



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

**The Inquisitors' Desire: An examination of Bernard Gui's and Geoffroy d'Ablis' policy in punishing apostate believers by investigating the sermo generalis of 7 March 1316, and the individual trials of Cathar leaders Pierre Autier, Amiel de Perles, and Pierre Raimond de Hugous.**  
Vijverberg, David

**Citation**

Vijverberg, D. (2025). *The Inquisitors' Desire: An examination of Bernard Gui's and Geoffroy d'Ablis' policy in punishing apostate believers by investigating the sermo generalis of 7 March 1316, and the individual trials of Cathar leaders Pierre Autier, Amiel de Perles, and Pierre Raimond de Hugous.*

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [License to inclusion and publication of a Bachelor or Master Thesis, 2023](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4257257>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# The Inquisitors' Desire

An examination of Bernard Gui's and Geoffroy d'Ablis' policy in punishing apostate believers by investigating the *sermo generalis* of 7 March 1316, and the individual trials of Cathar leaders Pierre Autier, Amiel de Perles, and Pierre Raimond de Hugous.

David Vijverberg

Europe 1000-1800 (MA) thesis

20 ECTS

P.C.H. Buc

Deadline: 1<sup>st</sup> of July 2025

16162 words

*This page is intentionally left blank*

## Table of contents

Introduction.....	3
1. Historiography.....	9
2. Methodology and quantitative analysis.....	18
Methodology.....	18
Quantitative analysis.....	21
3. Close reading sermon of 7 march 1316.....	26
4. Heretics processes.....	42
Process of Pierre Autier ( <i>sermo specialis</i> of 9 April 1310).....	44
Process of Amiel de Perles ( <i>sermo specialis</i> of 23 October 1309).....	48
Process of Pierre Raimond de Hugous ( <i>sermo specialis</i> of 20 September 1313).....	51
Conclusion.....	56
Bibliography.....	59
Appendix A: Sermon of March 7 Quantitative Analysis.....	62
Appendix B: Sentence against Jean Brayssan.....	63

# Introduction

“ If Gui had been questioned he would perhaps have acknowledged a link between demons and heresy; but he saw heretics essentially as people who had to be brought to penitence.”<sup>1</sup>

This is what Derek Hill wrote about the Dominican inquisitor Bernard Gui (1261-1331) on the basis of the latter’s *Pratica Officii Inquisitionis*, a manual for inquisitors. This *Pratica*, handbook, outlines in clear and accessible language the strategies for confronting the threat posed by heresy to the Catholic Church. It explains how to locate, recognize, and apprehend heretics; how to analyse their capabilities and vulnerabilities; how to conduct their trials; how to oppose their cunning tactics and stop them from concealing themselves with misleading language; and how to pass judgment and carry out sentences. In his *Pratica*, Gui makes it clear to his fellow inquisitors that they are the ones appointed to judge apostate or lukewarm believers. He stated this position in his manual; he repeated the same also prior to condemnations in a *sermo generalis*, as on March 7, 1316 in Toulouse, together with another inquisitor, Geoffroy d’Ablis (-1316). The *sermo generalis* should not be seen despite the Latin name *sermo* as something like the classic church sermon, for it was not a discourse in which a passage of scripture was cited with subsequent commentary.<sup>2</sup> It was a formal speech proclaiming with great publicity the verdict (read: punishment) inflicted on heretics of all sorts and the reasons

---

<sup>1</sup> D. Hill, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century: The Manuals of Bernard Gui and Nicholas Eymerich* (Martlesham 2019) 209.

<sup>2</sup> Beverly Kienzle is very helpful here. She discusses the wide range of medieval sermons, both geographically and thematically. Moreover, she explains that medieval sermons came in many forms and types, intended for different audiences and purposes. We today are unfamiliar with most of these configurations. This includes sermons for Christian converts, sermons for married couples, funeral sermons, court sermons in which a certain number of heretics were told their punishment. At stake here is a sermon of the latter kind. See: B. Kienzle, ‘Introduction’, in *The Sermon*, ed. B. Kienzle, *Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental*, 81–83 (2000) 141–74.

behind each verdict regardless of whether they were present.<sup>3</sup> The source provided the condemned with a description of what they had done wrong in the eyes of the inquisitors. At the beginning of the preaching, the inquisitors said the following:

“Since no Christian ought to impede the orthodox faith, on which were firmly established by our lord Jesus Christ the foundations of the holy Catholic Church, but rather further it with all his strength, we, Brother Bernard Gui and Brother Geoffroy d’Ablis of the order of Preachers [...] therefore by the authority entrusted by means of this document bind with the chain of excommunication and publicly denounce as excommunicated all those who have knowingly impeded or henceforth will impede the inquisition of heretical depravity, whether directly or indirectly, openly or secretly, by concealing the truth, by revoking those things that have been legitimately confessed, or by inducing others to so conceal or revoke;...”<sup>4</sup>

Few topics in medieval history have gained as much scholarly and popular attention as heresy and the subsequent actions from the Catholic Church to bring apostate believers back to the Catholic faith, or punish them fully if that was necessary. This phenomenon is also known as the inquisition. To begin with, heresy refers to religious ideas or practices that deviated from the official doctrine of the Catholic Church. Heretics were people who, in the eyes of the inquisitors, did not meet the standards of the orthodox Catholic faith, for which they were punished. Inquisitors, in turn, were people appointed by the Catholic Church to track down and try heretics. These heretics came in various forms, including mainly in the twelfth to fourteenth century Cathars and Waldensians. First of all, Cathars. Their faith, Catharism, was characterized by elements of dualism, Gnosticism, and assumed reincarnation. Dualism meant that they believed there were two Gods: a good one and an evil one. The first was the creator of the earth; the second was behind material creation and was the root of evil and darkness.<sup>5</sup> Persecuted by

---

<sup>3</sup> For a generic explanation of a general sermon, see: K. Sullivan, *The Inner Lives of Medieval Inquisitors* (Chicago 2011) 2.

<sup>4</sup> Philippi a Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis. : Cui subjungitur Liber sententiarum inquisitionis Tholosanæ, ab anno Christi CIJCCCVII ad annum CIJCCXXIII* (Amsterdam 1692), 184.

<sup>5</sup> E. Peters, *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe* (Pennsylvania 1980) 103.

inquisitors because of their deviant beliefs, the sect was completely eradicated by around 1350. The name 'Cathars' is purposely put in quotation marks, since there is an ongoing debate as to whether Catharism was a real sect, and more profoundly, whether it even existed. The main contributors in this discussion are R.I. Moore and Mark Pegg on the one hand and Peter Biller on the other hand. Moore contends that the Cathars are ultimately a fabricated myth. The commonly accepted narrative of their history—including the persecution and mass execution of heretics—may owe more to clerical propaganda than to actual historical events. Moreover, Moore argues that in examining the Cathars, historians base their arguments on a relatively small set of Latin texts, in which clerics imagine a coherent heresy.<sup>6</sