killing. Firstly, there is no mention of deaths in holy war here, as a rejection of holy wars was something Raymond never admitted to. Secondly, the language is very personal. We have seen in the previous chapter how Fournier employed hypothetical situations such as these to tease out the answers he was

and holy war is in Book 5, C.XIII, 508-46. Accessed at <https://archive.org/details/venerabilispatri00mone> (April 2020).

³⁵² Biller, *The Waldenses*, 84.

³⁵³ 'Item dixit quod si ipse accusaret apud iudices seculares aliquem in casu ubi deberet interfici vel mutilari, crederet peccare. Item dixit quod si ipse haberet potestatem interficiendi hereticum obstinatum, nullo modo interficeret eum nec faceret quod eius vita breviaretur, quia crederet peccare. Dixit etiam quod conscienciam haberet si hereticum vel credentem revelaret. Item dixit quod illi quis eos persequuntur persequuntur eos quia ipsi tenent veritatem Evangelii.' CRC, 112.

seeking. However, just because Raymond *personally* would have a troubled conscience about being involved directly with killing, does not *necessitate* an absolute rejection of all forms of killing within society as a whole.

Additionally, using this list of errors as an edited list of what Raymond ‘truly believed’ is extremely problematic, as it runs the risk of accepting the inquisition’s conclusions at face value and from their perspective. The kind of rhetorical tricks that were used to obtain some of these errors has been demonstrated above, and the direction and nature of the questioning was only partially influenced by Raymond’s responses. There is also a large degree of doubt over the agency Raymond had in editing and changing this list of errors, and that these were the errors he had made an explicit decision to die for. Although it is true that he is recorded as attempting to revoke a number of minor errors, such as on the making of the sign of the cross during confirmation, even these small technicalities could not be admitted as revocations due to Raymond’s continued refusal to swear an oath that he was telling the truth.³⁵⁴ Furthermore, due to the way Fournier had constructed this confession, most of the errors were interlinked and relied on the one to prove the other. For instance, Raymond could not have retracted his errors against the Roman Church unless he also revoked his core principle that swearing an oath was sinful. The formulaic language in Raymond’s final hearings should not be interpreted as literally true, and the idea that he had the power to ‘correct, amend and retract that which seems to him to be necessary’ is undermined regardless by the necessity of the oath to legally confirm a full confession of guilt.³⁵⁵ Raymond had already attempted co-operation in August of the previous year and would have been under no illusions about the reality of his options, which were to renounce his core beliefs on oath-taking, or to be put to death for them.

If Raymond’s views on killing cannot be drawn directly from his final confession, we must instead investigate the evidence contained within interrogation process itself, which provides a closer approximation of Raymond’s account of his truly held beliefs. Although Fournier pressed Raymond on this issue to get the level of detail he required to build a full confession, the Waldensian’s position actually remains reasonably consistent throughout. The subject first arose in session **R5**, when Raymond is asked whether it would be a sin to kill him on the basis of his refusal to swear an oath. He replies affirmative, and that it would be a graver sin than if one were to kill a criminal, but importantly adding the clarification that here he was talking about a killing ‘not

³⁵⁴ CRC, 115.

³⁵⁵ Henry Ansgar Kelly, ‘Oath-taking in Inquisitions’, *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* 35 (2018), 215-41, esp. 228-31.

because of a judicial decision but for some other reason.³⁵⁶ The inquisitor asks for clarification on this latter point, and Raymond states that a secular Lord does have the power to put criminals to death, and for people to accuse said criminals, without going against God's commandment: 'Thou shalt not kill.'³⁵⁷ There is a possibility that Raymond's distinction between killing as part of the judicial process and other forms of killing was at the prompting of Fournier, and that the question was not recorded separately in the record. Regardless, the important point to note is this distinction was there from the outset, and was not a result of Raymond attempting to soften an extreme position on killing after extensive questioning on the subject.

Raymond attempts to maintain the idea that the killing of malefactors under the correct judicial process was acceptable and necessary. In session **R5**, he argues that without the ability to execute or punish criminals there could be 'no peace and security amongst men.'³⁵⁸ Later, he offers a biblical passage to support this position and 'prove' that this was his opinion, citing Romans 13:4: 'Power does not wear the sword for no reason, because anger is vengeance against those who do ill.'³⁵⁹ However, as highlighted in the previous chapter, Raymond is unable to maintain this position when placed into a hypothetical situation in which he is required to do this kind of killing. He replies that although the killing of heretics is justified, he himself would not kill one, but rather keep them imprisoned indefinitely whilst providing for their basic needs.³⁶⁰ He also stated that if he were to accuse someone of a crime for which they would be executed or mutilated, he believed he would be sinning, though he was unsure if this would be a venial or mortal sin.³⁶¹ This somewhat contradictory position is engineered by Fournier's questioning strategy. By placing Raymond personally within the scope of the question, the inquisitor removed the anonymous judicial language and focused in on the act of killing itself. This personal involvement is clearly what troubled Raymond, as he had no qualms about stating his support for holy wars against heretics or even other Christians, neither of which concerned himself directly.³⁶² In this way, Fournier's pressure actually forces Raymond to back down from a conciliatory position, and into a more extreme one of dissension.

It is worth exploring other possible interpretations besides the notion that Raymond was 'covering up' his truly held beliefs on the absolute prohibition of all killing, not least because this

³⁵⁶ '...non propter iusticiam, sed propter quamcumque aliam causam.' *CRC*, 51.

³⁵⁷ *CRC*, 51.

³⁵⁸ 'pax et securitas inter homines', *CRC*, 75.

³⁵⁹ 'Potestas non portat gladium sine causa. Vindex est enim ira in hiis qui male agunt.', *CRC*, 76.

³⁶⁰ *CRC*, 75, 87

³⁶¹ *CRC*, 75.

³⁶² *CRC*, 76.

logic strays uncomfortably close to how the inquisition would have viewed his statements. In the first instance, Raymond's logic could be followed quite literally as he certainly did not have the jurisdiction to put anyone to death himself, and the question asking what he would do *if* he had such power is hardly a fair one. If Raymond believed that 'Thou shalt not kill' was a blanket ban on all killing in the same way that Matthew 5:37 prohibited oaths, why would he present these beliefs differently? It has been shown above that Raymond wished to depict himself and his Order as good Christians, but in areas where he believed he had better scriptural support than the Church he had no qualms about defending his beliefs. For this reason, something we can say with a high degree of certainty is that the rejection of killing was not core to Raymond's religiosity, in the same way his positions on oath-taking, purgatory and obedience to the Church were. He clearly understood that there was some scriptural basis for an ordered judicial process of killing within Christian society (even providing one of these passages himself). However, his endorsement of this process was lukewarm at best, and he clearly had concerns for his own salvation over endorsing the idea of killing someone himself or even indirectly causing their death.

In the wider history of Waldensian communities, positions on the validity of killing are murky and highly variable, as 'the meeting-point of doctrine and countless individual consciences and occasions of moral choice.'³⁶³ There clearly appears to have been a decline in the popularity of this belief by the fifteenth century, and communities after Raymond's time certainly resorted to violence themselves, even to the point of killing.³⁶⁴ Raymond's testimony is not irrelevant in explaining this decline. His evidence clearly shows that – whatever his true personal beliefs on the subject – Waldensian rejection of killing was not an absolute principle in the same way rejection of oath-taking and purgatory was. Though this may have varied by individual (with some *credentes* such as Huguetta presenting a far more simplistic interpretation of 'Thou shalt not kill'), there was clearly scope for nuance and differences of opinion on this issue. The secondary or tertiary importance placed on this subject by Raymond does not reflect the writings of polemicists, and may help to explain why this principle was one which gradually declined in popularity and significance, until its almost total absence by c.1400.

³⁶³ Biller, *The Waldenses*, 95.

³⁶⁴ Susanna Treesh, 'The Waldensian Recourse to Violence', *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 55, 3 (1986), 294-306.

2.2.e. Relationship with the Roman Church

In a similar vein to the Waldensian position on killing, there is no small disparity between Raymond's testimony and the polemical representation of Waldensian beliefs in Catholic literature. Anselm of Alessandria attributed the error of Donatism to both the Italian and French branches of the movement, claiming they believed only good men could perform the sacraments.³⁶⁵ Likewise, Rainier Sacconi painted a damning picture of the Waldensian opinion of the Roman Church, suggesting they believed it to be the 'whore of Babylon', and contrasting it with their own 'true' Church outside which no-one could be saved.³⁶⁶ This latter error was attributed to Raymond by the inquisition, yet as outlined in the previous chapter these beliefs were not stated in Raymond's own words, but rather conclusions drawn directly from his position on oath-taking. Extreme caution should be exercised in following this inquisitorial logic to form opinions about Raymond's beliefs, as it adds yet another degree of distance between the Waldensian and modern historian. Instead, an attempt should be made to peel back this layer of rhetoric and focus in on the moments where Raymond is allowed to answer more freely, and draw our own conclusions from these statements.

One area in which Raymond is indisputably at odds with the Church concerns the concept of obedience. At the time of his interrogation, the Church under Pope John XXII was increasingly pursuing a policy of total obedience to the Holy See, particularly concerning the evangelical poverty of the Franciscan Order.³⁶⁷ This formulation of absolute obedience was unequivocally rejected by Raymond, who offered an alternative understanding of the meaning of this term which appealed to the primacy of Scripture. This interpretation can be summarised by Raymond's response as to whether he is bound to obey the Church at all:

"...he replied that he was bound to obey the Church when it prescribed the same things as God, and because it had the authority to prescribe what God prescribed, on the condition that what it prescribed was more or less following God."³⁶⁸

³⁶⁵ Antoine Dondaine, 'La Hiérarchie Cathare en Italie, II: Le 'Tractatus de Hereticis' d'Anselme d'Alexandrie, O.P.; Catalogue de la Hiérarchie Cathare d'Italie', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XX (1950), 310-24; Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 371.

³⁶⁶ Rainier Sacconi, *Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno*, ed. F. Sanjek, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XLIV (1974), 31-60; Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 345.

³⁶⁷ Patrick Nold, 'Pope John XXII, the Franciscan Order and its Rule', in *The Cambridge Companion to Francis of Assisi*, ed. Michael J. P. Robson (Cambridge, 2011), 258-72.

³⁶⁸ '...respondit quod tenetur Ecclesie hoberire ex eo quia precipit illud idem quod Deus, et quia habet auctoritatem precipiendi illa que Deus precipit, dum tamen illa que precipit sint secundum Deum vel parum vel multum.', *CRC*, 55.

This general idea is repeated by Raymond many times throughout his process, and is clearly a practical manifestation of the biblical idea that it was 'better to obey God than men', noted earlier as an important passage Raymond used to justify his position. The Waldensian takes this principle even further, arguing that one should not obey a holy man's order to go against God's command, in the same way that one should obey a heretic who orders the opposite.³⁶⁹ This logic effectively cuts out the mediating role played by the Church between God and the general populace, and ties obedience directly to Scriptural commands regardless of their origin. He also takes this stance on excommunication, accepting the Church's right to excommunicate anyone who defies divine law, but rejecting its executive power to excommunicate anyone it chooses.³⁷⁰

Although Raymond is generally consistent in his position on obedience, it is worth noting that there is at least one session in which he appears less certain of himself on the subject. In session **R14**, when asked whether Raymond would obey his *majoral* or the Pope on the matter of being ordered to preach, he responds that he would obey his own superior, but 'with some anxiety'.³⁷¹ This phrase reflects a general mood of uncertainty during this session which Raymond did not express in his earlier responses on obedience. Beyond merely the taxing process of the inquisition having had more time to wear Raymond down, there may be a doctrinal explanation for this disparity. Unlike in the cases of oath-taking and purgatory, there is no specific divine precept which Raymond can draw on to demonstrate that the Church is transgressing on this point. He explains that although his *majoral* would receive the power to preach from the Pope if he were able, since this is impossible he receives it as the Apostles did - directly from God.³⁷² He admits that he 'does not know' how or why his *majoral* gets this power to preach from God.³⁷³ This again highlights Raymond's reliance on biblical literalism for his religiosity; as soon as he moves away from direct biblical quotations he lands on murkier ground and is far less sure of himself in his responses. Combine this with the fact that Raymond was almost certainly aware of the sentiment expressed in Romans 10:15, 'how shall they preach, except they be sent?', and it is understandable why he would be expressing more doubt in this circumstance than he did in the sessions mentioned earlier. Raymond even makes this distinction himself in one instance, allowing that since there was no specific biblical precept for exactly how one should celebrate mass, the Pope should be obeyed on this matter.³⁷⁴

³⁶⁹ CRC, 54.

³⁷⁰ CRC, 79-80.

³⁷¹ 'licet anxius', CRC, 78.

³⁷² Ibid.

³⁷³ '...respondit quod credit quod ex hoc solo acquirat dictam potestatem a Deo, nescit tamen quare.', CRC, 78.

³⁷⁴ CRC, 80.

Although Raymond generally seems more than willing to defy the Church, especially on the specific doctrinal points discussed above, his testimony contains little sense of the virulent anticlericalism and hatred of the Church often attributed to Waldensians.³⁷⁵ There is some indication that Raymond does not see the importance in some of the materiality of Church rituals, as when he suggests special vestments for ordination are 'only for solemnity', and that the robe and ring his own *majoral* uses is a spiritual rather than material one.³⁷⁶ Additionally, he struggles to defend the importance of churches as physical buildings, with the only reason for their existence he can suggest being that they allow certain people a separation from worldly troubles, which may be beneficial for prayer.³⁷⁷ However, a fundamental principle that Raymond is consistent on throughout is that salvation and remission are still attainable through the Roman Church. He rejects Donatism on several occasions, stating that laypeople are perfectly capable of receiving the sacraments from Roman priests even if they are sinful.³⁷⁸ On one occasion, he even appears to interject this latter clarification unprompted.³⁷⁹ Raymond shows some respect for the institutional importance of the Church as a means of preserving the faith from the time of the Apostles, and allows that the Pope is in this regard the legitimate successor of St Peter.³⁸⁰ Whilst the Church is still capable of defending the faith in most areas of Christian doctrine, Raymond's specific criticism is in its persecution of the Waldensians. Answering on behalf his *majoral*, whom Fournier attempts to question indirectly, Raymond lists the three main points preventing their order's unity with the Roman Church as its beliefs on purgatory and oath-taking, and its persecution of the apostolic life.³⁸¹ In these areas, he suggests, the Waldensian Order is living closer than the Roman Church to the original church of St Peter.³⁸²

2.3. John of Vienne - Strategy and Beliefs

The strategy of John of Vienne in dealing with the inquisition process in many ways mirrors Raymond's, though it is lacking in the same level of detail and complexity. In his first interrogation on August 19th, he refuses to swear an oath on grounds of health, claiming that doing so in the past had

³⁷⁵ See for example the Passau Anonymous's account cited above; Compare also with the anticlericalism in the testimonies of the Spiritual Franciscans in the same period (see chapter six).

³⁷⁶ CRC, 57.

³⁷⁷ CRC, 81.

³⁷⁸ CRC, 57-8

³⁷⁹ CRC, 70.

³⁸⁰ CRC, 84-5.

³⁸¹ CRC, 85.

³⁸² CRC, 86.

caused him to get seizures in his head and arms.³⁸³ Aside from this one issue, John attempts cooperation with his inquisitor in this first session, claiming to believe in concepts such as purgatory and prayers for the dead.³⁸⁴ As was the case with Raymond, John changes strategy after these denials do not have the desired effect, and after spending several months imprisoned he repudiates these ideas in no uncertain terms.³⁸⁵ He also makes the use of the 'I do not know' response on a number of occasions to avoid potentially difficult lines of questioning.³⁸⁶ As a lay believer who does not demonstrate much in the way of detailed religious knowledge, we can presume these claims of ignorance are more genuine, or at least more believable, than was the case with Raymond, yet the response still offers a convenient way to avoid complex philosophical and theological issues on which John felt he might say something to condemn himself. In session **J4**, his response to three consecutive questions on temporal justice, Church indulgences, and absolution of sin is recorded as: 'He said he did not know and did not know what to believe concerning this point.'³⁸⁷ As will be shown momentarily, John was certainly not incapable of any statement of belief, there were certain points on which he was confident. Yet on subjects which he knew to be controversial, yet which were not central to his religious principles, his appeal to his own ignorance was an effective way of avoiding rhetorical traps or accidentally making unorthodox statements.

Another similarity to Raymond's strategy is in John's diminishment of the significance of his disagreements with the Church, and his focus on aspects which emphasised the similarities of belief between the Church and his group. Although he is consistent in the view that oath-taking is sinful, he attempts to play down the severity of this sin, claiming that it was 'not the kind of sin one would go to hell for' and that he would sin albeit 'not mortally' were he to break his promise to the Brothers and swear an oath.³⁸⁸ This likely does not represent the seriousness with which John took this religious principle, and he later admits that he 'repented very much' having sworn in previous testimony to inquisitor John of Beaune and felt he 'sinned gravely'.³⁸⁹ He also attempts to tie the sinfulness of oath-taking more closely to the Church, suggesting in his first interrogation that he learned this from an unnamed Dominican and Franciscan preachers rather than a member of the Waldensian Order.³⁹⁰ A hint of sophistic language can be detected in John's response that preaching needs to be legitimised by the Pope 'or the prelates of the region'.³⁹¹ This somewhat vague term

³⁸³ *CJV*, 508.

³⁸⁴ *CJV*, 508-9.

³⁸⁵ *CJV*, 510.

³⁸⁶ '...respondit quod nescit...', *CJV*, 513.

³⁸⁷ '...nescit nec scit quid credat super hoc.', *Ibid.*

³⁸⁸ '...non tamen mortaliter...', *CJV*, 509.

³⁸⁹ '...multum eum penitent quia iuravit...'; '...graviter peccavit...', *CJV*, 510.

³⁹⁰ *CJV*, 508.

³⁹¹ '...vel prelatos in suis locis.', *CJV*, 509.

does not specifically identify bishops of the Catholic Church, and could be taken to include superior Waldensian Brothers, if one took the view that they were a legitimate Christian community. John also attempts to demonstrate his own orthodoxy by presenting a list of seven articles of faith he believes in, as well as naming the seven sacraments of the Church.³⁹²

Lastly, John takes considerable care to avoid naming any members of his community who are still alive and are at risk from inquisitorial attention. After being pressed with threats to reveal who taught him his beliefs (clearly Fournier did not believe the Franciscan story), John initially refuses to respond. Eventually, he does cite some names to satisfy his inquisitor, though he is careful to mention only a select few who are either already dead or captured by the Church authorities.³⁹³ In summary, John's strategy of initial denial followed by pleading ignorance, a reluctance to name names, and a focus on diminishing the gap between the Brothers and the Church, all appear to mirror the approach found in Raymond's deposition, if at a lower level of detail and complexity. This may suggest some degree of prior collusion between the deponents, in which principles for approaching the ordeal of interrogation were discussed before the process began. This idea will be explored further once the interrogation strategies of all four companions have been discerned.

In terms of belief, John's deposition is far less detailed in its discussion of theological ideas and the justifications behind them, owing to his position as a lay believer rather than an ordained Brother. Therefore, we can only gain a very general insight into John's beliefs in comparison to what was possible with Raymond. Certainly, rejection of oath-taking remains front and centre as the main principle John takes a stand on. It is not surprising that this topic was heavily emphasised by the inquisition, but it is important to note that John is equally consistent in giving no ground on this area, just as Raymond was, though he does admit to having sworn at least once in the past. He is equally unambivalent about purgatory, a concept which he rejects, alongside the associated idea of beneficial prayers for the dead.³⁹⁴ On the subject of the death penalty, his language becomes less certain. He claims not to know what he should think about the right of secular powers to put criminals to death, but he does not that he has been taught God's command, 'Thou shalt not kill.'³⁹⁵ As in Raymond's deposition, this belief is *not* presented as an unequivocal rejection of killing, in the same manner that purgatory and oath-taking were rejected. Instead, John presents a sense of the tension between God's commandment and the social reality, though he is not confident enough

³⁹² *CJV*, 514.

³⁹³ *CJV*, 512-3.

³⁹⁴ *CJV*, 510; 513.

³⁹⁵ 'Non occides.', *CJV*, 511.

here to reject judicial killings outright. There is also some sense of the primacy of God over the earthly powers of the Church, John argues that excommunication by the Pope is impossible if the beliefs in question are valid, as the power of excommunication ultimately derives from God.³⁹⁶

John's definition of the sacraments and articles of faith are effectively an abridged version of what can be found in Raymond's deposition. The articles of faith follow the same structure and content as Raymond (influenced by Valdes) proposed, including their appearance in the text without any inquisitorial prompting, the principal difference being the complexity of the ideas. Raymond, for example, supports the fourth article on the incarnation of Christ with a quote from Isaiah and Matthew, whereas John simply states, 'the fourth article is the incarnation of Christ'.³⁹⁷ There is a similar situation concerning the sacraments. John follows Raymond in his unusual definition of the sacraments, using 'imposition of hands' in place of confirmation, and including that an ordination only consisting of the three orders mentioned in Raymond's text.³⁹⁸ Again, Raymond provided at least a paragraph on each of the sacraments outlining his belief in them, whereas John provides only a simple list of their names. From this comparison it seems certain that John had been instructed in both the articles of faith and sacraments, but as a lay believer had only been given the basic principles, most likely orally to learn by rote.³⁹⁹ Although he claims to have learned these definitions from a woman named Jacqueline two years earlier, considering John's definitions are effectively a simplified version of Raymond's, the latter is far more probable tutor.⁴⁰⁰ If so, this represents one of the few actual glimpses into Raymond's work as a pastoral figure in his community, and the type of content he would discuss with lay believers. John's inclusion of these definitions may well have been part of a coordinated strategy to defend the orthodoxy of Waldensian belief, but the fact they do not appear in Agnes or Huguette's interrogations suggests that it was John's personal decision to make these statements, and that they represent a genuine part of his spiritual experience as a lay believer of the Brothers.

³⁹⁶ Ibid.

³⁹⁷ 'Quartus articulus est quod incarnacio Christi.', *CJV*, 514.

³⁹⁸ Ibid.

³⁹⁹ Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).

⁴⁰⁰ Jacqueline is mentioned by Agnes as having left Pamiers with Raymond's sister Jeanne and the cleric André Pascal before her arrest. *CA*, 125. Huguette confirms this story, and suggests Jacqueline was related to Raymond in some way. *CHC*, 521, 526.

2.4. Agnes Franco – Strategy and Beliefs

Agnes's deposition is defined by its simplicity and lack of detail, even in comparison to the other lay believers. However, even here we can detect some familiar patterns. In her first session on August 10th 1319, Agnes claims that she is unable to swear after having fallen ill some time ago. She states that a 'priest named Stephen' advised her that swearing was sinful and that she should avoid doing so if she wished to remain in good health.⁴⁰¹ In addition to this excuse, she also attempts to cover for her companions by feigning ignorance about them. Raymond, whom she later admits to have known since birth, she claims to have only just met, and Huguette, whom she admits to having travelled with, 'is dead'.⁴⁰² The latter seems to indicate that the four were not captured together, and that Agnes was unaware at this stage that Huguette had also been arrested by the inquisition. After some pressure she does on January 18th name a few other lay believers who had visited Raymond's house in Pamiers, though there are no Brothers among them, and that they had left Pamiers many months ago.⁴⁰³ There is less of a discernable strategy in Agnes' deposition in comparison to the other deponents, as her responses are usually either basic descriptions of her movements in Southern France, or simple yes or no responses, with the bulk of the text being taken up by inquisitorial procedure and lists of questions posed.

Agnes's beliefs are consequently far harder to determine, the only instance of certainty being her rejection of the oath. She shares with her fellow captives a persistent and obstinate refusal to compromise on this issue throughout the process. The importance of this point of doctrine is apparent, as it is the only point on which Agnes attempts an explanation of her faith, saying that the prohibition of oaths was directly commanded by Jesus, and later repeating that the 'Lord had forbidden all oaths'.⁴⁰⁴ She admitted to having been instructed in this manner by Raymond, and this seems to confirm the importance of the scriptural component of belief even for illiterate lay believers. Agnes did not reject oaths simply on the basis that Raymond has told her it was wrong, but because he shared with her a specific biblical passage in which Jesus prohibited it. Her understanding does seem limited to the basic repetition of this principle, as when questioned further on why oath-taking was wrong, she replied only that 'it was evil because it was a sin'.⁴⁰⁵

As was shown in the previous chapter, Fournier spent much less time questioning Agnes on the nature of her beliefs, instead focusing on her knowledge of other members of the community.

⁴⁰¹ CAF, 123. John of Vienne also mentions a Brother named Stephen, though it is impossible to know if these were the same individual. *CJV*, 512.

⁴⁰² '...est mortua...', CAF, 124. Fournier adds the phrase 'ut dixit' to this statement to indicate his scepticism.

⁴⁰³ CAF, 124-5.

⁴⁰⁴ '...Deus prohibet omne iuramentum.', CAF, 126.

⁴⁰⁵ '...est malum quia peccatum est.', *Ibid.*

Consequently, the only other information available on Agnes's belief is her simple agreement that a good and holy man cannot perform mass or absolve sins without being ordained, and that purgatory existed.⁴⁰⁶ This latter point is an anomaly in the depositions of the four Waldensians, as Agnes is the only one who does not argue this point, though her 'belief' in the concept is limited to a simple affirmative response on two separate occasions. It seems unlikely given the accounts of the other two lay believers that Agnes would have been unaware of the Brothers' doctrine on purgatory, so perhaps her acquiescence is explained by the lack of personal immediacy these questions implied. It was easier to agree to the existence of a theoretical purgatory than to actively contravene your religious principles by taking an oath. Certainly she was put under far less pressure on this point than Raymond was, and it could simply be the case that Agnes was alone in continuing the strategy of co-operation dropped by the other deponents after their imprisonment. Regardless, Agnes' testimony does indicate the degree of variation by which the Brothers' teachings were absorbed by lay followers, and to what extent they chose to defend these beliefs when questioned.

2.5. Huguette of Costa – Strategy and Beliefs

Huguette's deposition is considerably lengthier and contains much more detail with regard to her personal beliefs. As discussed previously, this was likely due to the inquisitor's interpretation that Huguette was more closely involved with the movement, or at least held a deeper understanding of the issues. The deposition begins with what should by now be a very familiar pattern, Huguette is asked to swear but she refuses on grounds of her health, and attempts to end the process quickly by claiming to believe what the Church required her to, alongside some not so subtle lying. Huguette's excuse for not swearing is slightly different from her compatriots, in that she claims to have miscarried due to swearing before, perhaps implying that she was (or was claiming to be) pregnant at the time of the interrogations.⁴⁰⁷ In the first session she also follows Agnes in an acceptance of the existence of purgatory, though this position would later change. Her testimony also contains the most glaring instance of falsehoods being employed by the deponents, as Huguette claims that Raymond was named 'Peter' and that she was living with him as he was her uncle, and that he was an 'important churchman' who had spent time in the papal court.⁴⁰⁸ As with Agnes's claim that Huguette had died, this lie only makes sense if Huguette was not at that moment aware that

⁴⁰⁶ 'Interrogata si credit quod non sacerdos possit celebrare missam et absolvere a peccatis si sit bonus homo et sanctus, dixit quod non', *CAF*, 124; 'Interrogata si credit esse purgatorium in alio seculo, dixit quod sic.', *CAF*, 124; 'Interrogata si credebat purgatorium esse, respondit quod sic', *CAF*, 126.

⁴⁰⁷ *CHC*, 519. This may also explain why Huguette did not receive her sentence until the latter half of 1321, a full year after the other three deponents, as she may have been permitted to give birth before her execution.

⁴⁰⁸ *CHC*, 519.

Raymond had also been captured, as her intention seems to be to cover up Raymond's true identity as a Waldensian Brother. This will have implications for the potential collusion between the deponents discussed below.

Subsequent to the first session, Huguette adapts her strategy in a similar manner to Raymond and John. Her explanation for the lie she told was that she had been instructed to call Raymond 'Peter' by some anonymous authorities from the papal court, and maintained her belief in the rumour that Raymond was an important churchman but had fallen out with other clerics, something she had heard said in Pamiers from a source she could not remember.⁴⁰⁹ This explanation represents an interesting adaption of a lie initially intended to preserve Raymond's anonymity, into a means of demonstrating Huguette's orthodoxy by focusing on her contact with officially sanctioned Church figures. Huguette seems to adopt this familiar strategy of defending her beliefs as orthodox, yet does it in her own way, without the tact and conciliatory language found in Raymond and John's depositions. She has no qualms in bluntly calling Church excommunication 'worthless' if used on her community, and simply claims she knows better than the Pope on matters of disagreement between them.⁴¹⁰ Like the other deponents, Huguette seems to be concerned with protecting the anonymity of some members of the community. However, as in Agnes's deposition, she does consent to naming some laypeople, particularly various women she travelled and visited churches with.⁴¹¹ These women did not live in Pamiers, but rather towns such as Montpellier and Vienne, which perhaps presented a safe enough distance from Huguette's current situation for her to feel comfortable naming them. What is certainly consistent with the other deponents is the protection of living Brothers, as Huguette only speaks of those already deceased, such as John of Lorraine and Gerard the Provençal.⁴¹² This seems likely to be an intentional strategy, as by focusing her responses on the close relationship she had with important deceased Brothers, she was able to satisfy the inquisition detailed accounts of their roles and movements without endangering the rest of the community.

Huguette's account is somewhat more detailed in terms of the nature of her belief than the other two lay followers. Although the usual pattern of refusing to swear an oath is present, it appears that for her second session on January 21st, 1320, Huguette did in fact agree to swear to tell the truth. We can infer this from the lack of the usual inquisitorial language at the beginning of sessions which comments on the deponent's refusal to swear, as well as Fournier's later question as

⁴⁰⁹ *CHC*, 520.

⁴¹⁰ '...ipsa credit quod in illis magis erret dominus Papa quam ipsa.', *CHC*, 525.

⁴¹¹ These names are unique to Huguette's deposition: Joanna, wife of Arnold Moulinier, Barchinona, wife of Bernard of Loubens, Wilhelmina, wife of John Prades, and Joanna, wife of Peter of Calmellis. *CHC*, 526.

⁴¹² *CHC*, 523.

to 'why she had sworn on another occasion'.⁴¹³ We can only speculate as to why Huguette chose to swear, her own explanation for refusing to do so again was that she 'knew she was sinning' when doing so, and perhaps felt guilty for betraying her principles.⁴¹⁴ Regardless, this is an important caveat to the otherwise consistent rejection of oath-taking among the deponents, suggesting even this dogmatic principle could be compromised in certain contexts. Aside from this exception, Huguette's testimony tends to follow the general pattern of beliefs outlined in the other depositions. In addition to rejecting purgatory and all forms of killing, Huguette also appears to have learned some of the more theologically involved concepts concerning the Brothers' Order. She follows Raymond's logic in that she sees herself and the Brothers as subject to the Pope only in matters which accord with God's will, and also suggests that the Brothers are not subject to his authority due to the ongoing persecution of their Order.⁴¹⁵ There is also repetition of the idea of the *majoral's* relationship to the Pope, as Huguette also puts forth the idea that the former receives his power directly from God due to the schism with the Roman Church.⁴¹⁶

Huguette's rejection of all forms of killing has been cited as evidence that this was a religious principle that Raymond and his Brothers strictly adhered to in the same manner as their rejection of oaths. Yet as discussed earlier, it is difficult to come to this conclusion from reading Raymond's testimony, as one would need to account for obfuscations and misleading statements not typical to responses on theological issues he felt strongly on. Huguette's opinion on this matter certainly does indicate that it was a concept the Brothers discussed with lay believers. She expresses a simple, literal view in which it was 'forbidden to kill any man or wound malefactors', and that killing a Christian in any war was a sin.⁴¹⁷ Huguette's statements here are certainly much more straightforward than Raymond's, yet it would be problematic to assume that her testimony represents a more accurate account of what the latter believed than his own statements. Huguette was deeply involved in the movement and had contact with numerous Brothers and fellow lay believers over the years, including John of Lorraine, Gerard the Provençal, and John Cerno, likely as well as several others who were not yet deceased. Any one of these men could have influenced Huguette in this position, and it is entirely possible that the ultimate interpretation was Huguette's herself. In her husband John of Vienne's testimony, we saw that he was less willing to come to a

⁴¹³ '...cur ipsa alias iuravit...', *CHC*, 521.

⁴¹⁴ '...credebat peccare...', *CHC*, 521.

⁴¹⁵ '...respondit quod ipsa credit esse subiectam domino Pape in hiis que pertinent ad fidem Dei, sed in aliis non credit se esse subiectam domino Pape.' ; '...videtur sibi quod ipsi [the Brothers] non reputant se esse subiectos quia dominus Papa persequitur illos quia sunt de dicta secta.', *CHC*, 525.

⁴¹⁶ *CHC*, 527.

⁴¹⁷ 'Item dixit ei quod nullus homo interfici debebat non excipiendo malefactores.', *CHC*, 522; 'Dixit eciam quod qui interficit Christianum in bello quocumque, est peccatum.', *CHC*, 527.

decisive conclusion, but knew that God had forbidden killing in the ten commandments. That Huguette could come to a more absolutist position from the same teaching is certainly plausible, and it is also worth noting that, unlike Raymond, she was not subjected to extensive questioning on the theological basis for the prohibition of killing or its implications for society.

2.6. Structure and Composition of Raymond's Order

Before investigating the nature of the Order as described by Raymond, it is worth setting out the evidence of membership of the Waldensian movement in Southern France in this period.

2.6.a. Relationship with the Toulouse Waldensians

In total, we have approximately fifty names of Waldensian Brothers active in this region in the early fourteenth century.⁴¹⁸ The vast majority of these names derive from the Toulouse inquisition headed by Bernard Gui between 1307 and 1323. Although the depositions of this process have not survived, we do have access to his sentences, given in a series of recorded public sermons starting in 1308.⁴¹⁹ Raymond himself appears in these documents as part of the sentence of his companions John of Vienne and Huguette, though unfortunately there is no record of his own sentence among Gui's collection.⁴²⁰ The commonalities between the names that appear in Gui's sentences and those that Raymond and his companions mention in their interrogations were first noted by Duvernoy in a footnote to his Latin edition.⁴²¹ He proposes seven persons who are potentially named in both sources, though in most cases their identities cannot be confirmed with certainty due to the imprecise nomenclature. For instance, Raymond mentions a 'deacon Bartholomew', which Duvernoy suggests could refer to Bartholomew of Cajarc, a Brother who helped set up a colony of Burgundian Waldensians in the diocese of Rodez.⁴²² We are on stronger ground with Waldensian Brother John Moran, who is named precisely by Raymond and also appears extensively in lists of Brothers given by

⁴¹⁸ Audisio, *The Waldensian Dissent*, 34.

⁴¹⁹ The original Latin edition was published by Philip van Limborch in 1692, following his *Historia inquisitionis*; Philip van Limborch, *Historia inquisitionis: cui subjungitur Liber sententiarum inquisitionis Tholosanae ab anno Christi MCCCVII ad annum MCCCXXIII* (Amsterdam, 1692). The manuscript was considered lost until a copy was rediscovered at the British Library in 1973, under the code Add. Ms. 4697, where it had been conserved since 1756. The full history of the document is covered in its most recent edition by Annette Pales-Gobilliard, which includes a French translation alongside the Latin; Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 14-25.

⁴²⁰ Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1265-75.

⁴²¹ CRC, 100-101, footnote 36.

⁴²² His name appears alongside other Brothers in several confessions of individuals from this diocese. Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1490-2, 1494-6, 1500-2, 1508-10.

various believers during the Toulouse inquisitions.⁴²³ Similarly, John of Cernon and Gerard the Provençal both appear in the testimony of Huguette⁴²⁴ Finally, the *majoral* Christin – identified by Raymond as having succeeded John of Lorraine in this role – is also a recurring figure in Gui's sentences, occasionally with the additional information that he held the title of *majoral*.⁴²⁵

To what extent Raymond was involved with the Toulouse Brothers remains unclear. Certainly, he is not himself mentioned in any of the sentences besides those of his companions, even though he was ordained in the movement in the late 1290s.⁴²⁶ From the limited evidence of belief in the Toulouse sentences, these Brothers' views seem to be in accordance with Raymond's testimony. The most common error that the Brothers' were said to have taught believers was that oath-taking was a sin.⁴²⁷ Purgatory was also a significant issue; Hugh of Cernon saw John Moran (among others) at his home and heard from him that Purgatory did not exist.⁴²⁸ Other infractions levelled against believers were more generic, principally sheltering heretics in their houses, visiting them, eating with them, confessing to them, and believing that they were good men. It is not insignificant therefore that the two main theological beliefs present in the Toulouse sentences were also the two beliefs at the core of Raymond's disagreements with the Church. However, there is at least one instance of potential divergence in belief involving a Brother named by Raymond. The *majoral* Christin is named as the inspiration for the conversion of a certain priest to the Waldensian sect, who was convinced by Christin's views on the sacraments, that 'it would be better for you to be a swine-keeper than to celebrate mass, because you are in a state of mortal sin.'⁴²⁹ Clearly this statement is very much at odds with the evidence from Raymond's deposition, in which he consistently and unambiguously rejects Donatism throughout. The idea that Christin's position as *majoral* necessitates that he must be representative of all Waldensian Brothers' beliefs is readily dismissed. In the first instance this does not accord with evidence from other sources. As well as Raymond's evidence, Donatism is certainly not prominent amongst the sentences given to the Burgundian Brothers and their believers, as noted above the errors of oath-taking and purgatory, as well as the unlawful assumption of clerical duties, were far more common in Gui's sermons. Secondly, the concept of a rigid hierarchical transmission of ideas has been challenged by recent scholarship even within

⁴²³ Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1065-9, 1077-81.

⁴²⁴ *CHC*, 523; Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1019-27, 1499-513, 1537-41.

⁴²⁵ *CRC*, 100; Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1469.

⁴²⁶ Raymond claims his ordination happened around twenty years prior to his capture, c.1299; *CRC*, 49.

⁴²⁷ e.g. Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1062, 1066, 1070, 1078, 1084.

⁴²⁸ Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1078-80.

⁴²⁹ 'Melius esset vobis quod essetis custos porcorum quam quia celebratis missam, quia estis in peccato mortali.' Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1128.

Church-approved monastic Orders.⁴³⁰ It follows that a clandestine Order of this type operating on the basis of intermittent contact between members over a large area could only be less likely to maintain a top-down control of its members' religious views.

If Christin's views on Donatism were an accurate account, this inconsistency might be explained via a curious statement from Raymond's deposition. After naming Christin as the *majoral* to succeed John of Lorraine, Raymond describes him as 'simple and without letters.'⁴³¹ This description seems out of place, not only in that it appears to be negative, but that Raymond gives any additional information at all – aside from John of Lorraine, he only mentions other Brothers by name without giving any opinion or detail on their characters. Duvernoy flagged this phrase in a footnote to his Latin edition, and hypothesized that, although the statement appears negative to the mind of the inquisitor and modern historian, perhaps Raymond meant it as a compliment of Christin's apostolic simplicity.⁴³² However, this interpretation just doesn't fit with the wider context of Raymond's testimony. Although he certainly aspired to imitate the Apostles closely, he never once intimates that this requires the renunciation of learning. In fact, the opposite is true, Raymond actively sought out education throughout his career as a Brother, and repeatedly highlights the Order's emphasis on biblical instruction and study in his process.⁴³³ In his descriptions of John of Lorraine, whom Raymond 'loved very much', what Raymond admires most about him is his wisdom and learning, not his simplicity and illiteracy.⁴³⁴ The disparity in degrees of education between the two *majorals* is not necessarily surprising. Raymond's personal experiences of education through Franciscan convents was hardly typical or readily available to all in the period, considering there were only 700-800 such schools operating in the fourteenth century in total.⁴³⁵ Shulamith Shahar is probably closer to the truth when she states that Raymond may have intended the contrast between John and Christin, and that he felt Christin unworthy of succeeding John as *majoral*.⁴³⁶ This interpretation fits the evidence from Gui's sentences; if Christin was an advocate of Donatism and either had insufficient education or rejected learning outright, Raymond would have good reason to compare him poorly with previous *majorals*, and feel he was misrepresented by these religious views.

⁴³⁰ Micol Long, 'Condiscipuli sumus: The Roots of Horizontal Learning in Monastic Culture', in Micol Long, Tjamke Sniijders and Steven Vanderputten (eds.), *Horizontal Learning in the High Middle Ages: Peer-to-Peer Knowledge Transfer in Religious Communities* (Amsterdam, 2019), 47-64.

⁴³¹ CRC, 100.

⁴³² CRC, 100, footnote 34.

⁴³³ See e.g. CRC 62-63, 101-2.

⁴³⁴ '...quem multum dilexit...', CRC 100.

⁴³⁵ Andreas Rüther, 'Educational Communities in German Convents of the Franciscan and Dominican Provinces before 1350', in Ronald Begley and Joseph Koterski (eds.), *Medieval Education* (New York, 2005), 128.

⁴³⁶ Shahar, *Women in a Medieval Heretical Sect*, 77.

Euan Cameron suggested that Raymond always remained ‘at arm's length’ from the Brothers named in the Toulouse inquisition, and the above analysis concurs with this interpretation.⁴³⁷ Although there are several common names that confirm a definite communicative link between the two groups, there are far more names that do not appear in Fournier’s investigation, and Raymond himself is absent from the lists of Toulouse Brothers. Raymond certainly has much in common with the Burgundians, and the overall prominence of the rejection of oath-taking and purgatory, and confession taken at believers’ homes is enough to suggest a common religious culture. We also know that one of Raymond’s *majorals*, the aforementioned Christin, was a member of the Burgundian contingent, which implies a sense of hierarchical unity. However, there is good reason to believe that Raymond’s religiosity diverged from some of his brethren, and the disparity between his descriptions of John of Lorraine and Christin cannot be ignored. An integrated solution to this problem proposes that Raymond’s relationship with the Burgundians is evidence of non-uniformity within the same Waldensian community in this period. Although united by shared religious values, history and important figures, there was space for debate and disagreement on certain issues, such as Donatism, judicial killing and the importance of learning. This interpretation supports the work of Grado Merlo and Pilar Jiménez-Sánchez, who have argued for the existence of ‘waldensianisms’ and ‘catharisms’ respectively, yet without reducing the Waldensian movement as a whole to a set of disparate provincial communities that had little to do with each other.⁴³⁸ Instead we must allow for a much more complex arrangement of interpersonal relationships between groups often separated by considerable distance but with a shared sense of religious identity, that defined their theological beliefs not through rigid hierarchical obedience but with far more reliance on horizontal learning through discussion and debate between equals.

2.6.b. A Three-tiered System?

One of the most striking pieces of evidence from Raymond’s process is his account of a three-tiered structure within his Order. He explains a system in which one is ordained first as a ‘deacon’, and later elevated to a ‘priest’, with the entire Order being overseen by a superior minister known as a *majoral*.⁴³⁹ This mode of operation is unique to Raymond’s testimony – its only other appearance is in the *practica* of Bernard Gui, which postdates Raymond’s confession and undoubtedly uses his deposition as a source for his writings on Waldensians. In other inquisition testimonies, there is no

⁴³⁷ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 92.

⁴³⁸ Merlo, *Valdesi e valdismi*; Jiménez-Sánchez, *Les catharismes: Modèles dissidents du christianisme médiéval (xiiie-xiiiie Siècles)* (Rennes, 2014).

⁴³⁹ CRC, 55-6.

such distinction made between the Waldensian Brothers, though there is some evidence of the existence of superior ministers.⁴⁴⁰ Among other heterodox communities, although there were some descriptions of intricate tiered hierarchies,⁴⁴¹ most scholarly interpretations mark a simple distinction between elite *perfecti* and the majority of believers (*credentes*).⁴⁴² Raymond himself struggles to differentiate between the role of a deacon and a priest in his sect, and his descriptions of the ordination of deacons and priests are virtually identical besides the different titles.⁴⁴³ The responsibilities of the two orders are extremely similar, both come together in the election of a new *majoral*,⁴⁴⁴ and both are capable of preaching.⁴⁴⁵ Raymond makes the distinction that only priests can hear confessions, and that the principal role of the deacons is to provide for the day-to-day needs of the priests.⁴⁴⁶

Cameron has offered the explanation that Raymond was here attempting to present his Order in a manner more intelligible to the Church, by equating roles within his movement to different Catholic orders.⁴⁴⁷ Whilst there may be some truth to this, ordination itself appears to play a key role in Raymond's religious life, as a vital requirement to join the Order and pursue the perfect apostolic life.⁴⁴⁸ Indeed, the identification of the three orders of deacon, priest and bishop are drawn directly from a desire to imitate the earliest Christian Church.⁴⁴⁹ The level of detail Raymond gives on various rites of ordination, as well as the overtly monastic nature of his descriptions, leaves little doubt that this sacrament played an important role in the movement. There is also little reason to doubt that there was some gradation of seniority and hierarchy within the community of Brothers, as we have evidence of *majorals* from both the Toulouse and Pamiers inquisitions. One possible explanation for Raymond's statements is that the system he described played into his strategy of

⁴⁴⁰ The Brother Christin is described as a superior minister or *majoral* on several occasions; Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 36, 216, 221-3, 375.

⁴⁴¹ Most famously the alleged 'Charter of Niquinta' which describes an 1167 meeting in which a Cathar Pope and council of bishops elected new members and adjusted diocesan boundaries. Franjo Šanjek, O.P., "Le rassemblement hérétique de Saint-Félix-de-Caraman (1167) et les églises cathares au XIII^e siècle", *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 67 (1972), 772-9; The authenticity of this document has been challenged by more recent analyses of the source. Monique Zerner, 'Mise au point sur les cathares devant l'histoire et retour sur l'histoire du catharisme en discussion: le débat sur la charte de Niquinta n'est pas clos', *Journal des Savants* 2, no. 1 (2005), 253-73.

⁴⁴² Donald Sullivan, 'Cathars', in William Jonston and Claire Renkin (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Monasticism*, vol. I (London; New York, 2013), 252.

⁴⁴³ *CRC*, 57-8.

⁴⁴⁴ *CRC*, 55-6.

⁴⁴⁵ *CRC*, 71

⁴⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴⁷ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 81.

⁴⁴⁸ At one stage he states that the Brothers' perfection lies chiefly in their ordination; *CRC*, 71.

⁴⁴⁹ The orders of bishop (e.g. Titus 1:5), priest (e.g. 1 Tim 5:17) and deacon (e.g. Acts 6:1-6) are found in the New Testament, and Raymond's description of the Brothers' roles match closely with these biblical precedents.

avoiding naming any of his living associates. By presenting himself as a mere deacon, Raymond diminishes his importance in the movement and therefore his knowledge of other members, since he would not be hearing confessions from believers nor be responsible for the training of junior Brothers. He also claims not to have seen the *majoral* celebrate mass, as this is an event reserved for priests, and consequently avoids questions on who he saw there, despite his overall knowledge of the process and intimate friendship with John of Lorraine stretching his credibility somewhat.⁴⁵⁰ This strategy is surely also present in Raymond's claim that he had never preached, even though deacons were technically permitted to do so, evading the problem of with who and where he did this.⁴⁵¹ This claim is directly contradicted by statements from his companions, who claim that Raymond taught them a variety of religious principles.⁴⁵²

In summary, the unique nature of the Raymond's three-tiered hierarchy in the wider body of sources precludes us from accepting it without question. The idea of the existence of junior and senior Brothers within the movement is relatively uncontroversial, and supported by additional sources, though perhaps the names Raymond ascribes to these gradations are inventions of his own, derived from his readings of Scripture, to make his group appear closer to an approved Catholic Order such as the Franciscans. Raymond's self-identification as a 'deacon' should also be viewed with suspicion, as it runs contrary to evidence that he was an experienced, educated and well-known figure in the Order, and has a dual-purpose of allowing him to avoid certain questions and feign ignorance on the identities of Brothers being sought by the inquisition.

2.6.c. *Recruitment and Initiation*

In session **R9**, Raymond sets out his version of the process by which new members are selected to join the Order. There is little doubt here that it is the Waldensian's intention to focus on the importance of the education and instruction of new members. The 'adolescent' who wishes to join must be from a 'faithful family', live a good, well-behaved life, and crucially be capable of learning. Grado Merlo has demonstrated the extensive nature of the study and education a Brother would have to go through according to Raymond's testimony, beginning with five to six years of Bible study, followed by an apprenticeship with a senior Brother who would continue the novice's instruction, not to mention Raymond's own experience of studying at a wide variety of theological

⁴⁵⁰ CRC, 56.

⁴⁵¹ CRC, 101.

⁴⁵² Agnes reports he instructed her on swearing, while John de Vienne's list of articles of faith and the sacraments are abridged copies of Raymond's versions; CAF, 134; CJV, 267.

schools across France.⁴⁵³ However, it is important to consider the possibility that Raymond's case is not necessarily typical. It has already been noted above that Christin, a *majoral* after John of Lorraine, was described by Raymond as 'simple and without letters.'⁴⁵⁴ Even if this were, as Duvernoy suggests, to be considered a compliment of Christin's evangelical simplicity, it runs somewhat counter to the idea that an extensive education was a core principle of the movement if an uneducated man could rise to its highest rank. Additionally, Raymond implies a far laxer standard for admission to the rank of deacon in a different session, in which the 'sole condition' is that the novice 'knows the Our Father and the Hail Mary and also that he leads a good life.'⁴⁵⁵ We must also consider Raymond's strategy of presenting a fully-orthodox movement, because by emphasising the existence of members who were formally educated in Scripture over a significant period of time, he could dismiss the accusation commonly levelled at Waldensians that they lacked the theological education required to preach, for example in Alan of Lille's attacks on the movement.⁴⁵⁶

However, Raymond's case is sufficient to suggest that his community did not reject learning outright, and his respect for John of Lorraine stemmed in no small part from his intimate knowledge of Scripture. His description of the recruitment process may represent a conflict between the theoretical ideal and the practical reality of operating a sect under the constant threat of persecution. Since Raymond himself had such an extensive education and valued learning so highly, it is understandable that his description of recruitment should mirror his own experience, and that he believed all new Brothers should have similar training. This idealised view must have inevitably clashed with the difficulties of providing this standard of education to all brothers whilst maintaining an Order that was both clandestine and transient. Therefore, we should read Raymond's experience as valid, but not necessarily representative, and instead conclude that there remained a great deal of scope for variation in the levels of the Brothers' educations, and the requirements for their initiation to the Order.

Regardless of the level of instruction novices received, we can be reasonably certain that a requirement for their joining the movement was an official ordination. Not only does Raymond state that ordination was a necessary part of becoming a Brother and pursuing a life of 'perfection', he also describes in reasonable detail the manner in which Brothers are ordained.⁴⁵⁷ This process is very similar for all three tiers of membership that Raymond describes. The prospective new member is

⁴⁵³ Merlo, *Valdesi e Valdismi*, 50.

⁴⁵⁴ '...ydiota et sine litteris.', *CRC*, 100.

⁴⁵⁵ '...eos ordinatur aliquis in dyaconem solummodo quod sciat Pater noster et Ave Maria, et aliter sit homo bono vite.' *CRC*, 71.

⁴⁵⁶ Alan of Lille, *De fide catholica*, II.i, in *PL* 210, 377-80.

⁴⁵⁷ *CRC*, 55-9.

brought before a group of Brothers, who unanimously elect him for the position of deacon, priest or *majoral*. The elected then kneels before the *majoral*, who says the Our Father and the Hail Mary and lays hands on the supplicant whilst praying that they might receive the Holy Spirit. Raymond makes the distinction that in the case of priests, both the *majoral* and all other priests present perform the laying on of hands.

This description is representative of Raymond's depiction of the Order's rituals in general. The simplicity of the ceremony is highly apparent, as there is little more involved than a prayer and the imposition of hands. In a later session, Raymond confirms that there was no material element to the ritual, and that he received neither 'a Gospel book, nor a robe, nor anything else' as part of his ordination.⁴⁵⁸ Additionally, he goes to great lengths to defend this formulation of ordination with reference to biblical passages. Not only does he reference sections in support of this formulation of the sacrament in general, but also provides support for the idea that this simple ceremony should apply to deacons, priests, *and* bishops.⁴⁵⁹ This attempt to closely imitate the primitive Church of the Gospels through the support of scriptural passages permeates Raymond's descriptions of the Brothers' religiosity, and will be a repeating theme throughout the following analysis.

2.7. Religiosity of the Order

In the same manner to Raymond's personal beliefs on oath-taking, purgatory and so on, his description of the Brothers' lifestyle and practices centres on the fundamental principle of Apostolic imitation. The origins and popularity of this concept have been reviewed above, but it will be important to keep in mind that all of the following rituals and practices can be interpreted through this lens. Although Raymond is not extensively questioned on the apostolic lifestyle in general,⁴⁶⁰ he does go as far as to say that the Brothers followed an austere lifestyle involving vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, and a daily ritual of prayers.⁴⁶¹ The Brothers' lives were largely based on the typical mendicant principles of renouncing manual labour and having their daily necessities provided by the laypeople they ministered to,⁴⁶² though the realities of persecution would have precluded the

⁴⁵⁸ '...non dedit ei librum Evangeliorum nec stolam nec aliquid aliud.' *CRC*, 70.

⁴⁵⁹ Raymond quotes Acts 1:24-26, Titus 1:5 and Acts 6 as establishing the procedure for the ordination of bishops, priests and deacons respectively. *CRC*, 58.

⁴⁶⁰ This lack of detail possibly stems from Fournier's prior assumptions on the errors of Waldensians and their relative importance. Whilst Apostolic poverty was certainly important to the Brothers', this issue was more closely associated with the Franciscan Spirituals in this period. See chapter six below for further comparison of the two groups.

⁴⁶¹ *CRC*, 71, 104-5.

⁴⁶² *CRC*, 71.

possibility of a truly mendicant lifestyle of itinerant preaching and begging for alms.⁴⁶³ Merlo has emphasised the Brothers' evangelical radicalism, and reminds us that even the terminology Raymond uses such as *perfectus* and *majoral* stem from specific New Testament passages.⁴⁶⁴ This form of apostolic lifestyle was reasonably generic in the context of the time period, common to a host of different religious sub-groups both heterodox and orthodox. However, Raymond's testimony also includes aspects of the Brothers' religious lives which seem far more specific to their own community and are not so obviously shared with other movements which grounded themselves in the principles of Apostolic poverty, such as the mendicant Friars.

2.7.a. Confession & Mass

Although Raymond listed all seven sacraments in his defence of his Order's orthodoxy, it is clear that the Waldensians placed a higher degree of importance on three sacraments in particular. The first, ordination (which could also be included as part Raymond's 'imposition of hands' sacrament), has been discussed already. However, the most significant sacrament involved in the Brothers' day-to-day religious lives was undoubtedly that of penance and confession. This topic was certainly of special interest to the inquisition. In Bernard Gui's sentences the act of confessing to heretics was one of the principal accusations levelled against *credens* as it represented an instance of connection between the layperson and the heretical *perfectus*.⁴⁶⁵ Therefore, one must be cautious in overestimating the significance of this ritual due to excessive inquisitorial questioning on the subject. Despite this, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the act of confession did play a significant role in the Brothers' religious lives, Fournier himself does not spend an unreasonable amount of time asking questions on the subject, and Raymond often references the practice without being directly asked about it.

An example of the latter instance comes during his description of the ritual of ordination summarised above. An additional component of this practice directly involves confession, as the ordinand is required to make a complete confession of all sins before he is able to be received into the Order.⁴⁶⁶ In the case of the ordination of a new *majoral*, the candidate not only makes a general confession of all his sins by category to the assembly of Brothers, but additionally confesses in secret

⁴⁶³ For a closer examination of the Brothers' movements and its relationship with inquisitorial persecution, see chapter three below.

⁴⁶⁴ Merlo, *Valdesi e Valdismi*, 69.

⁴⁶⁵ Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, e.g. 1065-9.

⁴⁶⁶ CRC, 53.

every sin he can recall to another superior minister.⁴⁶⁷ In the ordination process of a deacon, Raymond mentions unprompted that the laying on of hands takes place whilst the ordinand is confessing.⁴⁶⁸ Later, in session R12, Raymond gives a detailed account of the process of confession and penance, which is worth transcribing in full to convey the precise detail and language of the description:

“In this manner, he said, the *majoral* or priest have the one who would like to confess sit next to them, and when that person has confessed all his sins that he can remember, and the priest has interrogated them as he sees fit, and considering the quality of the person and the sins they have now confessed, then the *majoral* or priest induces in the penitent as far as he is able tears both internal and external, showing them through threats in Holy Scripture how they offended God by committing the preceding sins, and how they have lost the Kingdom of Heaven through said sins, and that they have made themselves worthy of hell. The confessor tells them to hold continual sorrow in their heart on account of these sins, citing the Apostle: “Continuous sorrow is in my heart” (Romans 9:2), and continues by bringing forth various threats in Scripture against sinners, until the penitent weeps, or the confessor sees that they are very sad and sorrowful. He then asks them if they regret greatly the sins they have committed, and if they reply yes, and show this through external signs, he asks them if they want to guard against the sins they have committed and against all others, and tells them to remember the wife of Lot, who was changed to a pillar of salt for looking back, and to “Go and sin no more, lest a worse thing happen to you,” (John 5:14, Vulgate), and also what God said to the woman who had fallen to adultery: “Nor do I condemn you, go and sin no more.” (John 8:11, Vulgate). When the penitent says that he does not propose to return to his previous sins nor others, then the *majoral* or priest asks if they will have continual sorrow for the preceding sins until death, citing the Psalm: “Following the multitude of sorrows in my heart, your consolations have gladdened my spirit.” (Psalm 93:19, Vulgate). Once this is done, the priest or *majoral*, lifting his eyes to heaven and recalling in his heart what God did when he resurrected Lazarus, invokes God, saying: “May the almighty Lord God who is able to remove all sins and from whom ‘all good an excellent things come from’ (James 1:17, Vulgate), by his mercy absolve you of all your sins, everything that you have committed from the hour of your birth up until the current hour, and I impose for all your sins such and such a penance up until such and such a time, on the condition that you have sorrow in your heart for your sins until death.”⁴⁶⁹

⁴⁶⁷ CRC, 56.

⁴⁶⁸ CRC, 54.

⁴⁶⁹ “Nam, ut dixit, eorum maior et presbiter facit sedere iuxta se illum qui sibi vult confiteri, et cum confessus fuerit omnia peccata sua de quibus recordatur, et ipse interrogaverit eum iuxta id quod ei videtur, considerata qualitate persone et peccatorum iam confessorum, tunc maior vel presbiter inducit confitentem quantum potest ad lacrimas tam interiores quam exteriores, ostendendo ei per minas Sanctarum Scripturarum quantum Deum offendit predicta peccata committendo, et quomodo regnum celeste amisit propter dicta peccata, et inferno se dignum facit. Dicit etiam ei quod debet habere continuum dolorem in corde de predictis peccatis, inducendo dictum Apostoli: ‘continuus dolor est cordi meo’ et hoc faciendo perseverat propos diversas minas

Merlo notes 'the emotional intensity of the penitential moment' which comes through in Raymond's description, in which the priest quotes scriptural passages that promise vengeance against sinners until the penitent is driven to tears.⁴⁷⁰ The level of detail that Raymond provides suggests the process was an extremely important religious experience to the Brothers. The specific reference to several relevant biblical quotations implies that Raymond had an intimate understanding of the process from personal experience, and underlines the importance to the Order of a scriptural foundation for religious ritual. Although Merlo focuses on the importance of confession between Brothers, and the significance of the shared moment between 'individuals totally dedicated to Christ',⁴⁷¹ this formulation undoubtedly applied to believers as well. Raymond's language does not specify the identity of the penitent, who is simply 'the one who wishes to confess', and evidence from both the Toulouse inquisition and Raymond's companion Huguette tell us that believers regularly took part in this process.⁴⁷² Although there is no direct evidence that Raymond himself heard confession, his familiarity with the ritual and position as the only Brother in a house of lay followers indicates a high probability that he did. We must also consider that since this act brought a Brother into direct contact with believers, Raymond may have been hesitant to admit to this role in order to avoid naming those from whom he had heard confession. This may have played into his self-identification as a deacon, as he ascribes the role of confessor only to priests and *majoralis*, thereby excusing himself from involvement. The importance placed on confession by the Languedocian Waldensians is in stark contrast to the Cathar position which rejected the sacraments including confession.⁴⁷³ Former dualist Ranier Sacconi affirmed that Cathars

Scripture contra peccantes, quousque lacrimatur peccator, vel videt quod multum tristis et dolens est, et tunc interrogat eum si multum dolet de peccatis suis commissis per eum, quo respondente quod sic, et per signa exteriora hoc idem ostendente, interrogat eum si vult se custodire a peccatis que iam commisit ei ab omnibus aliis, dicens ei quod memor esse debet uxoris Loth, que respiciens retro versa est in statuum salis, et 'Vade, iam amplius noli peccare, ne deterius tibi contingat', et illud quod Dominus dixit mulieri in adulterio deprehense: 'Nec ego te condempnabo. Vade et iam amplius noli peccare.' Cumque dictus penitens dixerit quod est in proposito suo non revertendi ad peccata preterita nec alia, tunc dictus maioralis sive presbiter dicit ei si vult continuum dolorem habere de peccatis predictis usque ad mortem, inducens illud Psalmi: 'Secundum multitudinem dolorum meorum corde meo consolationes tue letificaverunt animam meam.' Quibus factis dictus maioralis vel presbiter, elevatis oculis in celum et memor existens in suo corde facti Domini, quando Lazarum de monumento suscitavit, invocat Deum, dicens: 'Dominus Deus omnipotens qui potest dimittere omnia peccata et a quo omne bonum et datum optimum descendit, ipse per suam misericordiam te absolvat ab omnibus peccatis tuis, quecumque commisisti ab hora nativitatis tue usque ad hanc horam, et ego iniungo tibi pro omnibus peccatis tuis talem penitentiam usque ad tale tempus, sic tamen quod dolorem cordis habeas usque ad mortem de peccatis tuis.', *CRC*, 68-9.

⁴⁷⁰ Merlo, *Valdesi e Valdismi*, 65.

⁴⁷¹ Ibid.

⁴⁷² For Waldensian lay confession in the Toulouse inquisition see for example the believers interrogated in the diocese of Auch: Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1044-88; Huguette admits to confessing to a *majoral* 'often', *CHC*, 144.

⁴⁷³ Rebecca Rist, 'Lupi Rapaces in Ovium Vestimentis': Heretics and Heresy in Papal Correspondence', in Antonio Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (Melton: Boydell & Brewer, 2016), 230.

rejected contrition, confession and satisfaction through works in their way of penance.⁴⁷⁴ The strength and intensity of the Brothers' feelings towards the sacrament may in part relate to this Cathar denouncement of it, as the Waldensian community in southern France had a long history of combating dualist heresy.⁴⁷⁵

In addition to ordination and confession, Raymond also describes a third sacramental ritual performed by the Brothers: a yearly mass performed on Maundy Thursday. This 'commemorative meal' is a uniquely Waldensian ritual that is described by Raymond in some detail.⁴⁷⁶ Once again, the foundation of this ritual is a precise and literal imitation of what is found in the New Testament, in this case a re-enactment of the Last Supper. The *majoral*, who leads proceedings, does according to Raymond 'absolutely nothing beyond what the Lord did at the Last Supper.'⁴⁷⁷ The food prepared for the meal is blessed by the *majoral*, but not consecrated. Crucially this is not tantamount to a denial of transubstantiation, but rather a consequence of the nature of the ritual, which is performed solely 'in the memory of the Last Supper.'⁴⁷⁸ According to a prayer written in one of Raymond's books, the reason for the lack of consecration is that the Brothers did not feel worthy enough to eat the flesh of Christ.⁴⁷⁹ Unlike confession, it appears this event was restricted only to ordained Brothers, as this meal was 'not given to believers, and [the Brothers] did not even wish them to know about it.'⁴⁸⁰ This has been highlighted by Merlo as underlining the clerical dimension of Raymond's Order, that emphasised a marked separation between ordained members and lay followers.⁴⁸¹ This certainly seems to represent a shift from earlier Waldensian tradition. During the inquisition in Quercy almost a century earlier, thirty of the 165 Waldensian lay believers interrogated had either helped with the Maundy Thursday meal or eaten at it.⁴⁸² An alternative explanation for this change is the increased pressure of inquisitorial persecution after this date, which forced the Brothers to adopt a more clandestine approach to their rituals, only gathering together with those

⁴⁷⁴ Ranier Sacconi, *Summa*, 44.

⁴⁷⁵ See subsection 'Identity' below. See also chapter five for the importance of preaching against heresy to the early Waldensians.

⁴⁷⁶ Raymond first describes the ritual in session **R9** when asked about the celebration of mass. He later provides a more detailed account of the meal when questioned about it directly in session **R11** two days later. *CRC*, 61, 67-8.

⁴⁷⁷ '...non omnio aliud facit eorum maioralis dum conficit corpus Domini quam quod Dominus fecit in cena...', *CRC*, 61.

⁴⁷⁸ '...in memoriam dominice Cene...', *CRC*, 67.

⁴⁷⁹ '...Oh Lord, I do not dare offer you such an offering with my impure hands and eat the most sacred body of our Lord Jesus Christ your Son with my polluted mouth...'; '...Domine, non sum ausus tantum manus tibi offerre per inmundas manus et polluto ore sacratissimum corpus Domini nostri Ihesu Christi filii tui sumere...', *CRC*, 67.

⁴⁸⁰ 'Et non datur aliquid de predictis credentibus eorum nec eciam volunt quod hec ipsi sciant.', *CRC*, 68.

⁴⁸¹ Merlo, *Valdesi e Valdismi*, 66-7.

⁴⁸² Taylor, *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Medieval Quercy*, 207.

they knew they could trust, rather than risking a single lay believer exposing all their identities to the inquisition at once.

This commemorative ritual appears to be a specifically Waldensian version of Easter mass, and it therefore remains unclear what role the more traditional Catholic mass (involving the consumption of the consecrated host) played in the Brothers' religious lives. Although the Maundy Thursday meal was only commemorative, this was not tantamount to a denial of transubstantiation. Raymond claims that the *majoral* (though not priests or deacons) is capable of consecrating the host, but that he has never seen him do so.⁴⁸³ Similarly, after the above description of the blessing of the meal, he claims that the *majoral* also consecrates the bread and wine 'sometimes', and that this was more likely to take place around Easter.⁴⁸⁴ Raymond makes the distinction that the *majoral's* mass differs from that given in the Roman Church, as he wears no special garments nor stands in front of an altar, but simply makes the sign of the cross and repeats the words Jesus said at the Last Supper.⁴⁸⁵ Altogether, there is very little to differentiate Raymond's descriptions of mass from the purely commemorative blessing, and if the Brothers truly felt unworthy to eat Christ's flesh it seems unlikely that this was an important part of their religious customs. However, there is nothing in Raymond's testimony to suggest the Brothers did not view Catholic mass as a proper Christian tradition. Audisio has rightly noted that the Brothers' views on mass are a reflection of their clerical nature and their rejection of Donatism, and that it was the Donatist trend which flourished among Italian and later German communities which led to suspicions over the veracity of masses.⁴⁸⁶ For Raymond's community, it appears that the annual Last Supper ritual effectively replaced the sacrament of mass for the Brothers. Since this occasion was held separately from lay believers, only the *majoral* had the authority to perform it, and further considering that the Brothers were happy for them to receive sacraments from Catholic priests, we can be reasonably certain that mass was not a regular part of the Brothers' ministry. Raymond's lack of enthusiasm on the importance of mass and its replacement with a purely commemorative ritual may also be indicative of a transition towards the outright denial of transubstantiation found in later Waldensian communities.⁴⁸⁷

⁴⁸³ CRC, 61.

⁴⁸⁴ '...in die Pasche aliquando conficiat corpus et sanguinem Christi...', CRC, 68.

⁴⁸⁵ CRC, 67.

⁴⁸⁶ Audisio, *The Waldensian Dissent*, 116.

⁴⁸⁷ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 275-6.

2.7.b. Preaching

In addition to hearing confessions, we can also say with certainty that the Brothers preach to their lay faithful, at least in the general sense of transmitting certain religious ideas and principles. In both the Toulouse inquisition and Pamiers inquisitions there are examples of lay believers hearing from a certain Brother that swearing an oath was sinful, that purgatory did not exist, that all forms of killing were wrong, and so on.⁴⁸⁸ Raymond is more reticent about this practice in his deposition than he is on other issues, but once again we can attribute this to his overall reluctance to name names; clearly the process of preaching involved interactions, places and people that he would rather not discuss. However, he does give some insight into the process. He assigns the power to preach as being in the hands of the *majoral* first, and then the priests. Again, the exclusion of the 'deacon' status here conveniently excuses Raymond from having any personal involvement with lay believers he might be able to name. The Waldensian seems to be aware of the polemic against unauthorised preaching, as he attempts to present a system which mirrors the Catholic Church in so far as the *majoral* gives permission to the various priests to preach to the faithful.⁴⁸⁹ However, his defence is somewhat muddled by the problem that the *majoral* should require permission from the Pope, whom Raymond insists his Order recognises and respects.⁴⁹⁰ His solution – that the *majoral* acquires his permission directly from God as he does not 'get along' with the Pope – is unconvincing and lacks the scriptural support and detail that he so often provides for his Order's practices.⁴⁹¹ Considering the above, it would be unwise to take Raymond's statements as evidence for a formalised and hierarchical clerical structure, as the importance placed on permission is clearly being derived from the inquisitor's questions rather than Raymond, who is attempting to fit his Order's preaching within the orthodox framework being presented to him.

In terms of the act of preaching itself, Raymond minimises its importance to the Brothers, claiming that they 'preach rarely, as they do not have a public.'⁴⁹² Similarly, he applies this logic to himself, claiming that he would preach if given permission by the *majoral*, but only on the condition that he had 'a public' to preach to.⁴⁹³ Since Raymond had alternative motives for diminishing the Brothers' involvement in preaching, there is good reason to believe that this is a genuine example of a deponent practising the kind of sophistry Bernard Gui wrote of in his inquisitor's manual.⁴⁹⁴ By

⁴⁸⁸ Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1044-88; *CHC*, 142-3; *CAF*, 134.

⁴⁸⁹ *CRC*, 77-8.

⁴⁹⁰ '...The Pope holds the keys to the kingdom of heaven...'; '...Papa habent claves regni celorum...', *CRC*, 79.

⁴⁹¹ '...non potest cum eo convenire...', *CRC*, 78.

⁴⁹² '...licet raro predicent quia populum peccato inobediencie.', *CRC*, 78.

⁴⁹³ '...solum quod haberet populum cui posset predicare, licet, ut dixit, modo non habeant populum cui predicare possent.', *CRC*, 78.

⁴⁹⁴ Bernard Gui, *Manuel de l'inquisiteur*, vol. I, ed. and trans. G. Mollat (Paris, 1926), 64-72.

placing special emphasis on the word *populum* in this context, Raymond brings to mind the kind of general public preaching which was only permitted to approved Catholic ministers, and had been denied to Waldensians by the Church since at least 1184 outside the odd case of public debates in the early thirteenth century.⁴⁹⁵ However, this is a needlessly narrow definition of preaching, and selectively ignores the possibility of small-scale clandestine preaching between a Brother and a very small group of lay believers. This latter form of preaching indisputably formed a large part of the Brothers' religious duties. In addition to the evidence from lay believers' testimonies above, Raymond's description of his travels with John of Lorraine involve journeys between various houses of believers and other associates, in which the transmission of this religious ideology must have taken place.⁴⁹⁶ Raymond himself may have denied his role in preaching, but we know at the very least he taught both Agnes and Huguette various religious beliefs, and it is unthinkable that such a well-educated figure as himself would not be involved in the Brothers' preaching activities.

In summation, we should not allow Raymond's reticence on this subject to cloud the importance of preaching to his Order. Preaching of religious principles was a highly significant component of the Brothers' interaction with their lay followers, taking place in amenable safehouses across Southern France and beyond. Although the concept of permission to preach may not have been an important one, the ideal of spreading the word of Christ was a central component of the Brothers' religious identity as imitators of the earliest apostolic Church.

2.8. Conclusions

The depositions of the Waldensians in Fournier's register provide a fascinating insight into the lived religion of a marginalised group in the Late Middle Ages. Although the inquisitorial process dictated lines of questioning and was ultimately responsible for the recording and translation of statements, the depositions demonstrate the ability of the accused to have some forms of agency over how they approach the ordeal. This can be seen, for instance, refusing to swear on the basis of a prior illness (or in the case of Huguette a miscarriage), a strategy used by all four deponents. Raymond's more extensive process reveals a consistent strategy focused on conciliation without betraying his core religious principles, while his occasional criticisms of inquisitorial procedure represent evidence of his ability to have his own pre-prepared statements put on record. Approaches did differ, as with Huguette who was much more abrasive with her language when speaking of the Church and its leaders, but all four deponents pursued a general strategy of portraying themselves as devout

⁴⁹⁵ Audisio, *The Waldensian Dissent*, 24-34.

⁴⁹⁶ *CRC*, 100-2.

Christians, not denying their core beliefs concerning oath-taking, and remaining silent on the names and locations of living companions. The consistency in strategy, particularly the use of illness or miscarriage as an excuse to initially refuse to swear, must indicate a prior discussion between the deponents on what they should do if captured and questioned by the inquisition. The threat of capture and persecution loomed over all members of the Waldensian community at this time, so it is little surprise that such a plan of action might be prepared, yet the detail with which these strategies come through in the historical record may be unique to the Fournier record.

This record is also an excellent medium for analysing the deponents' religious values. The core religious value revealed in this way is the refusal to swear an oath. Although this topic may be over-emphasised by the inquisition's insistence on the oath as part of the legal process for recording testimony, there is remarkable consistency among the deponents in their obstinance on this particular point.⁴⁹⁷ Other issues common to the depositions include a denial of purgatory and prayers for the dead, and a rejection of killing, the latter ranging from Raymond and John's general uneasiness to Huguette's forthright repudiations. These beliefs are largely in line with what we know of Waldensian beliefs in this period, but these sources also allow the historian to note some of the complexities and individualities of religious values. As outlined above, the difference between Huguette and Raymond on the matter of judicial killing may not simply be the latter concealing his true opinions, but could genuinely represent a difference of emphasis on the teaching. Similarly, while the other three deny purgatory exists, Agnes has no issues with accepting it, instead making her stand on the subject of oath-taking alone. None of the deponents show any overt inclinations towards Donatism, yet there is some evidence of this idea being held by one of the group's *majorals*.⁴⁹⁸ While the overall character of belief is consistent across the testimonies, there is space for slightly differing interpretations and emphases which may offer a glimpse at the true complexity of personal religious belief which must have existed. These differences may have been exacerbated by the nature of clandestine life under threat of persecution, under which Brothers would have been unable to meet and discuss belief regularly, especially considering the isolation resulting from their geographically diffuse status.⁴⁹⁹

Also restrained by such practical concerns may have been the Brothers' rituals, and the religious lives they pursued. Raymond's deposition paints a picture of a pseudo-monastic lifestyle made up of regular schedules of prayer and contemplation, alongside vows of poverty, chastity and

⁴⁹⁷ Only Huguette appears to swear on a single occasion, though she later expresses great remorse for doing so.

⁴⁹⁸ See footnote 146 above.

⁴⁹⁹ For a more detailed exploration of this topic see chapter four below.

obedience. His testimony also highlights the ritual of the annual commemorative meal held around Easter, as well as the importance of the sacrament of confession, and of preaching to lay followers. Overall Raymond's description of his Order, with its three-tiered hierarchy and rigorous initiation process alongside a monastic life of prayer, likely represents an idealised vision of his group rather than the practical reality.⁵⁰⁰ However, we can still say that values such as the vows, regular prayer, and recruitment of individuals with good moral character remained significant in the Brothers' religious lives. Raymond's conception of the perfect religious life was inspired by the mendicant lifestyle of preaching and relying on alms for daily sustenance, but again this could hardly have been practical in the circumstances. Instead, the Brothers seem to have adapted the preceding values to suit a more clandestine existence. The level of detail and emotional intensity in Raymond's description of confession betrays the importance of this rite to the Brothers' religious lives. That the act of confession naturally held a degree of hiddenness as a private interaction between the penitent and confessor made it an ideal rite to cement the relationship between the Brothers and their lay believers. The significance of confession is also supported by numerous attestations in Gui's sentences. Both confession and preaching took place in the various Waldensian safe-houses dotted across southern France, allowing the Brothers to perform a clandestine version of the mendicant lifestyle followed by the first Waldensians,⁵⁰¹ receiving gifts and alms in return for providing private religious services away from the prying eyes of the inquisition.

⁵⁰⁰ We know from the analysis of his response strategy that he wished to make his Order look as similar to established Church Orders as possible.

⁵⁰¹ Valdes and his legacy clearly still influenced Raymond's group, such as in the latter's profession of faith. For further analysis of the ties to earlier Waldensian groups, see chapter five.

Chapter Three – Women and Gender

The testimonies of Agnes and Huguette present a rare opportunity for the historian to gain some sense of the lived experience of medieval laywomen. This chapter aims to add depth to our understanding of the role of laywomen in the movement, and more broadly the gender roles that operated within the Order. The first section will investigate the gendered perspective in the inquisition depositions, and outline the relevant pieces of evidence we have available to us. The chapter will then tackle the question of the existence of Waldensian Sisters – a parallel Order to Raymond’s Brothers – which have been posited as a component of the French Waldensian community in this period.⁵⁰² The final section will offer an original analysis of the role gender played within Raymond’s group, and investigates parallels between pious lay believers such as Huguette, and the Beguines, a contemporaneous lay spiritual movement.

The study of the role of women in medieval heretical sects did not become popular among historians until the latter half of the twentieth century. In 1920, Max Weber had suggested the idea that heretical groups may have allotted increased equality to women, but it wasn’t until the 1960s that the subject came under serious investigation.⁵⁰³ One of the pioneers of the history of women’s involvement with heresy was Herbert Grundmann, who dedicated several chapters of his *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter* to describing the popularity of various movements among women.⁵⁰⁴ Grundmann did not attribute this popularity to anything more than individual piety, but a more structuralist explanation was sought by later studies. Marxist historians argued that women were attracted to heresy in that it provided a means of dissent from the prevailing socio-economic system, in which wealth and power were inevitably expressed in religious terms. The most prominent proponent of this idea was Gottfried Koch, who developed Kautsky’s analysis of class struggle in the Cathar Church into a more general framework for all heresies.⁵⁰⁵ Arguing along similar lines, a competing structuralist explanation for heresy’s attractiveness to women presented involvement with heterodoxy as a means of escape from a patriarchal and misogynistic society.⁵⁰⁶ In this vein, Brenda Bolton’s *Mulieres Sanctae* explains the development of women’s lay piety and the

⁵⁰² Peter Biller, ‘The Preaching of the Waldensian Sisters’, in Biller, *The Waldenses*, 125-58.

⁵⁰³ Weber, *Religionssoziologie. English The Sociology of Religion* trans. Ephraim Fischoff (London, 1965), 104.

⁵⁰⁴ Grundmann, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages* trans. Steven Rowan (London, 1995). See esp. chapters 4-6.

⁵⁰⁵ Karl Kautsky, *Vorläufer des Neueren Sozialismus* (Berlin, 1947); Koch, *Frauenfrage und Ketzertum im Mittelalter: die Frauenbewegung im Rahmen des Katharismus und des Waldensertums und ihre Sozialen Wurzeln* (Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte 9; Berlin, 1962); As discussed in Richard Abels and Ellen Harrison, ‘The Participation of Women in Languedocian Catharism’, *Medieval Studies* 41 (1979), 215-51.

⁵⁰⁶ Joseph R. Strayer, *The Albigensian Crusades* (New York, 1971), 32; Walter Wakefield, *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Southern France, 1100-1250* (Berkeley, 1974), 74; Anne Brenon, *Les Femmes Cathares* (Paris, 1992).

success of heretics in recruiting them as a result of their rejection by the established Church Orders.⁵⁰⁷

Both of the preceding interpretations have been criticised by scholars taking a post-structuralist approach. Richard Abels and Ellen Harrison questioned the fundamental presumption that heresy had any particular popularity with women, using a statistical analysis to demonstrate that their participation was more marginal.⁵⁰⁸ Shulamith Shahar has questioned the usefulness of the source material for this endeavour, arguing that without a distinctive female narrative, motivation for female participation is impossible to determine.⁵⁰⁹ John Arnold has also supported this view, arguing that heresies held no particular attraction to women.⁵¹⁰

Other scholars have approached the subject from a different angle, focusing on the concept of gender itself rather than the involvement of women. Caroline Walker Bynum has been highly influential in this field, proposing the existence of a feminine spirituality distinct from the dominant male scholastic religiosity.⁵¹¹ Shannon McSheffrey has taken a similar approach in her study of the English Lollard communities, emphasising that both male and female gender roles are important considerations in heresy studies.⁵¹² Most recent studies reflect these developments, for example Yvette Debergue's article on women in the Cathar heresy interprets their role through the existing gender norms of the period, rather than as a space of female liberation.⁵¹³ However, the direction of scholarship has not been entirely uniform, with historians such as Kathryn Green writing in favour of heresies acting as a means for women to subvert their gender roles in society.⁵¹⁴

As is often the case in the study of medieval heresy, far less material has been produced on women in the Waldensian movement than is the case for the Cathar heresy. Grundmann mentions the existence of early female preachers in the sect, though he goes little further in terms of detail.⁵¹⁵ The first substantial work on the topic was carried out by Grado Merlo, who questioned the assumption that women played a significant role in the early movement, and proposed that the very

⁵⁰⁷ Bolton, 'Mulieres Sanctae', *Studies in Church History* 10 (1973), 77-95.

⁵⁰⁸ Abels and Harrison, 'The Participation of Women in Languedocian Catharism'.

⁵⁰⁹ Shahar, *Women in a Medieval Heretical Sect*, 4.

⁵¹⁰ Arnold, 'Heresy and Gender in the Middle Ages', in Judith Mackenzie Bennett and Ruth Maro Karras (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Women and Gender in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 2013), 496-510.

⁵¹¹ Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley, 1987), 24-6.

⁵¹² McSheffrey, *Gender & Heresy – Women and Men in Lollard Communities 1420-1530* (Philadelphia, 1995), 1-4.

⁵¹³ Debergue, 'Bonas femnas and the consolamen', *Journal of Religious History* 35, no.4 (2011), 532-45.

⁵¹⁴ Green, 'The Joys of Heresy: Benefits for Women in Medieval Heretical Sects', in Gregory Erickson and Bernard Schweizer (eds.), *Reading Heresy: Religion and Dissent in Literature and Art* (Berlin, 2017), 83-98.

⁵¹⁵ Grundmann, *Religious Movements*, 41.

notion of female preachers might be a clerical invention.⁵¹⁶ Beyond the question of preaching, women and gender has received very little attention in the more recent histories of Waldensianism. Neither Cameron nor Audisio's histories cover the topic in any detail, with Cameron following Merlo in his rejection of the historicity of female preaching.⁵¹⁷ Shulamith Shahar has used the testimonies of Agnes and Huguette as case studies for the involvement of women in heterodoxies more generally, while Peter Biller has argued the case for the continuation of a parallel female Order from the early years of the movement through to the fifteenth century.⁵¹⁸ However, there remains a gap in the literature for an investigation of gender which specifically addresses the Waldensian movement.

3.1. Gendered Perspective in the Depositions

In her work on the subject, Shahar claims that 'Jacques Fournier's interrogation reveals no gender perspective', and that it is difficult to 'pinpoint a distinctive feminine identity' in the testimonies of Huguette and Agnes.⁵¹⁹ It is certainly true that, as we have seen in an earlier chapter, Fournier adapted his questioning strategy principally based on preconceived notions of how much each individual ought to know. The range of topics covered is similar in both Jean and Huguette's depositions, whilst the intensive detail of Raymond's process is best explained by his education and leadership role within the group. However, although Fournier may not have had a conscious determination to ask Huguette and Agnes different questions by reason of their sex, there is ample evidence to suggest that societal gender norms of the period had an influence on his lines of questioning. In addition to the inquisitorial angle, the responses from the deponents address gender either directly or indirectly, and it will be useful to the current investigation to provide an overview of this evidence before proceeding to the more technical analysis.

Fournier's inquisition was an expression of the male-dominated power structures of its period, and as such it is no surprise that it reflected preconceptions on the role of women in heresy, as well as society more broadly. This is evident from the very beginning of each deposition, in which the women are introduced as their husband's wives, whereas Raymond and Jean are identified by their home towns. This is a consistent theme throughout the process, in which women who are principal actors in the testimony are attached in the text to men who have no relevance to it. Agnes

⁵¹⁶ Merlo, *Valdesi e Valdismi*, vol. II, 93-112.

⁵¹⁷ Gabriel Audisio, *The Waldensian dissent*; Cameron, *Waldenses*, 31-2, 73-4.

⁵¹⁸ Biller, 'The Preaching of the Waldensian Sisters', 125-58.

⁵¹⁹ Shahar, *Women in a Medieval Heretical Sect*, 88.

remains identified as the widow of her dead husband Etienne, and when she does not remember the name of the husband of another believer, the husband's profession is used in its place.⁵²⁰ In the case of unmarried women, they are attached to their nearest male relation, or in one case as the servant of a particular group of men.⁵²¹ This simple nomenclature is reflective of the underlying assumption that women were not capable of having agency without reference to their relationship with a man, and it is this assumption which can be seen as principally 'gendering' Fournier's treatment of his subjects.

In the first instance, the bishop does not seem particularly interested in investigating women. He asks few direct questions concerning the role of women in the sect, these appearing only in the depositions of Raymond and Huguette.⁵²² This may be part of a broader trend among inquisitors of this period; Biller has noted the decline in interest of the clergy in the existence of Waldensian Sisters between the inquisitions of the early Thirteenth Century and those of a century later.⁵²³ What caused this decline in interest is difficult to determine, but Fournier was certainly presented with an abundance of female names throughout the process without ever asking further questions on their roles in the movement.

The gendered disparity in Fournier's questioning is best demonstrated through a comparison of his treatment of husband and wife. Of the two, Huguette is clearly more advanced in her knowledge of the sect, and this is duly reflected in her lengthier deposition. However, the way in which this knowledge is framed by the questioning differs between Huguette and her husband. Fournier asks both of them the same basic belief questions, and the principal cause of the additional length of Huguette's process is the addition of questioning on her relationship to a single man: John of Lorraine. Huguette names Jean as the main source for her beliefs, and once she has done this the majority of her inquisitor's questions begin to revolve around him – when and where did she meet him, what did he teach her, what she thought of him, and so on.⁵²⁴ In contrast, when John of Vienne names John of Lorraine as a teacher, little further is asked about this relationship beyond a single report of a meeting with him in Toulouse.⁵²⁵ This is especially interesting as Jean and Huguette were interrogated on exactly the same days during March 1320, yet Fournier does not attempt to cross-check information about John of Lorraine between two deponents who both knew him. Additionally, when John of Vienne states that a literate woman named Jacqueline taught him to discern the

⁵²⁰ *CAF*, 123.

⁵²¹ *CHC*, 523.

⁵²² *CRC*, 74; *CHC*, 527.

⁵²³ Biller, 'The Preaching of the Waldensian Sisters', 129-33.

⁵²⁴ *CHC*, 522-3; 525-7.

⁵²⁵ *CJV*, 512.

article of faith and the seven sacraments, Fournier does not seem overly concerned with learning more about her, asking for a few extra details but not pressing the issue when Jean refused to respond.⁵²⁶ Perhaps the inquisitor found the idea of a theologically trained woman so inconceivable he believed it a lie, but since Fournier acted similarly in the case of John of Lorraine it seems more likely that he saw John of Vienne's limited knowledge as satisfactorily explained by his relationship with Raymond of Costa.⁵²⁷ Huguette's depth of understanding conflicted with what the inquisition thought a female believer should know, therefore Fournier's additional questions on John of Lorraine may be seen as an attempt to explicate this knowledge by demonstrating the existence of a close personal relationship with a second male heretical leader.

A gendered distinction between the depositions can also be seen in the deponents' testimonies. As Biller has noted, women tend to talk about women in inquisition depositions far more than men do, and this is certainly the case among the four Waldensians. Throughout Raymond's extensive process, he mentions only three women besides Huguette and Agnes. Petronilla, Huguette's sister-in-law, is named twice as an individual Raymond taught not to swear, while two women from Vienne named Guillelma and Petrona appear in a single instance as other companions who were living in Pamiers.⁵²⁸ Similarly, John of Vienne's testimony is almost completely devoid of female names, with only the above-mentioned Jacqueline making an appearance as one of Jean's instructors in the faith.⁵²⁹ Despite producing an extremely brief deposition, Agnes's process reveals more female names than Raymond's, including Jacqueline and two Jeannes, one of whom was Raymond's sister.⁵³⁰ Huguette's testimony amplifies this disparity, as she names eight different women throughout her interrogation, many of them unique to her process. New names include a travelling companion named Martine of Arles, yet another Jeanne who was a maidservant in Montpellier, and two local townspeople Huguette claims to have visited various churches with.⁵³¹ The reason for this discrepancy between the testimonies is multifaceted, and will be discussed in more detail below. What is beyond doubt is that women are far more visible in the testimonies of the two female believers, and that the deponents have a gendered perspective of their lives as Waldensians.

⁵²⁶ *CJV*, 514.

⁵²⁷ Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1266. Jean's sentence preserved in the records of Bernard Gui demonstrate this inquisitorial association.

⁵²⁸ *CRC*, 41; 44.

⁵²⁹ *CJV*, 514.

⁵³⁰ *CAF*, 125.

⁵³¹ *CHC*, 522-3; 526.

It is also possible to discern some sense of the gendered nature of religious belief in the depositions. As has been suggested by Biller and Shahar, Huguettes' unequivocal rejection of all forms of killing in comparison to Raymond and Jean's ambiguity may be representative of a wider trend in which this tenet is particularly attractive to female believers of the Waldensian movement.⁵³² Huguettes' statements, even adding her rejection of killing in holy wars without any prompting by her inquisitor, certainly read as though this principle was at the core of her faith, alongside the rejection of oaths. In comparison, Raymond seems to accept the logic that killing should be legitimate in certain cases, but is not able to justify it being carried out in practice without sin.⁵³³ Similarly, Jean at first accepts the practice, but later claims he is unsure due to the conflict with God's command 'thou shalt not kill.'⁵³⁴ Unfortunately, Fournier never asks Agnes for her opinion on the matter, but the small evidence pool does seem to conform to the broader trend of rejection of killing being more important among women.

There is also certainly a sense of the gendered difference between the lived experience of religion in the four depositions. Due to the nature of the inquisitorial process this topic is never fully elucidated, yet there are some tantalising clues worth highlighting. A broad characterisation of the period suggests that female spirituality involved a greater focus on the mystical, emotional and personal aspects of religious experience, in contrast to the male clergy's emphasis on textual knowledge and ordered ceremony.⁵³⁵ In Raymond de la Côte's process, it can be seen that his religious experience generally follows the male-dominated scholastic vision of Christianity. His religious experience is drawn from the structured nature of his Order; his vows, his study of Scripture, his belief in and performance of the sacraments, and the keeping of canonical hours. There is little to suggest a more personalised spirituality or emotional connection to Christianity. This is typified, for example, in Raymond's lukewarm opinion of churches. These holy sites seem to have little importance to him spiritually, as he describes them as no more than practical structures in which one may find it easier to pray without being disturbed.⁵³⁶ In contrast, Huguettes' experience of religion does not rely on the textual nature of her belief, or the orderly rituals it prescribes. Where Huguettes describes her religious praxis, it is in far more active and personalised terms. Unlike Raymond, her religious experience places a great deal of importance on churches as places of

⁵³² Biller, 'The Preaching of the Waldensian Sisters', 142; Shahar, *Women in a Medieval Heretical Sect*, 91.

⁵³³ *CRC*, 75-6.

⁵³⁴ *CJV*, 511.

⁵³⁵ Tanya Stabler Miller, 'What's in a Name? Clerical Representations of Parisian Beguines (1200-1328)', *Journal of Medieval History* 33, no.1 (2007), 76; Bynum, *Holy Feast*, 26.

⁵³⁶ *CRC*, 81.

worship. She spends time travelling to various churches with female companions, and even spends an entire night's vigil at a church in Montpellier.⁵³⁷

The personal relationship is also far more prominent in Huguette's testimony. When Raymond is questioned about John of Lorraine, he describes the majoral in terms of a professional friendship. Raymond admired Jean for his learning, and speaks positively about the time he spent traveling with him in the early years of his involvement with the Order.⁵³⁸ However, there is little indication that Jean was an important part of Raymond's spirituality, beyond him being the head of the Order and the earthly person to whom he owed his vow of obedience. In contrast, for Huguette, John of Lorraine represented a key connection to the religious movement she was a part of, and an important focus of her spirituality. Whilst the inquisition focuses on their relationship for its own reasons, outlined above, this is not to say that this relationship was not meaningful. Huguette confessed to Jean 'often', exchanged gifts with him, ate with him, and made long pseudo-pilgrimages just to meet him. For a female believer like Huguette, outside the formal structure of the Order, relationships with holy men such as Jean and Raymond represented a personalised connection to religion, and a means of embodying the abstract beliefs found in Scripture.

This more interpersonal approach to lived religion may be broadly defined in terms of gender. Huguette's husband certainly knew John of Lorraine and recognised him as a religious teacher, but speaks of him far less in terms of devotion and far more in terms of respect for a figure of authority. For example, John of Vienne speaks of being ordered to exchange some coins for his majoral – a very worldly exercise – and does not even claim to have confessed to him.⁵³⁹ Finally, there is also some evidence from Agnes's deposition in favour of this hypothesis. When asked if she was in fear of her life for defying the inquisition, she replies that 'Jesus did not lie for fear of death so neither would she'.⁵⁴⁰ This is an unusual style of response in these depositions that seems to directly connect Agnes's personal belief (that she should not lie) with the lived experience of Jesus. This represents further evidence that personalised relationships – in this case with the figure of Christ – were of particular importance to the lived experience of the two female deponents.

In summary, although the depositions are broadly similar in their questions and responses in terms of the male and female Waldensians, it would be an oversimplification to suggest that 'no gender perspective' can be discerned in Fournier's register.⁵⁴¹ The inquisitor's questions may not

⁵³⁷ *CHC*, 522.

⁵³⁸ *CRC*, 99-100.

⁵³⁹ *CJV*, 512.

⁵⁴⁰ '...adiciens quod Dominus noster Ihesus Christus non fuerat mentitus timore mortis, nec ipsa mentiretur pro timore mortis...', *CAF*, 123.

⁵⁴¹ Shahar, *Women in a Medieval Heretical Sect*, 88.

overtly differ along gender lines, but the process was couched in the patriarchal presumptions of the time. Fournier spent much less time finding out about female members of the heresy because his principal interest was in the leaders of the movement, who to his mind could only be men. Huguette's deposition is more substantial in greater part due to the amount of time Fournier spends on exploring the details of her relationship to John of Lorraine, thus providing a satisfactory explanation for her advanced knowledge to the inquisitor.

3.2. Status of Women in Raymond's Order

Raymond is questioned only once on the presence of female members of his Order, when he categorically denies that 'virgin women' may be admitted under any circumstances.⁵⁴² In the same session he entirely diminishes the role of women in the Order, saying that they cannot join since women cannot receive holy orders nor preach. He goes further to state that even a married man who had been widowed was not permitted to join, and that Brothers were not permitted to have a wife, touch women, allow them to kiss their hands, or sleep in the same room as them.⁵⁴³ This absolute rejection of women being involved at an official level, and the diminishment of the Brothers' contact with them, has been interpreted by Biller as a strategy employed by Raymond to disguise the existence of Waldensian Sisters.⁵⁴⁴ Biller argues that Raymond was using sophistries in his responses to steer the inquisitor away from the truth, for example by saying that women could not be admitted to the Order, but meaning specifically the Waldensian Brothers, and not necessarily including the Sisters. He also notes that Fournier may have suspected this strategy, adding '*ut dixit*' ('[so] he said') to indicate he doubted Raymond was being fully truthful.⁵⁴⁵ This analysis contributes to Biller's overall conclusion that despite their overall lack of presence in the sources around 1300, Waldensian Sisters continued to exist in clandestine houses, escaping the notice of a disinterested inquisition. This would provide an explanation for the presence, disappearance and reappearance of Sisters in Waldensian communities living before and after those currently under investigation.

Whilst Biller's theory follows sound logic, it is worth re-examining the evidence for alternative interpretations that may be worth considering. Firstly, it cannot be overemphasised how limited the evidence is for the existence of Waldensian Sisters in Raymond's time. We know they were present in the region a century earlier, when houses of Sisters appear in the 1241-42 sentences

⁵⁴² 'Dixit ... quod nullo modo reciperent virgines ad statum suum.', *CRC*, 74.

⁵⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴⁴ Biller, 'The Preaching of the Waldensian Sisters', 144.

⁵⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

of Peter Sellan (describing events about forty years prior to this date).⁵⁴⁶ For Raymond's community in the fourteenth century, we have a single reference to a Waldensian Sister appearing in a 1314 sentence of inquisitor Bernard Gui.⁵⁴⁷ This is the testimony of one Stephen Porchier, a former Brother who gave the inquisition a list of names of his old compatriots, including one woman, Raymonda of Castres.⁵⁴⁸ Although this evidence may point to the continued existence of female adherents, it certainly does not suggest that they were particularly prominent. The ratio of male to female names in Stephen's list is sixteen to one, and his status as a converted heretic strongly reduces the likelihood that he was covering up the existence of further Sisters. Furthermore, while the sentence states that 'all [the members of the preceding list] preached... and held the life and doctrine of the Waldensians',⁵⁴⁹ this reads as more of a catch-all statement of inquisitorial bureaucracy than definitive evidence of a female preacher. Conceivably, an enthusiastic and intelligent woman such as Huguette, well-versed in the tenets of her faith, could have appeared on a list similar to this without ever taking official vows or being a formal part of the leadership structure of the Order. Frustratingly, we have no way of knowing what Raymonda's role was in the movement, or how she might have fit in to the community described by Raymond of Costa.

One further piece of evidence to consider concerning Waldensian Sisters in Raymond's Order appears in the *De vita et actibus*,⁵⁵⁰ likely written in France around 1300, and describing the structure of the Waldensian heresy from an inquisitorial perspective. Biller has suggested an early fourteenth-century date for this work, as it appears to be a collation of information found principally in the inquisition of Bernard Gui in Toulouse (1307-1323).⁵⁵¹ *De vita* may also have used Fournier's register as a source, as its description certainly squares with the evidence found there. This document states that Waldensians lived:

⁵⁴⁶ Biller, 'Preaching of the Waldensian Sisters', 134-7; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Doat 21, fols. 219r-228r-v.

⁵⁴⁷ Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 930.

⁵⁴⁸ This Raymonda can be linked to Raymond de la Côte's group via the overlap of names found in his testimony and those of the Burgundians. See Chapter 3 above.

⁵⁴⁹ '...omnes predictos ... tenere vitam et sectam Valdensium.', Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 930.

⁵⁵⁰ This text is preserved in three manuscript editions: Dôle, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 109, fols. 32r-34r; Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS Vat. Lat. 2648, fols. 71va-72vb; Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS A. 129. Inf., fols. 182r-187r. A Latin transcription and English translation has been produced by Peter Biller: Biller, 'Fingering an Anonymous Description of the Waldensians' in Peter Biller and Caterina Bruschi (eds.), *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy* (Woodbridge, 2003), 195-207.

⁵⁵¹ *De vita et actibus*, 176-7.

‘...in houses and households, two or three in a hospice with two or three women, who pretend to be their wives or sisters. Sometimes old women live in hospices without men...’⁵⁵²

This passage has been used by Biller to support the idea that the southern French Waldensians did include female members in their Order in the fourteenth century. However, even disregarding the interpretative problems associated with the second-hand or third-hand nature of the source, the text itself does not necessitate a formal female branch of Sisters in the Order. The first state of living described, in which a number of men and women live together in one house, seems to accord very well with the evidence we have from Fournier’s inquisition. Raymond of Costa was living with several men and women at the time of his arrest, at least one of whom initially pretended to be his niece.⁵⁵³ We know from these testimonies that Agnes and Huguette were not Sisters in the formal religious sense – they had jobs, husbands, and were very much part of lay society. What the *De vita* may be describing then, is a system in which one Brother (Raymond) operates a household in which several believers, both male and female, might stay for a period of time.

This interpretation is supported by further evidence from the document itself. The *De vita* describes ‘the one who rules the hospice’, or ‘rector’ as being principally in charge of religious matters.⁵⁵⁴ This man (and we have no reason to suspect it would not be a man) leads the others in prayer, teaches from Scripture, blesses meals, hears confessions and gives penances. Again, there is nothing here which precludes the majority of the household being lay believers, as seems to have been the case with Raymond of Costa. In fact, hearing preaching and giving confession were the principal spiritual activities that lay believers of the movement were involved in.⁵⁵⁵

The second style of living mentioned in the *De vita* concerns a group of ‘old women’ who would live together without men.⁵⁵⁶ This statement stands on less firm ground as we have no contemporary corroborating evidence to support it. The use of the adverb ‘sometimes’ (*aliquociens*) suggests that even the author of the *De vita* considered it a less common occurrence. Furthermore, the text states that these women would be ‘visited by heretics time and again’, suggesting that they

⁵⁵² ‘...per domos et familias, duos vel tres in uno hospicio cum duabus vel tribus mulieribus, quas suas uxores esse fingunt vel sorores. Aliquociens Antiquae mulieres sine hominibus in hospiciis vitam ducunt.’, *De vita et actibus*, 198.

⁵⁵³ *CHC*, 519.

⁵⁵⁴ ‘ille qui regit hospicium’; ‘rector’, *De vita et actibus*, 200.

⁵⁵⁵ Huguette stated she had often confessed to John of Lorraine: ‘Interrogata si unquam confessa fuit de peccatis suis dicto Iohanni respondit quod sic, et frequenter.’, *CHC*, 523; See also *CJV*, 512; *CAF*, 123; Fournier was particularly interested in whether any of the lay believers confessed to the Brothers.

⁵⁵⁶ *De vita et actibus*, 198.

were not separated from contact with men.⁵⁵⁷ If we are to propose that such hospices did exist after 1300, the line between Sister and lay believer remains blurry. Need these necessarily be formal religious houses in which cloistered women took vows and followed a Rule? This interpretation does not seem to account for the specificity of their age, and it seems just as possible such houses might be accommodation for elderly, widowed female believers such as Agnes, visited and provided for by local Brothers in their spiritual and material needs.

In summary, the *De vita* text may appear to suggest the existence of a female component of the Waldensian Order. However, when viewed in light of the evidence we have of Waldensian living conditions from the testimony of Raymond and his companions, the source can also be legitimately interpreted as describing a system which incorporated lay believers within households led by at least one Brother. There is nothing in the *De vita* that would necessarily indicate the existence of a parallel female Order (in the manner of the Poor Clares, for example) within the fourteenth century Waldensian community.

Let us return now to the evidence given by Raymond in his testimony. As has been described in Chapter two above, one of Raymond's objectives in his ordeal was to protect the other members of his movement. He does not give any names of living Brothers or believers, nor the burial sites of dead ones, throughout his process. Therefore, Biller's argument that Raymond was concealing the existence of Waldensian Sisters is certainly plausible – if they existed he would not have named them. However, the suggestion that Fournier believed the Sisters existed and doubted Raymond's testimony on this point deserves a re-examination. The single response to which Fournier adds the phrase *ut dixit*, certainly indicating doubt, is as follows:

“He said also that they do not receive widows amongst them, nor other women and they do not live with them.”⁵⁵⁸

There was good reason for Fournier to doubt this statement, but not because of the existence of a female Order. The inquisitor had already well established that Raymond was, at the time of his arrest, living with at least four other women, one of whom was a widow. He had several eyewitness accounts to support this. Therefore, the idea that the Brothers did not involve themselves with women and did not live with them would seem completely spurious. Fournier need not be

⁵⁵⁷ ‘...per alios hereticos sepe et sepius visitantur’, *De vita et actibus*, 198.

⁵⁵⁸ ‘Dixit eciam quod vidue non recipiuntur apud eos, nec alique alie mulieres nec cohabitant cum eis’, *CRC*, 74.

suspecting that Raymond is lying about the reception of Sisters to his Order, as the *ut dixit* phrase can already be explained by his knowledge that Raymond is lying about not living with women.

If Raymond was not attempting to conceal the existence of Waldensian Sisters, another explanation must be offered to interpret the undeniably odd responses outlined above. He was extremely dismissive of the role of women and diminished the Brothers' contact with them to almost zero, even to the point of attempting a bare-faced lie about his own living conditions. This flies in the face of what we know, not only about Raymond, but also about Huguette, who in her own testimony describes a close relationship with another Brother, John of Lorraine. To satisfy this discrepancy, we must remember that one of Raymond's principal strategies of dealing with the inquisition process was to present himself and his Order in the most orthodox manner possible. He would have been well aware of the general anti-heretical polemic of false appearances, through which mixed living arrangements such as Raymond's might be interpreted as cover for sexual deviance.⁵⁵⁹ Raymond knew that his living arrangements would be looked upon unfavourably by the Church, and attempted to portray his Order as a strictly all-male affair with extremely limited contact with women, in the manner of the Church-approved Dominicans or Franciscans. He rejected all notions of impropriety, even telling his inquisitor that 'he did not know what extraordinary depravities were.'⁵⁶⁰ Raymond would also have been aware that the Waldensians had often been criticised for allowing female preachers, and was clear in pointing out that his Order did not allow this as women could not receive Holy Orders.⁵⁶¹

Raymond's responses on the subject of women may be better explained in terms of the conflict between theory and praxis. There is one particular response he gave which deserves special attention here, when asked if Brothers could have a wife:

"...he responded no, in fact they do not dare touch a woman with their hands ... nor permit a woman to sleep in the room where they sleep, *unless there is no way to do otherwise.*"⁵⁶²

The italicised phrase is a concise summary of Raymond's predicament. There is little reason to doubt that the Waldensian did indeed reject female preaching, as this position is consistent with his

⁵⁵⁹ Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics*, 38-9.

⁵⁶⁰ '...nescit que sunt corruptiones extraordinarie.', *CRC*, 74.

⁵⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶² '...respondit quod non, immo nec eciam non audent tangere mulierem cum manibus ... nec in camera ubi iacent permetterent quod aliqua mulier iaceret, *nisi aliter facere non possent.*', *CRC*, 74 (Emphasis mine).

emphasis on the necessity of ordination and his general proximity to orthodoxy. Furthermore, it seems reasonable to infer that Raymond would in fact have preferred it if his Order could have been kept strictly separated from women, but that this was not possible due to the realities of persecution. He was painfully aware that his own living conditions would cast the Brothers in a poor light, and his excessive denials can be seen as an attempt to ameliorate this. Although exaggerated for this effect, the overall substance of Raymond's beliefs may not have been too far from the truth, though the practical circumstances of the time meant that they were kept strictly in the realm of theory.

Evidence for the existence of Waldensian Sisters in Raymond of Costa's community remains extremely sparse. Although we have mentions of Sisters' houses from both the early thirteenth century and from around 1500, the former was many generations before Raymond's time, and the latter appeared in a German community with no direct ties to Raymond's French group.⁵⁶³ The best piece of evidence is the abovementioned Sister, Raymonda of Castres, in the records of Bernard Gui, though her appearance in a generic inquisitorial list of names leaves us with little idea about the nature of her role. The houses described in the *De vita* may appear to suggest the existence of Sisters, but can be interpreted differently using the evidence from Raymond's deposition, in which the women in these houses were lay believers only staying for a period of time. Even the houses which were purportedly female-only might be explained in similar terms, as hostels for widowed believers such as Agnes to be cared for by the Brothers. What is certain is that Raymond's excessive denials of contact with women need not be interpreted as him covering for the existence of Sisters. Just as plausibly given the available evidence, he simply saw the Brothers' tangible proximity to women as problematic to his strategy of demonstrating their orthodoxy. Raymond presented in his testimony an idealised and exaggerated position that combined some of what he believed in theory with what he believed his inquisitor wanted to hear.

Taking all the above into consideration, it is defensible to conclude that there existed no female Order parallel to Raymond's Brothers in fourteenth-century Languedoc. The existence of Sisters both a century and earlier and a century later is not necessarily problematic, as there is no specific reason why there should be an unbroken continuity in this area, especially considering the scope for nuance and individuality within different Waldensian communities over time. Certainly, there were numerous women involved in the movement, but the contemporary evidence for Sisters taking formal vows is insufficient and open to alternative interpretations.

⁵⁶³ See chapter five for an analysis of the genealogy of Raymond's group.

3.3. Gender Roles in Raymond's Order

There is little doubt that Raymond's Order was a male-dominated affair. In terms of playing an active role in running of the group, there seems little room for a female element. Raymond's description of initiation to the Order is one designed with men in mind; he describes a '*puer adolescens*' as the target candidate, and stipulates they must 'be capable of learning'.⁵⁶⁴ This emphasis on education certainly seems to exclude the involvement of women, as scholarly learning was almost exclusively the domain of men in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. There appears to have been an intentional division between business involving the Brothers alone, and that which they shared with a wider lay audience. The election of a new majoral and the celebration of the Last Supper are both described as events that only ordained Brothers could attend. Raymond is particularly clear on the latter, stating that the blessed food '...is not given to [our] believers, nor do [we] even wish they know about it.'⁵⁶⁵ Although Raymond's language in the description of confession does default to male-gendered Latin (*eum, peccator*, etc.), phrases such as 'the person confessing' do leave more space for female involvement in this process.⁵⁶⁶

That Raymond's Order was male-dominated is not in itself surprising, as the principal foundations of his faith seem to necessitate this fact. Ordination, one of Raymond's requirements for living in a state of 'perfection', was not permitted to women, as Raymond himself argues.⁵⁶⁷ Secondly, the imitation of the apostolic life upon which the Waldensians' lifestyle rested was often seen as a strictly male pursuit, not least because all of the Apostles were men. Although both the Franciscan and Dominican Orders accommodated women, both were increasingly hesitant to admit them, and the mendicant lifestyle of the Apostles was never offered to them.⁵⁶⁸ Finally, Raymond's emphasis on biblical literalism and the textual aspect of his faith also encouraged a male-dominated space. Not only did the importance of scholarly education restrict women's access on a practical level, it also excluded the more feminine aspects of medieval religiosity which placed greater emphasis on mysticism and a more experiential relationship with God.⁵⁶⁹

Raymond's presentation of his Order almost precludes the involvement of women entirely. However, as argued above distancing himself from women may have been part of a wider strategy to prove the orthodoxy of his faith. If we step outside Raymond's theoretical description, there is evidence that women in fact played a very important role in the Waldensian community. Certainly,

⁵⁶⁴ CRC, 59.

⁵⁶⁵ 'Et non datur aliquid de predictis credentibus eorum nec eciam volunt quod hec ipsi sciant.', CRC, 68.

⁵⁶⁶ 'persone confitentis', CRC, 61.

⁵⁶⁷ CRC, 74.

⁵⁶⁸ Bolton, '*Mulieres Sanctae*', 80.

⁵⁶⁹ Bynum, *Holy Feast*, 26.

there were numerous lay women involved with the movement. As has been stated above, when lay believers are mentioned in the sources, the names are disproportionately female.⁵⁷⁰ There may be some bias here in that women are more likely to name other women, but it is notable that John of Vienne does not name any male companions in his meetings with the Waldensian Brothers.

These women acted as an important support structure for the Brothers. Most importantly, they provided an outlet for the Brothers' spiritual ministrations, giving them a congregation to preach to and hear confession from. Lay women also helped the Brothers on a more practical level, aiding them in their material needs and acting as co-conspirators in their clandestine existence. Considering the amount Huguette knew about John of Lorraine, he certainly must have relied on her silence to the authorities during his lifetime. Finally, women were primarily responsible for maintaining and expanding the community. Due to their illegitimate nature, it would have been difficult for Brothers to preach to new people without being certain they could be trusted. For this reason, reliable lay believers such as Huguette were better placed to introduce potential new members to the community. Huguette effectively admitted to this role in her testimony, stating she was responsible for introducing her husband to the movement, and that she also proselytised to one John of Montpellier.⁵⁷¹

When considering Raymond's Order, it is possible to discern a definite gendered split between the clerical 'male' element, and the lay believer 'female' element. The former took a leadership role in the movement and were responsible for the administration of the Order, preaching, and the performance of rites and sacraments. The latter provided a support network through which the Order could operate, offering an outlet for pastoral care, supplying material sustenance to the Brothers, and recruitment of additional community members. Not all lay believers were women (though from the available evidence they seem to have been in the majority), but men could also be understood as fulfilling a feminine gender role in this context, excluded as they were from the masculine elements of the Order. In summary then, although Raymond's theology seemed to exclude women from the principal elements of his Order (preaching, ordination, and the study of Scripture), the involvement of lay women may have been the *de facto* reason the group was able to sustain itself. The two groups may be conceptualised as an efficient symbiosis of two gendered roles, of leadership and spiritual provision on the one hand, and practical and material support on the other.

⁵⁷⁰ See particularly Huguette's description of her companions, and Agnes' testimony on Raymond's visitors in Pamiers. *CHC* 522-3, 526; *CAF*, 125.

⁵⁷¹ *CHC*, 527.

3.4. Relationship to the Beguine Model

One way of setting the above gender roles in the wider context of the period is by comparing them to one of the most popular lay spiritual movements of the time, the Beguines. These were communities of lay women who lived together in houses, called Beguinages, often taking informal vows to live piously. They are not to be confused with the similarly named Beguins, a disparaging term for the lay supporters of the Spiritual Franciscans, who will be discussed later.⁵⁷² Having their origins in the early thirteenth century *vitas* of pious women, the Beguines were initially encouraged by the Church as an anti-heretical model for laywomen, involving a life of reflective prayer and deference to the clergy.⁵⁷³ Beguinages became popular from the latter half of the thirteenth century in northern France, Germany and the Low Countries.⁵⁷⁴ However, unlike nuns the Beguines were not formally cloistered and were free to renounce their vows and return to worldly life. This fostered suspicion in some circles that Beguines were using their status as a disguise for impious behaviour.⁵⁷⁵ Beguines were eventually officially condemned by the Church in the 1311-12 Council of Vienne, after the controversy of Marguerite Porete's *Mirror of Simple Souls*, a text which suggested female mystical spirituality's superiority over clerical learning.⁵⁷⁶

Despite this, the Beguine community certainly did not represent a liberation from the patriarchal Church hierarchy. The *vitae* of holy women that Beguinages were initially set up to imitate heavily emphasised their subordination to the clergy. Both Mary of Oignies and Margaret of Ypres were said to have relied on the clergy for their salvation, and their relationship to their male confessors was described as an allegory for a marriage to Christ.⁵⁷⁷ Although the Beguines came under clerical suspicion in later years, they also had their defenders. Many sermons and exempla praised the Beguines for their piety, and their ability to have a more intimate relationship with God than the clergy could through textual study.⁵⁷⁸ There is little doubt that the Beguines relied on the existence of sympathetic clergymen as confessors and defenders, as although some Beguinages persisted after the Vienne decrees, there was a marked decline in their popularity and prevalence.⁵⁷⁹

⁵⁷² It is likely they were so named as by the fourteenth century clerical opinion of the Beguines had dimmed and the word had taken on a pejorative sense. Miller, 'What's in a Name?', 61-4, 84-5; Dyan Elliott, *Proving Woman: Female Spirituality and Inquisitional Culture in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton, 2004), 35.

⁵⁷³ Elliott, *Proving Woman*, 36-7.

⁵⁷⁴ Ernest McDonnell, *The Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture: with Special Emphasis on the Belgian Scene* (New York, 1969), 7.

⁵⁷⁵ Miller, 'What's in a Name?', 70.

⁵⁷⁶ Joanne Robinson, *Nobility and Annihilation in Marguerite Porete's Mirror of Simple Souls* (Albany, 2001), xi-xvi; Robert Lerner, 'New Light on The Mirror of Simple Souls', *Speculum* 85, no.1 (2010), 92-5.

⁵⁷⁷ Elliott, *Proving Woman*, 39.

⁵⁷⁸ John Coakley, 'Friars as Confidants of Holy Women in Medieval Dominican Hagiography', in Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinski and Tímea Klára Szell (eds.), *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, 1991), 225.

⁵⁷⁹ Walter Simons, *Cities of Ladies: Beguine Communities in the Medieval Low Countries, 1200-1565* (Philadelphia, 2001), 135-7.

Both the Beguines and the Waldensian communities of southern France offered laywomen a Christian spiritual outlet that did not require entering a convent or taking formal vows. The Waldensian hospices such as that run by Raymond of Costa can be seen as analogous to Beguinages in that they freely admitted laywomen into a space that incorporated an element of religious structure and pious living. In both models, deference to a male-dominated power structure is acknowledged. The archetypal Beguine relationship to a male confessor is mirrored, for examples, in Huguette's dedication to John of Lorraine, or Agnes' loyalty to Raymond.⁵⁸⁰ Despite this, the models allowed for laywomen to engage in a personal, active religious lifestyle. Although neither groups were permitted to preach, both were able to feel part of the *vita apostolica*. For the Beguines this included performing good works, and living a chaste, pious lifestyle in the imitation of archetypal holy women. Similarly, the Waldensian laywomen were offered a more formalised structure for living under the supervision of a Brother, and even the prospect of proselytising new members.

In this way, the Waldensian community was offering a very similar solution to Beguinages in answer to the desire of laywomen to be able to take part in the *vita apostolica*, which had been growing since the twelfth century. This may go some way to explaining the numbers of women among the lay believers, which are in the majority in Raymond's group at least. The attractiveness of the Waldensian model to laywomen, which followed similar lines to the popular Beguine one, may also contribute to our understanding of how this community maintained its numbers and identity despite remaining so close to orthodoxy. As outlined above, these women were crucial to the maintenance and survival of the movement, so it may be no coincidence that the community disappeared around the same time Beguines were condemned and their popularity declined.

3.5. Conclusions

Although Fournier's questioning did not necessarily delineate itself in gendered terms, there are nevertheless several useful perspectives that can be unpicked from the Waldensians' depositions in this regard. The principal role of women in the movement appears to have been as lay believers, supporting the Waldensian Brothers in their spiritual lives. Evidence for Sisters in the formal religious sense is very thin in this period, and it has been argued here that even this evidence does not necessarily point to the existence of a parallel female Order. This does not mean that the Waldensian community did not offer an outlet to women in following a religious life. By comparing the depositions of Raymond with those of Huguette and Agnes, we can see a sharp gendered contrast in the movement between the male-dominated, clerical leadership structure, and the

⁵⁸⁰ Whilst Agnes was also Raymond's wet-nurse and would have already been close to him, it seems implausible she did not also respect him on religious grounds, based on her unwavering commitment to his core religious principles.

majority-female support structure of lay believers. This extended to their differing interpretations of religious experience, Raymond's intellectualised and scholarly approach to religion contrasting with the much stronger emphasis on personal experience found in the testimonies of the two women. Although women did not play an active role in teaching or performing religious rituals, it appears that they were indispensable to the movement, not only providing a lay community for the Brothers to minister to, but also playing an active role in the proselytization of new members, and thereby protecting the identity of Brothers from the inquisition. The role of female Waldensian believers can be usefully compared with the Beguine communities of the same period, in that they both allowed for a more personalised expression of feminine religious identity and experience otherwise denied to them by the Roman Church, which offered only the restrictive conventual model of female religiosity.

Chapter Four – Spatial Analysis

There is a strong spatial component to the depositions in Fournier's register, and this chapter will analyse this dimension of the texts with a focus on the practico-social activities by which the Waldensians produced this space. The discussion will be broadly divided into two, first considering a large-scale spatial network between towns and cities, followed by an analysis of the micro-scale use of space within those cities.

The spatial activities of the Waldensians of Languedoc in the early fourteenth century were not restricted to isolated rural villages or even local areas. The evidence from Fournier's register instead suggests a religious community spread out across a vast area, from Gascony in the west, throughout the towns and cities of the Languedoc and Provence, as far north as Burgundy, and east to the Po Valley in Northern Italy. Despite the distances between them and the relatively small number of adherents (as seems to be suggested by the overall lack of sources describing them in this period),⁵⁸¹ the Waldensians of Southern France still managed to maintain the cohesion of their social group on a macro as well as a micro level. As written letters were far too incriminating to a community condemned as heresy by the Church, there was only one way in which the Waldensians were able to achieve this – travel.

4.1. Macro-Space: Networking disparate communities

Evidence of long-distance travel between towns peppers the depositions of the four Waldensians in Fournier's register. Perhaps the most detailed of these journeys is described by Huguette when asked how she travelled alongside her husband and sister-in-law from her hometown of Arles to Pamiers. After leaving Arles:

“...they came to Belcaire, and from there to Montpellier, and on another occasion from Montpellier to near Saint-Thibéry, the next day from there to Narbonne, from Narbonne to Carcassonne, from Carcassonne to Mirepoix, and from there to Pamiers...”⁵⁸²

⁵⁸¹ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 63-64.

⁵⁸² ‘...venerunt apud Bellicadrum et de dicto loco usque ad Monte Pessulanum, et de Monte Pessulano alia vice usque ad Sanctum Tiberium et Sancto Tiberio altera die venerunt Narbonam et de Narbona Carcassonam et de Carcassona ad Mirapiscem, et de Mirapisce venerunt Appamias...’, *CHC*, 526.

This kind of journey does not seem to have been particularly unusual for the Waldensians in the sources. This was not the first time Huguette had left Arles; she mentions travelling from there to Montpellier to visit Waldensian spiritual leader John of Lorraine, as well as a similar journey from Vauvert to the same city in the company of a woman named Martine.⁵⁸³ Agnes is also recorded as having travelled from Montpellier to Pamiers, though the route she describes took her through Béziers, Toulouse, Castelsarrasin, and Beaumont-de-Lomagne.⁵⁸⁴ John of Vienne for his part recalls a journey from Cabezac, north-west of Narbonne, to Toulouse, in order to meet John of Lorraine in a house there.⁵⁸⁵

Clearly travel was an essential part of being a Waldensian lay believer but to an active member of the Order – that is, one responsible for the spiritual work of preaching and pastoral care – itinerancy seemed to be a way of life. Raymond of Costa's movements are difficult to summarise concisely, but he does not appear to have remained in one place for very long during his time as a Brother. Raymond's description of his history in the Order consists of various blocks of time, usually several years, which he spent in the company of other members of the group, travelling and ministering to those in their community.⁵⁸⁶ Here we see evidence for the group's links to Italy; Raymond recounts travelling there with John of Lorraine and visiting the houses of various sympathetic individuals. He was also sent to spend several years living under the tutelage of an individual he knew as 'Michael the Italian'. Although there is no evidence that Raymond was living with any other Brothers whilst in Pamiers, he does not seem to have stopped travelling. Both Agnes and Huguette state that Raymond left and returned to Pamiers periodically (the latter dubiously suggesting he was on a mission to the papal court), whilst Raymond himself describes making the long journey to and from Vienne, near Lyon, on at least two occasions.⁵⁸⁷ This continual movement is also reflected in the sources' descriptions of spiritual leader John of Lorraine, who appears in Toulouse, Montpellier, Arles, and Northern Italy throughout the four depositions.

The evidence in Fournier's inquisitorial register seems to fit the model of itinerancy for heretical groups set out by Caterina Bruschi.⁵⁸⁸ Bruschi suggests that long-distance travel of this kind can be explained as the result of four interlinking and consequent factors. The first is itinerancy as a result of imitating the unfixed lives of the Apostles,⁵⁸⁹ which leads naturally into the necessity of

⁵⁸³ *CHC*, 526.

⁵⁸⁴ *CAF*, 124.

⁵⁸⁵ *CIV*, 512-3.

⁵⁸⁶ Raymond's description of his history and movements in the group can be found in *CRC*, 99-102.

⁵⁸⁷ *CAF*, 124; *CHC*, 520-1; *CRC*, 102.

⁵⁸⁸ Bruschi, *The Wandering Heretics*, 128-133.

⁵⁸⁹ It has been shown in an earlier chapter the extent to which Raymond de la Côte based his theology on an imitation of the Apostles.

movement as a vehicle for preaching the Gospels to a diverse audience. This preaching, illegitimate in the eyes of the Church hierarchy, results in persecution, which may encourage further travel as a means of escape, to areas under less scrutiny from the inquisition. Finally, the previous three factors generate a necessarily disparate, clandestine community which is only able to be functionally held together across regions via the itinerant travel of its members.

This kind of ‘functional itinerancy’ is also described in the *De vita et actibus*. The manuscript describes the existence of Waldensian ‘houses’ or ‘hospices’ spread out across many towns and cities, in which several members of the community live together, usually under the guidance of a senior member.⁵⁹⁰ This senior Brother would be responsible for pastoral care, hearing confessions and preaching to local members of the community. Journeys between these safe-houses were made to maintain connection and communication between groups across the region, often under the disguise of religious pilgrimages.⁵⁹¹ Finally, the *De vita* mentions a ‘chapter-general’ that ordained members travelled to from all regions, and during which one of the orders of business was to decide which Brothers would be paired up with each other and where they would be sent to preach and provide pastoral care services.⁵⁹²

Much of the structure of the wider Order described in *De vita* can be found in the depositions of the Waldensians in Fournier’s register. Most of the meeting places in the sources are houses in various urban centres,⁵⁹³ and Raymond’s house in Pamiers seems to follow the pattern of a senior member living with several believers. Here, Huguette’s initial claim that Raymond was her ‘uncle’ (which she later rescinded),⁵⁹⁴ mirrors the strategy of deception described in *De vita*, in which women living in the safe-houses pretended to be related to the male members of the Order.⁵⁹⁵

We can also see elements of disguise in the way in which members of the community travelled. After meeting Huguette in Beaumont-de-Lomagne, Agnes states they travelled to meet Raymond in Toulouse under the pretence of being impoverished and looking for work.⁵⁹⁶ Similarly, Huguette states that she and her husband journeyed to Pamiers to live with Raymond on the basis of Jean’s job as a cooper, and the amount of work available for him in the town being a reasonable

⁵⁹⁰ *De vita et actibus*, 198.

⁵⁹¹ ‘...habentes secum aliquem clericum vel alium interpretatorem, et fingunt aliquot modo se velle apostolorum Petri et Pauli limina visitare.’ *De vita et actibus*, 202.

⁵⁹² *Ibid.*

⁵⁹³ These will be discussed in greater detail in the section below.

⁵⁹⁴ *CHC*, 519-520.

⁵⁹⁵ ‘...tres in uno hospicio cum duabas vel tribus mulieribus, quas suas uxores esse fingunt vel sorores.’ *De vita et actibus*, 198.

⁵⁹⁶ *CAF*, 124.

alibi.⁵⁹⁷ Furthermore, Huguette's trip from Arles to Montpellier to visit John of Lorraine may have been disguised as a religious pilgrimage, as she mentions she spent 'a night's vigil at the Church of Saint Mary of the Tablets'.⁵⁹⁸ These journeys certainly would not have been unusual in the period. Montpellier's pre-plague population was between 35,000 and 40,000, and as a major commercial hub had a great deal of immigrant inhabitants, particularly traders and merchants from Italy.⁵⁹⁹ Avignon, which possibly contained a Waldensian 'hostel' according to John of Vienne,⁶⁰⁰ had a similar population of migrants that had travelled there from diverse regions, even before the Papacy's arrival.⁶⁰¹ Waldensian travel was able to fit unnoticed within the broader connective networks already in place across the region, and the bustling urban trading centres with their high population of non-native citizens were the perfect place for the community to operate.

In addition to the clandestine nature of the community, some of the hierarchical and administrative organisation set out in *De vita* can be seen in the testimony of Raymond of Costa. His description of the ordination of a new majoral seems to fit the notion of a 'chapter-general' at least in the sense of there being a large number of Brothers present.⁶⁰² His own account of his history with the Order also seems to fit with this narrative, as he is sent to live with various different members of the group throughout his time as a member, usually for at least a few years.⁶⁰³ In addition to meeting in person, communication was also made possible through 'messengers', individuals who travelled between towns to relay information. This was a system used by the Cathars after they had been forced into secrecy by inquisitorial persecution, and also appears to have been used within the Waldensian community.⁶⁰⁴ John of Vienne, who was at that time in Cabezac, north-west of Narbonne, was informed of John of Lorraine's presence in Toulouse by one Jean Mourier. Mourier did not come himself but instead sent a messenger from Béziers, presumably to all sympathetic ears between there and Toulouse, who told Jean when and where he could meet the majoral.⁶⁰⁵ Raymond of Costa also made use of messengers; Huguette states that during her stay in Pamiers one of his messengers returned there, after which Raymond travelled to Narbonne.⁶⁰⁶

⁵⁹⁷ *CHC*, 520.

⁵⁹⁸ *CHC*, 522.

⁵⁹⁹ Jacqueline Caille, 'Urban Expansion in the Region of Languedoc from the Eleventh to the Fourteenth Centuries: the Examples of Narbonne and Montpellier' in Kathryn Reyerson and John Drendel (eds.), *Urban and Rural Communities in Medieval France: Provence and Languedoc, 1000-1500*, (Leiden, 1998), 60-7.

⁶⁰⁰ *CJV*, 514.

⁶⁰¹ Joëlle Rollo-Koster, 'Mercator Florentinensis and Others: Immigration in Papal Avignon' in Reyerson and Drendel (eds.), *Urban and Rural Communities in Medieval France*, 92-5.

⁶⁰² *CRC*, 56.

⁶⁰³ *CRC*, 101-2.

⁶⁰⁴ For messengers in the Cathar sources, see Bruschi, *Wandering Heretics*, 66-7.

⁶⁰⁵ *CJV*, 512-3.

⁶⁰⁶ *CHC*, 521.

From the above evidence we can construct a reasonable picture of the macro-scale spatial organisation of the Waldensian Order in this period. Activities were mainly centred in towns and cities, which contained known 'safe-houses' or 'hospices' in which members could conduct their business safely. Despite the large distances between them, these communities were by no means isolated. Using pre-existing travel networks originally created for the purposes of trade, and under the guise of poor craftsmen or pilgrims, Waldensians performed a continual series of movements between these houses, maintaining a sense of group identity across a large geographic area. These journeys included ordained members travelling to preach and give pastoral care to local communities, local believers moving to a particular town where they knew such a minister was already present, or messengers who relayed information between Waldensian houses. By performing these frequent and numerous long-distance journeys, Waldensians were able to compress what was a very large space geographically, into a much smaller space socially.

This spatial structure may be further conceptualised with reference to Pierre Bourdieu's work on the notion of social space and the formation of groups. Bourdieu argues that social space may be conceptualised as a matrix within which individuals can be positioned, depending on relative factors such as access to material goods and 'cultural capital'.⁶⁰⁷ A person's position on this matrix would then determine their level of power and prestige within a social group, and thereby determine their use and perceptions of the social space, for example within a city. Bourdieu argues that – although not a certainty – there is an increased likelihood of groups forming among individuals positioned similarly on the social space matrix.⁶⁰⁸ However, Bourdieu was largely envisioning society as a homogenous entity in his work, with individuals on the lower end of the cultural capital spectrum consequently having less privileged access to the spatial components of that society (he cites the modern-day example of museums being more likely to be visited by those with higher cultural capital).⁶⁰⁹ Instead, it may be better to describe the Waldensian community as producing a subaltern social space, which was laid out on top of and intermingled with a more general social space, but which was only understood and accessed by members of the group. Although perhaps more egalitarian than wider society, one can still identify 'cultural capital' within this subaltern space. Knowledge and understanding of Scripture, alongside official ordination as a Brother, would certainly grant prestige and respect, but would also grant greater spatial freedom. As

⁶⁰⁷ Cultural capital is a broad term which can loosely be defined as an individual's ability to access and articulate privileged properties of a society. For example, someone born to a well-respected family, or with a privileged social role such as a judge or bishop, would have much higher cultural capital than a labourer or prostitute.

⁶⁰⁸ Bourdieu, 'The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups', *Theory and Society* 14, no.6 (1985), 724-5.

⁶⁰⁹ Bourdieu, 'The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups', 727.

a majoral, Jean of Lorraine knew all the houses of believers across a wide area, and could travel between them at will. In contrast, believers such as Huguette and John of Vienne only travelled when they were notified of the majoral's presence, and told when and where to find him. By constructing their own social space over a wide geographic area, Waldensians were able to subvert normal means of travel (as when they hid their religious trips under the guise of being travelling artisans), and produce a hidden spatial network only visible to those with the necessary 'cultural capital' to understand it.

4.2. Micro-Space: Subverting Social Space in Towns and Cities

Now that we have built up a reasonable picture of the spatial structure of the Waldensian Order on a large scale, it will be worth considering their production and use of this space on a micro scale within individual towns. An obvious place to start this analysis would be the meeting places they used. As has already been mentioned, the majority of such places that appear in our sources are individuals' houses. John of Vienne met majoral John of Lorraine alongside six other members of the Order at what he describes as 'a house in Toulouse near Saint-Sernin'.⁶¹⁰ In Arles, Huguette was instructed in Scripture at the house of a man named Bertrand de Tarascon, and on a later occasion she met John of Lorraine in the same place.⁶¹¹ Raymond of Costa describes his first interactions with the Order as having been when he was visited at his father's house by a particular Brother.³⁴ Later, on his journey through Italy with John of Lorraine, they moved from between different believers' houses as they travelled.³⁵

These houses take on two principal forms in the sources. Mostly, they appear to be normal domestic dwellings which are visited for a short while by a Waldensian brother, as when Raymond was first introduced to the sect. However, there is also evidence for the type of 'hostels' mentioned earlier in the *De vita* manuscript, in which a group of believers who were not from that town might stay, and where larger congregations could be held. Raymond's house in Pamiers might fit such a description, as he was living with up to eight other Waldensians at the time of his arrest, none of whom were natives to the city.⁶¹² Agnes also states that Raymond hosted meetings of believers at this house.⁶¹³ An additional piece of evidence for this type of meeting place can be found in John of

⁶¹⁰ CJV, 512-3.

⁶¹¹ CHC, 520; 523.

⁶¹² In addition to herself and the others that appear in Fournier's register, Huguette mentions her sister-in-law Petronille, Raymond's relations Jeanne and Jacqueline, and two other men named Etienne. CHC, 526.

⁶¹³ CAF, 124.

Vienne's deposition, in which he is recorded as saying that the woman he learned the Articles of Faith from ran a 'hostel' in Avignon.⁶¹⁴

These clandestine houses form the bulk of the meeting places mentioned in the depositions, but there is also evidence of interactions outside of this domestic space. In Huguette's account of her many encounters with John of Lorraine, she does not only meet him in a designated house, but also in more public places. Most notably, she states that she on one occasion met him outside the Franciscan convent in Montpellier, where they 'spoke publicly'.⁶¹⁵ Another time, also in Montpellier, they met each other in the street, and only then walked to the house of a local sympathiser.⁶¹⁶ Finally, Huguette also met Jean at a public inn in St-Gilles-du-Gard, between Montpellier and Arles, though it is unclear whether this meeting was pre-planned.⁶¹⁷

There seems to have been a division between the use of public and private space in towns by Waldensians, though this split is not entirely binary. Inquisitorial persecution certainly confined to the private sphere the performance of religious rituals and celebrations, as well as the preaching of doctrine. In Raymond de la Côte's words, the rite of ordination within the Order could only occur after the relevant parties had 'assembled in a house'.⁶¹⁸ Similarly, most meetings and discussions of religious matters occurred within the private space of the house, such as the meetings John of Vienne attended in Toulouse and Montpellier, in which six or more Waldensians were gathered.⁶¹⁹ However, this practical necessity for secrecy did not prevent Waldensian use of more public space. We have mentioned the example of Huguette and John of Lorraine speaking publicly outside the Franciscan convent in Montpellier, but it is notable that Huguette states they 'did not discuss any of the [Waldensian] errors'.⁶²⁰ In this case it is also possible that there were not as many people around to listen in, as the convent was sited outside the walls of the city.⁶²¹ Public meeting places could be used, but any serious discussion of matters of faith could not be had there. This is why, when Huguette 'wished to speak' with John of Lorraine in the streets of Montpellier, he needed to lead her to a local house to be able to do so.⁶²² At the St-Giles-du-Gard inn, John is concerned that Huguette might cause some embarrassment by her presence, and asks her to leave.⁶²³

⁶¹⁴ '...tenebat hostalarium.', *CJV*, 514.

⁶¹⁵ *CHC*, 522-3.

⁶¹⁶ *CHC*, 522.

⁶¹⁷ *CHC*, 523.

⁶¹⁸ *CRC*, 56.

⁶¹⁹ *CJV*, 512-3.

⁶²⁰ *CHC*, 522-3.

⁶²¹ Caille, 'Urban Expansion in the Region of Languedoc', 62.

⁶²² *CHC*, 522.

⁶²³ *CHC*, 523.

Overall, it may be argued that – as a general rule – public space was used by the Waldensians for the purposes of travel and occasionally as a meeting point, but any serious discussion of spiritual matters had to take place behind closed doors. However, there are important caveats to point out here. Most importantly, unlike the Cathars, Waldensians still believed in the fundamental institution of the Catholic Church, their main quarrel being with those in charge of it. Therefore, they were still capable of using public churches and other religious sites for their own purposes, without attracting any unwanted attention. Already cited above was Huguette’s vigil at the Church of Saint Mary of the Tablets in Montpellier, where John of Lorraine sent a messenger ferrying a gift,⁶²⁴ as well as the use of religious pilgrimage as a pretext for Waldensian travel between towns. She also mentions attending Church publicly with several other women.⁶²⁵ Raymond of Costa claims he was made deacon at a church in Vienne, and attends one regularly to pray, whilst Agnes claims to have received the sacrament of extreme unction from a ‘local chaplain’ after falling ill in Vermelle.⁶²⁶ As will be discussed below, these latter two examples may be using a more liberal definition of the word ‘church’, but it is undeniable that Waldensians were perfectly willing and capable to use Catholic spiritual facilities in conjunction with their own.

Finally, it is also worth briefly discussing an example from Huguette’s deposition which challenges a simplified notion of ‘private safety’ versus ‘public danger’ in terms of Waldensian use of space. When Huguette is at the house of Bertrand de Tarascon in Arles, a regular meeting place during her early years as a believer, she speaks to John of Lorraine in the garden there. Despite this being an ostensibly safe place to talk, she recalls urging him to leave because ‘there were many people in the house’.⁶²⁷ This is an intriguing statement which does not seem to fit in with the other depositions, in which private houses are the place to speak freely. If not a mistranscription, one might speculate that either uninitiated individuals were also present in the house, or that simply the volume of attendees might have caused undue attention. Regardless, the example stands as an important caveat to the use of these private spaces by Waldensians, which will be analysed further below.

Another significant aspect to consider is the way in which the private space of the houses that served as meeting points for the Waldensians were kept concealed. When John of Vienne was

⁶²⁴ *CHC*, 522.

⁶²⁵ Huguette claims these women were not Waldensians, though it is possible she is attempting to save them from inquisitorial interest. *CHC*, 526.

⁶²⁶ *CAF*, 123.

⁶²⁷ *CHC*, 523.

sent to such a house in Toulouse, he was directed there by a messenger. His account of the event records the designated meeting place in some detail:

“...and he found [John de Lorraine] in a certain house that is near the Great Street near Saint-Sernin, next to the house is a large tower, and the house was formed on the exterior by the ramparts, on the interior by the walls, and there was a workshop in the house.”⁶²⁸

This description seems to relate the instructions given to Jean on how to find the correct house. Indeed, the directions are specific enough that Duvernoy has speculated a modern location of the site on the rue du Taur.⁶²⁹ Similarly, in his recollection of meeting Raymond of Costa in Montpellier, Jean describes the meeting as having happened ‘on Butcher Street in a house with red-trimmed windows.’⁶³⁰ Again, the specificity of the description suggests a navigational purpose, one would find the correct house by identifying distinguishing features, which would only have meaning for those involved in the community.

The meeting places themselves were also disguised with a dual purpose. In the example above Jean mentions a workshop in the house, which would have offered a publically acceptable function to the building, whilst cloaking the second purpose of the site as a Waldensian meeting place. Proximity to workshops was likely common due to the popularity of the movement with urban tradesmen. Elsewhere, John of Vienne mentions that the ‘hostel’ in Avignon was situated ‘next to a threshing house.’⁶³¹ In Montpellier, there were some meeting points around the Franciscan convent there. Huguette met John of Lorraine outside the gate, and later mentions a house ‘near the Franciscans’. The similarities in the two groups, with their emphasis on poverty and the Gospels, may have been beneficial here in disguising the existence of a Waldensian community from the inquisition.⁶³²

The use of ‘hidden knowledge’ by members of the community to navigate cities and identify concealed meeting points may be further illuminated by reference to Michel de Certeau’s work on the spatial composition of cities. According to de Certeau, the geographic component of space found on maps can only tell part of the story, and to truly understand how the space of a city is produced one

⁶²⁸ ‘...et invenit dictum Iohannem cum predictis in quadam domo que est iuxta magnam carreriam iuxta Sanctum Saturnium, iuxta quam domum est una magna turris, et erat domus a parte exterior de muro, et interius errant parietes, et erat operatorium in ea.’ *CJV*, 512.

⁶²⁹ *Ibid.*, footnote 196.

⁶³⁰ ‘...in carreria de Sannaria in quadam domo cuius fenestre sunt barrate de rubo colore...’, *CJV*, 513.

⁶³¹ *CJV*, 514.

⁶³² For a comparative analysis of the Spiritual Franciscans and Waldensians, see chapter six.

must consider the 'lived, anthropomorphic space' as understood by the user.⁶³³ Spaces in cities are therefore built up by the culmination of individual agents moving through it, each contributing their own understanding of the space to the whole. Although there are always structural restrictions on movement, an individual agent is still capable of adding their own restrictions or cultivating new possibilities.⁶³⁴ Crucially for our purposes, this means that there are 'as many spaces as there are distinct spatial experiences.'⁶³⁵ By virtue of having access to the esoteric knowledge of the locations of meeting places, Waldensians were able to produce their own unique understanding of the spatial components of a city such as Toulouse or Montpellier. Again we can see the subversion of public places such as streets, churches and workshops, by their incorporation into navigational systems and meeting points. Even the imposing basilica of Saint-Sernin, ostensibly a reminder of the power and authority of the Catholic Church, is in this way absorbed into the subaltern space, as a waypoint to find a specific meeting house in Toulouse.

A final way in which the Waldensians were able to subvert and reappropriate space was by their use of religious rites. This subject can best be introduced with a statement from the deposition of Raymond of Costa. When asked for his definition of the word 'Church' he responded:

"...that he understood the word Church to be a gathering of men who have the true faith and live faith by their works, and who preserve as far as possible the divine precepts."⁶³⁶

Crucially, this definition does not require a specific consecrated building in order to perform the function of the Church. Raymond's understanding, drawn from a literal interpretation of Scripture, is that the community and their shared beliefs are the Church. The logical consequence of this is that any Waldensian meeting place can be transformed into a church merely by the presence of true believers and the performance of Christian rites. In this way, Waldensians were able to produce sacred spaces of their own which did not require the use of Catholic churches. Henri Lefebvre argued that spatial meaning is only embodied by the practio-social activity that produces it.⁶³⁷ By the performance of sacraments and the act of preaching, Waldensians turned workshops and private houses into churches, imbuing a hidden double-meaning on these spaces to those involved with the

⁶³³ De Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley, 1984), 91-3.

⁶³⁴ *Ibid.*, 98-9.

⁶³⁵ *Ibid.*, 118.

⁶³⁶ '...quod ipse intelligit nomine ecclesie congregationem hominum rectam fidem habentium et ipsam fidem opera implentium, et precepta divina pro posse custodientium.', *CRC*, 83.

⁶³⁷ Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford, 1991), 131.

Order. Lefebvre was considering community activity as a homogenous entity,⁶³⁸ but here we can see the activity of a marginalised and oppressed group being capable of producing their own meaningful space within the framework wider society. The social space of a city such as Toulouse or Montpellier was shared by both Waldensians and the Roman Church, and the former's formulations of space can best be understood as transgressive of the latter's power.⁶³⁹

4.3. Conclusions

Waldensian use of space in this period is typified by the themes of compression and subversion. The community was spread out across a large geographic area, partly due to the evangelical ideology of the movement, and partly due to inquisitorial pressure. In order to maintain a group identity over such a large space, a system of 'functional itinerancy' was required in which movement between communities in different towns and cities was commonplace. Constant journeys by spiritual leaders, believers, and messengers kept disparate individuals in contact with one another, and served as a means of compressing the space between them. These movements also appropriated pre-existing transport networks, and Waldensians were able to subvert traditional reasons for travel by disguising their journeys as related to work, business or religious pilgrimage.

This subversion extended to their use of space within cities. By incorporating signs and signifiers in towns and cities into a navigational network only understood by the community, Waldensians were able to produce their own space even in the public sphere. In this way streets and churches became signposts for those who knew where to look. The Waldensians' houses themselves acted as an important component of this subaltern space, particularly as a transgressive challenge to the power of the Catholic Church. Using an Apostolic understanding of a church as a gathering of people of true faith, Waldensians transformed their private houses and workshops into sacred spaces of worship and sacramental ritual, directly undermining the Roman Church's monopoly over this sphere.

Traditional analyses of social space have largely assumed a functional homogeneity in societies, such as in Bourdieu's concept of 'cultural capital' and the spatial restrictions and freedoms it can engender. Yet subaltern groups were not powerless to produce their own space, and the

⁶³⁸ Clarke, 'Introduction – Medieval Chester: Views from the Walls' in C. Clarke (ed.), *Mapping the Medieval City: Space, Place and Identity in Medieval Chester c.1200-1600* (Cardiff, 2013), 11.

⁶³⁹ For a similar analysis using the example of Welsh subversion and transgression of English power and space in Medieval Chester, see Fulton, 'Medieval Chester and North Wales as a Social Space' C. Clarke (ed.), *Mapping the Medieval City* pp.149-168.

example of the French Waldensian community demonstrates that social power over space can be subverted by a clandestine, persecuted community.

Chapter Five – Durand of Huesca and Textual Memory

This chapter seeks to compare the views expressed by Raymond during his interrogation with the work of Durand of Huesca, a similarly well-educated Waldensian writing over a century earlier. Durand is of particular significance due to his authorship of two lengthy theological treatises, the *Liber Antiheresis* and the *Liber Contra Manicheos*, both of which defend the faith of the Catholic Church against the dualist heretics of southern France.⁶⁴⁰ The former work was written whilst Durand was a member of the Waldensian Order, and likely builds on his experiences of preaching in southern France. The latter was an updated version of this anti-heretical treatise, compiled after his formal reconciliation with the Church in 1207. After this reconciliation, Durand went on to found his own papally-approved Order, the Catholic Poor.⁶⁴¹ Durand's work is significant in the study of both early Waldensian and dualist theology, as it represents a rare example of surviving writing from a position outside the Church hierarchy.⁶⁴²

By comparing Durand's theology as presented in his *Liber Antiheresis* with the ideas expressed by Raymond in his interrogation, this paper will show his ideas to have had a more influential impact on the Waldensian movement than previously believed, and that this influence may have been partly responsible for the distinctive character of the French wing of the sect, which was far closer to orthodoxy than its Italian or German counterparts.⁶⁴³ The chapter will build on ideas of cultural memory and identity, and demonstrate that Durand's brand of Waldensian theology enjoyed a revival in southern France in the early fourteenth century. This has significant implications for the history of the movement, particularly in the tension between the more diverse and contextual 'Waldensianisms' promoted by Merlo,⁶⁴⁴ and the greater emphasis on continuity proposed by Biller.⁶⁴⁵ More broadly, the conclusions will contribute towards the study of continuity and identity within marginalised groups, and demonstrate the importance of written texts within these communities in the medieval period.

⁶⁴⁰ The *Liber Antiheresis* exists in two manuscript copies, and an edition has been published by Kurt-Victor Selge: Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, MS 1114, fols. 1r-120v; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat. 13446, fols. 1r-134v; Kurt-Victor Selge, *Die Ersten Waldenser: mit Edition des Liber Antiheresis des Durandus von Osca*, vol. 2, *Der Liber Antiheresis des Durandus von Osca* (Berlin, 1967), 3-257. A complete manuscript of the *Liber Contra Manicheos* is in Prague, Metropolitan Chapter, MS 527, fols. 38r-68r.

⁶⁴¹ For a history of the Catholic Poor see Damian Smith, *Crusade, Heresy, and Inquisition in the Lands of the Crown of Aragon (c. 1167-1276)* (Leiden, 2010) 149-163.

⁶⁴² Adam Hoose, 'Durán of Huesca (c. 1160–1230): A Waldensian Seeking a Remedy to Heresy', *Journal of Religious History* 38, no. 2 (2014), 173-189. See for example Adam Hoose's recent work, using Durand's *Liber* to examine dualist theology in Languedoc.

⁶⁴³ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 87.

⁶⁴⁴ Grado Merlo, *Valdesi e Valdismi*, 9-25.

⁶⁴⁵ Peter Biller, 'Goodbye to Waldensianism?', *Past and Present* 192, no. 1 (2006), 3-33.

5.1. Methodological Considerations

Before beginning such an ambitious project, one must take into consideration the justified criticism of history based purely on the similarity of ideas, especially considering the near century-long gap between the lives of Durand and Raymond. Mark Pegg has been the leading voice of this criticism in the field of heresy studies, arguing that an 'intellectualist bias' among historians has reduced the study of heretical groups to merely a comparison of abstract ideas - ideas which might not match up to the lived experiences of people at the time.⁶⁴⁶ This has led, he states, to a situation in which heresy is being constructed by historians in a very similar manner to the medieval inquisition, by considering any community with even vaguely similar ideas to be part of a single homogenous group. Monique Zerner has similarly questioned the paradigms of heresy studies, suggesting that historians have relied far too much on medieval anti-heretical polemics to inform their view of the subject.⁶⁴⁷ Zerner has been an outspoken sceptic on the authenticity of the 'Charter of Niquinta', which purports to describe a meeting between Cathar leaders in 1167, questioning its use as evidence for the existence of an organised counter-Church.⁶⁴⁸ Another French historian, Julien Théry-Astruc, has also written against the notion of an organised Cathar movement, arguing that heresy in the period was largely formed by the Church's association of it with disobedience, and that the 'good men' of Languedoc were simply extra-ecclesial Christian holy men whose popularity lay in their less strenuous demands on the nobility.⁶⁴⁹ Finally, R. I. Moore has argued that historians have been reading the primary source material outside its proper chronological context, and have therefore misinterpreted localised activities as part of a wider 'Cathar heresy' to which they do not belong.⁶⁵⁰ These ideas have great merit and cannot be simply ignored; Pegg's work has done much to focus studies of heresy in France towards cultural specificity and nuance, and challenged lazy assumptions of uniformity among 'Cathars',⁶⁵¹ particularly their association to the Bogomils.⁶⁵² For

⁶⁴⁶ Pegg, 'On Cathars, Albigenses, and Good Men of Languedoc', *Journal of Medieval History* 27, no. 1 (2001), 183-8.

⁶⁴⁷ Zerner, *Inventer l'hérésie?: Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l'inquisition* (Nice, 1998), 7-13.

⁶⁴⁸ Zerner, 'Mise au point sur les cathares devant l'histoire et retour sur l'histoire du catharisme en discussion: le débat sur la charte de Niquinta n'est pas clos', *Journal des Savants* 2, no. 1 (2006), 253-73.

⁶⁴⁹ Théry-Astruc, 'Les hérésies, du XI^e au début du XIV^e siècle', in Marie-Madeleine de Cevins and Jean-Michel Matz (eds.), *Structures et dynamiques religieuses dans les sociétés de l'Occident latin (1179-1449)* (Rennes, 2010), 373-86, esp. 384; Théry-Astruc, 'The Heretical Dissidence of the 'Good Men' in the Albigeois (1276-1329) : Localism and Resistance to Roman Clericalism', in Antonio Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (Melton, 2016), 79-111, esp. 99-102.

⁶⁵⁰ Moore, 'The Cathar Middle Ages as an Historiographical Problem' in *Christianity and Culture in the Middle Ages: Essays to Honor John Van Engen*, ed. David C. Mengel and Lisa Wolverton, (Notre Dame, Indiana, 2015), 72-4; idem, *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe* (London, 2012), 132-40.

⁶⁵¹ Pegg, 'On Cathars', 191-192. Pegg argues that this designation has little historical value, instead referring to them as 'good men'.

⁶⁵² Pegg, 'Albigenses in the Antipodes: An Australian and the Cathars', *Journal of Religious History* 35, no. 4 (2011) 587.

example, Antoine Dondaine's description of six distinct 'Cathar Churches' operating in thirteenth century Italy certainly does not stand up to this modern methodological scrutiny, based as it is on polemical tracts which are trying to demonstrate the divisions among heretics.⁶⁵³

Any analysis based on a comparison of ideas must therefore address the aforementioned critiques. The similarities must be contextual and specific, it must be demonstrated how these ideas might survive the intervening generations, and the individuals concerned must be shown to have a complete understanding of the concepts presented. This paper will be divided into three sections to satisfy these objectives. The first will concern the life and intellectual activities of Durand of Huesca. This will demonstrate his lasting influence as a prominent theologian, and his continuing relationship with the Waldensians of southern France. The second section will discuss the continuity of Waldensian communities in France in the intervening period of the thirteenth century, to demonstrate how Durand's ideas might have survived to be rediscovered in the early fourteenth century sources. This section will also include an analysis of Raymond of Costa, arguing for his broad intellectual horizons, and his capability of accessing and understanding the ideas involved. Finally, the ideas of the *Liber Antiheresis* will be examined in comparison with those expressed by Raymond in Fournier's register, with an emphasis on concepts specific to the Waldensian community.

5.2. Durand of Huesca: Life and Works

Comparatively little attention has been given to Durand of Huesca in the historical literature, especially in recent years. Antoine Dondaine can be credited with bringing Durand to modern scholarly attention, with his description of the manuscript editions of Durand's two main works, the *Liber Antiheresis* and the *Liber Contra Manicheos*.⁶⁵⁴ Christine Thouzellier has written on Durand's theology and anti-Cathar polemic both as a Waldensian and as a reconciled Catholic in her works on heresy in southern France, and published an edition of the *Liber Contra*.⁶⁵⁵ Kurt-Victor Selge has published a Latin edition of the *Liber Antiheresis* as part of his history of the early years of the Waldensian movement.⁶⁵⁶ The early life of Durand has been investigated by Yves Dossat and Esteban

⁶⁵³ Dondaine, 'Catalogue de la Hiérarchie Cathare d'Italie', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XX (1950), 278-305.

⁶⁵⁴ Dondaine, 'Durand de Huesca et la Polémique Anti-Cathare', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XXIV (1959), 228-76.

⁶⁵⁵ Thouzellier, *Une somme anti-cathare: le Liber Contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca* (Louvain, 1964); idem, *Catharisme et Valdésisme en Languedoc à la fin du XIIIe et au début du XIIIe siècle politique pontificale; controverses* (Paris, 1965), 60-79, 215-38, 301-424; idem, *Hérésie et hérétiques: Vaudois, Cathares, Patarins, Albigeois* (Rome, 1969), 39-79.

⁶⁵⁶ See note 640 above.

Sarasa Sánchez, with the latter addressing the importance of his Aragonese origins.⁶⁵⁷ More recently, Carlo Papini has analysed Durand's theological beliefs in the *Liber Antiheresis*,⁶⁵⁸ and Sergio Torres and Damian Smith have looked at Durand's life as evidence in favour of a significant presence of heterodox dissent in Aragon.⁶⁵⁹ Finally, the most comprehensive recent work on Durand has been completed by Adam Hoose, who has used the *Liber Antiheresis* and *Liber Contra Manicheos* to argue convincingly for the existence of substantive theological differences between Catholics and French dualists.⁶⁶⁰

Little is known of Durand's early life other than that he was from the town of Huesca, in the lands of the Crown of Aragon. Dossat attempted to argue that Durand's birthplace was the other side of the Pyrenees in the Rouergue, based on the idea that Durand was not a typical Aragonese name at the time and that the Waldensian heresy was otherwise unknown to the region.⁶⁶¹ Sánchez has also suggested that Durand may be of French origin, as the son of an immigrant family from Languedoc.⁶⁶² This theory has been rejected by Damian Smith, who cites the relatively plentiful numbers of Duranduses present in records of the conquest of the Ebro valley. Smith also highlights the frequency of references to heresy in the region at the time, particularly the legislation enacted against heretics specifically present in the lands of Aragon by Alfonso II and Peter II.⁶⁶³

What we do know of Durand's personal life stems largely from his surviving writings, which suggest a good level of education in Latin, with a strong grasp of Scripture and a familiarity with the Church Fathers. Durand was also familiar with Latin grammar, as well as certain Classical poets such as Horace, Virgil and Plautus.⁶⁶⁴ Smith points to the cathedral school in Huesca as the only feasible location where Durand could have received such an education, and he may have been the same Durandus recorded as the *scriptor* for a donation made to the Bishop of Huesca in 1182.⁶⁶⁵ Whatever

⁶⁵⁷ Dossat, *A propos du prieur des Pauvres catholiques, Durand de Huesca ou de Losque en Rouergue?* (Paris, 1969); Sarasa Sánchez, 'Durán de Huesca, un Heterodoxo Aragonés en la Edad Media' in *Miscelanea de Estudios en Honor de D. Antonio Durán Gudiol*, ed. Amigos de Serrablo (Sabiñánigo, 1981).

⁶⁵⁸ Papini, *Valdo di Lione e i poveri nello spirito: Il primo secolo del movimento valdese (1170-1270)* (Turin, 2002), 203-22.

⁶⁵⁹ Torres, 'Durand de Huesca y la lucha contra el catarismo en la Corona de Aragón', *Anuario de Estudios Medievales* 39, no. 1 (2009), 3-25; Smith, *Crusade, Heresy, and Inquisition*, 137-69.

⁶⁶⁰ Hoose, 'A Waldensian Seeking a Remedy to Heresy'.

⁶⁶¹ Dossat, *A Propos du Prieur des Pauvres Catholiques*.

⁶⁶² Sarasa Sánchez, 'Durán de Huesca', 227.

⁶⁶³ Smith, *Crusade, Heresy, and Inquisition*, 138-9.

⁶⁶⁴ Thouzellier, *Catharisme et Valdésisme*, 215; Smith, *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition*, 139; Sarasa Sánchez, 'Durán de Huesca', 227.

⁶⁶⁵ Smith, *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition*, 139. For the donation see Antonio Durán Gudiol, ed., *Colección Diplomática de la Catedral de Huesca*, vol. 1 (Zaragoza: C.S.I.C, 1965), 372-3.

the case, we know that Durand went on to be involved with the Waldensian movement from at least the late 1180s, when he wrote his first surviving work, the *Liber Antiheresis*.

Two manuscripts of Durand's first known work have survived in the historical record. The Madrid manuscript was probably completed in the late 1180s, whilst the revised Paris version has been dated to the mid-to-late 1190s.⁶⁶⁶ The latter manuscript contains additional material concerning particularly Waldensian subjects such as oath-taking and blood punishments.⁶⁶⁷ The most recent Latin edition of the text was published by Kurt-Victor Selge in 1967, as a second volume to his work *Die Ersten Waldenser*.⁶⁶⁸

Durand's *Liber Antiheresis*, which will be discussed in more detail below, was first written towards the end of the 1180s and includes in the introduction the same profession of faith made by Valdes and his followers at a diocesan council at Lyons in 1180.⁶⁶⁹ The use of this text suggests that Durand was involved with the movement at a very early stage. Duvernoy has even suggested that Durand may have been the author of this profession of orthodoxy,⁶⁷⁰ though the first definitive evidence of his involvement in the movement we have remains around a decade later.

The *Liber Antiheresis* and Durand's later work, the *Liber contra Manicheos*, are both heavily focused on refuting heretical ideas and defending orthodoxy, particularly against the dualist heretics present at that time in Southern France. It is likely that Durand spent much of his time in the final decades of the twelfth century travelling in the Languedoc disputing with heretics, possibly alongside other members of the early Waldensian movement. We can infer this from his intimate knowledge of the arguments heretics often put forth when attacking the Church, as well as from records of disputations between heretics and the orthodox. According to William of Puylaurens Waldensians often represented the side of the Church in these debates, and Durand himself was involved in at least one public disputation.⁶⁷¹ Such debates appear to have been relatively common

⁶⁶⁶ Thouzellier, *Catharisme et Valdésisme*, 351-2.

⁶⁶⁷ Smith, *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition*, 144.

⁶⁶⁸ See note 5 above.

⁶⁶⁹ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 6-10.

⁶⁷⁰ Duvernoy, 'Le Mouvement Vaudois, Origines', *Heresis*, no. 13/14 (1990), 173-98. This speculation is supported by Durand's position as a prominent literate figure in the early movement, his scholarly interest in defending Waldensian orthodoxy, his close relationship with and respect for Valdes, and the inclusion of the profession in Durand's *Liber*.

⁶⁷¹ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat. 5212, fols. 1-22; William of Puylaurens, *Guillaume de Puylaurens: Chronique (Chronica Magistri Guillelmi de Podio Laurentii)*, ed. Jean Duvernoy (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1976); W. A. Silby and M. D. Silby, trans., *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens: The Albigensian Crusade and its Aftermath* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 8, 24-5.

in the region at the time, and undoubtedly influenced the arguments presented in Durand's writings.⁶⁷²

Although Waldensianism was officially categorised as a heresy in 1184 by Lucius III's *Ad Abolendam*, Durand continued to see himself as very much part of the orthodox Catholic Church. Despite drifting into Pelagianism in his discussion of predestination, his *Liber Antiheresis* is fundamentally based in orthodox biblical Scripture.⁶⁷³ In a later revision of this work, Durand adds additional sections in response to criticisms from the clergy, in which he discusses the specifically Waldensian topics of oath-taking and blood punishments. In both cases, Durand seems to struggle to harmonize his movement's principles with orthodoxy, insisting that both actions are just, but only in certain circumstances.⁶⁷⁴ This conflict between the Waldensian movement and the Catholic hierarchy was clearly of great concern to Durand, and eventually in 1207 he took part in a debate at Pamiers with Bishop Diego of Osma and Saint Dominic, at which he was confounded and formally appealed for reconciliation with the Catholic faith.⁶⁷⁵ Durand's decision to be reconciled was almost certainly planned in advance rather than an act of spontaneity,⁶⁷⁶ and he subsequently travelled to Rome to press his case directly with the Pope.

In order to compare Durand's theology with that of Waldensians over a hundred years later it is necessary to show that he was an influential figure of the period who might have had a lasting influence, and it is likely due in large part to his conversion to Catholicism that this was the case and that his writings survived. Durand spent a lot of time in and out of the papal court between 1207 and 1212 attempting to establish an officially sanctioned Church order, and it was at this time that he began to make contacts within the established clergy, including those on the list of cardinals which he thanks in the prologue to his *Contra*.⁶⁷⁷ It was also during this period that Durand completed his third surviving work, a revision of Peter of Capua's *Alphabetum in artem sermocinandi*, which has been discovered by Mary and Richard Rouse in a manuscript collection at Yale University.⁶⁷⁸ The manuscript is important evidence of how broad Durand's intellectual horizons were, and how

⁶⁷² Giovanni Domenico Mansi, (ed.), *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 22 (Graz, 1961), 157-168; William Stubbs, ed., *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1869), 150-55; Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York, 1991), 190-4, 195-200.

⁶⁷³ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 89-93; Lambert, M., *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (Oxford, 1992) pp.74-5.

⁶⁷⁴ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 248-57; Smith, *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition*, 147.

⁶⁷⁵ Silby and Silby, *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens*, 24-5.

⁶⁷⁶ Smith, *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition*, 152.

⁶⁷⁷ Thouzellier, *Liber Contra Manicheos*, 82-5.

⁶⁷⁸ Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS Marston 266; Rouse and Rouse, 'The Schools and the Waldensians: A New Work by Durand of Huesca' in *Christendom and its Discontents: Exclusion, Persecution, and Rebellion, 1000-1500*, ed. Scott Waugh and Peter Diehl (Cambridge, 1996), 86-111;

involved he was with the upper echelons of the Church hierarchy. Rouse and Rouse suggest that Durand was introduced to the *Alphabetum* by one of the cardinals he met at the papal court, and a post-reconciliation date for this work is further evidenced by the dedication in its prologue to the Church canonist Bernard of Pavia.⁶⁷⁹ In this prologue Durand states he hopes to win Bernard's approval, and it is likely that they met at some point during one of Durand's visits to Rome. We know at least that Durand spent a considerable amount of time preaching against the poor Lombards around Milan in 1209, which is little more than twenty miles from Pavia.⁶⁸⁰ The *Alphabetum* is mainly an alphabetised list of biblical distinctions used to help clergy in writing sermons, but Durand also includes a life of Peter of Capua in the form of rhymed verse.⁶⁸¹ It is possible that Durand was introduced to Peter's work by Leo Brancaloni, who was Durand's most helpful supporter at the papal court, as there is a potential link between Leo and Peter via a shared canon named Andreas.⁶⁸² Whatever the case, the manuscript is clear evidence that Durand knew and was known by several influential members of the Church, had broad intellectual horizons, and was involved at the highest level of the clerical hierarchy. This is strong evidence in favour of the lasting significance of Durand's work and ideas, and this will be further attested by the fact that he retained contact with the Waldensian movement even after his reconciliation.

Despite the fact that Durand appeared to fully embrace orthodox Catholicism during this period, there is also evidence that he had a continuing influence among those who persisted in the Waldensian dissent. His exploits in Milan, preaching to the Lombard wing of the movement, have already been mentioned, but it is also clear that he continued to have contact with Waldensians in Aragon and the Languedoc after his conversion. This is apparent from letters sent from the papal court, one to the archbishop of Tarragona in 1208,⁶⁸³ a second to Durand himself in 1209,⁶⁸⁴ and another circulated among various bishops in Aragon and the Languedoc in 1212.⁶⁸⁵ The first explains Durand's wish to set up his own, papally approved Order in the region. It contains a copy of his profession of faith, including a rejection of Donatism and the commitment not to preach without the approval of a Church prelate.⁶⁸⁶ The 'Catholic Poor', as his order was to be known, were to live a life of apostolic poverty and spend their time studying, teaching and disputing with heretics.⁶⁸⁷ Dondaine notes that Durand does not mention Waldensians in his mission statement, suggesting he

⁶⁷⁹ Rouse and Rouse, 'The Schools and the Waldensians', 87, 94.

⁶⁸⁰ *PL* 216, cols. 29-30 (XII.17).

⁶⁸¹ Rouse and Rouse, 'The Schools and the Waldensians', pp.104-110.

⁶⁸² Rouse and Rouse, 'The Schools and the Waldensians', p.94.

⁶⁸³ *Regestorum sive epistolarum*, *PL* 215, cols. 1510-3 (XI.196).

⁶⁸⁴ *Regestorum sive epistolarum*, *PL* 216, cols. 75-7 (XII.69).

⁶⁸⁵ *Regestorum sive epistolarum*, *PL* 216, col. 607 (XV.90).

⁶⁸⁶ *Regestorum sive epistolarum*, *PL* 215, cols. 1510-2 (XI.196).

⁶⁸⁷ *Ibid*, cols.1512-3.

does not consider them to be ‘true’ heretics in the same fashion as the dualists.⁶⁸⁸ Durand clearly expected to interact with his former Waldensian brethren as well as Cathar heretics, and we can see that he did so in the letter sent to him from Rome the following year. This letter was sent in response to complaints from the archbishop of Narbonne, as well as the bishops of Béziers, Uzès, Nîmes and Carcassone, that Durand was fraternising with unreconciled Waldensians, and drawing people away from preaching in Church.⁶⁸⁹ They also charge his order with continuing to hold certain Waldensian beliefs, particularly that no-one may impose a blood judgement without sin.⁶⁹⁰ It seems that despite his reconciliation, Durand did not wish to distance himself from his former order, instead actively seeking them out and engaging with them.

It also appeared, at least to the local Bishops, that he was not overly concerned with changing their views, and that his preaching was in active competition to that of the established Church in the region. A papal letter instructs Durand that whilst confounding heretics was commendable, care should be taken that this preaching is correct, and that any newly reconciled recruits should be paired up with experienced orthodox preachers.⁶⁹¹ This suggests that the papal court was aware of Durand’s intention to attempt to reconcile some of his former Waldensian brethren, and was advising him on the best way to do so without upsetting the local clergy. The final letter, *cum dilectus filius*, was circulated in 1212 amongst the bishops of Marseilles, Huesca and Barcelona. The short missive instructs the bishops to act kindly in welcoming Durand and newly reconciled Waldensians back to the Catholic flock.⁶⁹² Again, this is evidence that Durand did not entirely separate himself from his old order after his reconciliation, instead returning to where he had been preaching as a Waldensian in an attempt to convert other members of his former sect. His fondness for his former brethren can also be found in the *Liber contra manicheos*, written after Durand’s reconciliation. In the introduction, he praises Waldensian founder Valdes as an inspirational figure of unquestionable faith, comparing him to the biblical raven which checks to see if the flood has ended in Genesis.⁶⁹³ Durand explains that despite the good intentions of early Waldensians, some bad ideas crept into the movement and generated a heresy among some followers. Durand is referring here to the Poor Lombards under the leadership of Giovanni da Ronco, who had adopted a much more anticlerical stance.⁶⁹⁴ Papini notes that the Aragonese wrote

⁶⁸⁸ Dondaine, ‘Durand de Huesca’, p.238.

⁶⁸⁹ *Regestorum sive epistolarum*, PL 216, cols. 75-7 (XII.69).

⁶⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹¹ *Regestorum sive epistolarum*, PL 216, cols. 76-7 (XII.69).

⁶⁹² *Regestorum sive epistolarum*, PL 216, col. 607 (XV.90).

⁶⁹³ Thouzellier, *Une Somme Anti-Cathare*, 70.

⁶⁹⁴ *Rescriptum Heresiarcharum Lombardie ad Pauperes de Lugduno, qui sunt in Almania*, in Wilhelm Preger, ‘Beiträge zur Geschichte der Waldesier im Mittelalter’, *Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* XIII (Munich, 1875), 56-63. This Waldensian letter, known as the

specifically against the errors of the Lombards, but never attacked his former Lyonist comrades.⁶⁹⁵ Clearly, Durand's reconciliation did not mark a significant departure from his previous views, nor did it meaningfully distance him from the Waldensian community he was once a part of.

Even after Durand's death, the Order he founded continued to be viewed with great suspicion by the clergy. In 1237, Gregory IX sent a commissioner to the provincial prior of the Dominicans in Aragon to correct the Poor Catholics in the region, who were suspected of the 'heresy of Lyon'.⁶⁹⁶ A decade later, the bishops of Narbonne and Elne complained to the Holy See about the Order's unregulated preaching.⁶⁹⁷ The Catholic Poor disappear from the historical record by the middle of the thirteenth century,⁶⁹⁸ but the Order certainly had an impact on the Waldensian movement in southern France in the time they were active, and may have been a vehicle by which Durand's ideas were propagated and stored in the cultural memory of the Waldensians in that region.

5.3. Waldensians in the Languedoc after Durand's Death

Evidence for Waldensian presence in southern France is plentiful in the first half of the thirteenth century, but becomes sparser after the mid-1240s, when they appear to have become more marginal. However, the record is not entirely silent about them in this period, and in the 1241-1242 sentences of Peter Seilan in Quercy Waldensians are not hugely outnumbered by Cathars at Montauban.⁶⁹⁹ Waldensians are also present, if less prominent, in the 1245-1246 Toulouse inquisition.⁷⁰⁰ While the movement itself may have become less popular in the latter half of the thirteenth century, it remained a relevant threat in the polemics of the Catholic clergy. Damian Smith argues that the categorisation of heretics discussed at the Council of Tarragona in 1242

Rescriptum or the 'Conference of Bergamo', is a record of a meeting between the two parties and lists their various disagreements, such as whether Valdes was in paradise, and whether a sinful priest can perform the sacraments.

⁶⁹⁵ Papini, *Valdo di Lione*, 212.

⁶⁹⁶ Santiago Domínguez Sánchez, (ed.), *Documentos de Gregorio IX (1227-1241) Referentes a España*, (Leon, 2004), doc. 675, 538-39; Cited in Torres, 'Durand de Huesca', 23.

⁶⁹⁷ Augusto Quintana Prieto, (ed.), *La Documentación Pontificia de Inocencio IV (1243-1254)*, vol. VII (Rome, 1987), doc. 397, 396-97; Cited in Torres, 'Durand de Huesca', p.23.

⁶⁹⁸ Thouzellier, *Catharisme et Valdésisme*, 298-9. The final mention of the Catholic Poor in the sources occurs when a Lombard group joined the Hermits of St Augustine in 1256.

⁶⁹⁹ Biller, 'The *Topos* and Reality of the Heretic as *Illitteratus*', in *The Waldenses: 1170-1530: Between a Religious Order and a Church*, ed. Peter Biller (Aldershot, 2001), 176; The original manuscript is held in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. lat. Doat 21, fols. 185r-312v.

⁷⁰⁰ Toulouse, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 609; For the English translations of the relevant sections see Biller, 'Interrogation of Waldensians', in *Medieval Christianity in Practice*, ed. Miri Rubin (Princeton, 2009) pp.231-8.

primarily targeted Waldensianism,⁷⁰¹ while both Stephen of Bourbon and Anselm of Alessandria – both writing after 1250 – talk in the present tense about the sect, their errors and how they are to be recognised and refuted.⁷⁰² In this period, we also have evidence for a Waldensian presence in the Rouergue in 1273, of which five were from Burgundy, as were the Waldensians from Fournier’s period.⁷⁰³ The lacuna between the 1250s and 1270s might be best explained in terms of migration as a response to persecution, with communities moving to and from the Languedoc depending on the degree of tolerance they found there. Claire Taylor has shown how this form of migration took place during the Albigensian Crusade, and it is entirely possible the inquisitions of the 1240s had a similar effect.⁷⁰⁴

While we do not have an unbroken historical account of Waldensian presence in Southern France, it continued to be an important location for remaining members of the movement, and subject to reinvigoration by small communities from Burgundy and elsewhere, possibly in response to outbreaks of persecution. It could be that the similarities suggested below between Durand’s work and the views of Raymond of Costa are evidence for continuity in itself, as opposed to such ideas having been lost and then reinvented over the period of just a few generations. However, as discussed earlier it is necessary to use caution in arguing for the continuity of ideas themselves without continuity of evidence for these ideas. This chapter hopes instead to demonstrate similarities between Durand’s ideas and those of Raymond, and use this as evidence for a revival or rediscovery of this theology.

5.4. Raymond of Costa and his Community’s Textual Memory

In order to support this hypothesis, it will be necessary to show that the group of Waldensians present in Fournier’s register, particularly Raymond of Costa, had the means and intellectual horizons to access and understand this kind of material. Despite becoming a far more clandestine sect by this period due to the threat of persecution, the Waldensians we find in Fournier’s record are hardly insular or provincial. Raymond of Costa had received theological training from the Franciscans

⁷⁰¹ Smith, *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition*, 197.

⁷⁰² ‘*Stephani de Borbone tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilis*’, in *Anecdotes historiques: Légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d’Étienne de Bourbon, Dominicain du XIIIe siècle*, ed. Albert Lecoy de la Marche, Société de l’Histoire de France, CLXXXV (Paris, 1877), 290-2; Dondaine, ‘La Hiérarchie Cathare en Italie’, 310-24; English translations can be found in Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 208-10, 369-73.

⁷⁰³ Duvernoy, *Le registre d’inquisition de Jacques Fournier*, 16.

⁷⁰⁴ Claire Taylor, ‘*Sunt quadraginta anni vel circa*’: Southern French Waldensians and the Albigensian Crusade’, *French History* 32, no. 3 (2018), 327-49.

in Montpellier, and had travelled with his mentor John of Lorraine across Southern France and Northern Italy for almost a decade, and would have had ample time to meet and have discussions with numerous other Brothers and believers from diverse locations.⁷⁰⁵ Cameron has suggested that this John may be the same as the preachers John of Chalon and John of Grandvaux mentioned in earlier depositions.⁷⁰⁶ This evidence of travel also supports Biller's argument that the movement of Brothers between communities represented continuity and connection within a wider movement, adding a French example to a phenomenon which he has noted as also having occurred in Lombardy and Austria.⁷⁰⁷

The literacy of the community is also important to demonstrate for our purposes, and Alexander Patschovsky has argued convincingly for the continuing influence of literate Waldensians in the movement.⁷⁰⁸ He concludes that leaders within communities were often well-educated, and that even among the general membership there was a strong textual element to the movement based on reading and memorising Scripture in the vernacular.⁷⁰⁹ That Raymond of Costa was literate is inferred from his solid understanding of the Bible and knowledge of the Church Fathers, as well as the fact that he was initially arrested for being in possession of 'certain books and writings found in his house'.⁷¹⁰ Raymond made the rather ambitious claim that he kept the texts merely for their beautiful calligraphy, but this story seems difficult to believe in light of his education and obvious interest in Christian theology.⁷¹¹ Clearly we cannot identify the *Liber Antiheresis* in these documents, yet it undoubtedly shows that Raymond had access to manuscripts of a similar kind, and that it is highly likely that he would have had the opportunity to come across the works of Durand – a major theological influence in the earlier years of his order – at some point during his travels. Biller argues that Raymond may also have had knowledge of the Waldensian historical text *Liber electorum*, and highlights the fact that dead Brothers mentioned in Raymond's confession also appear in the register of Bernard Gui, further supporting the existence of a contiguous, geographically widespread movement.⁷¹² Gui also describes the case of Raymond in one of his sermons, so he may have had some small degree of fame or notoriety himself.⁷¹³ This idea is supported by a further mention of

⁷⁰⁵ CRC, 99-102.

⁷⁰⁶ Cameron, *Waldenses*, 89.

⁷⁰⁷ Biller, 'Goodbye to Waldensianism?', 25.

⁷⁰⁸ Patschovsky, 'The Literacy of Waldensianism from Valdes to c.1400', in *Heresy and Literacy, 1000-1530*, ed. Peter Biller and Anne Hudson (Cambridge, 1994), 112-36.

⁷⁰⁹ Ibid, 134-36.

⁷¹⁰ '...et ex quibusdam libris ac scriptis aliis apud eum repertis suspectus esset vehementer de heresi...', CRC, 40.

⁷¹¹ CRC, 41-2.

⁷¹² Biller, 'Goodbye to Waldensianism?', 27.

⁷¹³ 'Sermo factus apud Appamias anno domini MCCXXI, die secunda mensis augusti' in Bernard Gui, *Sentences, 1264-74*; Biller, 'Fat Christian and Old Peter: Ideals and Compromises among the Medieval Waldensians', in

Raymond in the case of William Austatz, also interrogated by Fournier, who believed the Waldensian had been wrongly executed and was a 'good cleric'.⁷¹⁴ Regardless, we know for certain that Raymond was very much involved in the movement as it was in his time, that he spent a lot of time travelling and interacting with other members of his order, and that he had access to or knowledge of a wide array of theological literature, and very likely an understanding of the history of his group.

5.5. The *Liber Antiheresis* and Raymond's Interrogation

Durand's *Liber* is intended as both a defence of orthodox faith and an attack on heretical beliefs. The work begins with a copy of the profession of faith made by Valdes and his companions at Lyon in 1180, setting out the author's principle claims to orthodoxy and belief in both the Church and Scripture.⁷¹⁵ The opening chapters concern the nature of God, Jesus and the Trinity, with a heavy emphasis on the physical reality of subjects such as Jesus and his resurrection, and refuting common heretical arguments such as the idea that Jesus was not fully human as well as fully divine.⁷¹⁶ This is followed by a section defending the unity and authenticity of the Catholic Church in comparison to the heretics' beliefs, and a chapter devoted to each of the seven sacraments in turn, setting out the proper Catholic interpretations of them, and refuting heretical errors associated with them.⁷¹⁷ The remaining chapters of the book are dedicated to miscellaneous theological topics, including manual labour, predestination, and salvation after death, all with a focus on setting the author's scripturally-based views against those of the heretics.⁷¹⁸ The Paris manuscript includes additional material after the epilogue, which tackles certain other heretical teachings (such as there being more than one God), as well as chapters on oath-taking and blood punishments, which attempt to defend Waldensian orthodoxy rather than reply to external heretical errors.⁷¹⁹

Unsurprisingly, Durand draws heavily from Scripture throughout the book. He makes use of both Testaments, but there is a large emphasis on the Gospels, particularly Matthew, which is the most cited Book by a large margin.⁷²⁰ Durand also makes plentiful use of Paul, particularly 1 Corinthians and Romans, as well as frequent references to the Psalms, which represent

Pragmatic Utopias: Ideals and Communities, 1200-1630, ed. Rosemary Horrox and Sarah Rees Jones (Cambridge, 2001), 181.

⁷¹⁴ 'Confessio Guillaume Autast', in Duvernoy, *Le Régistre d'Inquisition de Jacques Fournier*, 195.

⁷¹⁵ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 1-9.

⁷¹⁶ *Ibid*, 12-38.

⁷¹⁷ *Ibid*, 38-69.

⁷¹⁸ *Ibid*, 69-199.

⁷¹⁹ *Ibid*, 200-257.

⁷²⁰ Selge has compiled a helpful list of the biblical and extra-biblical passages cited in the *Liber* which can be found in Selge, *Die Ersten Waldenser*, vol. 2, 269-72.

approximately forty per-cent of the total Old Testament verses used. Outside of biblical sources, Augustine is the most prominent figure in Durand's work, though he occasionally makes use of more contemporary canonists and theologians such as Gratian and Peter Lombard. An interesting point of comparison here is the similarity between the ratio of Durand's sources and those present in the confession of Raymond of Costa. Raymond's principle source is also Matthew, whom he cites twenty-two times throughout his interrogation, as well as further fifteen passages from the other Gospel authors. Raymond's second-most significant source is Paul, who he cites a total of ten times. Of the Old Testament Books Raymond makes reference to, the Psalms are most prominent, featuring six times, whereas the sum total of references to all other Old Testament books is just thirteen. Overall, the composition of Biblical material between the two sources is very similar, with Matthew being the key authority, followed by Paul, the other Gospels, and the Old Testament, from which the Psalms are cited most frequently.⁷²¹ It must also be noted that Raymond does not use any extra-Biblical material in his defence as Durand does, which is a strict difference between the two. In defence of similarity it may be reasonably argued that Raymond would not have had access to such materials whilst imprisoned, whereas he may have learned biblical Scripture by rote or had a Bible provided for him to study.

5.5.a Ecclesiology

The similarities between the theology of Raymond and Durand are in no way limited to such general observations. In his section on the sacrament of ordination in the *Liber*, Durand addresses the criticism from heretics that his order is invalid because it has no bishop to lead it. In response, Durand states that his group have no need for an earthly leader, as Jesus Christ is the bishop of the Waldensians, and that therefore ultimate authority lies with God and not men.⁷²² This idea is repeated several times throughout the work, and Durand is consistent in his argument that the words of men are inferior to Scripture, which is the word of God.⁷²³ This idea is a principle defence used by Raymond during his interrogation, as to why he does not obey the Church on certain matters such as oath-taking.⁷²⁴ He also rejects the need for an earthly bishop to ordain members of his order, claiming that the members of his group were ordained in the same way that the apostles were, by an election and simple laying on of hands, which derived its ultimate authority from

⁷²¹ CRC; My own count of biblical passages quoted by Raymond.

⁷²² *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 60.

⁷²³ *Ibid*, 76, 134, 170, 256.

⁷²⁴ CRC, 52-3, 75-7.

Jesus.⁷²⁵ This idea is also repeated in replies by Raymond on the subject of his order's right to preach, in which he states this right comes directly from God, since the Pope has rejected the movement.⁷²⁶ Despite both men apparently rejecting the authority of the earthly Church in favour of Scripture, both accepted the legitimacy of the Roman Church and neither subscribed to Donatism. In his section on the unity of the Church, Durand counters the argument that the Church is divided by stating that any differences between orders are inconsequential, so long as they derive their belief from the word of God, and that they are like different branches on a single tree.⁷²⁷ Raymond echoes this sentiment several times throughout his interrogation, stating that the Roman Church had 'the same faith and belief' as his order.⁷²⁸ With regards to Donatism, Durand rejects it due to the superiority of the word of God over the word of man, stating that so long as the message given is true and scriptural, it does not matter who the messenger is.⁷²⁹ Raymond repeats this sentiment quite precisely when questioned as to whether he believed the blessings of Catholic priests to be valid, saying that since the priests bless with the authority of the Apostles, and say the words of the Lord, what they say is good and just regardless of their personal moral state, or whether they persecute Waldensians.⁷³⁰

This is not to say that either Durand or Raymond claim the Church to be infallible. Durand accepts the existence of sins such as usury, simony and fornication within the Church, but focuses on its legacy as the direct descendent of the Church of St Peter as providing its legitimacy, rather than the acts of any later individual.⁷³¹ Similarly, Raymond believes the Church to be in error on some points (such as oath-taking, purgatory and the persecution of his order), but accepts that the Catholic Church is the Church of the Apostles, and that the Pope holds the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven.⁷³² The overall impression one gets of the Church from reading both sources is of an institution that is worthy of respect for its long history of preserving the word of God since the time of the Apostles, yet which is by no means infallible and can perfectly well contain sinful people and bad ideas.

⁷²⁵ *CRC*, 54-5, 93-4.

⁷²⁶ *CRC*, 77-8.

⁷²⁷ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 72-3.

⁷²⁸ *CRC*, 79.

⁷²⁹ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 95-6.

⁷³⁰ *CRC*, 82.

⁷³¹ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 40-3.

⁷³² *CRC*, 79.

Durand's ecclesiology makes a consistently nuanced distinction between the Church as an institution and the Church as a theological concept. Durand defines this latter Church as existing anywhere there was a gathering of true believers:

*"Nos vero dicimus, quia semper ibi dei est ecclesia, ubi congregatio fidelium, qui fidem rectam tenent et operibus implent."*⁷³³

In Raymond's testimony, the Waldensian used very similar language in response to a question asking him for his definition of a church:

*"...respondit quod ipse intelligit nomine ecclesie congregationem hominum rectam fidem habentium et ipsam fidem opere implentium, et precepta divina pro posse custodientium."*⁷³⁴

For both Durand and Raymond, there was a separation of the 'immaculate' Church found in Scripture (which merely required a gathering of true believers) and the Roman Church. The latter could only strive towards the former, but was only as 'perfect' as the people it consisted of. This distinction allowed Durand to pursue his measured but consistent criticism of certain aspects of the Church in the *Liber*, in which sinful bishops should be reprimanded, and prelates judged based on the nature of their works.⁷³⁵ Papini has summarised Durand's ecclesiology as an ongoing conflict between the 'good' and the 'bad' elements of the Church. True believers such as the Waldensians must separate themselves as far as possible from all things 'wicked', which can exist even within the Church hierarchy.⁷³⁶ For Raymond of Costa, this conflict had become a terrible reality in which these 'wicked' elements of the Church were putting him on trial for heresy.

This contradiction can be explicated further by considering attitudes to Waldensian identity. Durand's theology of conflict between positive and negative forces in the Church gave the Waldensians an obvious purpose; to oppose heresy outside the Church, and evil prelates within it. In this way Waldensians could act as a 'wedge of orthodox faith in the Church which opposes heretical dogmas', and who 'reprove and resist' the sinful elements of the clergy.⁷³⁷ This latter activity was highlighted by Durand as the reason the movement faced persecution, and he vows to persevere in

⁷³³ 'Truly we say, that there is always a church of God, where there is a congregation of good people, who uphold the true faith and fulfil good works'; *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 95.

⁷³⁴ '...he responded that he understood the word church as a congregation of people who have the true faith and who fulfil this faith by their works, and who preserve as much as possible the divine precepts.'; *CRC*, 83.

⁷³⁵ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 60-2, 99.

⁷³⁶ Papini, *Valdo di Lione*, 220-1.

⁷³⁷ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 110; Thouzellier, *Catharisme et Valdésisme*, 78.

his faith until death, without renouncing for any reason.⁷³⁸ Raymond de la Côte's later persecution by the inquisition is therefore anticipated in Durand's writings, and we can see elements of this Waldensian identity as martyrs for the 'true Church' appearing in the fourteenth century testimony. Most obvious is Raymond's refusal to renounce any of his beliefs to the point of execution, despite his proximity to orthodoxy, and despite Fournier's general unwillingness to sentence his inquisition suspects to death. The glorification of persecution is a recurring theme in Raymond's testimony. He states that he believes he will acquire 'merit from God' for being persecuted, and that if he were to die for his beliefs he would be a martyr.⁷³⁹ He is also recorded as preaching to his inquisitor, warning that persecuting him was a punishable sin in the eyes of God, and that executing him would be comparable to the biblical stoning of martyr Saint Stephen.⁷⁴⁰ Raymond appears to be positioning his own group along similar lines to what Durand described in his *Liber*, as an element of the 'good' part of the Church opposing sinful clergy who wished to oppress them, and that will oppose these malevolent forces even to the point of death. Additionally, the use of Durand's position on ecclesiology would go some way to explaining the apparent contradiction between Raymond's identification of the Church as sinful persecutors of his Order, and his comparatively moderate criticisms of the Church and its prelates. Durand's theology anticipates evil in the Church, and the persecution of his own movement, yet does not necessitate the existence of two opposing Churches, as any large institution is bound to contain 'wicked' elements. The actions of Raymond's group can therefore be viewed as a pursuit of its obligation as a 'good' part of the Church by an unwavering opposition to these elements.

5.5.b Sacramental Theology

One of the most striking similarities between our two sources comes in their definition of the sacraments, which appear in seven distinct sections in both the *Liber Antiheresis* and Raymond's confession. In Raymond's case, these appear towards the beginning of the document as an attempt to prove the completeness of his Catholic faith to the inquisitor.⁷⁴¹ For Durand, they were principally a device by which he might show the heretics to be in error, though as a member of a controversial new Order he would also have been keen to demonstrate the soundness of his theology. Most of the definitions are unremarkable; the sacraments of baptism, the Eucharist, penance, extreme unction

⁷³⁸ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 99.

⁷³⁹ *CRC*, 50.

⁷⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 54, 72.

⁷⁴¹ *CRC*, 46-8.

and marriage are all defined in an orthodox manner. However, in the remaining two sacraments of confirmation and holy orders we begin to see some departures from traditional medieval theology.

Durand titles his subsection on confirmation '*De manuum impositione*' (on the imposition of hands). The Latin word '*confirmatio*' does not appear a single time in the section itself,⁷⁴² though the author mentions the sacrament is 'called confirmation by the Church' whilst introducing the subject in the previous section.⁷⁴³ For Durand, this sacrament was contained in the laying on of hands by the Apostles in Acts, a ritual which imparts the Holy Spirit to the recipient. He quotes the traditional biblical support for the sacrament found in Acts 8:14-17,⁷⁴⁴ as well as an excerpt from Maccabees 10 to show that Jesus also imposed his hands to grant benediction. Although the exact definition of confirmation was still a matter of debate in Durand's time, his interpretation is strictly biblical in a way that is not mirrored by any contemporary theologians. Peter Lombard locates the power of the sacrament in the words said by the bishop whilst he is signing a baptised recipient with the chrism.⁷⁴⁵ Both Thomas Aquinas and Alexander of Hales place the materiality of this sacrament in the anointing oil, rather than in the apostolic imposition of hands.⁷⁴⁶ Later in the thirteenth century, St. Bonaventure further cemented the definition of confirmation as the pronouncement of an oral formula by a bishop, alongside making the sign of the cross and anointing the recipient with the chrism.⁷⁴⁷

Clearly, Durand's interpretation of the sacrament was original, and held little similarity to definitions compiled by the influential theologians of the period beyond the passage in Acts. This is why it is all the more surprising that Raymond of Costa defines confirmation in such a similar manner, introducing it as '*manuum impositione*', and supporting this with Acts 8:14-17.⁷⁴⁸ As with Durand, there is no mention of oral formulas, genuflections or anointments. Raymond does not mention '*confirmatio*' at all, and struggles to explain when this sacrament should be used, suggesting that it happens as part of ordination. This confusion was noted by the inquisition; one of the heretical errors Raymond is eventually accused of is denying the necessity of the chrism as part of this sacrament.⁷⁴⁹ This raises an important question: Why would Raymond, a literate, theologically

⁷⁴² *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 56-7.

⁷⁴³ '...que ab ecclesia confirmatio vocatur...', *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 56.

⁷⁴⁴ Acts 8:14-19 is almost invariably the principal scriptural basis for confirmation; Thomas Marsh, 'The Theology of Confirmation', *The Furrow* 27, no. 11 (1976), 607.

⁷⁴⁵ Peter Lombard, *Sentences*, Book IV Distinction VII, trans. Giulio Silano (Toronto, 2010), 39-41.

⁷⁴⁶ Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 3a. 72, 2, ed. and trans. James J. Cunningham (London: Blackfriars, 1975); Alexander of Hales, *Summa universae theologiae*, Part IV Question IX, in *Alexandri de Ales angli, doctoris irrefragabilis Ordinis Minorum Universae theologiae summa*, ed. Franciscum Franciscum (Venice, 1575).

⁷⁴⁷ Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, Part VI Ch. VIII, ed. and trans. Dominic V. Monti (New York, 2005), 235-8.

⁷⁴⁸ *CRC*, 47.

⁷⁴⁹ *CRC*, 112.

trained preacher, lack such basic knowledge on one of the Catholic sacraments? The answer surely lies in a textual culture of scriptural literalism. Both Durand and Raymond reject or ignore the ceremonial trappings of the sacrament because they do not appear in the Bible. Both therefore struggle to explain why the imposition of hands should be a distinct sacrament, separate from baptism and ordination. From this example we can clearly see a shared heuristic method, begun by Durand and revived by Raymond's Waldensians in the fourteenth century.

This scriptural literalism can also be seen in the definition of the sacrament of ordination. Both Durand and Raymond identify only three orders in the Church: that of the bishop, priest, and deacon.⁷⁵⁰ Again, this goes against Catholic tradition, which usually identifies the additional minor orders of subdeacon, acolyte, exorcist, lector and porter.⁷⁵¹ Raymond is questioned on these latter orders, but he claims that they are effectively parts of the diaconate.⁷⁵² Once again, the Waldensian's definition of the sacrament in this way is listed as an error at the end of his interrogation.⁷⁵³ Durand's conclusion that there are three orders stems from the fact that the majority of the short amount he writes on the subject consists of direct quotes from Paul's first letter to Timothy.⁷⁵⁴ Raymond does not cite the biblical support for his claim, as he was more concerned with showing that his own group could ordain ministers, but it is very likely he rejected the minor orders as having no obvious scriptural foundation.

The similarities between Durand and Raymond's definition of the sacraments are quite precise; neither stray far from orthodoxy except on the subject of confirmation and ordination. Durand was never attacked by polemicists for these oddities, as they were far more concerned with unauthorised preaching,⁷⁵⁵ so they have often been missed by those examining Durand's heterodoxy. By contrast, Raymond is explicitly condemned for expressing these same ideas to the inquisition. The specific similarity in these definitions, particularly the use of 'imposition of hands' as a sacramental name, is fairly strong evidence that Raymond was using the *Liber* as a source, either himself or via a third party. At the very least, the evidence demonstrates the existence of a theological subculture basing itself on a strictly literal interpretation of Scripture - particularly the Gospels - founded by Durand and rediscovered by the moderate French wing of Waldensianism in the fourteenth century.

⁷⁵⁰ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 59-60; *CRC*, 47-8.

⁷⁵¹ For example Peter Lombard, *Sentences*, Book IV Distinction XXIV, 139.

⁷⁵² *CRC*, 48.

⁷⁵³ *CRC*, 109.

⁷⁵⁴ 1 Tim 3:1-7, 1 Tim 5:17, 1 Tim 3:8 (New International Version); *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 59.

⁷⁵⁵ For example Alan of Lille, *Contra haereticos* in *PL* 210, cols. 377-80 (II.1).

5.5.c Poverty and Labour

A final point of comparison worth exploring concerns beliefs about the nature of the apostolic life, and opinions on the value of manual labour. Clearly, imitation of the apostolic life was not unique to the theology of Durand, as it was a very popular idea in the period, practiced by the Franciscan and Dominican orders among others.⁷⁵⁶ As noted above, both Durand and Raymond use Matthew as a principle source, and both cite chapter six of this Gospel in which Jesus instructs the apostles not to work or care for material things (Matthew 6:25-34, NIV).⁷⁵⁷ In his chapter on the nature of work, Durand goes on to argue that most references to labour in the Bible concern both manual *and* spiritual work, and that in terms of overall importance, the latter is clearly superior to the former. Whilst he accepts that there is a role for manual labour, it is vulnerable to earthly sins such as greed and desire, and the spiritual work of holy men is far more important, as it has an eternal impact on the salvation of the soul.⁷⁵⁸ Thouzellier has summarised Durand's thoughts on work in terms of tiers of spiritual perfection. Manual labour was not evil in itself, but risked participation in worldly affairs that might lead to sin.⁷⁵⁹ Similarly, whilst God had not prohibited earthly possessions, He had endorsed embracing poverty as an 'advice' for those seeking to live the most pious lives they could.⁷⁶⁰

When Fournier interrogates Raymond on the subject of work, his answers seem to support this theological position. In order to join Raymond's group fully, one had to take a vow of poverty, which as he explained meant giving up all worldly possessions, and ceasing to live by manual labour. After this, and being ordained a deacon in the sect, Raymond states that any member would then be in a 'state of perfection', only achievable after giving up all earthly labour.⁷⁶¹ Raymond clearly does not think manual labour to be sinful in itself; the three companions arrested alongside him were not ordained members of the group and 'worked for their bread', probably helping to support Raymond in the process.⁷⁶² Yet Raymond would also not consider them to be in a state of perfection, and thus he is clearly in harmony with Durand in believing that a life of poverty and spiritual labour is strictly superior to a life of manual work. This agreement is more significant than it may at first seem, because it stands in contrast to the opinion of most other Waldensian communities of the period. The split between the Lyonists and Poor Lombards mentioned above partially revolved around the

⁷⁵⁶ On this topic see Constable, G., *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Little, L., *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (London: Elek, 1978).

⁷⁵⁷ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 80; *CRC*, 24.

⁷⁵⁸ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 81-4.

⁷⁵⁹ Thouzellier, *Catharisme et Valdésisme*, 73.

⁷⁶⁰ *Ibid*, 74.

⁷⁶¹ *CRC*, 71-2.

⁷⁶² *CRC*, 44.

involvement of labourers in the movement, and the creation of ‘workers’ communities’.⁷⁶³ In the view of the Lombards (and later the Germanic communities), there was no distinction between spiritual and manual work. This is reflected, for example, in the Passau Anonymous’s remark that Waldensians were proud of the fact they worked because it stood in favourable contrast to the laziness of the clergy.⁷⁶⁴ Raymond’s group represents a distinct ‘Lyonist’ identity as late as the fourteenth century, and a cultural memory of Durand’s *Liber* would account for the revival of the ideas that we find in Fournier’s register, even after a period in which the sources are largely silent on Waldensians in the region.

5.5.d. Theological Discrepancies

Despite the clear similarities presented above, a full comparison of the sources would not be complete without also addressing any theological differences between the two. The Paris manuscript of the *Liber Antiheresis* contains a chapter each on the subject of oath-taking and the imposition of the death penalty. In both cases, the author argues that these things are acceptable under the right circumstances. Durand does not give a ringing endorsement of the benefit of oaths, but he does point out several scriptural passages to support the argument that swearing is not in itself a sin, as there are certain circumstances when they are necessary.⁷⁶⁵ Raymond is in comparison unequivocal about oath-taking, consistently refusing to swear under any circumstances throughout his interrogation. In fact, it is one of the few areas where he seems unwilling to make any attempt at consolidation with his inquisitor. When given a selection of Biblical passages which involve an oath being sworn, he denies that this undermines his position as he states that Jesus had given a ‘new law’ in the Gospels concerning this matter.⁷⁶⁶ Raymond’s stance is more extreme here than Durand’s, though this might be expected after almost a century of persecution. It is also worth noting that the defence of oath-taking does not appear in the earlier Madrid manuscript, and that Durand is here intentionally softening his brethren’s views in an attempt to heal divisions between Waldensians and the Church. He takes a similar line on killing, showing that if it were not acceptable under certain conditions, both God and the angels had sinned many times in the Bible.⁷⁶⁷ On this

⁷⁶³ Papini, *Valdo di Lione*, 215-6.

⁷⁶⁴ ‘The Passau Anonymous: On the Origins of Heresy and the Sect of the Waldensians’, in *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe: Documents in Translation*, ed. Edward Peters (Philadelphia, 1980), 150-63, esp. 152-155; *Quellen zur Geschichte der Waldenser*, ed. Alexander Patschovsky and Kurt-Victor Selge, *Texte zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte*, Heft 18 (Gütersloh, 1973), 70-103;

⁷⁶⁵ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 248-52.

⁷⁶⁶ *CRC*, 9.

⁷⁶⁷ *CRC*, 52-7.

matter, Raymond is a little closer to Durand in his position. He accepts that the death penalty is necessary for 'peace and security amongst men' and that killing a heretic would not be sinful, yet he is very uncomfortable with the idea of killing on a personal level and states he believes he would be sinning were he himself to kill a heretic, even by handing one over to the secular authorities knowing they would be put to death.⁷⁶⁸ The difference between Raymond and Durand on this latter point is therefore quite nuanced, both accept there are circumstances under which it is just or at least necessary, though Raymond appears more ambiguous concerning the practicalities of the act.

A final significant issue to address concerns remission of sins after death. Durand believes that certain small sins may be forgiven after death, and quotes the standard authorities in support of this.⁷⁶⁹ He therefore also endorses the practice of prayers and alms for the dead. Raymond rejects the existence of Purgatory as non-biblical, and consequently denies that prayers or alms could have any benefit.⁷⁷⁰ There are two factors to consider which may explain this anomalous discrepancy. Firstly, unlike the vast majority of Durand's work, the authorities he cites on this matter are primarily from the Church fathers and not from Scripture.⁷⁷¹ This would have conflicted with Raymond's group's obvious theological foundation of Biblical literalism, which may have taken precedence over Durand's opinions on the subject. Secondly, the idea of Purgatory was not officially defined by the Church until well after Durand's lifetime,⁷⁷² and it was this specific notion of a 'third place' alongside heaven and hell which Raymond was rejecting in his testimony, rather than the willingness of God to forgive sins after death.

The existence of these theological disagreements may in some part explain Durand's choice to reconcile with the Catholic Church. Damian Smith has argued that his passages on oath-taking and blood judgments in the Paris manuscript are directed more at the extreme wing of his own movement rather than towards the orthodox clergy or dualist heretics.⁷⁷³ Purgatory in particular seems to be a point on which Durand and Raymond's community fundamentally differed. This single point of difference should not, however, overshadow the consistent theological similarities, and as shown above any differences did not prevent Durand from continuing to have contact and influence with the movement. It is also worth noting that denial of purgatory was not commonly cited as an

⁷⁶⁸ *CRC*, 27.

⁷⁶⁹ *Liber Antiheresis*, ed. Selge, 100-4.

⁷⁷⁰ *CRC*, 42-44, 64-66.

⁷⁷¹ Durand does begin with three short biblical quotations: I John 5:16, I Corinthians 3:11-15, Matthew 12:32 (NIV). However, the majority of his interpretation of these passages relies on the work of Gregory the Great, Augustine, and Peter Lombard.

⁷⁷² Heinrich Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum: definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, 35th edition (Barcinone, 1974), 276 (856). The Second Council of Lyon in 1274 marked the first official catholic pronouncement on purgatory, confirming its existence and the usefulness of prayers and alms for the dead.

⁷⁷³ Smith, *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition*, 148.

error of the Waldensian sect by the clergy, especially at this early stage of the movement's history when the concept had not been fully defined. Alain of Lille is representative of the polemics of the period, basing his attack on lines of unlicensed and uneducated preaching, and accusing Waldensians of wishing to avoid manual work by pretending to be clerics.⁷⁷⁴ As demonstrated above, on these fundamental points of the right to preach and manual labour, Durand and Raymond are in much closer agreement.

5.6. Conclusions

A comparison of the ideas contained within Durand of Huesca's *Liber Antiheresis* and Raymond of Costa's inquisition process can leave little doubt of a close theological connection between the two. The specificity of some of the ideas, particularly their ecclesiology and definition of the sacraments, may even suggest that Raymond had personal access to Durand's text. At the very least, Durand's ideas were not entirely forgotten, and enjoyed a revival in the early fourteenth century. This has significant implications for the study of identity and culture within Waldensianism, and in marginalised groups more generally. This paper demonstrates the importance of a literary culture within a group often characterised as rural and illiterate. The educated Raymond of Costa using Durand's text perfectly fits the model suggested by Brian Stock, in which largely illiterate groups could still access a core of written material through the oral interpretation of literate individuals.⁷⁷⁵ The evidence from this article also supports notions of collective memory and identity-formation through 'storing' memory in written texts.⁷⁷⁶ Pekka Tolonen has shown how the differences between what is 'stored' and 'used' in these texts can allow for change and renewal in Waldensian identities.⁷⁷⁷ The presence of specific ideas from Durand's *Liber* in fourteenth-century sources demonstrates that marginalised groups such as the Waldensians had developed cultural memories, and were able to maintain and revive old ideas through the use of written texts.

This process may also help to shed light on one of the historiographical problems in the study of Waldensianism – the theological differences between French communities and their counterparts in Italy and Germany. These differences are set out explicitly in the *Rescriptum* letter of

⁷⁷⁴ Alan of Lille, *Contra haereticos*, in *PL* 210, cols. 377-80 (II.1).

⁷⁷⁵ Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton, 1983), 88-151.

⁷⁷⁶ Aleida Assmann, 'Memory, Individual and Collective', in *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*, ed. Robert Goodin and Charles Tilly (Oxford, 2006), 211-33.

⁷⁷⁷ Tolonen, 'Medieval Memories of the Origins of the Waldensian Movement', in *History and Religion: Narrating a Religious Past*, ed. Bernd-Christian Otto, Susanne Rau, and Jörg Rüpke (Berlin, 2015), 165-87.

1218, in which French and Italian representatives met to discuss theology.⁷⁷⁸ That the French Waldensians were much less anti-clerical and closer to orthodoxy in their beliefs is clear from this text, and has been cited in all major histories of the movement, yet a comprehensive reason for why the group in France was so distinct has yet to be put forth. This paper has shown that theological influence of Durand of Huesca in the early years of the movement (even after his reconciliation with the Church), alongside a later revival of his ideas through use of his *Liber antiheresis* as a written store of cultural memory, go a long way to explaining why these differences arose, and why they can still be detected in the sources as late as the fourteenth century.

Finally, this chapter has put forward evidence in favour of consistency and continuity amongst Waldensian groups. Although we do not have the evidence to suggest a community entirely static in its ideology – a proposition which certainly seems implausible – use of ideas found in the *Liber* suggests that his community and the Waldensians of Durand's time were not entirely unrelated. The evidence presents a challenge to the idea of 'Waldensianisms' put forward by Merlo, which places emphasis on the localised and unique nature of individual groups. Neither Raymond nor Durand are isolated or rural, both being well-travelled, and both are educated in the theology of their order. The similarities in theology between the pair are abundant, from their reliance on the same key Scriptural sources, to specific positions on manual labour and the sacraments, Donatism, and the role of the Church. The evidence suggests that medieval subaltern communities were capable of maintaining meaningful connections with temporally distant predecessors, remaining aware of their own histories through both oral and written cultural memories, and using these to forge and re-forge identities that had a distinct awareness of their own histories. This has significant implications for the study of any persecuted group, heretical or otherwise, and casts doubt on a deconstructionist view of history which may often sever ideological links too readily. Whilst the historian must take great care not to artificially produce this homogeneity, this should not be done at the expense of the communities' agency – their ability to produce nuanced identities that contain an active awareness of their own histories.

⁷⁷⁸ *Rescriptum*, ed. Preger, 56-63.

Chapter Six – Waldensians and Franciscans: A Comparative Analysis

Following on from the discussion of Waldensian religious identity, the final chapter will seek to understand how this identity fit with the religious culture of the Languedoc more broadly. To achieve this, the chapter will examine the similarities and parallel development of ideas between Waldensians and the Spiritual Franciscans and their lay followers, who were active in the same time and place. The study will begin with an overview of the development of Spiritual Franciscan thought from the time of Saint Francis to the early fourteenth century, noting parallels and similarities with the Waldensians where relevant. For a representative example of the type of religious culture popular in Southern France around the time of Raymond and his companions, the writings of Peter Olivi, a Franciscan Spiritual native to Montpellier, will be discussed. This discussion will set the context for an analysis of the evidence of the direct evidence linking the Waldensians and Franciscans in the period, and similarities in thought and practice shared by the two Orders and their lay followers. Finally, a case study of a particular Franciscan Spiritual, Raymond Dejean, will attempt to show that Raymond of Costa 's experiences and relationship with the Church were by no means unique to himself.

6.1. Development of Spiritual Franciscan Thought – St. Francis

In order to effectively trace the development of ideas that would ultimately lead to the persecution of the Franciscan Spirituals in the fourteenth century, it is essential to begin with an analysis of the founder of their Order, Saint Francis of Assisi. His views on key issues such as poverty and obedience would inform much of the debates and controversies surrounding the Franciscans in later years, particularly concerning how rigorously he should be imitated.

The principle sources for Saint Francis's life are the two biographical works by Thomas of Celano; a *Vita Prima* written a few years after Francis's death around 1229, and a *Vita Secunda* of 1247 which updated the text to include stories from those who knew the Saint in his lifetime.⁷⁷⁹ An additional collection of such stories from brothers Leo, Rufino and Angelo, have been collated from manuscripts into a single volume by Rosalind Brooke.⁷⁸⁰ These sources are augmented by Francis's later writings, including various letters and exhortations, two Rules for his newly established Order,

⁷⁷⁹ Both lives are published as *Vita Prima, Vita Secunda et Tractatus de Miraculis*, in *Analecta Franciscana* vol. 10, fasc. 1-3 (Quaracchi, 1926). An English translation is available in Placid Hermann, (ed.), *St. Francis of Assisi: First and Second Life of St. Francis, with Selections from Treatise on the miracles of Blessed Francis* (Chicago, 1963).

⁷⁸⁰ Brooke, (ed.), *Scripta Leonis, Rufini et Angeli, Sociorum S. Francisci* (Oxford, 1970).

and a final Testament written just before his death.⁷⁸¹ Despite the relative abundance of sources concerning Francis, accessing the personal views of the man himself is not straightforward. The two *Vitas* are more hagiographical exercises than genuine attempts to record the details of their subject's thoughts and deeds, and the different versions of the Rule would need to have both been approved and if necessary edited by the Papacy.⁷⁸² Nevertheless, consistent themes emerge throughout the sources which allow for general inferences about Francis's theological views and general understanding of the religious life he was trying to pursue.

The general story of Francis's early life as recorded by Thomas of Celano follows a pattern very similar to many others of the period who were caught up in the mood of apostolic poverty so popular in twelfth century Europe.⁷⁸³ Born to a wealthy merchant and originally hoping to become a knight, Francis had a conversion experience in which he kissed a leper and afterwards renounced all his worldly possessions in order to devote himself to a life of poverty.⁷⁸⁴ Although by no means the only other story of this kind, the most useful comparison to make here for our purposes is with the origins of the Waldensians' founder, Valdes. The narratives are obviously very similar, with both figures starting off fully embedded in the mercantile life of the laity, followed by a singular event which ignites the religious zeal within them, and ending with both renouncing their material goods to follow the life depicted in the Gospels. Again, these two tales are not unique, both have precedents in earlier twelfth century figures such as Norbert of Xanten and Peter of Bruis,⁷⁸⁵ yet these similarities show quite unequivocally that both the Waldensian and Franciscan movements started under almost exactly the same circumstances. Therefore it is worth examining the early Franciscan sources further to look for the origins of parallel developments between the two movements which would ultimately lead to the similarities present in the fourteenth century, which will be discussed below.

The Franciscan Rule, ostensibly written by Saint Francis but perhaps edited (and at the very least approved) by the papacy, survives in two main versions. The earliest surviving copy of c.1221 is

⁷⁸¹ A Latin edition of this document is published in *Opuscula sancti patris Francisci Assisiensis*, vol. 1 (Quaracchi, 1904), 77-82, with an English translation in Rosalind Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars* (London, 1975), 117-9.

⁷⁸² For Celano's writings as hagiographical constructs, see for example Michael Cusato, 'Francis of Assisi, Deacon? An Examination of the Claims of the Earliest Franciscan sources' in Michael Cusato and Guy Geltner, (eds.), *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life: Essays in Honor of John V. Fleming* (Leiden, 2009), 9-37.

⁷⁸³ See for example Lester Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (London, 1978), or Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 2002).

⁷⁸⁴ Thomas of Celano, *Vita Secunda*, in *Analecta Franciscana*, vol. 10 (Quaracchi, 1926), c.12.

⁷⁸⁵ Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 58-66.

commonly known as the First Rule,⁷⁸⁶ but this was soon revised and updated to a final version – the *Regula bullata* – composed around 1223 and published in an official papal bull of 1226.⁷⁸⁷ The fact that Francis was determined to create his own unique rule, rather than adopt an existing monastic model, was key to the subsequent development of controversy surrounding the order.⁷⁸⁸ The original 1221 rule begins by equating the document with the Gospels – which are the ultimate rule that one can live by.⁷⁸⁹ Francis was not concerned with overruling traditional concepts in favour of Gospel literalism, for example in his treatment of fasting, usually a staple of religious life. Although both rules suggest dates where abstinence is required, the text follows Luke in advising brothers to ‘eat of all the foods which are set before them’.⁷⁹⁰ The primacy of the Gospels is particularly apparent in the First Rule, which includes over eighty direct quotations from the holy texts, though this is massively culled to just twelve in the updated version.⁷⁹¹ This change illustrates some of the problems that must have been presented by the initial form of Francis’s rule, which effectively required a complete and literal adherence to the Gospel texts, which some ministers believed was too impractical for a large religious order to follow.⁷⁹² Although strict adherence to Francis’s original intentions did not gain traction until much later, there are some early examples of Gospel literalism, as when a Franciscan brother of Penna refused a judicial oath in 1224 citing the Gospel of Matthew, a view more generally associated with the Waldensian than Franciscan orders.⁷⁹³

Additionally, by putting the First Rule on the same level as the Gospels, issues of obedience to the Church inevitably arose, as it became difficult to justify the latter being a higher authority than the former. In the First Rule, obedience is very much conditional. Brothers were encouraged to keep a close eye on their superiors and be ready to denounce them if they were found to be straying from the right path. Such superiors were not to be obeyed, and further to this any order which contradicted the Rule or that the individual thought would be harmful to their salvation, were also to be justifiably ignored.⁷⁹⁴ Tellingly, the *Regula bullata* removes any notion that the Rule and the Gospel are directly connected, and opens by exhorting brothers to ‘[live] in obedience, without

⁷⁸⁶ The original rule can be found in Heinrich Denifle, and Franz Ehrle, (eds.), *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 3 (Berlin, 1887), 93-130.

⁷⁸⁷ The Rule is published in *Opuscula*, vol. 1, 24-62; the bull is titled *Solet annuere* and can also be found in *Opuscula*, 63-74. An English translation of the Rule is in Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 120-5.

⁷⁸⁸ The desire to create a unique Rule is recorded by statements from Francis’s companions. Brooke, (ed.), *Scripta Leonis*, no.114; see also Malcolm Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty: The Doctrine of the Absolute Poverty of Christ and the Apostles in the Franciscan Order, 1210-1323* (New York, 1998), 37.

⁷⁸⁹ Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 120.

⁷⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 122.

⁷⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁷⁹² Michael Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2006), 18.

⁷⁹³ Joannes Sbaralea, and Conrad Eubel, (eds.), *Bullarium Franciscanum*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1759), no. 28, 21.

⁷⁹⁴ *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 3, 101.

property and in chastity'.⁷⁹⁵ The primacy of obedience is clear here, yet even the second Rule allows for some deviation from absolute obedience.⁷⁹⁶ The Rule was also careful not to repeat the mistakes of the Church's early relationship with the Waldensian brothers, imposing strict restrictions on preaching which required the approval of the local bishop and Minister General of the order.⁷⁹⁷ Despite the Church's efforts to moderate Francis's vision of his order, the notion that the Rule and the Gospels were inextricably linked was never completely vanquished. The fundamental idea that the Rule was a higher authority than any earthly one persisted and would ultimately cause outright conflict, in much the same way as obedience had caused problems for the Waldensian movement years before.

The Rule also gives general guidelines on Francis's vision of Apostolic poverty, though again the concept appears more important than the detail. There is an absolute ban on any receiving of money, even through an intermediary, yet immediately after this restriction the Rule makes vague reference to 'spiritual friends' who might help and 'special circumstances' which might undermine the need for strict adherence.⁷⁹⁸ The clothes that the brothers must wear should be 'wretched', though it is not explained exactly what kind of clothing meets this qualification, other than it should be patched rather than replaced.⁷⁹⁹ The Rule exhorts followers to live a life of absolute poverty, owning nothing themselves, and to spend their days doing manual labour in return for non-monetary alms.⁸⁰⁰ The lack of precise commands in the Rule meant that its meaning had to be continually revised and updated in the following century.⁸⁰¹ This is likely because the text represents what was at its core very much Francis's personal interpretation of Scripture, with the kind of absolute poverty he promoted not always to be found in the Gospels.⁸⁰² Nevertheless, worries about straying from Francis's strict notion of poverty - accentuated by the vagaries of the Rule needing to be glossed for practical reasons - also played a large part in the divisions that later developed in the order. The Church's attempts to restrict some members' ability to follow what they believed was the original rule of Saint Francis (effectively equivalent to the Gospels), would then effectively turn them into schismatics considered in very similar terms to the French Waldensians of the same period.

Perhaps if Francis had left the *Regula bullata* as his final word on the constitution of his order, some of the conflict over his intentions may well have been avoided. However, he was clearly

⁷⁹⁵ Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 120.

⁷⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 124.

⁷⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 122.

⁷⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 121.

⁸⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 122-3.

⁸⁰¹ Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty*, 83.

⁸⁰² Gordon Leff, *Heresy in the Middle Ages*, 62.

not entirely satisfied with its contents, and composed a document now known as his Testament just before his death in 1229. This text would be pivotal in the development of tensions between Spiritual and Conventual factions within the order towards the end of the century, as it is cited by prominent figures of the former party - such as Angelo Clareno - as recording the true intentions of the founder.⁸⁰³ The Testament appears to be an attempt by Francis to bind his successors to a strict adherence to the Rule, though in practical terms this appears to have been a spectacular failure.⁸⁰⁴ The text reaffirms Francis's conviction that his Rule was directly inspired by the Gospels and should be treated on the same terms.⁸⁰⁵ As the Gospels are permanent and inerrant, and the Rule is a strict imitation of the Gospels, it follows that the Rule should be treated in the same way. It is probably for this reason that Francis issues a ban on the use of any papal dispensations to contravene the Rule, and explicitly prohibits any future glosses or interpretations of that text. This ban on interpretation is extended to the Testament as well as the Rule, both of which should be read literally.⁸⁰⁶ Following this theme of literal adherence to Gospel principles, Francis reaffirms his belief that brothers should live by working with their hands for food.⁸⁰⁷ These exhortations fundamentally opposed the traditional framework of life within the clergy, built as it was upon years of Church tradition, and which pursued spiritual rather than manual labours. With the increased clericalization of the order which was beginning even in Francis's own lifetime, a strict adherence to the principles he was setting out quickly became impractical.⁸⁰⁸ This problem was compounded by a second; that any attempt to modify the Rule to better suit a clerical order was in itself directly contradicting the explicit will of the founder.

The conundrum may have had a solution if the Church was simply able to ignore the Testament as merely an opinion-piece. Unfortunately, Francis prevented this outcome by attempting to tie the Testament directly to the Rule. Although he states that this document is not a new rule, by ordering it to be 'kept next to the Rule' and read alongside it at chapter meetings, he effectively attempted to establish the Testament as an official addendum to the papally approved text.⁸⁰⁹ Some

⁸⁰³ Angelo Clareno, *A Chronicle or History of the Seven Tribulations of the Order of Brothers Minor*, trans. David Burr (New York, 2005) prolog., nn. 58-64, 150, 102-5, 118-19.

⁸⁰⁴ Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 24-5.

⁸⁰⁵ 'Et, postquam Dominus dedit mihi de fratribus, nemo ostendebat mihi, quid deberem facere; sed ipse Altissimus revelavit mihi, quod deberem vivere secundum formam sancti Evangelii', *Opuscula*, vol. 1, 79.

⁸⁰⁶ 'Et omnibus fratribus meis clericis et laicis praecipio firmiter per obedientiam, ut non mittant glossas in regula neque in istis verbis...simpliciter et pure intelligatis et cum sancta operatione observetis usque in finem.' *Opuscula*, vol. 1, 82.

⁸⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 79.

⁸⁰⁸ Michael Cusato, 'Francis of Assisi, Deacon? An Examination of the Claims of the Earliest Franciscan sources' in Cusato and Geltner, (eds.), *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life*, 9.

⁸⁰⁹ This can be seen in his language concerning the use of the Testament text, ordering ministers: '...semper hoc scriptum habeant secum iuxta regulam.', *Opuscula*, vol. 1, 82.

reasons why this was not practically possible have already been discussed above, but an additional important one was the Testament's treatment of obedience. It can be argued that Francis was being fundamentally contradictory on this point, in one breath extolling the need for obedience to Ministers, and in the next ordering the Ministers not to alter the meaning of the text.⁸¹⁰ This added weight to the later Spiritual argument that anything contradictory to the Rule or Testament could therefore be justifiably disobeyed. The ultimate consequence of the Testament was the existence of a document written by the founder of the Franciscans, which gave orders fundamentally incompatible with the reality of a large religious order within the Church. The contradictions presented here continued to be struggled with throughout the first century of the order's existence, and combined with the twin principles of poverty and obedience, would lead some Franciscans into direct confrontation with the rest of the Church hierarchy.

Before moving on, it is worth briefly considering some of the stories about Saint Francis recorded by his followers, which will help add context to his beliefs and the intentions he was trying to express through his Rule and Testament.⁸¹¹ For our purposes, Francis's belief in a strict, literal imitation of the Gospel is important to note, as this will have parallels in both later Franciscan and Waldensian beliefs. Several stories attest to this, such as his belief that food should not be prepared in the evening for the following day due to Matthew's exhortation to 'take no thought for the morrow' (Matt 6:34, NIV).⁸¹² Perhaps the most extreme example is the record of him walking with '*timore et reverentia*' over rocks due to the Gospel association of the word rock to St Peter and the Church.⁸¹³ Also important to the later Spiritual disputes was his understanding of the nature of Apostolic poverty. There is no ambiguity in the *Scripta Leonis* that Francis's poverty was anything less than extreme. An illustrative example is the story of his stay with a local hermit who had made a simple cell for him to spend the night; Francis considered the accommodation far too homely and requested stones and branches to be strewn over it and inside it to make it more suitable.⁸¹⁴ He believed poverty best followed individually or in small groups, and did not want large houses of friars

⁸¹⁰ E.g. 'Praecipio firmiter per obedientiam fratribus universis...', followed by 'Et omnes alii fratres teneantur ita obedire guardianis suis...', *Opuscula*, vol. 1, 80-1.

⁸¹¹ The *Scripta Leonis*, compiled by Rosalind Brooke, is a collection of these stories put together from a variety of manuscript sources – principally Perugia, Biblioteca Augusta Comunale, MS. 1046. Brooke argues for Leonine authorship, and that the initial text was composed by Francis's companions in 1246. For a full discussion of the manuscript sources see Brooke, (ed.), *Scripta Leonis*, 26-66.

⁸¹² Brooke, *Scripta Leonis*, 94.

⁸¹³ *Ibid.*, 178.

⁸¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 110.

or huge churches.⁸¹⁵ When he was struck by illness in his later years he refused medicines and even the comfort of Scripture, such was his commitment to a life of austerity.⁸¹⁶

Whether or not his companions' recollections are exaggerated, this image of Saint Francis as an immaculate example of Christ's poverty and a strict observant of the Gospels was very important to his followers. These stories, alongside his Testament, allowed the later Spiritual Franciscans to connect directly with their founder without mediation by other authorities. Angelo Clareno claims to have been inspired by Francis's close companion, brother Leo, and compares the original life of the founder and his disciples unfavourably with the situation in his time.⁸¹⁷ When the time came for open conflict within the Order, many had to make a choice that they would have seen as between adherence to Francis and by extension the Gospels, or obedience to the Church. As will be discussed below, this was a very similar choice to that made by Raymond de la Cote and his companions, and one which brought the two groups – if not by the same path – to the same destination.

6.2. Development of Spiritual Franciscan Thought – the Thirteenth Century

A complete analysis of the early history of the Franciscan order falls outside the scope of this thesis.⁸¹⁸ However, to help put some of the later events in context, it will be worth briefly mentioning some of the key developments which would lead to conflict within the order. Relevant to the above discussion is Gregory IX's 1230 bull *Quo elongati*.⁸¹⁹ The most significant aspect of this decree was to declare Francis's Testament non-binding, which paved the way for future popes to add glosses on the Rule.⁸²⁰ The bull also permitted brothers to have access to 'money-handlers' for necessities, which would later be seen as an example of the Church hierarchy undermining the founder's vision of an order of absolute poverty.⁸²¹ This principle was later added to by Innocent IV's *Ordinem vestrum* of 1245, which extended the scope of the money-handlers role to include conveniences, and set up a scheme whereby the Papacy would take on legal ownership of all

⁸¹⁵ Brooke, *Scripta Leonis*, 114.

⁸¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 154-6.

⁸¹⁷ Angelo Clareno, *A Chronicle or History of the Seven Tribulations of the Order of Brothers Minor*, prol.; see also David Burr, 'History as Prophecy, Angelo Clareno's *Chronicle* as a Spiritual Franciscan Apocalypse' in Cusato and Geltner, (eds.), *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life*, 119-134.

⁸¹⁸ See e.g. John Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order from its origins to the year 1517* (Oxford, 1968); For a specific history of the Spiritual dispute see Burr, D. *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century after Saint Francis* (Pennsylvania, 2001).

⁸¹⁹ Herbert Grundmann, 'Die Bulle *Quo elongati* Papst Gregors IX', In *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 54 (1961), 2-23, text 18-23.

⁸²⁰ Leff, *Heresy in the Middle Ages*, 65.

⁸²¹ This would tie in with the *usus pauper* controversy, the idea that the vow of poverty required poor use as well as lack of ownership. For the origins of this dispute see Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans*, 49-66.

Franciscan property, effectively employing a loophole to allow the order to build and maintain large churches and friaries.⁸²² At this stage there was no definitive split between the Franciscan brothers, though some were critical of Innocent's bull and what they saw as abuses or laxity. John of Parma, Minister General in the decade after 1247, managed to convince the order not to accept the relaxations of *Ordinem vestrum*, and revert to Gregory's earlier prescription.⁸²³ Another early critic was French cleric Hugh of Digne, who strongly believed that the vow of poverty had primacy over any earthly authority, and that the Pope did not have the power to decree anything which might impact upon that vow.⁸²⁴ His *Dispute between a Zealot for Poverty and His Domestic Enemy* is an early example of an argument in favour of a more rigorous and severe Franciscan lifestyle; Hugh shuns the lavish buildings of the Church and heavily implies that Francis's mode of living is strictly superior to any other.⁸²⁵

Despite this, the majority of criticism in the latter half of the thirteenth century was coming from outside the order. When a friar at Paris published an adaption of the works of Joachim of Fiore in 1254, which asserted that his writings were to form the basis of a new Gospel and that St. Francis was the Angel of the Sixth Seal in the Apocalypse, secular masters were given a perfect opportunity to attack the theological foundations of the order.⁸²⁶ Such ideas were obviously heretical and could easily be extended to implicate the entire order, which in the minds of its critics believed itself to be spiritually superior to other religious, and held Francis's teachings to the same standards as a new Gospel. John of Parma was forced to resign over this controversy, and his successor Bonaventure was forced to publish several tracts in defence of Franciscan orthodoxy. His *Apologia pauperum* became the definitive treatise defending the Franciscan understanding of poverty and the apostolic life.⁸²⁷ This tract theologially developed the principle of Christ and the Apostles' absolute poverty in the Gospels, which previously had been a relatively vague assumption.⁸²⁸ Bonaventure also defended the notion of Franciscan poverty being the most perfect form of renunciation available.⁸²⁹ The ideas of Bonaventure were officially approved by the Papacy and enshrined in the bull *Exiit quit seminat* of 1279.⁸³⁰ This bull attempted to solve issues with obedience to the vow by making a distinction in the Rule between precepts to be obeyed and counsels to be strived towards, but

⁸²² The bull can be found in Sbaralea and Eubel, (eds.), *Bullarium Franciscanum*, vol. 1, (Rome, 1759) no.114.

⁸²³ Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty*, 111-2.

⁸²⁴ Burr, D., *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty: The Origins of the Usus Pauper Controversy* (Philadelphia, 1989), 20.

⁸²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.22-3.

⁸²⁶ Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty*, 113-5.

⁸²⁷ Bonaventure, *Opera Omnia*, vol. 8, (Quaracchi, 1898), ch. III, 233-330.

⁸²⁸ Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 37.

⁸²⁹ Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty*, 134-5.

⁸³⁰ *Bullarium Franciscanum*, vol. 3, no.415-6.

ultimately may have caused more problems than it solved by giving legitimacy to the idea that the Rule was in principle an encapsulation of the Gospels.⁸³¹

By the last two decades of the thirteenth century, there was still no outright split within the Franciscan order itself over matters of adherence to the Rule. However, issues of individual laxity, questions of obedience, and theological disputes had already been smouldering for some time. Bonaventure's attempts to reign in abuses had not gone far enough for some members of the order, and it was in this atmosphere of controversy that we come to the next figure of interest in our discussion, Peter Olivi.

6.3. Peter Olivi – Background and Context

It is worth taking the time to analyse Olivi and his work in more detail, as he was a significant figure in the Franciscan Spiritual movement, who lived and worked for much of his life in the same region as the French Waldensians. As will be shown below, his theological ideas also had many parallels with those expressed by Raymond of Costa and his companions. This thesis will not argue that the Waldensians were directly influenced by Olivian thought (I have instead traced the origins of their beliefs to early Waldensian writer Durand of Huesca), but rather that similar contexts and core principles had produced many mutually compatible views, and that it is unlikely that Raymond at least did not know of Olivi's ideas. Finally, Olivi left a legacy of belief crucial to the later Beguins persecuted by the Church in the 1320s, which will also be a topic of discussion in this chapter, and therefore a slightly more involved analysis of his views will be useful before approaching that topic.

It seems highly unlikely that Raymond could have been unaware of Olivi's works and thoughts. We know from his testimony that Raymond travelled extensively through the towns of the Languedoc during his twenty years as a Waldensian deacon, and those he mentions (including Orange, Montpellier, and Agde)⁸³² were very much at the centre of Olivi's geographic homeland.⁸³³ Olivi taught as a lector at Montpellier in the early 1290s, and Raymond states that in the year he spent in the city he made occasional visits to the Franciscan theological schools there, albeit around a decade later.⁸³⁴ In any case, Olivi's popularity in the region truly took off after his death, with his grave-site at Narbonne becoming the centre for a significant regional cult, popular with pilgrims and

⁸³¹ Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages*, 98-9.

⁸³² CRC, 46.

⁸³³ Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 107.

⁸³⁴ CRC, 102; Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans*, 62.

local lay people in the early fourteenth century.⁸³⁵ Angelo Clareno writes of this cult that there was a regular and well-attended feast held on March 14th each year to celebrate Olivi's unofficial sainthood.⁸³⁶ The popularity of this cult is further attested by the removal of Olivi's remains by the Church in 1318,⁸³⁷ though even this does not appear to have dampened enthusiasm for his teachings, as he is repeatedly mentioned in inquisition records of the 1320s, with his unofficial feast day continuing to be celebrated despite the destruction of his shrine.⁸³⁸ There is no doubt that Olivi was a highly prominent figure in the region Raymond was living in during the early fourteenth century, so it is well worth examining his theological ideas and the relationship between them, his Spiritual and Beguin followers, and parallels with other dissenters such as the Waldensians of the Languedoc. Olivi was a prolific writer, who produced treatises and letters covering a diverse range of subjects, so it would be wise to focus on the aspects of his thought which brought him closest to conflict with the Church, namely obedience, poverty, and the evangelical life.

6.4. Olivi's Theology

Olivi's views on obedience were quite complex, due in no small part to the inherent conflict between obedience as a virtuous and inescapable part of the evangelical life, and the attempts by the Church hierarchy to constrict and alter that life. In his *Questions on Evangelical Perfection*⁸³⁹ - his most significant work regarding the Franciscan way of life - Olivi is deliberate in placing obedience as the subordinate virtue of the main three, in that it is good and necessary yet strictly inferior to both poverty and chastity.⁸⁴⁰ Therefore, should any authority require the compromise of these latter two virtues, they are not to be obeyed. Olivi extends this to include any order that requires sinning, or would endanger one's own salvation. He reasons that to obey would be heretical, as it would effectively place the one giving the order above God's divine law.⁸⁴¹ Olivi applies this thinking equally to Papal authority, stating that the Pope is incapable of dispensing from the vow of poverty or chastity, as the source of his power is Christ's laws, which he cannot contravene.⁸⁴² This belief in the limitation of Papal authority is not unique to Olivi; as mentioned earlier Hugh of Digne had rejected

⁸³⁵ Louisa Burnham, *So Great a Light, So Great a Smoke: The Beguin Heretics of the Languedoc* (Ithaca, 2008), 23; Burr, *Spiritual Franciscans* p.91,

⁸³⁶ Angelo Clareno, *Opera I: Epistole*, ed. Lydia Von Auw (Rome, 1980), 174-5; Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 7-8.

⁸³⁷ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 23-4.

⁸³⁸ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 112.

⁸³⁹ MS. Vat. Lat. 4986, as cited in Burr, 'The Persecution of Peter Olivi', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 66, no.5 (1976), 1-98; A Latin edition of Question 16 has been published in David Burr, and David Flood, 'Peter Olivi: On Poverty and Revenue', *Franciscan Studies* 40 (1980), 34-58.

⁸⁴⁰ Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 163-4.

⁸⁴¹ Ibid.

⁸⁴² Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 166.

any man's ability to compromise the Franciscan vows earlier in the century,⁸⁴³ and Franciscan Minister General Bonaventure also seemed to have preferred this view.⁸⁴⁴ There are also earlier examples of direct disobedience to the Pope, such as when the bishop of Lincoln Robert Grosseteste refused to admit the pontiff's nephew as a canon in 1253.⁸⁴⁵ Where Olivi is original is in his imagery and the way he presents the argument as a direct choice between two authorities which is likely to happen, rather than as a hypothetical thought experiment. In number 16 of his *Questions*, Olivi states that if the Pope were to order any subversion of the precepts of Christ he should be resisted as 'the noonday devil' with all one's power.⁸⁴⁶ This sense of immediacy and use of demonic imagery reflects his apocalyptic belief in the imminent coming of the Antichrist, which will be discussed further below. For now it is sufficient to say that Olivi absolutely expected conflict between the Church and those living a life of evangelical poverty, and that this strongly influenced his above views on obedience to authority.

This life of poverty was itself a key aspect of Olivi's writings, and he was a chief proponent of the idea of *usus pauper*, which proposed that restricted and austere use of goods was necessary to fulfil a vow of poverty, rather than simply lack of ownership. Olivi's involvement in the *usus pauper* controversy was a strictly Franciscan affair which will not be discussed in detail here,⁸⁴⁷ but his emphasis on the importance of poverty and the evangelical life which underpinned his position in that dispute is worth expanding on. To Olivi, poverty was the principal virtue, the foundation stone without which no other virtues could truly exist. Chastity – probably the second in importance in his line of virtues – was not truly possible without a commitment to the vow of poverty, as a married man requires wealth to provide for his family and leave an inheritance. Poverty, therefore, precludes marriage.⁸⁴⁸ Similarly, other Christian virtues such as fortitude and contemplation can only be fully achieved within the context of a life of poverty, which moves the mind's focus away from the material to the spiritual.⁸⁴⁹ This power of poverty as a tool to fully realise the Christian life makes it strictly superior to wealth, and equally it provides the best way to minimise the risk of sin, as to Olivi all heresies ultimately stem from a veneration of material things, to the detriment of the immaterial.⁸⁵⁰ This emphasis on poverty is built on a conviction that the Franciscan way of life is that which most closely follows Christ's life and his use of goods. Therefore, the Franciscan state is the

⁸⁴³ Hugh of Digne, *De finibus paupertatis*, in Sisto, A., *Figure del primo Francescanesimo in Provenza: Ugo e Douceline di Digne* (Florence, 1971), 331-6.

⁸⁴⁴ Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 167.

⁸⁴⁵ Burr and Flood, 'Peter Olivi: On Poverty and Revenue', 25-6.

⁸⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 57-8.

⁸⁴⁷ See e.g. Burr, 'The Persecution of Peter Olivi', 61-6.

⁸⁴⁸ Burr, 'The Persecution of Peter Olivi', 12.

⁸⁴⁹ Burr, 'The Persecution of Peter Olivi', 13.

⁸⁵⁰ Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 44.

highest possible, and there is no way to ascend to a higher level of perfection.⁸⁵¹ This belief is also reflected in his controversial statements about marriage in Question 6. Here, Olivi writes that he does not see how marriage could be a truly equal sacrament to the others, due to the superiority of Christ-like virginity. He does not deny marriage as a valid way of living the Christian life, but he is ambiguous about its overall benefits and is quite clear that abstaining from all sexual activity is preferable.⁸⁵² Olivi's picture of the Christian life can therefore be summarised as a pursuit of the most perfect imitation of the life of Jesus and the Apostles, with poverty the central foundational principle of this life.

Finally, a discussion of Peter Olivi is not complete without reference to his apocalyptic expectations. His Apocalypse commentary⁸⁵³ was highly influential amongst his followers and supporters, including a vulgar translation of the work used by his lay disciples.⁸⁵⁴ A full deconstruction of Olivi's apocalyptic expectations has been well documented elsewhere,⁸⁵⁵ and a brief summary will suffice for the purposes of this paper. Olivi was influenced like many of the Spirituals by Joachim of Fiore, and drew much of his eschatological ideas from Joachim's work. He believed that the material world was divided temporally into three Ages, corresponding to the three persons of the Trinity. He saw his time as the end of the Second Age – the age of Christ – which would be soon replaced by the third and final Age. The transition between the two periods would be marked by a decline in the Roman Church and the appearance of two Antichrists who would corrupt it spiritually and then destroy it through war.⁸⁵⁶ This Church would then be replaced by a new, spiritual Church, reborn in a manner of apostolic poverty which rejected all possession and material wealth. This new Church was to be achieved, not by the actions of the current Church hierarchy, but in spite of direct persecution by it.⁸⁵⁷ It is also important to note that Olivi believed all this would happen imminently, and that the new Church would be in operation as soon as a few decades into the fourteenth century.⁸⁵⁸ These apocalyptic expectations add an additional context through which we can understand Olivi's theology and spirituality. If the Roman Church was doomed, the best way

⁸⁵¹ Burr, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty*, 63-6.

⁸⁵² Burr, 'The Persecution of Peter Olivi', 44-6.

⁸⁵³ A critical Latin edition has been published as part of a doctoral thesis in Lewis, W., *Peter John Olivi, Prophet of the Year 2000: Ecclesiology and Eschatology in the Lectura super Apocalipsim* (University of Tübingen, 1972). Sections of the text have been translated by David Burr, and can be accessed at <http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/olivi.asp> [Accessed August 2017].

⁸⁵⁴ There is evidence for this in the testimony of Raymond D'Antusan. Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1298-1427. See also Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 60-1.

⁸⁵⁵ See especially Burr, *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom: A Reading of the Apocalypse Commentary* (Philadelphia, 1993).

⁸⁵⁶ Burr, *Spiritual Franciscans*, 76-8.

⁸⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 88.

⁸⁵⁸ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 19-20.

to salvation was by taking individual responsibility for one's faith, reading the Scriptures and practising the evangelical life. This also adds to our understanding of his writings on obedience. Unlike other theologians, Olivi actively expected that the Church would soon need to be opposed, as his eschatological beliefs told him it would soon begin to contradict fundamentals of Scripture, particularly by restricting the ability of individuals to pursue an apostolic life.

We can see many parallels between this Franciscan understanding of poverty and its relationship to obedience, and the views of the French Waldensians. It is therefore worth exploring similarities in thought between the two, in an attempt to show that Raymond and his companions were not isolated in their beliefs in the wider context of fourteenth-century Languedoc. Raymond's obedience was a key issue throughout his interrogation, and his approach to it appears to be in line with that of Olivi. When directly questioned on the subject, one can easily imagine his answers coming directly from any hard-line Franciscan. He states that one is not bound to obey any Church that orders something against a precept of God, as this would be putting the Church above the divine. Similarly, he states that anyone who is erring on a 'precept of the Lord' is also not to be obeyed,⁸⁵⁹ and later that even his own majoral should be obeyed only to the extent that he does not contradict the Gospels.⁸⁶⁰ John of Vienne echoes this sentiment when he replies that ordering someone to swear – contradicting a principle of Scripture – was 'certainly a sin', and refuses to do so even if the Pope himself asked it.⁸⁶¹ From this we can understand that both were applying a very similar standard of obedience to Olivi, in that orders which contradict Scripture, and particularly the precepts of Christ which underpin the evangelical life, are to be ignored or actively opposed. Raymond states that his superior (and by extension the rest of the order) does not obey the Pope because he 'does not permit him to follow the path of poverty which he has chosen'.⁸⁶² Raymond also applies the rule of not endangering his own salvation through obedience. He calls oath-taking a mortal sin multiple times during his interrogation, and is consistent in his refusal to swear despite being ordered to, as he believes this would harm him in the next world.⁸⁶³ It is also worth pointing out that Raymond is not simply being obstinate for the sake of it, as there are multiple issues on which he appears less sure and is more willing to follow the Church's precepts. For example, he is able to accept that his order may be wrong in the way it celebrates masses, as the Pope has set out

⁸⁵⁹ '...respondit quod si Ecclesia errat contra aliquod Domini preceptum, homo non tenetur ei obedire, precipue si illud quod precipit si malum prohibitum per Deum.', *CRC*, 53.

⁸⁶⁰ *CRC*, 75.

⁸⁶¹ *CRC*, 125.

⁸⁶² '...respondit quod pro tanto eorum maior non vult obedire domino Pape, ... quia dominus Papa non permetteret quod teneret viam paupertatis quam elegit tenere ipse et sui, ut credit.', *CRC*, 85.

⁸⁶³ *CRC*, 50.

the correct manner as a precept and this does not contradict Scripture.⁸⁶⁴ In this example Raymond's own salvation may not be at stake as he does not claim to perform this sacrament, thus he may have been more willing to show obedience to the Church on this issue.

Olivi's emphasis on poverty and the evangelical life can also be found in Raymond's process. The vow of poverty appears to be the central tenet on which his faith is based, and his understanding of it often appears quite Franciscan. He states that the mendicant lifestyle is that which is most closely aligned to the Apostles, and that the vow of poverty requires ownership of nothing at all, even in common.⁸⁶⁵ A new brother joining his order is required to take vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience to the majoral.⁸⁶⁶ Frustratingly, Fournier does not spend much time questioning Raymond on his poverty, though there are reasons to believe he took it very seriously. Firstly, we have already seen that he places the vow of obedience as subordinate to that of poverty, as an order to abandon poverty would have to be refused as going against a precept of Christ. Also, the imitation of the apostolic life is a consistent theme throughout his interrogation, and this usually relates to their poverty and lack of ownership. From the evidence we have it is reasonable to suggest that Raymond's order was principally founded on this devotion to poverty by means of imitating Christ and the Apostles. On this point it is also worth mentioning Raymond's statements about marriage, which appear to be similarly lukewarm as Olivi's. Like Olivi, he believes that the state of marriage is strictly inferior to his own order, and that it is only for those who are too weak to maintain a vow of chastity.⁸⁶⁷ He also states that anyone who is married cannot be in a state of perfection. Further to this, even a man who was once married but is now a widower is not able to join Raymond's order, as he has been forever tainted by carnal sin.⁸⁶⁸ Again, this appears to be in harmony with Olivi's idea that the evangelical life was the most perfect state to live in, and that marriage was a lower form of Christian life for those less able to follow the life of Christ.

Olivi's apocalyptic expectations are not explicitly present in Raymond's deposition. This is not unexpected, as we know that Raymond's order was not founded on Olivian thought (I have argued elsewhere that Durand of Huesca was a significant influence on the group's theology), and its members were not direct disciples of Olivi like the later Beguins. However, an important point to note is that Fournier never asked a single question of Raymond on this topic, which is also unsurprising as such ideas were not part of the body of stereotypical Waldensian beliefs found in

⁸⁶⁴ *CRC*, 80.

⁸⁶⁵ *CRC*, 71.

⁸⁶⁶ *CRC*, 59.

⁸⁶⁷ *CRC*, 77.

⁸⁶⁸ *CRC*, 74.

inquisitor's handbooks.⁸⁶⁹ Therefore, we cannot make any direct assertions about Raymond's beliefs on this point. However, there is circumstantial evidence that Raymond may have been aware of Olivi's apocalyptic mood which is worth discussion. Several times throughout his ordeal Raymond is recorded as beginning a day's proceedings by effectively preaching to his inquisitor, warning him of his and the Church's impending damnation if they continue to persecute Raymond and his order.⁸⁷⁰ Anyone who persecutes a member is in mortal sin, and any brother who is executed without proper reason would die a martyr.⁸⁷¹ It is also notable that Raymond seemed to have no problem at all with the idea that the Pope was error on important points of doctrine, and this would certainly mesh with the idea that the current Church is in a state of moral decline. Finally, Raymond is clearly of the belief that his order is in a state of perfection, and that the evangelical life of poverty they live is the closest to the ideal Christian life, superior to any other.⁸⁷² Again, this notion of superiority over other ways of worship would sit well with Olivi's idea that the Church would be replaced by one cut from evangelical cloth. It is not possible to say that Raymond and his order held strictly Olivian views on the decline of the Church. However, there is certainly a sense in the testimonies that Raymond believes the Church is falling somewhat from God's standards, though his deposition completely lacks the immediacy and urgency present in Olivi and the later Beguins, and this discrepancy will be further examined in the section dealing with Olivi's lay followers.

In general histories of Waldensianism, the Languedoc group found in Fournier's register are often treated as a curious anomaly within the history of that dissent.⁸⁷³ The structure of their order, apparent closeness to orthodoxy, and Raymond's literacy are not in obvious harmony with the broader scope of the movement. However, Raymond and his companions did not exist in a vacuum. They were embedded in a wider pattern of dissent present in Southern France throughout the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The similarities in thought presented here are not intended to show a direct intellectual influence from one party to the other. Indeed, it has been shown above how Franciscan thought developed through the Gospels, Francis, and writers like Hugh of Digne and Bonaventure, while the French Waldensians drew on traditions and beliefs based in the

⁸⁶⁹ See for example Bernard Gui, *Practica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis*, ed. Célestin Douais (Paris, 1886), 133-8.

⁸⁷⁰ *CRC*, 72, 92, 96.

⁸⁷¹ *CRC*, 50.

⁸⁷² See for example: '...sed si antequam fuisset factus dyaconus fecisset dicta vota non esset in statu perfectionis, cum dyaconus sit primus gradus perfectionis.', *CRC*, 71. Being a member of the order confers a higher degree of perfection than even taking evangelical vows.

⁸⁷³ For example Audisio struggles to find any evidence for the tripartite hierarchy described by Raymond outside of his testimony when trying to fit it into the overall history of Waldensianism: Audisio, G., *The Waldensian Dissent*, 113-119. Euan Cameron considers his confession to contain 'oddities' and suggests he might form part of a sub-group of French Waldensians. Cameron, *Waldenses*, 91-2.

ideas of Durand of Huesca. However, the similar starting points of both groups, shared key principles, and a shared cultural context and religious environment in the Languedoc, generated very similar beliefs. These similarities are underlined by Raymond's willingness to attend a Franciscan school, rather than simply learning from other members of his group. Thus, when the Franciscan Spirituals and their lay followers began to be actively persecuted, one of the principal differences between them – their acceptance by the Church authorities – was removed. By examining these groups more closely, it will be possible to spot similarities in experience which will help provide a deeper understanding of the experiences of the Waldensians in Fournier's register.

6.5. Waldensians and Franciscans – Direct Evidence of Connection

As has been stated already, the main argument of this chapter is not that the Waldensians in Fournier's register were directly involved with the Franciscan Spiritual crisis in the early fourteenth century, but rather to map out the parallel experiences of very similar dissenting groups operating within the same geographic and cultural context. However, there are some mentions of or allusions to the Franciscans within the Waldensians' depositions, and it is worth collecting these in one place to better present the scope of the evidence.

Raymond of Costa first entered the Waldensian movement in the 1290s, a time when the Spirituals were beginning to come into serious conflict with the central Church authorities, and it is during this decade he is likely to have come into contact with their ideas.⁸⁷⁴ Already mentioned above is Raymond's testimony that he frequented the schools of the Friars whilst staying in Olivi's hometown of Montpellier.⁸⁷⁵ The combination of Raymond's obvious theological competence, and the extensive Franciscan education system in place at the time, makes this a rather uncontroversial statement.⁸⁷⁶ It has also been shown in the discussion of Olivi – who as a Franciscan lector of Montpellier held representative views – that Raymond's theology was perfectly compatible with the type of material he would have learned there. This is not the only allusion to the Friars in the Waldensian testimonies. John of Vienne, on being asked where he learned that one should not swear an oath, replies that he heard this in sermons given by 'the Preachers and the Friars Minor'.⁸⁷⁷ There is no evidence in this period of such a view being popular among the Spirituals (though it is not inconceivable that a rogue Friar might have taken Biblical literalism to the extreme). More

⁸⁷⁴ Andrew Roach, *The Devil's World: Heresy and Society 1100-1320* (Harlow: 2005), 202.

⁸⁷⁵ For the Franciscan school at Montpellier see Moorman, *A History of the Franciscan Order*, 138.

⁸⁷⁶ For the extensive system of Franciscan education, see William Courtenay, 'Franciscan Learning: University Education and Biblical Exegesis' in Cusato and Geltner, (eds.), *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life*, 55-65.

⁸⁷⁷ *CJV*, 121.

plausibly we may see this as an attempt by Jean to deflect the blame away from his immediate companions, but the fact he named Dominicans and Franciscans is evidence that he may have known of the controversy surrounding the latter, and that this might not be unbelievable testimony. Later, Jean attributes some of his unorthodox views to Waldensian preacher John of Lorraine⁸⁷⁸ – which is probably closer to the truth – yet in this latter individual there is also some trace evidence of Franciscan influence.

Jean de Lorraine is mentioned most frequently in the testimony of Huguette, wife of John of Vienne. Huguette recounts meeting Jean on multiple occasions during her life as a Waldensian, and interestingly she states these meetings took place for the most part in Montpellier, a town not known for its popular heresy yet as the hometown of Olivi central to the Franciscan Spiritual conflict.⁸⁷⁹ On one occasion when she went to visit him, she met him outside the Franciscan convent there.⁸⁸⁰ This is a strong piece of corroborating evidence for Raymond's claim to have studied with the Friars in Montpellier; the meeting point would suggest that Jean was studying or meeting with Friars at the convent, or at the very least that he was perfectly comfortable as a Waldensian preacher being seen outside their gates. This is an incidental detail in Huguette's deposition – there is no evidence she is trying to blame the Franciscans for her beliefs, or otherwise bring them into the discussion. She does give us a little more information about John, which may support the notion that he had some kind of relationship to the Franciscan order. This evidence comes in the form of his poverty, as Huguette reports that he was very strict about not carrying money, on one occasion showing her his empty purse.⁸⁸¹ This alone may not be particularly surprising, yet Huguette also states that she received the gift of a silver coin from John, given to her by one of his servants.⁸⁸² This seems to suggest that Jean had actually adapted the principle of the Franciscan *nuncius* – a money-handler first prescribed to them by Gregory IX in *Quo elongati* – as a means of combining a life of absolute poverty with the practicalities of living in a secular world. This practice is also mentioned by Anselm of Alessandria in his c.1266-76 account of the heresy.⁸⁸³ This may also help explain Raymond's anomalous statement about 'collecting money owed to him',⁸⁸⁴ which appears in conflict

⁸⁷⁸ *CIV*, 122.

⁸⁷⁹ John XXII himself calls the town 'fixed to the firm rock of the Catholic faith.'; Coulon, A., (ed.), *Lettres secretes et curiales relatives a la France, extradites des registres du Vatican par A. Coulon* (Paris, 1900), 658-9.

⁸⁸⁰ *CHC*, 135.

⁸⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸² *Ibid.*, 136.

⁸⁸³ Antoine Dondaine, 'La Hiérarchie Cathare en Italie, II: Le 'Tractatus de Hereticis' d'Anselme d'Alexandrie, O.P.; Catalogue de la Hiérarchie Cathare d'Italie', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XX (1950), 310-24; Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 371.

⁸⁸⁴ *CRC*, 80.

with his obvious zeal for the apostolic life. We know from the sources that he had a servant,⁸⁸⁵ and if Raymond collected the money via such an intermediary like Jean perhaps he did not consider it to be breaking his vow.

Mentions of the Franciscans are largely incidental in the Waldensian testimonies, as they were never directly interrogated about the subject. Yet the evidence presented above very much paints a picture of compatibility between the two groups. Theologically astute members such as John of Lorraine and Raymond of Costa spent time learning at Franciscan schools, and Jean in particular seemed comfortable with the association, choosing a meeting point with one of his followers outside a Franciscan convent. There is also tantalising evidence of similarity in structure. The use of a *nuntius* was very particular to the Franciscan order within the Church, so Huguette's recollection of John of Lorraine using the same solution to the same problem suggests that – for the French contingent at least – similarities in the two groups had persisted from the days of their respective foundation. With the above in mind, we can now turn to the group of lay people who supported the Franciscan Spiritual brothers after their condemnation, and whose experiences of inquisition and persecution draw parallels to those in the Fournier register.

6.6. Franciscan Lay Followers – the Beguins

At the same time as Raymond and his followers were being interrogated at Pamiers, another religious movement was also coming under the focus of the Church. The Beguins, as they were labelled by the inquisition, were a popular lay religious group active in the Languedoc from the 1290s onwards, and had fallen out of favour with the Church hierarchy due to their support for the Franciscan Spirituals. Bernard Gui describes them in his *Manuel* with typical categorical certainty: They were to be identified by their belief that Christ and the Apostles owned nothing, even in common, that the Church was the Whore of Babylon, and that the Rule of Saint Francis was equivalent to the Gospel of Christ.⁸⁸⁶ However, in reality the term Beguin could be applied to a broad group of communities with far more heterogeneous beliefs centred on Narbonne. These communities were usually linked together through familial ties, as well as their broad support for local Franciscan Brothers.⁸⁸⁷ Burnham describes these people and their beliefs as relatively ordinary for their time and place, but who were “enticed into defying the hierarchy by a complex mixture of

⁸⁸⁵ *CHC*, 131.

⁸⁸⁶ Bernard Gui, *Manuel de l'inquisiteur*, ed. Guillaume Mollat (Paris, 1926), 118-121, 144-5.

⁸⁸⁷ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 240-3.

social, familial and religious factors”.⁸⁸⁸ Therefore, when discussing Beguin beliefs and practices it must be kept in mind that these were by no means universal. Nevertheless, there are certain core themes which are repeated throughout the sources which are worth exploring, particularly in terms of their parallel relationship with Raymond of Costa’s contemporaneous group of Waldensians.

Before addressing specific beliefs and practices, it will be helpful to sketch a brief outline of the movement’s history and development before 1320. The term Beguin was originally associated with members of the Franciscan Third Order, hence Gui’s inclusion of a fervent belief in the Rule as part of his description. The Third Order was the lay branch of the Franciscan Brotherhood, and had been recognised by Saint Francis himself as early as the 1220s, when a special Rule was codified for them from one of Francis’s letters.⁸⁸⁹ This Rule was further defined in the bull *Supra montem* issued by Nicholas IV in 1289.⁸⁹⁰ These lay brothers lived a frugal life of poverty, penitence and abstinence, dressing humbly and eating modestly.⁸⁹¹ Gui records that they commonly lived together in celibate communities called ‘Houses of Poverty’, would say a particular form of grace before meals, and had a special way of greeting each other.⁸⁹² They began being viewed with suspicion in the late 1290s, particularly for their Olivian views on the impending Apocalypse and rise of an Antichrist, and in 1299 a council held at Béziers rebuked this group - “commonly called Beguins” - for preaching without authority.⁸⁹³ However, the movement was not officially condemned as heresy until almost two decades later in 1317.

This year was key in the development of the group as it was in 1317 that a party of sixty-one brothers of the Franciscan Spiritual movement were called to Avignon to answer charges before the Pope. The result was never in doubt (several of those brought to speak on behalf of the Spirituals were condemned before they even got a chance to do so), and John XXII issued a bull ordering them to cease their unorthodox practices and obey their superiors.⁸⁹⁴ Twenty-five of the brothers refused to accept this, citing lack of papal authority, and through two additional bulls of late 1317 and early 1318, the brothers and their lay supporters were officially condemned as heretics. *Sancta romana*, issued on December 30, 1317, targeted those called ‘Beguins’ directly, as well as other lay groups in Italy and Sicily.⁸⁹⁵ This bull also addressed membership of the Third Order, clarifying that this was no

⁸⁸⁸ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 259.

⁸⁸⁹ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 31.

⁸⁹⁰ Conrad Eubel (ed.), *Bullarii, Franciscani epitome* (Quaracchi, 1908), 302-6.

⁸⁹¹ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 31-2.

⁸⁹² Gui, *Manuel de l’inquisiteur*, 31-2.

⁸⁹³ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 34.

⁸⁹⁴ Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans*, 195-7.

⁸⁹⁵ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 49. The original bull can be found in Jacqueline Tarrant (ed.), *Extrauagantes Iohannis XXII* (Vatican City, 1983), 198-204.

excuse as no such heretical lifestyle was permitted by any Rule of Saint Francis. Four of the Avignon brothers refused to recant their testimony under interrogation, and were burned at the stake in Marseille as unrepentant heretics for their beliefs, principally the denial of papal authority.⁸⁹⁶ These events marked the beginning of official inquisition procedures by the Church against the Beguins of Languedoc, and in 1318 many citizens of the region were taken before the inquisitors of Toulouse and Carcassonne to be questioned, particularly about their support of the Avignon brothers, their obedience to the Pope, and their apocalyptic expectations.⁸⁹⁷ Therefore, most of the information we have about the Languedoc Beguins comes from after this date, and some of their existing beliefs may have been further radicalised by the pressures of persecution. However, we know from evidence such as the Béziers council that these communities were already on the radar of the Church long before their condemnation, and the inquisition evidence can shed some light on their beliefs and practices before as well as after their persecution.

There is evidence to suggest that the execution of the four Spiritual brothers at Marseille did have a profound impact on the communities that continued to support the renegade friars in defiance of the Church. These deaths - along with the burning of three Beguins at Narbonne in 1319 and five at Capestang in 1320 - brought the reality of the conflict home, especially as many of those killed would have been well-known to those who remained.⁸⁹⁸ The actions of the inquisition began to foster a culture of martyrdom in Beguin circles. Not only were those already dead considered martyrs for God, but there are numerous examples of individuals who seemed very willing to die for their beliefs. Na Prous Boneta preached that her fellows should be ready for martyrdom if it should come, and did not abjure in her interrogation in 1325, instead stating she wished to 'live and die' in her beliefs.⁸⁹⁹ Similarly in 1327, William Serallier obstinately refused to recant any of the errors recorded in his confession, and accused his captors and those who persecuted the Beguins of persecuting 'the life of Jesus Christ'.⁹⁰⁰ We do not have evidence of a determined choice to die from all those burned at the stake, but it is abundantly clear that their deaths were considered martyrdoms by those who witnessed or heard about them. The most striking piece of evidence for this are the martyrologies compiled by some Beguins listing their executed brethren. Bernard Gui mentions the existence of saint's calendars which had been edited to include the names of

⁸⁹⁶ Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans*, 205.

⁸⁹⁷ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 49.

⁸⁹⁸ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 64.

⁸⁹⁹ May, W. H., 'The Confession of Prous Boneta, Heretic and Heresiarch', in John Mundy, Richard Emery and Benjamin Nelson (eds.), *Essays in Medieval Life and Thought: Presented in Honour of Austin Patterson Evans* (New York, 1955), 19.

⁹⁰⁰ Raoul Manselli, *Spirituali e beghini in Provenza* (Rome, 1959), 324-6.

condemned Beguins.⁹⁰¹ No record of this type of synthesis with official saints has survived, but manuscript copies of exclusively Beguin names have.⁹⁰² The list begins with the friars executed in Marseille in 1318 and ends at Toulouse in 1347, with a total of 113 names included. This Beguin martyr-cult is further attested to by inquisition records which show that the collection of relics from the condemned dead was a relatively common practice. Raymond d'Antusan, testifying before Bernard Gui in 1322, had built up a small collection of bones from various executions, and even a piece of wood he believe was from the stake where one of the Marseille friars had been burned.⁹⁰³ Various others also admitted to taking relics from the corpses, treating them reverently and sometimes even enshrining them in their homes.⁹⁰⁴ Thus the Beguins burned at the stake were not merely unjustly persecuted in the eyes of their surviving companions, but became martyrs for God whose names and remains were revered with the same awe as traditional saints.

As these concepts of martyrdom were clearly an important part of Beguin religious culture in fourteenth century Languedoc, especially in the context of inquisitorial persecution, it is worth exploring the Waldensians' relationship with these ideas from their perspective. In contrast to many of the Beguins that we only know of through their execution in the early years of their persecution after 1318, we can be reasonably certain that Raymond and his companions ultimately chose death rather than renounce their religious beliefs. In the first instance, it is clear that Jacques Fournier was not quick to hand out the death penalty. Of the 95 subjects we know of from his inquisition record, just one was burned – a relapsed dualist heretic – aside from the four Waldensians.⁹⁰⁵ The vast majority were sentenced to a mixture of prison, pilgrimages, and the wearing of crosses, and there is no indication that this option was not open to the Waldensians. Fournier spent an extended period of time with Raymond in particular, 'exhorting him to recant' on numerous occasions, which we can reasonably infer included the promise of a less severe sentence. In the final days of Raymond's ordeal, the notary records that Fournier explained several times that refusing to recant would force them to proceed with the harshest penalties.⁹⁰⁶ Due to the constraints placed on our knowledge by the inquisitorial procedure, it is impossible say for certain why Raymond and his companions chose death, though there are certain points in the interrogation where some light may be shed on this subject.

⁹⁰¹ Gui, *Manuel de l'inquisiteur*, 134-5.

⁹⁰² Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 82-3. Wolfenbüttel: Herzog-August-Bibliothek, MS Helmstedt 1006, fols. 12v-13v, Prague: University of Prague IV. B. 15, fols. 304r-315r.

⁹⁰³ Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1340-58.

⁹⁰⁴ For a detailed list see Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 79-80, who is using Beguin deposition records transcribed in Manselli, *Spirituali e Beghini in Provenza* (Rome, 1959), 310-25.

⁹⁰⁵ For a tabulated list of Fournier's interrogations and their sentences, see Bueno, I., *Defining Heresy*, 31-44.

⁹⁰⁶ CRC, 113.

There is certainly no doubt that Raymond subscribed to the idea of martyrdom for those unjustly put to death by Church authorities. He states his belief that being persecuted for not swearing an oath would gain him merit with God, and that he would become a martyr if put to death for this reason.⁹⁰⁷ Later, he compares his plight to those who suffered persecution by Saul before his conversion, and suggests that anyone putting him to death would be just as guilty as those who had stoned the martyr Saint Stephen.⁹⁰⁸ It seems that Raymond actively expected some sort of persecution as an intrinsic part of his particular Christian worldview. When asked if he would compare his plight to that suffered by Jesus and his disciples, he replied that all true Christians suffer persecution for their belief in the Gospel, and only those who go against this truth will be free from persecution.⁹⁰⁹ Finally, he twice echoes the example of Proux Boneta in stating that he wished to 'live and die' in his beliefs. The first instance is relatively early on in the interrogation, after he states his belief in each of the seven sacraments in turn, to prove his Catholic faith to the inquisitor.⁹¹⁰ Although this might not be taken literally on its own, the second time this phrase appears is more telling. At his formal trial on Sunday April 27th, 1320, after hearing the list of errors levelled at him by the inquisition, he refuses to abjure and is recorded as saying he wished to 'live and die' in this belief.⁹¹¹ This principle is also expressed in the testimonies of his companions; Agnes, Huguette and John of Vienne are all unrepentant, and a version of the phrase 'live and die in their belief' also appears in the latter two depositions.⁹¹² Clearly, the Waldensian deponents at least subscribed to an ideal of martyrdom which was very similar to the Languedoc Beguins, down to a sense of connection with the first Apostles and their persecution for a belief in the Gospels.

There is also a tantalising piece of evidence that Raymond's death did not go unnoticed by the wider population. William of Austatz, a royal official of Ornodac, was investigated by Fournier's inquisition soon after Raymond's death partially due to his belief that the persecution of the Waldensian and his companions had been unjust. William had been accused of calling Raymond a 'good cleric', 'one of the better people in all Christendom', and of suggesting that it would have been better had Fournier been burned instead.⁹¹³ He initially denies these accusations but confesses to them after being imprisoned, adding that others in the village, including one Raymond de Nan, had believed that Raymond was a good Christian and unjustly persecuted.⁹¹⁴ He also stated that his

⁹⁰⁷ CRC, 47.

⁹⁰⁸ CRC, 54-55.

⁹⁰⁹ CRC, 90.

⁹¹⁰ CRC, 45.

⁹¹¹ CRC, 113.

⁹¹² CJV, 122; CHC, 137.

⁹¹³ 'Confessio Guillaume Autast' in Duvernoy, *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier*, 195.

⁹¹⁴ Ibid., 196.

death had been a talking point, and that it seemed neither to him 'nor others he spoke to' that Raymond was a heretic.⁹¹⁵ Whatever the reality of William's personal beliefs, we can at least be certain from this incident that Raymond's trial and execution, and perhaps even some of the details of his interrogation, were public knowledge in the region, and that there was some controversy over the legitimacy of the process. This is not surprising, as the sermons general of the inquisition which carried out trials and sentencing were open affairs involving not only the administrators of the inquisition, but other local officials and a crowd of the general public.⁹¹⁶ Unfortunately we have no further records surviving which speak of Raymond's death (though even the existence of one is unusual), and there is no evidence that the Beguin community had heard of him. Despite this, the pattern of Raymond's persecution on grounds of disobedience, choice of martyrdom, and legacy post-execution as a 'good cleric' is remarkably similar to the experiences of the Beguins after their official condemnation. Although the two groups were not connected directly, both the Beguin and Waldensian experiences of persecution and martyrdom reflected a shared involvement with the same culture of religious dissent present in fourteenth century Languedoc. This culture extended to the importance of personal religious experience, and the responsibility of the individual for their own soul, and this concept is worth looking at in more detail.

6.7. Personal Religious Experience in Waldensian and Franciscan Theology

The emphasis on the importance of a personal religious experience, and the active involvement of the individual in their own spiritual life, was not unprecedented before the time of Valdes and Saint Francis. Earlier, more extreme examples of this philosophy can be found in the preaching of Peter of Bruis (1117-c.1131), who rejected the need for Church institutions and instead believed in a total personal responsibility for one's own salvation.⁹¹⁷ His successor Henry of Lausanne continued this theme, rejecting even the need for churches as buildings, and considered following the New Testament literally preferable to obeying Church prelates.⁹¹⁸ Both men cultivated a popular following (referred to as Petrobrusians and Henricians respectively), and both found most support for their ideas in Southern France, particularly around Narbonne, Toulouse, and further east in Lyon. Brooke argues that the nascent Waldensians' popularity in Lyon was directly aided by the continuing influence of these beliefs in the region.⁹¹⁹ Although Valdes was much more keen to involve his order

⁹¹⁵ 'Confessio Guillaume Autast' in Duvernoy, *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier*, 196.

⁹¹⁶ For a full discussion of the workings of Fournier's court see Bueno, I., *Defining Heresy*, 15-30.

⁹¹⁷ Brooke, *The Coming of the Friars*, 63-6.

⁹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 66-9.

⁹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 71-2.

with the Church hierarchy than Peter or Henry, there are certainly similarities in his direct, un glossed reading of the New Testament, and his emphasis on the importance of lay preaching – effectively undercutting a key purpose of the Church. As the Waldensian movement developed after its condemnation as a heresy, it adapted these principles as a core part of its ideology, alongside a belief in Scripture as ultimate authority, though in Southern France at least they did not stray much further from orthodoxy. These concepts persisted to Raymond of Costa's time, as will be shown below, but first it is also worth considering the development of similar ideas in Franciscan thought.

Saint Francis would have been horrified by the total rejection of the Church expressed by Peter of Bruys and Henry of Lausanne. Indeed, he held the institution in the highest regard as a successor to Saint Peter and the Rock on which Christ built his Church.⁹²⁰ Yet there is no denying the extreme emphasis he placed on the Gospel texts as literal instruction - some examples of this literalism have been presented already - and that his interpretation of this scripture was highly personal. We can see this expressed in his insistence on a new Rule for his order, to represent his own way of life he believed had been revealed to him by God.⁹²¹ This is further reflected in some of his highly innovative and personal interpretations of Biblical texts. The absolute and unmitigated poverty of Christ and the Apostles seen by Francis is not always obviously present in the Gospels. The scene at the Last Supper in which Judas is carrying a bag of money had traditionally been interpreted as evidence for at least common ownership among the disciples. Yet in Francis's unique understanding, the bag's possession by the one who would betray Christ is significant, and he saw it as an exemplary distinction between the perfect, naked Christ and the worldly 'bag-havers'.⁹²² Leff has argued that many of the order's subsequent problems came from trying to make a Church institution out of what was a highly individual understanding of the Gospel,⁹²³ and Lambert has similarly made the point that Franciscan theology was 'inseparable from the ideals and personality of Saint Francis himself'.⁹²⁴ Although the order was clericalized and became a highly influential body in the Church hierarchy, these underlying problems were never fully solved, and as has been shown above the wish by certain brothers to be able to follow Francis more closely was the fundamental reason for the dispute which led to persecution in the fourteenth century. The importance of personal religious experience and an individual understanding of the Gospels were also concepts

⁹²⁰ Francis's close relationship to the Popes in his lifetime helped solidify the reputation of the order, see Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages*, 69-70.

⁹²¹ Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty*, 37.

⁹²² Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty*, 65-9.

⁹²³ Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages*, 62.

⁹²⁴ Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, 189.

espoused by Peter Olivi, and it is worth returning to him as a key figure influencing the ideas of the later Beguins on these issues.

6.8. Olivi's Philosophy on the Nature and Purpose of the Spiritual Life

Earlier it had been demonstrated that many of the key tenets of Olivi's concept of the perfect Christian life were also subscribed to by Raymond, including some specific subjects such as obedience and the value of marriage. However, Olivi also advocated a more general philosophy of spiritual experience, which focused on an individual understanding of God, particularly through Scripture and imitation of Christ. An important section of his body of writing are works that advise individuals on how to best live their lives spiritually and in accordance with God, and were intended not for other theologians but for lay people, possibly anticipating their coming persecution by the inquisition.⁹²⁵ Before examining Olivi's works in more detail it is worth pointing out that his writings formed part of a wider shift in the intellectual understanding of religious experience taking place in the late thirteenth century. The Aristotelian philosophy which formed the basis for medieval scholasticism – a theology which focused on an understanding of God through study of the natural order of things – began to be viewed with suspicion by many in the Church during this period due to its ties to paganism and potential conflicts with Scripture.⁹²⁶ The nominalist philosophy (later championed by William of Ockham) which grew in opposition to scholasticism instead turned to the omnipotence and transcendence of God, and argued that since God was entirely superior to and unrestrained by the material world he had created, the only way to gain an understanding of him was through the revelation of Scripture. The Franciscan Spiritual movement followed this principle in its belief that the only way to truly know God was through strict imitation of the life of Christ as revealed in the Gospels. This philosophy directly threatened the Classical socio-political structures on which the Roman Church was based, undermining its authority as a necessary aspect of the passage to salvation. The nominalist and Spiritual philosophy threatened to destroy the order of the world as the Church saw it - removing its role as a mediator between God, the natural world, and the individual - by giving the individual direct access to God.⁹²⁷

This emphasis on the importance of a personal understanding of God, and an individual pursuit of a spiritual life, were key aspects of Olivi's thought. In his *Tractus de Septem Sentimentis*

⁹²⁵ Robert Karris, (ed. and trans.), *Spiritual Warfare and Six Other Writings by Peter of John Olivi* (New York, 2012), 7.

⁹²⁶ Michael Allen Gillespie, *The Theological Origins of Modernity* (Chicago, 2008), 20-1.

⁹²⁷ Gillespie, *The Theological Origins of Modernity*, 22-7.

Christi Iesu,⁹²⁸ he advises on the best way one can live a good Christian life, which in typical Franciscan style involves a strict adherence to the example of Jesus. The titular seven virtues (humility, compassion, meekness, patience, sufferings, poverty and charity) are what an individual must strive for to achieve a true, personal, Christian religious experience. To achieve this requires only an individual commitment to live a Christ-like life, meditation, and prayer.⁹²⁹ The Church is notable by its absence in Olivi's advice, and it becomes clear in some of his other works that he is less than enthusiastic about its ability to save souls. As part of a prayer of thanksgiving Olivi compares the clergy unfavourably to the Apostles, asking: "What of all [the Apostles'] virtues has remained for us except authority and lip-serving faith?"⁹³⁰ He also notes with dismay that these men seem to be now 'more mercenaries than pastors'.⁹³¹ As an antidote to this, the prayer asks that the true faithful be returned to the Church - those with the virtues of the Apostles – and exhorts individuals to find their own way by coming closer to the lives of Jesus and his disciples.⁹³² Olivi wrote several more tracts advising lay people on how to find God, including an essay on how to 'grow in the spiritual life',⁹³³ and a document discussing how to approach personal visions.⁹³⁴ In this latter work he is careful to promote a diligently scriptural approach to revelation, warning that one should be very careful when deciding if a vision is genuine. He advises that anyone who experiences one should consult Scripture and the holy fathers, and to practice extreme caution in anything which is not in accordance with the life of Christ.⁹³⁵ However, he does not suggest seeking help from the clergy in this matter, and in fact warns against this, stating that someone should not be believed simply for their intellect or pious life, as the only true authority is the revelation of Scripture.⁹³⁶ This focus on personal understanding is key throughout Olivi's writings on this subject, and the type of faith he is encouraging his readers to pursue involves a completely individual journey through Scripture and imitation of Christ to find salvation, effectively cutting out the need for the established Church.

Olivi's theoretical musings found active expression in the lives of the Spirituals' lay followers in the Languedoc. The overall picture that we can draw from the depositions of these persons is

⁹²⁸ Bartoli, M., 'Il *Tractatus de Septem Sentimentis Christi Iesu* di Petro di Giovanni Olivi', *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 91 (1998), 535-49. The English translation is in Karris, R., *Spiritual Warfare and Six Other Writings by Peter of John Olivi* (New York, 2012), 79-101

⁹²⁹ Karris, *Spiritual Warfare*, 95-7.

⁹³⁰ The Latin edition of this prayer is published in Appendix I of Manselli, R., *Spirituali e Beghini in Provenza*, 274-8. The English translation is in Karris, *Spiritual Warfare*, 10-16.

⁹³¹ Karris, *Spiritual Warfare*, 15.

⁹³² *Ibid.*, 14.

⁹³³ Peter Olivi, *Informatio Petri Ioannis*, in Manselli, *Spirituali e Beghini*, 278-81.

⁹³⁴ Manselli, *Spirituali e Beghini*, 282-7. The English translation is in Karris, *Spiritual Warfare*, 27-35.

⁹³⁵ Karris, *Spiritual Warfare*, 30-4.

⁹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 33-4.

certainly not one of structured, formalised belief, but rather what Burnham calls ‘a collective shaping of personal opinions based on certain principles’.⁹³⁷ Burr has also noted this trend, pointing out the apparent importance of personal spiritual decisions in the records. He cites the case of Berenger Roque, who judged whether the victim of an execution was a martyr by collecting the remains to see if they would rot.⁹³⁸ This essence of individualistic interpretation repeats itself throughout the depositions. Pierre Tort had his own unique explanation for events, being happy to denounce the Church for persecuting Beguins, yet suggesting responsibility lay with certain unscrupulous advisors, in contrast to most of his peers who blamed the Pope directly.⁹³⁹ This open and often forthright denouncement of the Church’s actions was representative of the Beguins’ deeper personal involvement with their religion. Pierre Guiraut’s ability to accuse Bernard Gui of ‘pertinacious error’,⁹⁴⁰ and Prous Boneta’s to go almost willingly to her death, was founded in an absolute certainty in their beliefs brought about by personal religious experience – usually the study of authoritative texts, or in the case of Prous Boneta through spiritual visions. Peter of Tornamira is especially clear about this last point, expressing doubts over some points of his inquisitor’s idea of Beguin doctrine, and stating he could not have faith in any opinion without personally inspecting it and checking for contradictions with Scripture.⁹⁴¹ This behaviour contrasts sharply with the suspected dualist heretics found in Fournier’s register, most of whom have no such confidence in their religious beliefs, and are sooner or later ready submit to the inquisitor’s demands and get the ordeal over with.⁹⁴² The only individuals Fournier could not secure complete recantations from were the four Waldensians, and this is likely because their religious experience was much closer to that of the Beguins than the dualists.

The idea of personal religious experience and its importance is prevalent in Fournier’s interrogation of Raymond of Costa. We learn from his description of the structure of his order that the minor members (which he refers to as Deacons) are required to have been instructed in Scripture for up to six years before joining.⁹⁴³ This emphasis on a strong understanding of the holy texts is certainly evidenced by some of Raymond’s responses. He states that no-one taught him what to believe on oath-taking or purgatory, but that he found this out himself by ‘reading the Scriptures and meditating on it’.⁹⁴⁴ Although he immediately clarifies that he was indeed instructed by

⁹³⁷ Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 115.

⁹³⁸ Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans*, 254-5.

⁹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 222-3.

⁹⁴⁰ Bernard Gui, *Sentences*, 1622.

⁹⁴¹ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. Doat 35, fol. 13r-v; Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 116.

⁹⁴² The list of abjurations can be found in Bueno, *Defining Heresy*, 31-44.

⁹⁴³ *CRC*, 57, 59.

⁹⁴⁴ ‘...dixit quod hoc habuit ex se legendo scripturam et cogitando...’, *CRC*, 43.

Burgundian Pierre Clergue, Raymond's answer emphasises the importance of a personal understanding of Scripture rather than merely memorising beliefs from a senior minister. Certainly, he knew the Bible well enough to quote passages extensively from it to support his case, and even Fournier is puzzled as to how he has presented the articles of faith he professes so differently from the Nicaean and Apostle's Creeds; Raymond explains it is because he has drawn them directly from the authority of Scripture.⁹⁴⁵ Even if Raymond had help from someone else in coming to these conclusions, it is clear that his order valued a direct, personal approach to religion which cut out Church tradition. Fournier asks him why – if the subject of oath-taking is in doubt – he obeys his majoral over the Pope, who is superior in rank. Raymond's response is that he follows the majoral, not through mere obedience, but that *as it seems to him* the majoral's interpretation of Scripture is correct on this point.⁹⁴⁶ He states that the Pope has not given any justification or scriptural support for his beliefs on oath-taking and purgatory, and therefore Raymond believes his own interpretation to be superior.⁹⁴⁷ Similarly, on the hypothetical question of who he would obey in the case of a new point of doctrinal dispute, he states he does not know who he would choose, though it seems likely he would make up his own mind based on the evidence presented.⁹⁴⁸

This also appears to be the case in the interrogation of Huguette and John of Vienne, who are similarly persistent in beliefs despite threats of execution. Huguette's certainty seems to stem from her own understanding of Scripture, probably transmitted to her via Raymond or John of Lorraine, who she also mentions frequently. She is unsure on her own level of accountability to the Pope, yet she assures her inquisitor he is in error on the matters of faith in question, and doesn't have any problem with the idea that she might know better than him.⁹⁴⁹ Further to this, she does not seem to be simply following Raymond in his beliefs; she states that it does not matter who one confesses to, as only God can actually absolve the sin.⁹⁵⁰ This is a not a view espoused by Raymond in his interrogation on the sacraments, despite his apparent willingness to cling to other unorthodox beliefs, so Huguette may have come to this conclusion via other channels. John of Vienne appears to be a lot less theologically astute than his wife and Raymond, yet even he is absolutely unequivocal in his insistence not to swear an oath. He also shows signs of independence in religious thought. He is not willing to merely accept Fournier's account that criminals may be put to death without sinning,

⁹⁴⁵ CRC, 49.

⁹⁴⁶ '...sed tamen obedit maioralis in hoc, quia precipit idem quod Deus, ut ei videtur.', CRC, 75.

⁹⁴⁷ CRC, 79-80.

⁹⁴⁸ CRC, 75.

⁹⁴⁹ CHC, 133.

⁹⁵⁰ Ibid.

and though he does not fully express an opinion, Jean states he does not see how this could be compatible with the command 'thou shalt not kill' he knows is direct from God.⁹⁵¹

There were certainly key shared beliefs in Raymond's order, yet the overall impression one gets from their testimony suggests a much more personal experience of religious faith. Full members were required to understand the Scriptural basis for their beliefs, and to be able to use the texts as Raymond did to support their arguments in disputes. Blind obedience was not encouraged, and the fundamental path to salvation was a personal relationship with Jesus through an imitation of his lifestyle. We can see almost the exact same pattern repeat itself in the lives of the Beguins. Although they shared certain general principles in common, their spiritual lives were very personal, and they drew their views directly from the texts of the Gospels and Olivi, as well as discussion with their peers. They are often unwilling to accept their inquisitor's religious arguments if they feel they are contradictory to their own understanding. These parallels demonstrate a shared drawing from the same popular religious culture founded in apostolic poverty present in the Languedoc, a culture contributed to by both the Franciscans and Waldensians over the previous century, yet antedating them both. Such similarities may therefore be useful in expanding our knowledge of Fournier's Waldensians beyond what is within their own testimonies. This point will be illustrated more clearly with reference to a case study of one of the Spiritual Franciscan brothers who went into hiding after his condemnation as a heretic.

6.9. Case study – Raymond Dejean

Originally one of the friars summoned to Avignon, Raymond Dejean went on to become an important figure in the Franciscan Spiritual movement which the Church began to suppress in the 1320s, and the record of his inquisition process provides some insight into the life of a spiritual leader of the dissent.⁹⁵² After Avignon, Raymond was sent to an out-of-the-way friary in Anduze, but went into hiding after being summoned before the inquisition at Marseilles, subsequently becoming a wandering cleric in secular clothing.⁹⁵³ There is no question that the Church believed him to be a 'heresiarch', an important figure among the lay Beguins who provided for spiritual needs. There is evidence to support this in other depositions, four women testified in 1325 that they gave him gifts

⁹⁵¹ *CIV*, 124.

⁹⁵² Raymond's inquisition deposition forms part of the Doat collection: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. Doat 27, ff. 3r-112r. A Latin edition has been published in Manselli, *Spirituali e Beghini*, 302-6. Other information about his life has been researched by David Burr from other archival sources, see Burr, 'Raymond Dejean: Franciscan Renegade', *Franciscan Studies* 57 (1999), 57-78.

⁹⁵³ Manselli, *Spirituali e Beghini*, 302.

and confessed to him, and Pierre Montlaur stated in 1326 that he heard mass from Raymond in Narbonne.⁹⁵⁴ We also have evidence that Raymond gave sermons that were critical of the Church even before his condemnation.⁹⁵⁵ He also seemed to move about a great deal during his time on the run, with evidence of his presence in Béziers, Montréal, Narbonne and Montpellier, before his capture whilst moving from the latter city towards Gascony.⁹⁵⁶ The geographic region encompassed here is almost identical to that travelled by the Waldensians, and his life as a fugitive cleric providing spiritual services to members of an underground group bears no small similarity to the position of Raymond of Costa, or Waldensian leader John of Lorraine.

The similarities between these figures are not merely passing, and there is much in the content of Raymond's deposition that also speaks to a shared understanding and experience of persecution. Much like Raymond of Costa, Raymond Dejean is accused of having heretical texts in his possession, though unlike in the Waldensian case, we know the identity of this work as a copy of Olivi's Apocalypse commentary.⁹⁵⁷ Again echoing Fournier's interrogation, much of the discussion in Raymond's deposition surrounds the limits of papal authority, particularly on whether the Pope can make any order which contravenes a religious vow. The Olivian idea that the vow of poverty made by Franciscans is superior to the authority of the Church had been taken in very practical terms by Raymond, who believed John XXII was invalidating this vow by trying to make him conform with abuses within the order.⁹⁵⁸ Raymond had suddenly found himself in the same position the Waldensians had been in for over a century, for as Raymond of Costa states, the main reason the Waldensians did not 'get on' with the Pope was because 'he [did] not permit [them] to live the life of poverty they had chosen'.⁹⁵⁹

Raymond Dejean is also very similar to the French Waldensians in terms of his general closeness to orthodoxy. In his case it is probably more apparent, as the Franciscan views he followed had been official Church policy as recently as the previous decade. Much like Raymond of Costa, he is willing to give ground to his inquisitor on many occasions, attempting to compromise on issues such as the Pope's right to grant property in common.⁹⁶⁰ However, on the particular principle of the Pope directly contravening a vow he was unmoving, rejecting the pontiff's ability to marry off a man who vowed chastity, or give regular income to one who had vowed poverty.⁹⁶¹ This was clearly

⁹⁵⁴ Burr, 'Raymond Dejean: Franciscan Renegade', 67.

⁹⁵⁵ Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans*, 220.

⁹⁵⁶ Manselli, *Spirituali e Beghini*, 305.

⁹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 302.

⁹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 305.

⁹⁵⁹ '...non permetteret quod teneret viam paupertatis quam elegit tenere...', *CRC*, 85.

⁹⁶⁰ Burr, 'Raymond Dejean: Franciscan Renegade', 69.

⁹⁶¹ Manselli, *Spirituali e Beghini*, 305.

fundamental to him, and has parallels with certain concepts in the Waldensian interrogations – particularly oath-taking and unqualified obedience – on which the deponents gave no ground to their inquisitor. Burr states that Raymond probably joined the order in the mid-1290s, before the serious attacks on the Spiritual wing of the movement began.⁹⁶² Thus it must have seemed to him all the more distressing that the Church should start persecuting an order that was very much at the heart of its operations when he joined. This, then, is the fundamental difference between the experience of Raymond Dejean and the Waldensians. When Raymond of Costa joined his order in the 1290s, he would have known very well that it was in schism from the Church, and it would have been no surprise on his capture that he would face inquisitorial questioning (indeed, as has been shown in an earlier chapter he appears to have done some preparation on defending his faith). In contrast, to Raymond Dejean persecution must have felt like a titanic betrayal by an institution he thought was on his side. This idea may go some way to explaining why Raymond and his lay followers were so receptive to Joachimite and Olivian ideas of imminent apocalypse, while the Waldensians do not seem to have taken up this philosophy, despite it being readily available in their cultural context.⁹⁶³ For those supporting the Spiritual Franciscans, it was a means of understanding and coping with the very dramatic shift between being an orthodox member of the Church, and being persecuted as a heretic. For the Waldensians, this sense of immanency was lacking – their order had long faced persecution – so the idea that the Church was suddenly lapsing into evil was less powerful.

Raymond Dejean was an educated cleric, wandering the Languedoc providing covert spiritual services to a group of lay supporters. The parallels with the Waldensian order active at the same time are unmistakable, and has been shown above their theology was also fundamentally very similar. The record of Raymond's life, therefore, is of great value to understanding the lives of the French Waldensians. His secret meetings with lay followers to receive tithes and administer sacraments, his itinerant movements across the country staying with friends and relations,⁹⁶⁴ and his giving of sermons critical of the Church, must by necessity of circumstance have been closely reflected in the lives of Waldensian clerics such as Raymond of Costa and John of Lorraine. These similarities extend to their inner religious experiences, as they both placed ultimate authority in God and the Gospels, and the Church's unwillingness to allow either groups to follow the life of apostolic poverty they believed in was the root cause of disagreement. The difference in belief evidenced by

⁹⁶² Burr, 'Raymond Dejean: Franciscan Renegade', 62.

⁹⁶³ Apocalyptic leanings – alongside poverty - are usually cited as a defining feature of Beguin ideology that separated them from other pious lay groups, see Burnham, *So Great a Light*, 7-181.

⁹⁶⁴ We know he stayed with a nephew in Montréal, and likely sought shelter with sympathisers elsewhere; Manselli, *Spirituali e Beghini*, 302-3; Burr, 'Raymond Dejean: Franciscan Renegade', 66-7.

both Raymond Dejean and the Beguins' apocalyptic leanings may at first suggest a very clear distinction between the two groups. However, this difference might be better explained by the circumstantial context of their persecution rather than philosophical dogma – if the Waldensians were also thrown out of the Church at the same time, they may have had cause to reach for such ideas. As it was, they were not necessary as there was no need for an explanatory framework to comprehend a rapid change in Church policy towards them.

6.10. Conclusions

The Waldensians in the register of Jacques Fournier have largely been considered a dead-end offshoot of the broader movement, for some reason sticking closer to orthodoxy than their Italian and German counterparts, and having little relevance to other dissenting groups. By a comparison with the contemporaneous Franciscans, this paper has instead shown that this group's ideas and motivations fit perfectly into the broader culture of religious dissent in the region. This relationship with Franciscan ideas started with their respective founders and retained similarities – at least in Languedoc – as both groups developed. Saint Francis's vision as founder was fundamental to later Franciscan disputes with the Church, and therefore his similarities to Valdes in Scriptural literalism and strict imitation of the Apostolic life were still very much relevant in the fourteenth century. The theology of Peter Olivi was also representative of the Spirituals and their lay followers, and it is telling that Raymond de la Cote's deposition fits smoothly into this framework. The connection between the two groups is not just theoretical or ideological, but material. All but one of the Waldensian testimonies make reference to the Franciscans, and in the case of Raymond and Huguette, there is complementary evidence of a connection between Waldensians and Franciscans through the brothers of Montpelier.

This chapter has shown that the Waldensians of Southern France were more closely related to the Spirituals and Beguins than to the more dualist heretics that made up the majority of Fournier's register, sharing core ideologies such as the importance of absolute poverty, and of charting an individual path to one's own salvation through Scripture and imitation of the Apostles. Therefore, it can be said that both groups represented slightly different expressions of the same culture of religious dissent present in Languedoc for some time – at least to the age of St. Francis and Valdes, if not earlier. Case studies of figures such as Raymond Dejean can consequently shed light not only on the lives and beliefs of the Spirituals, but must also have important parallels with Waldensians such as Raymond and John of Lorraine, who were living under much the same conditions in the same region. The beliefs of these French Waldensians do not seem at all

anomalous or strange when put in their proper context and when considering an idealist history of the region and the climate of personal lay religion in which they operated.

Conclusions

The preceding analysis of the Waldensian depositions in the inquisition record of Jacques Fournier contributes important evidence relevant to the study of Waldensianism, inquisition, and the history of heterodoxies more broadly. In order to effectively interpret the evidence in this document on the nature of the Waldensian Order in the period, it was necessary to understand its place within the totality of Fournier's inquisition procedure, and this process provides valuable insight into the treatment of heterodoxies by the Church. Most generally, Fournier's treatment of his Waldensian captives is an excellent example of the application of anti-heretical polemical theory. Fournier himself wrote much on the nature of heresy later in his life, and in the Waldensian depositions we can see the influence of his inquisitorial career on this work. The stratification of the deponents based on their presumed knowledge is evidenced in Fournier's lines of questioning, in which technical theological problems are reserved for Raymond, whom Fournier viewed as the spiritual leader of the group. The bishop's later writings also emphasised that the Church's principal goal in tackling heresy should be to secure the heretic's reconciliation with Catholicism, with the death penalty only justified as a last resort. The Waldensians' depositions stand as an example of how this idea was put into practice. Although the effectiveness and fairness of these measures seem dubious to a modern reader, there is no doubt that the depositions were constructed to demonstrate that the inquisitor had gone to great lengths in attempting to secure a reconciliation, with extended grace periods for reflection, repetitive paragraphs describing the inquisitor pleading and ordering his subjects to recant, and in Raymond's case a detailed breakdown of the authorities read to him that refuted his errors.⁹⁶⁵

Most significantly, Fournier's approach made use of the anti-heretical polemic of hiddenness in the construction of the deposition record. The inquisitor's goal was not so much to find out *what* his subject believed (though the details of belief were an ancillary goal), but rather to *reveal* the errors he knew Waldensian heretics held. This results in several sections in which the 'questions' are little more than different steps in a logical argument which proved to the satisfaction of the inquisition that the deponent held certain erroneous beliefs. We can see this most clearly in the manner in which Fournier used Raymond's rejection of oath-taking as a logical proof that he also believed the entire Church was mortally sinful. Of course, by constructing a confession in this way, the actual content of the Waldensians' religious experiences is necessarily obscured. It is insufficient to point to the errors ascribed to them at the end of their depositions and state that these were the beliefs that they died for. However, this in no way means that an analysis of Waldensian religious

⁹⁶⁵ CRC, 112.

belief through these documents is a fruitless endeavour. The deponents did still retain some agency over how they responded to the process, as will be discussed below, though this mainly affected the direction of discussion and the way they chose to frame their responses, but not necessarily the final outcome of the confession.

The unusual level of detail by which Fournier carried out his inquisition enables a rare insight into the lived experience and beliefs of the deponents. This study has shown that these deponents were not entirely free of agency in how they chose to face their ordeal. Several strategies employed by the Waldensians can be seen throughout the interrogation transcripts, including a refusal to name living associates, appeals to ignorance to avoid difficult subjects, and even attacks on the inquisition for their persecution of fellow Christians. In terms of belief, oath-taking and purgatory seem to have been central issues on which Raymond and his companions disagreed with the Church. On these two issues the deponents were, with only two exceptions, absolutely unequivocal.⁹⁶⁶ Aside from this area of clarity, a focused analysis of belief in the testimonies reveals much ambiguity and nuance in terms of individual interpretations of Waldensian teachings. On the morality of killing, only Huguette was insistent on it being unacceptable under any circumstances, whereas both Raymond and John made less absolute statements. Similarly, the deponents' relationship to the Church was variable, characterised by an overall rejection of its necessity for salvation, yet maintaining a certain respect for the institution which prevented any of them crossing the line into hostile anticlericalism or donatism. The malleability of these beliefs should not be interpreted as the disguising of secretly held unified positions on these issues, as there is no consistently compelling reason why they should conceal some beliefs whilst freely admitting others. Instead, we should see the testimonies as a rare example of the textured and nuanced nature of heterodox belief, in which groups share the same fundamental ideas and teachings, but with the interpretation and practical application of these teachings differing on an individual level. The scope for such diffusion would likely scale based on the importance of a particular idea to the group, thus

Fournier's inquisition document is notable in that it has often been overlooked by modern interpretative methodologies. The application of spatial and gender theory on the source, using the Waldensian depositions, has revealed a number of insights into the nature of this branch of the movement. The spatial makeup of the group can be considered on both a large and small scale. At the macro-level, the necessity of itinerancy brought on by the Waldensians' imitation of the apostolic life, later exacerbated by their persecution, seems to have created a community which was

⁹⁶⁶ Huguette seems to have agreed to swear once, but later recanted, while Agnes is the sole deponent to accept purgatory with a simple affirmative.

very thinly spread across a wide geographic area. These disparate pockets of membership necessitated a system of continuous travel between them, a system which fit seamlessly into the background of trade and immigration to urban centres which was common at the time. The Waldensians would disguise their movements as traders, immigrants or pilgrims, and their leaders would send out messengers to deliver important information to their followers. This series of constant movements was critical to the maintenance of a sense of group identity despite the great distances involved, and helped to compress the vast geographic space into a manageably small social one. By disguising their movements as pre-existing socially accepted ones, the Waldensians had constructed a subaltern social space using an existing framework. Although such subaltern social spaces might be considered more egalitarian than wider society, it is worth noting that a degree of social stratification was still present in this system, as only the initiated Brothers could travel freely between believers' houses, and only higher-ranking ones knew where each of these houses were. This stands as a note of caution in that although the Waldensians worked to construct their own spatial network as an alternative to the status-quo, this system still retained considerable constrictions on where, when and how its members could move within it.

The depositions also reveal how the Waldensians made use of space on a smaller scale. We can see the general separation between public and private space to be expected of a persecuted group, in which certain controversial ideas could only be discussed behind closed doors. However, public meetings between members still took place, though topics of discussion had to be carefully managed. To enable freer discussion of their ideas, the community made use of certain 'safe-houses', among which Raymond's house in Pamiers almost certainly counted. As with journeys between cities, these houses could be disguised as legitimate entities, such as the meeting place above a workshop in Toulouse. The locations of these safe-houses would be revealed to initiated members through navigational instructions designed for their ears only. We can see echoes of these directions in the specificity of the descriptions in the depositions, such as the 'house with red-trimmed windows' in Montpellier, or the workshop attached to the tower of the city wall behind Saint-Sernin in Toulouse. As with their use of space on a larger scale, the Waldensians imbued pre-existing spatial structures with new meaning only understood by members of the community. In this manner, we see an example of a marginalised group capable of adding their own layer to the complex spatial make-up of a medieval town or city, incorporating existing pathways and landmarks into an esoteric network of meeting-points both public and private.

Modern interpretative techniques can also be applied to the documents through the lens of gender, specifically the methodology popularised by scholars such as McSheffrey which pursues an inclusive analysis of gender roles rather than exclusively focusing on the role of women.

Nevertheless, it was important to first understand the involvement of women in the Waldensian movement, and whether there is a case for the existence of a parallel female Order to Raymond's Brothers. This thesis has argued that the evidence for the Sisters in this period is insufficient to prove their existence beyond question. The only direct evidence potentially pointing to Sisters is a single name in Gui's *sentences*, and reference to houses exclusively for elderly women in the *de vita et actibus*. Neither of these cases is supported by other contemporary testimony, and as argued above, could equally be understood as mistaken references to female lay believers, an interpretation which would fit better with the evidence of the Waldensian depositions. A second argument for the Sisters involves Raymond's testimony directly, interpreting his strangely extreme stance on women as a means of covering for the female branch of his Order. This argument is not unreasonable, yet an alternative exists which also takes into account the broader scope of Raymond's intentions and statements. It is possible that Raymond's living conditions, in a house alongside several unrelated women, was an impediment to his goal of portraying the Order as unquestionably orthodox, and on par with organisations such as the Franciscans or Dominicans. These conditions were a necessary result of persecution and clandestine living, and therefore Raymond might simply be describing an ideal situation where men and women could be kept strictly separate. Raymond's embarrassment over his proximity to women is an entirely plausible explanation for his extreme stance on female involvement in the religious structure of the Order.

Although the depositions provide little evidence for the role of women as Sisters, there is nevertheless a gendered perspective arising from the testimonies. This is particularly notable when comparing the religious experiences of Raymond with those of lay believers Huguette and Agnes. The former centres his religiosity directly on Scripture, supporting every theological argument he makes with direct quotations. For Raymond, religion is grounded in intellectual study, and is expressed through a structured lifestyle within the Order derived from that study. Only with these foundations can more experiential rituals such as confession hold meaning, while Raymond sees little use for churches as sacred spaces. In contrast, the depositions of Huguette and Agnes contain a far more personalised perspective on religious belief. Huguette's experience with the movement was based on her relationships with holy men such as Raymond and John of Lorraine who acted as spiritual instructors. There is more emphasis on the mystical and experiential aspects of religion in her testimony, as when she spent a night's vigil at a certain church in Montpellier. Additionally, the structure of the Waldensian Order itself can be described in terms of gendered roles. Although ordained membership was restricted to men, the support system of lay believers by which they maintained themselves seems to have been disproportionately female. This latter fact offers us an

excellent point of comparison with the contemporary Beguines, with both groups offering women a spiritual outlet to an active, personalised religious life which was often otherwise denied to them.

Comparisons to other religious groups active at the same time and place do not end with the Beguines. This thesis has also demonstrated the importance of similarities between the Waldensian and Spiritual Franciscan movements in southern France in this period. Both Waldensians and Franciscans had similar origins in the hagiographical stories of their founders as rich men who renounced their worldly possessions to pursue an apostolic life of poverty. In both cases, the pursuit of this poverty led to disagreements with the established Church. By the beginning of the fourteenth century, Franciscan Spirituals were actively criticising the Church for its interference with the religious life they had chosen, and there are many parallels between their views and those espoused by Raymond Costa. This thesis has not argued for the direct influence of Franciscans such as Peter Olivi on the Waldensian Brothers, but rather has shown the parallel development of similar ideas based on the same underlying principles. That Raymond had similar criticisms of the Church as Olivi shows them to be part of the same intellectual milieu, and demonstrates that the nature of the Waldensian Order in this time and place – often remarked upon for being unusual in their beliefs and closeness to orthodoxy – is in fact unsurprising when considering the wider cultural and religious context in which they operated. The connection between the groups is more than theoretical, with evidence of Brothers such as Raymond and John of Lorraine being in contact with the Franciscans in Montpellier, and even that the Waldensians adopted the Franciscan ‘loophole’ of using money-handler servants to protect their vows of poverty.

The lay followers of the Spiritual Franciscans, the Beguins, also have important similarities to the Waldensian Order. The importance of martyrdom and a willingness to be executed rather than recant beliefs unites the Waldensian and Beguin believers in comparison with dualists interrogated in Fournier’s register, who are almost never given the death penalty. The likely reason for this is both groups’ fundamental emphasis of a direct relationship with Scripture, and the belief that these precepts were infallible and not to be controverted by any earthly authority. Both Waldensians and Beguins essentially rejected the role of the Church as a necessary intermediary between God and man, and the tension arising from this belief led to much of the depositions of both groups revolving around the issue of obedience. This is exemplified in the testimony of Franciscan Spiritual preacher Raymond Dejan, whose profile and lifestyle were extremely similar to that of Raymond Costa. Both men held the same fundamental disagreement with the Church, in that it would not let them pursue the apostolic life they had chosen for themselves. Raymond Dejan’s example demonstrates that the Waldensians’ ideas were not anomalous but rather representative of a wider religious culture of the Languedoc in the period.

Raymond and his group are also connected to a more specifically Waldensian religious culture, and the history and significance of their beliefs can be illuminated by reference to the earlier work of Durand of Huesca. Durand – certainly a significant intellectual figure in Waldensian circles - continued to be involved with the movement even after his reconciliation with the Church, likely pushing a more moderate theology which sought to minimise conflict with established authorities. His continued preaching to Waldensians in southern France and Aragon attracted the ire of local bishops, but he seemed to have some support from the papacy in his mission to reconcile Waldensians and form a new Order of his own, the Catholic Poor. Durand's major work before his reconciliation, the *Liber Antiheresis*, is remarkably close in its theological arguments and emphases to what can be found in the testimony of Raymond Costa. From their positions on Church authority, both making the argument for God as the ultimate authority for Waldensian ordination, to their particular definitions of the sacraments (with Raymond still using Durand's 'imposition of hands' in place of confirmation), to their positions on the nature of poverty and spiritual over manual labour, the two sources bear many striking similarities. We know Raymond to have been a well-educated and widely travelled individual with access to writings, and a knowledge of the history of his Order to the time of Valdes (his profession of faith being adapted from the latter's). It is not inconceivable that Raymond had access to the *Liber* as a source, but at the very least it is evident that he and his Order had a textual memory of its contents, and that Durand's conceptions of the Waldensians' core beliefs were influential to Raymond in the early fourteenth century. Frustratingly, the sources do not present an unbroken chain of connection which the historian can follow between the two men, and it is possible that Raymond may represent someone reviving or rediscovering some of Durand's earlier ideas rather than inheriting them directly. Whatever the case, a comparison of the two documents highlights the depth of Waldensian history and religious culture present in Raymond's Order, and helps to explain his more moderate views in comparison to the much more anti-clerical positions often held by Waldensians in other testimonies.

This thesis also contributes to some of the key historiographical debates in the history of Waldensianism, namely the exact position of Raymond's group in relation to the wider movement, and more broadly the debate between the unity versus discontinuity of different groups of Waldensians in the historical record. Fournier's interrogations reveal evidence both for and against the concept of a unified Waldensian movement. Certainly, Raymond was aware of his Order's history, and clear lines of similarity can be traced between his beliefs and those of the earliest Waldensians. We also know that he was widely travelled, with connections in Burgundy and northern Italy. However, his beliefs certainly hold a unique character, and these cannot be ignored or disregarded as simple falsehoods. This thesis has argued that Raymond's views were

representative of the historical and religious context in which he lived, and that from this perspective we need not see any of his beliefs as anomalous or unexpected. It is only when comparing his theology with that of Waldensians in other times and places that discrepancies become obvious. However, this fact does not necessitate some kind of Waldensian schism in this period, or that these groups were entirely separate from one another. The need for strict ideological purity was a notion pushed by the Church inquisitions, and did not necessarily apply to heterodox groups. As early as 1218 we have evidence of the development of different avenues of thought amongst the movement, when Italian and French representatives met at a conference in Bergamo.⁹⁶⁷ Although they could not resolve all their disagreements, particularly on the subject of the Eucharist, there is no sense that either side left in the belief that the other was no longer considered part of the movement.

Cameron has argued that Raymond's group represent the last vestiges of the moderate wing of the movement who closely followed the original ideas of Valdes, and that this branch of Waldensianism was too close to orthodoxy to survive as a separate group.⁹⁶⁸ There is certainly merit to this argument, as Raymond's views are generally more moderate, and have strong links to another early moderate in Durand of Huesca. However, Cameron's language implies that Raymond's group was some form of 'living fossil' that survived in isolation in southern France. This is contradicted by the highly mobile and geographically widespread nature of the Waldensians in Fournier's register, as well as the other Brothers and companions they mention. Instead, it may be better to make an argument framed by the notion of *transition*. Many of the ideas expressed by Raymond and the others can be interpreted as transitional forms between the ideas of Valdes and Durand, and those of later Waldensian communities. Raymond's group still holds a rejection of most forms of killing and violence, yet the ambiguity in much of the language on this topic suggests its fading importance as a core belief, and we know that later communities dropped this principle entirely.⁹⁶⁹ Similarly, the relationship of the group to the Roman Church remains mostly non-confrontational, without the hostile anticlericalism and donatism that proliferated among later groups. However, there is evidence to suggest that this relationship is at a breaking-point, particularly in Raymond's veiled threats about the consequences of his continued persecution. Using this lens, the evidence of Fournier's register does not represent a vestigial remnant of an earlier

⁹⁶⁷ Preger, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Waldesier im Mittelalter', *Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* XIII (1877); 'Council of Bergamo 1218' in Wakefield and Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, 279-89.

⁹⁶⁸ Cameron, *Waldenses*,

⁹⁶⁹ Susanna Treesh, 'The Waldensian Recourse to Violence', *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 55, no. 3 (1986), 294-306.

group which faded back into orthodoxy, but rather a snap-shot in time showing older ideas put under pressure, and beginning to decline or morph into the beliefs which sustained Waldensian communities in later decades and centuries.

One of the key components of this transition was the inquisitorial persecution faced by the deponents and their companions, and this persecution is a key explanatory tool for much of the evidence presented in the current study. Most obviously, this persecution affected the Waldensians' relationship with the Church. It is difficult to imagine how the cautious respect for the Church institutions Raymond displays in his testimony could be maintained when the same institution was responsible for their imprisonment and death sentence. However, Raymond's group was already living under the threat of the inquisition, and this threat was central to how their community operated. The evidence of a co-ordinated strategy between the four deponents, most notably the attempt to avoid swearing by appealing to some form of illness, indicates that the prospect of arrest and interrogation was anticipated by the community, and that some form of discussion and planning on this eventuality had taken place. Raymond's depiction of the Brothers' daily lives imitates those of members of established Orders such as the Franciscans, yet the realities of persecution necessarily changed this ideal way of living to something more practical. Brothers like Raymond were forced to live in houses of mixed occupancy, and preaching for alms could only be carried out in private and in secret. This may also explain Raymond's particular emphasis on the sacrament of confession, as there is a sense of privacy and secrecy inherent to the relationship between confessor and penitent. As mentioned above, the threat of persecution influenced the Waldensians' travel, forcing them to disguise their journeys, and use trusted messengers to co-ordinate a network of safe-houses. The difficulty of travel and meeting must have made it difficult for Brothers from different regions to meet regularly, and this may have exacerbated differences in interpretation of doctrine, which would help to explain some of Raymond's unique positions, as well as the apparent anomaly of one of his own *majors* subscribing to Donatism.⁹⁷⁰ The Waldensian depositions in Fournier's register provide a fascinating insight into the scale of which the threat of inquisitorial persecution affected the lives of heterodox groups, and demonstrates how this threat was a fundamental factor in determining their structure, social relationships, and beliefs.

List of Works Cited

Manuscripts

- Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, MS Philipps 1880.
- Dôle, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 109.
- London, British Library, MS Add. Ms. 4697.
- Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, MS 1114.
- Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, MS A. 129.
- New Haven Connecticut, Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS Marston 266.
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. Doat 21.
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. Doat 27.
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. Doat 35.
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5011.
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5212.
- Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 13446.
- Perugia, Biblioteca Augusta Comunale, MS 1046.
- Prague, Metropolitan Chapter, MS 527.
- Prague: University of Prague, IV. B. 15.
- Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS vat. Lat. 2648.
- Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS vat. Lat. 4030.
- Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS. Vat. Lat. 4986.
- Toulouse, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 609.
- Troyes, Médiathèque du Grand-Troyes, MS 549.
- Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, MS Helmstedt 1006.

Published Primary Works

Alan of Lille, *Contra haereticos*, in *PL* 210.

Alexander of Hales, *Summa universae theologiae*, in *Alexandri de Ales angli, doctoris irrefragabilis Ordinis Minorum Universae theologiae summa*, ed. Franciscum Franciscium (Venice: Franciscum Franciscium, 1575).

Angelo Clareno, *Opera I: Epistole*, ed. Lydia von Auw (Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1980).

Angelo Clareno, *A Chronicle or History of the Seven Tribulations of the Order of Brothers Minor*, trans. David Burr (New York: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2005).

Augustine of Hippo, *Contra Faustum*, in Zycha, (ed.), *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*.

Augustine of Hippo, *De Mendacio*, in Zycha, (ed.), *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. XXXI.

Augustine of Hippo, *De sermone Domini in monte libros duos*, ed. Almut Mutzenbecher, *Corpus Christianorum series Latina* 35 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1967).

Augustine of Hippo, *De civitate Dei*, in Zycha, (ed.), *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. XXXX.

Augustine of Hippo, *Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et caritate*, ed. E. Evans, *Corpus Christianorum series latina* 46 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969).

Baluzius, Stephanus, *Vitae paparum Avenionensium: hoc est historia pontificum Romanorum qui in Gallia sederunt ab anno Christi MCCV usque ad annum MCCCXCIV*, ed. Guillaume Mollat, 4 vols. (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1914-1922).

Bernard Gui, *Practica Inquisitionis heretice pravitatis*, ed. Célestin Douais (Paris: Picard, 1886).

Bernard Gui, *Manuel de l'inquisiteur*, ed. Guillaume Mollat (Paris: Les belles lettres, 1926).

Bernard Gui, *Le livre des sentences de l'inquisiteur Bernard Gui: 1308-1323*, ed. and trans. Annette Pales-Gobilliard (Paris: CNRS Editions, 2002), 2 vols.

Bonaventure, *Opera omnia* (Quaracchi: Bonaventurae, 1882-1902).

Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, ed. and trans. Dominic V. Monti (New York: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2005).

Brooke, Rosalind, (ed.), *Scripta Leonis, Rufini et Angeli, Sociorum S. Francisci* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970).

Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus Miraculorum*, ed. Joseph Strange (Cologne: J. M. Heberle, 1851), vol. 2, 296-8.

Coulon, Auguste, (ed.), *Lettres secretes et curiales relatives a la France, extradites des registres du Vatican par A. Coulon* (Paris: A. Fontemoing, 1900-1965).

da Milano, Illarino, 'Il "Liber supra stella" del piacentino Salvo Burci contro i Catari e le altre correnti ereticali', *Aevum* XIX (1945), 308-341.

- Denzinger, Heinrich, and Schönmetzer, Adolfus, (eds.), *Enchiridion symbolorum: definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, 35th edition (Barcinone: Herder, 1974).
- Duvernoy, Jean, (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier, évêque de Pamiers (1318-1325) : Manuscrit n° Vat. Latin 4030 de la Bibliothèque Vaticane* (Toulouse: Privat, 1965).
- Duvernoy, Jean, (ed.), *Inquisition à Pamiers, interrogatoires de Jacques Fournier, 1318-1325* (Toulouse: Privat, 1966).
- Duvernoy, Jean, (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (évêque de Pamiers), 1318-1325* (Paris: Mouton, 1978).
- Duvernoy, Jean, (ed.), *Inquisition à Pamiers: Cathares, Juifs, Lépreux - devant leurs juges* (Toulouse: Privat, 1986).
- Duvernoy, Jean, (ed.), *Inquisition en terre cathare: paroles d'hérétiques devant leurs juges* (Toulouse: Privat, 1998).
- Duvernoy, Jean, (ed.), *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier (évêque de Pamiers), 1318-1325* (Paris: Mouton, 2006).
- Eubel, Conrad, (ed.), *Bullarii Franciscani epitome* (Quaracchi: Bonaventurae, 1908).
- Giovanni Villani, *Cronica di Giovanni Villani: a miglior lezione ridotta coll' ajuto de' testi a penna*, ed. Ignazio Moutier and Gherardi Dragomanni (Florence, 1844-1845).
- Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé and Paul Antin (Paris: Éd. du Cerf, 1980).
- Hugh of Digne, *De finibus paupertatis*, in Alessandra Sisto, (ed.), *Figure del primo Francescanesimo in Provenza: Ugo e Douceline di Digne* (Florence: L.S. Olschki, 1971).
- John XXII, *Extrauagantes Iohannis XXII*, ed. Jacqueline Tarrant (Vatican City: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1983).
- Pagi, Franciscus, (ed.), *Breviarium historico-chronologico-criticum* (Antwerp: Van der Haert, 1730).
- Peter Lombard, *Sentences*, trans. Giulio Silano (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2010).
- Peter Olivi, *Tractatus de septem sentimentis christi iesu*, in Marco Bartoli, 'Il Tractatus de Septem Sentimentis Christi Iesu di Pietro di Giovanni Olivi', *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 91 (1998), 535-49.
- Peter Olivi, *Spiritual Warfare and Six Other Writings by Peter of John Olivi*, ed. and trans. Robert Karris (New York, 2012).
- Peters, Edward (ed.), *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe: Documents in Translation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980).
- Prieto, Augusto Quintana, (ed.), *La Documentación Pontificia de Inocencio IV (1243-1254)*, vol. VII (Rome: Inst. Español de Historia Eclesiastica, 1987).
- Rainier Sacconi, *Summa de Catharis et Pauperibus de Lugduno*, ed. Franjo Šanjek, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XLIV (1974), 31-60.

- Ricchini, Thomas A., (ed.), *Venerabilis patris Monetae Cremonensis ordinis praedicatorum S.P. dominico aequalis Adversus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque : quos ex manuscriptis codd. Vaticano, Bononiensi, ac Neapolitano* (Rome: Ex Typographia Palladis, excudebant Nicolaus, et Marcus Plearini, 1743).
- Riezler, Sigmund, (ed.), *Vatikanische Akten zur Deutschen Geschichte in der Zeit Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern* (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1891).
- Roger of Hoveden, *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. William Stubbs, 4 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1869).
- Sánchez, Santiago Dominguez, (ed.), *Documentos de Gregorio IX (1227-1241) Referentes a España*, (Leon: Universidad de León, 2004).
- Šanjek, Franjo, O.P., 'Le rassemblement hérétique de Saint-Félix-de-Caraman (1167) et les églises cathares au XIIe siècle', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 67 (1972), 772-9.
- Sbaralea, Joannes, and Eubel, Conrad, (eds.), *Bullarium Franciscanum*, 7 vols. (Rome: Sancta Congregatio de Propaganda Fide [vols. i–iv] and Vaticana [vols. v–vii], 1759–1904).
- Saint Francis of Assisi, *Regula bullata*, in *Opuscula sancti patris Francisci Assisiensis*, vol. 1 (Quaracchi: Bonaventurae, 1904).
- Saint Francis of Assisi, *Regula prima*, in Denifle, H., and Ehrle, F., (eds.), *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 3 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1887).
- Saint Francis of Assisi, *Testamentum*, in *Opuscula sancti patris Francisci Assisiensis*, vol. 1 (Quaracchi: Bonaventurae, 1904).
- Stephen of Bourbon, *Stephani de Borbone tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus*, in ed. Esteve de Borbo, Jacques Berlioz and Jean-Luc Eichenlaub (Turnhout: Brepolis, 2002-2006), 3 vols.
- Täutu, Aloysius, (ed.), *Acta Benedicti XII (1334-1342)* (Rome: Typis polyglottis Vaticanis, 1958).
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, ed. and trans. James J. Cunningham (London: Blackfriars, 1975).
- Thomas of Celano, *Vita Prima, Vita Secunda and Tractatus de Miraculis*, in *Analecta Franciscana* vol. 10, fasc. 1-3 (Quaracchi: Bonaventurae, 1926).
- Thomas of Celano, *St. Francis of Assisi: First and Second Life of St. Francis, with Selections from Treatise on the miracles of Blessed Francis*, ed. Placid Hermann (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press 1963).
- van Limborch, Philip, *Historia inquisitionis: cui subjungitur Liber sententiarum inquisitionis Tholosanae ab anno Christi MCCCVII ad annum MCCCXXIII* (Amsterdam: Apud Henricum Westenum, 1692).
- Wakefield, Walter and Evans, Austin, (eds.), *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969).
- Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium* I, xxxi, ed. Montague R. James (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914).
- William of Puylaurens, *Guillaume de Puylaurens: Chronique (Chronica Magistri Guillelmi de Podio Laurentii)*, ed. Jean Duvernoy (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1976).

William of Puylaurens, *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens: The Albigensian Crusade and its Aftermath*, ed. and trans. W. A. Silby and M. D. Silby (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003).

Secondary Works

Abels, Richard, and Harrison, Ellen, 'The Participation of Women in Languedocian Catharism', *Medieval Studies* 41 (1979), 215-51.

Albaret, Laurent, *Les inquisiteurs – portraits de défenseurs de la foi en Languedoc (XIIIe – XIVe siècles)* (Toulouse: Privat, 2001).

Arnold, John, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).

Arnold, John, (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

Audisio, Gabriel, *Les vaudois des origines à leur fin (XIIe-XVIe Siècles)* (Turin: Meynier, 1990).

Audisio, Gabriel, *The Waldensian Dissent: Persecution and Survival, c.1170-c.1570* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Barber, Malcolm, *The Cathars: Dualist Heretics in Languedoc in the High Middle Ages* (Harlow: Longman, 2000).

Begley, Ronald, and Koterski, Joseph (eds.), *Medieval Education* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2005).

Benedetti, Marina and Betri, Maria Luisa, (eds.), *“Una Strana Gioia di Vivere”: a Grado Giovanni Merlo* (Milan: Biblioteca Francescana, 2010).

Bennett, Judith Mackenzie, and Karras, Ruth Maro, (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Women and Gender in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Biller, Peter and Hudson, Anne, (eds.), *Heresy and Literacy, 1000-1530* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Biller, Peter and Dobson, Barrie, (eds.), *The Medieval Church* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1999).

Biller, Peter, *The Waldenses, 1170-1530: Between a Religious Order and a Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001).

Biller, Peter, and Bruschi, Caterina, (eds.), *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy* (York: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell & Brewer, 2003).

Biller, Peter, 'Goodbye to Waldensianism?', *Past & Present* 192, no. 1 (2006), 3-33.

Blumenfeld-Kosinski, Renate, and Klara Szell, Timea, (eds.), *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991).

Böhmer, Heinrich 'Waldenser', in *Realencyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, xx (Leipzig, 1908).

- Bolton, Brenda, 'Mulieres Sanctae', *Studies in Church History* 10 (1973), 77-95.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 'The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups', *Theory and Society* 14, no.6 (1985), 723-44.
- Brenon, Anne, *Les Femmes Cathares* (Paris: Perrin, 1992).
- Brooke, Rosalind, *The Coming of the Friars* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1975).
- Bruschi, Caterina, *The Wandering Heretics of the Languedoc* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- Bueno, Irene, 'False Prophets and Ravening Wolves: Biblical Exegesis as a Tool against Heretics in Jacques Fournier's Postilla on Matthew', *Speculum* 89, no.1 (2014), 35-65.
- Bueno, Irene, *Defining Heresy: Inquisition, Theology, and Papal Policy in the time of Jacques Fournier* trans. Isabella Bolognese, Tony Brophy and Sarah Rolfe Prodan (Leiden: Brill, 2015).
- Burnham, Louisa, *So Great a Light, So Great a Smoke: The Beguin Heretics of the Languedoc* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008).
- Burr, David, 'The Persecution of Peter Olivi', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 66, no.5 (1976), 1-98.
- Burr, David, and Flood, David, 'Peter Olivi: On Poverty and Revenue', *Franciscan Studies* 40 (1980), 18-58.
- Burr, David, *Olivi and Franciscan Poverty: The Origins of the Usus Pauper Controversy* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1989).
- Burr, David, *Olivi's Peaceable Kingdom: A Reading of the Apocalypse Commentary* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1993).
- Burr, David, 'Raymond Dejean: Franciscan Renegade', *Franciscan Studies* 57 (1999), 57-78.
- Burr, David, *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century after Saint Francis* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 2001).
- Bynum, Caroline Walker, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).
- Caldwell Ames, Christine, 'Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages', *American Historical Review* 110 (2005), 11-37.
- Caldwell Ames, Christine, *Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).
- Cameron, Euan, *The Reformation of the Heretics: the Waldenses of the Alps, 1480-1580* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984).
- Cameron, Euan, *Waldenses: Rejections of Holy Church in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).
- Clarke, Catherine, (ed.), *Mapping the Medieval City: Space, Place and Identity in Medieval Chester c.1200-1600* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2013).
- Clifford, James, and Marcus, George E., (eds.), *Writing Culture: the Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986).

- Constable, Giles, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Cusato, Michael, and Geltner, Guy, (eds.), *Defenders and Critics of Franciscan Life: Essays in Honor of John V. Fleming* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).
- Davidson, Lola Sharon, 'Montaillou: Cosmology and Social Structure', *Journal of Religious History* 35, no.4 (2011), 516-31.
- de Certeau, Michel, *The Practice of Everyday Life* trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).
- de Cevins, Marie-Madeleine, and Matz, Jean-Michel, (eds.), *Structures et dynamiques religieuses dans les sociétés de l'Occident latin (1179-1449)* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2010).
- de Serrablo, Amigos, (ed.), *Miscelanea de Estudios en Honor de D. Antonio Durán Gudíol* (Sabiñánigo: Amigos de Serrablo, 1981).
- Debergue, Yvette, 'Bonas femnas and the consolamen', *Journal of Religious History* 35, no.4 (2011), 532-45.
- Deanesly, Margaret, *The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920).
- Dondaine, Antoine, 'Aux origines du valdéisme : une profession de foi de Valdès', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, XVI (1946), 191-235.
- Dondaine, Antoine, 'La hiérarchie Cathare en Italie, II: Le "Tractatus de Hereticis" d'Anselme d'Alexandrie, O.P.; III: Catalogue de la hiérarchie Cathare d'Italie', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XX (1950), 310-24.
- Dondaine, Antoine, 'Durand de Huesca et la polémique anti-Cathare', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* XXIV (1959), 228-76.
- Dossat, Yves, *A propos du prieur des Pauvres catholiques, Durand de Huesca ou de Losque en Rouergue?* (Paris: B.N., 1969).
- Duvernoy, Jean, 'Le mouvement vaudois, origines', *Heresis*, no. 13/14 (1990), 173-98.
- Elliott, Dyan, *Proving Woman: Female Spirituality and Inquisitional Culture in the Later Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).
- Erickson, Gregory, and Schweizer, Bernard, (eds.), *Reading Heresy: Religion and Dissent in Literature and Art* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017).
- Frassetto, Michael, *Heretic Lives: Medieval Heresy from Bogomil and the Cathars to Wyclif and Hus* (London: Profile Books, 2007).
- Gillespie, Michael Allen, *The Theological Origins of Modernity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).
- Given, James, *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline and Resistance in Languedoc* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).
- Gonnet, Jean and Molnár, Amedeo, *Les vaudois au moyen âge* (Turin: Claudiana, 1974).

- Goodin, Robert, and Tilly, Charles, (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- Grundmann, Herbert, 'Die Bulle *Quo elongati* Papst Gregors IX', In *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 54 (1961), 2-23.
- Grundmann, Herbert, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*, 2nd. Edition (Hildesheim: Olms, 1961).
- Grundmann, Herbert, *Religious Movements in the Middle Ages* trans. Steven Rowan (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995).
- Grundmann, Herbert, *Herbert Grundmann (1902-1970): Essays on Heresy, Inquisition, and Literacy*, ed. Jennifer Kolpacoff Deane, trans. Steven Rowan (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2019).
- Guillemain, Bernard, *La Cour pontificale d'Avignon : 1309-1376, étude d'une société* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1966).
- Guiraud, Jean, *The Medieval Inquisition*, trans. E. C. Messenger (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1929).
- Hamilton, Bernard, *The Medieval Inquisition* (London: Edward Arnold, 1981).
- Hamilton, Jeffrey S., 'The Yellow Cross: The Story of the Last Cathars, 1290-1329', *Journal of Church and State* 44, no.1 (2002), 153-4.
- Hill, Derek, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century: the Manuals of Bernard Gui and Nicholas Eymerich* (York: York Medieval Press, 2019).
- Hoose, Adam, 'Durán of Huesca (c. 1160–1230): A Waldensian Seeking a Remedy to Heresy', *Journal of Religious History* 38, no. 2 (2014), 173-189.
- Jiménez-Sánchez, Pilar, *Les catharismes: Modèles dissidents du christianisme médiéval (xiie-xiiiie siècles)* (Rennes: Rennes University Press, 2014).
- Jonston, William, and Renkin, Claire, (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Monasticism*, vol. I (London; New York: Routledge; Taylor et Francis Group, 2013).
- Kautsky, Karl, *Vorläufer des Neueren Sozialismus* (Berlin: Dietz, 1947).
- Kelly, Henry Ansgar, 'Inquisition and the Prosecution of Heresy: Misconceptions and Abuses', *Church History* 50, no. 4 (1989), 439-51.
- Kelly, Henry Ansgar, 'Oath-taking in Inquisitions', *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* 35 (2018), 215-41.
- Kieckhefer, Richard, *Repression of Heresy in Medieval Germany* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1979).
- Koch, Gottfried, *Frauenfrage und Ketzertum in Mittelalter: die Frauenbewegung im Rahmen des Katharismus und des Waldensertums und ihre Sozialen Wurzeln* (Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte 9; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962).
- Lambert, Malcolm, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977).
- Lambert, Malcolm, *Franciscan Poverty: The Doctrine of the Absolute Poverty of Christ and the Apostles in the Franciscan Order, 1210-1323* (St. Bonaventure: NY Franciscan Institute, 1998).

- Lambert, Malcolm, *The Cathars* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).
- Lambert, Malcolm, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 3rd edition (Oxford: Blackwell 2002).
- Le Roy Ladurie, Emmanuel, *Montaillou, village occitan de 1294 à 1324* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975).
- Le Roy Ladurie, Emmanuel, *Montaillou: the promised land of error* trans. Barbara Bray (New York: George Braziller, 2008).
- Lea, Henry Charles, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1922).
- Lecoy de la Marche, Albert, (ed.), *Anecdotes historiques: Légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Étienne de Bourbon, Dominicain du XIIIe siècle*, Société de l'Histoire de France, CLXXXV (Paris: Renouard, 1877).
- Lefebvre, Henri, *The Production of Space* trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991).
- Leff, Gordon, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages: the Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent, c. 1250-c. 1450* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967).
- Lerner, Robert, 'New Light on The Mirror of Simple Souls', *Speculum* 85, no.1 (2010), 92-5.
- Lewis, Warren, *Peter John Olivi, Prophet of the Year 2000: Ecclesiology and Eschatology in the Lectura super Apocalipsim* (University of Tübingen, 1972).
- Little, Lester, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (London: Elek, 1978).
- Long, Micol, Snijders, Tjamke and Vanderputten, Steven, (eds.), *Horizontal Learning in the High Middle Ages: Peer-to-Peer Knowledge Transfer in Religious Communities* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2019).
- Manselli, Raoul, *Spirituali e beghini in Provenza* (Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1959).
- Manselli, Raoul, 'Bernard Gui face aux Spirituels et aux Apostoliques', in *Bernard Gui set son Monde. Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 16 (1981), 265-78.
- Mansi, Giovanni Domenico, (ed.), *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 22 (Graz: Akademische Druck, 1961).
- Marsh, Thomas, 'The Theology of Confirmation', *The Furrow* 27, no. 11 (1976), 606-16.
- McDonnell, Ernest, *The Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture: with Special Emphasis on the Belgian Scene* (New York: Octagon, 1969).
- McSheffrey, Shannon, *Gender & Heresy – Women and Men in Lollard Communities 1420-1530* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995).
- Mengel, David C., and Wolverson, Lisa, (eds.), *Christianity and Culture in the Middle Ages: Essays to Honor John Van Engen* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2015).
- Merlo, Grado, *Valdesi e Valdismi Medievali: Itinerari e Proposte di Ricerca* (Turin: Claudiana, 1984).
- Miller, Tanya Stabler, 'What's in a Name? Clerical Representations of Parisian Beguines (1200-1328)', *Journal of Medieval History* 33, no.1 (2007).

- Mollat, Guillaume, *Les papes d'Avignon, 1305-1378* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1966).
- Molnár, Augusto Armand Hugon and Vinay, Valdo, *Storia dei Valdesi*, 3 vols (Turin: Claudiana, 1974-80).
- Moore, Jill, *Inquisition and its Organisation in Italy, 1250-1350* (York: York Medieval Press, 2019).
- Moore, Robert I., *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950-1250* (Malden, Mass.; Blackwell Publishing, 2007).
- Moore, Robert I., *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe* (London: Profile Books, 2012).
- Moorman, John, *A History of the Franciscan Order from its origins to the year 1517* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).
- Müller, Karl, *Die Waldenser und ihre einzelnen Gruppen: bis zum Anfang des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Gotha: F.A. Perthes, 1886).
- Mundy, John, Emery, Richard, and Nelson, Benjamin, (eds.), *Essays in Medieval Life and Thought: Presented in Honour of Austin Patterson Evans* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955).
- Němec, Richard, 'Solitude or Performance? The Papal and Royal-Imperial Residences of Benedict XII and Charles IV in Avignon, Prague and Karlstein', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 170, no.1 (2017), 115-151.
- Otto, Bernd-Christian, Rau, Susanne, and Rüpke, Jörg, (eds.), *History and Religion: Narrating a Religious Past* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2015).
- Papini, Carlo, *Valdo di Lione e i poveri nello spirito: Il primo secolo del movimento valdese (1170-1270)* (Turin: Claudiana, 2002).
- Patschovsky, Alexander and Selge, Kurt-Victor, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Waldenser*, Texte zur Kirchen-und Theologogieggeschichte, Heft 18 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1973).
- Pegg, Mark, 'On Cathars, Albigenses, and Good Men of Languedoc', *Journal of Medieval History* 27, no. 1 (2001), 181-95.
- Pegg, Mark, *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245-46* (Princeton, N.J.; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001).
- Pegg, Mark, 'Albigenses in the Antipodes: An Australian and the Cathars', *Journal of Religious History* 35, no. 4 (2011), 577-600.
- Peters, Edward, *Inquisition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).
- Preger, Wilhelm, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte der Waldesier im Mittelalter', *Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* XIII (Munich, 1877).
- Rees Jones, Rosemary, and Rees Jones, Sarah (eds.), *Pragmatic Utopias: Ideals and Communities, 1200-1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Renouard, Yves, *The Avignon Papacy, 1305-1403*, trans. Denis Bethell (London: Faber & Faber, 1970).
- Reyerson, Kathryn, and Drendel, John, (eds.), *Urban and Rural Communities in Medieval France: Provence and Languedoc, 1000-1500* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

- Roach, Andrew, *The Devil's World: Heresy and Society 1100-1320* (Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd, 2005).
- Robinson, Joanne, *Nobility and Annihilation in Marguerite Porete's Mirror of Simple Souls* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001).
- Robson, Michael, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2006).
- Robson, Michael, (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Francis of Assisi* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Rubin, Miri, (ed.), *Medieval Christianity in Practice*, (Princeton: Princeton University, 2009).
- Sackville, Lucy, *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century: the Textual Representations* (York: York Medieval Press, 2011).
- Selge, Kurt-Victor, *Die Ersten Waldenser: mit Edition des Liber Antiheresis des Durandus von Osca* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1967), 2 vols.
- Sennis, Antonio, (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (Melton: Boydell & Brewer, 2016).
- Shahar, Shulamith, *Women in a Heretical Sect: Agnes and Huguetta the Waldensians*, trans. Yael Lotan (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001).
- Simons, Walter, *Cities of Ladies: Beguine Communities in the Medieval Low Countries, 1200-1565* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).
- Smith, Damien, *Innocent III and the Crown of Aragon: The Limits of Papal Authority* (Aldershot: Ashgate Ann Arbor, 2004).
- Smith, Damien, *Crusade, Heresy and Inquisition in the Lands of the Crown of Aragon (c. 1167-1276)* (Boston: Brill, 2010).
- Stock, Brian, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).
- Strayer, Joseph R., *The Albigensian Crusades* (New York: Dial Press, 1971).
- Taylor, Claire, *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Medieval Quercy* (York: York Medieval Press, 2011).
- Taylor, Claire, 'Sunt quadraginta anni vel circa': Southern French Waldensians and the Albigensian Crusade', *French History* 32, no. 3 (2018), 327-49.
- Thouzellier, Christine, *Une somme anti-cathare: le Liber Contra Manicheos de Durand de Huesca* (Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense Administration, 1964).
- Thouzellier, Christine, *Catharisme et Valdésisme en Languedoc à la fin du XIIe et au début du XIII siècle politique pontificale; controverses* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966).
- Thouzellier, Christine, *Hérésie et hérétiques: Vaudois, Cathares, Patarins, Albigeois* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1969).
- Torres, Sergio, 'Durand de Huesca y la lucha contra el catarismo en la Corona de Aragón', *Anuario de Estudios Medievales* 39, no. 1 (2009), 3-25.
- Treesh, Susanna, 'The Waldensian Recourse to Violence', *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 55, no.3 (1986), 294-306.

Välimäki, Reima, *Heresy in Late Medieval Germany: the Inquisitor Petrus Zwicker and the Waldensians* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press in association with The Boydell Press, 2019).

Wakefield, Walter, *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Southern France, 1100-1250* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).

Waugh, Scott, and Diehl, Peter, (eds.), *Christendom and its Discontents: Exclusion, Persecution, and Rebellion, 1000-1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Weber, Max, *Religionssoziologie. English The Sociology of Religion*, trans. Ephraim Fischhoff (London: Methuen, 1965).

Weis, René, *The Yellow Cross: The Story of the Last Cathars, 1290-1329* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2001).

Zbiral, David, 'The Norm-Deviation Model Reconsidered: Four Cases of 'Alternative' Sexual Morals Judged by the Inquisition', *Journal of Religion in Europe* 3, no.2 (2010), 215-40.

Zerner, Monique, *Inventer l'hérésie?: Discours polémiques et pouvoirs avant l'inquisition* (Nice: Centre d'Études Médiévales, 1998).

Zerner, Monique, 'Mise au point sur les cathares devant l'histoire et retour sur l'histoire du catharisme en discussion: le débat sur la charte de Niquinta n'est pas clos', *Journal des Savants* 2, no. 1 (2005), 253-73.

Appendix – Interrogation Summary of Waldensians in Fournier’s Register

Raymond of Costa

Session number	Folio	Date	Summary of areas covered
1	Fol. I r	August 9th, 1319	-Oath-taking, purgatory, prayers for the dead -Whether Raymond taught or was taught these beliefs
2	Fol. I r; Fol. I v	August 11th, 1319	-Raymond retracts statements from previous session -Raymond’s movements and companions
3	Fol. I v; Fol. II r	December 17th, 1319	-Raymond’s statement of Catholic faith; Includes his interpretation of the seven articles of faith and seven sacraments
4	Fol. II r; Fol. II v	December 18th, 1319	-Raymond’s deaconate in his Order -First article of faith (the Trinity)
5	Fol. II v; Fol. III r	December 21st, 1319	-Third article of faith (that God gave the Law to Moses) -Oath-taking (Raymond’s disobedience; Scriptural backing of) -Persecution and martyrdom
6	Fol. III r	December 29th, 1319	-Fournier establishes Raymond’s belief that the Church errs on subject of oath-taking
7	Fol. III r	December 31st, 1319	-Oath-taking (sinful nature of) -Sinful Churches (should they be obeyed; can they excommunicate)
8	Fol. III v; Fol. IV r	January 2nd, 1320	-Sinful Churches (should they be obeyed; can they excommunicate) -Raymond’s majoral (personal details; what he taught; was he ordained) -Raymond’s Order (rituals of ordination)
9	Fol. IV r; Fol. IV v; Fol. V r	January 3rd, 1320	-Raymond’s Order (rituals of ordination; structure of; what actions they perform; sacrament of penance)
10	Fol. V r; Fol. V v	January 4th, 1320	-Raymond’s Order (penance, other sacraments) -Donatism -Church penance, indulgences, purgatory
11	Fol. V v; Fol. VI r	January 5th, 1320	-Purgatory, prayers/alms for the dead -Saints (veneration of) -Raymond’s Order (role of priests in, ritual of the Eucharist)
12	Fol. VI r; Fol. VI v; Fol. VII r	January 7th, 1320	-Raymond’s Order (sacrament of penance, persecution of, roles and responsibilities in, state of perfection) -Vow of poverty, manual labour

13	Fol. VII r; Fol. VII v; Fol. VIII r	January 8th, 1320	-Vow of poverty (ownership of goods, status of the Apostles) -Preaching (authority to, nature of) -Vow of obedience -Capital/corporal punishment and violence
14	Fol. VIII r; Fol. VIII v	January 9th, 1320	-Status of married men -Authority to preach -Authority of the Pope, excommunication and obedience
15	Fol. VIII v; Fol. IX r; Fol. IX v	January 10th, 1320	-Raymond's Order (preaching) -Value of churches -Fourth article of faith (incarnation of Jesus) -Fifth article of faith (Christ chose a Church according to the Apostles) -Nature of the Church
16	Fol. IX v; Fol. X r; Fol. X v	January 11th, 1320	-Obedience to the Pope and Church -Persecution (theoretical/hypothetical) -Sixth article of faith (the Resurrection)
17	Fol. X v; Fol. XI r	January 12th, 1320	-Sacrament of Baptism
18	Fol. XI r; Fol. XI v; Fol. XII r	January 14th, 1320	-Persecution of Raymond's Order -Sacrament of Penance -Purgatory, prayers for the dead -Sacrament of Marriage
19	Fol. XII r; Fol. XII v	January 15th, 1320	-Sacrament of Confirmation (Raymond refers to this as 'imposition of hands') -Ordination in Raymond's sect -Sacrament of Ordination -Names and movements of others in Raymond's Order
20	Fol. XIII r; Fol. XIII v; Fol. XIV r; Fol. XIV v	January 16th, 1320	-Canonicity of Scriptural texts -Canonical hours in Raymond's Order -Rituals and fasting in Raymond's Order -Complete list of errors attributed to Raymond
21	Fol. XIV v; Fol. XV r	January 19th, 1320	-Various authorities read to Raymond in an attempt to convince him to abjure (oath-taking, purgatory, prayers for the dead, sacraments)
22	Fol. XV r; Fol. XV v	January 23rd, 1320	-Additional authorities on oath-taking -Raymond retracts some errors (on baptism, confirmation, ordination)
23	Fol. XV v	April 24th, 1320	-Raymond warned/ordered to abjure his remaining errors
24	Fol. XV v; Fol. XV r	April 27th, 1320*	-Official 'trial'; court proceedings against Raymond -Once more warned/ordered to abjure errors
25	Fol. XV r	April 30th, 1320	-Raymond receives his sentence (the text of the sentence is not preserved)

*This date is only recorded as 'the assigned Sunday', though since there is only one possible Sunday between the prior and subsequent sessions, it can be assumed that Raymond's trial took place on April 27th.

John of Vienne

Session number	Folio	Date	Summary of content
1	Fol. CVII r; Fol. CVII v	August 11th, 1319	-Basic belief questions: oath-taking, obedience, donatism, preaching, death penalty, purgatory, etc.
2	Fol. CVII v; Fol. CVIII r	March 9th, 1320	-Oath-taking, purgatory, Church's right to excommunicate, death penalty -Attempt to find out who taught Jean these beliefs
3	Fol. CVIII r; Fol. CVIII v	March 13th, 1320	-Who taught Jean his beliefs, his relationship with them, when and where he saw them
4	Fol. CVIII v	March 16th, 1320	-Miscellaneous belief questions -Jean's statement of belief in articles of faith + sacraments -Who taught Jean the above
5	Fol. CVIII v	March 18th, 1320	-Jean asked if he wished to abandon his errors
6	Fol. CVIII v; Fol. CIX r	March 23rd, 1320	-List of 7 errors read to Jean -Asked/ordered to abjure heresy
7	Fol. CIX r	April 7th, 1321	-Above articles read to Jean in vulgar tongue -Asked/ordered to abjure heresy
8	Fol. CIX r	May 21st, 1321	-Above articles read to Jean in vulgar tongue -Asked/ordered to abjure heresy
9	Fol. CIX r	July 17th, 1321	-Above articles read to Jean in vulgar tongue -Asked/ordered to abjure heresy; Slightly more detail given than previous sessions
10	Fol. CIX r; Fol. CIX v	July 31st, 1321	-Above articles read to Jean in vulgar tongue -Asked/ordered to abjure heresy;
11	Fol. CIX v	August 1 st , 1321	-Ordered to appear to receive his sentence
12	Fol. CIX v	August 2 nd , 1321	-Jean receives his sentence

Agnes Francou

Session number	Folio	Date	Summary of content
1	Fol. XVII v; Fol. XVIII r	August 10th, 1319	-Oath-taking (Agnes's refusal, who taught her) -Relationship with Raymond -Basic belief questions
2	Fol. XVIII r	January 18th, 1320	-Oath-taking -Names/places/times other people involved with Raymond
3	Fol. XVIII r	January 21st, 1320	-Short session with only her refusal to swear recorded
4	Fol. XVIII r	January 23rd, 1320	-Similar to session 3 with one question on purgatory
5	Fol. XVIII r; Fol. XVIII v	April 25th, 1320	-Attempt at persuading her to swear -Asked/ordered to abjure heresy
6	Fol. XVIII v	April 30th, 1320	-Agnes receives her sentence

Huguette of Costa

Session number	Folio	Date	Summary of content
1	Fol. CIX v; Fol. CX r	August 9th, 1319	-Huguette's refusal to swear -Relationship with Raymond/his movements prior to arrest
2	Fol. CX r	January 21st, 1320	-Her own movements and contacts with the Waldensians -Movements of Raymond and other members of the group
3	Fol. CX r; Fol. CX v; Fol. CXI r	March 13th, 1320	-Oath-taking -Who had taught Huguette her beliefs -Jean de Lorraine (when and where she met him, what she did with him) -Purgatory
4	Fol. CXI r; Fol. CXI v	March 16th, 1320	-Attempt to convince Huguette of her error concerning oaths/purgatory -Jean de Lorraine (sacraments, his relationship to the Church) -Structure and status of the sect -Indulgences, martyrdom -Details of her movements/companions prior to arrest
5	Fol. CXI v; Fol. CXII r	March 18th, 1320	-Jean de Lorraine (obedience, sacraments, the <i>Credo</i>) -Death penalty -If she taught anyone herself -Some retractions of minor details

6	Fol. CXII r; Fol. CXII v	March 23rd, 1320	-List of Huguette's errors read to her -Asked/ordered to abjure
7	Fol. CXII v	April 7th, 1320	-List of Huguette's errors read to her -Asked/ordered to abjure
8	Fol. CXII v	July 17th, 1320	-List of Huguette's errors read to her -Asked/ordered to abjure (threatened to be punished as impenitent heretic)
9	Fol. CXII v; Fol. CXIII r	July 30th, 1321	-List of Huguette's errors read to her -Asked/ordered to abjure (threatened to be punished as impenitent heretic)
10	Fol. CXIII r	August 1 st , 1321	-Ordered to appear to receive her sentence
11	Fol. CXIII r	August 2 nd , 1321	-Huguette receives her sentence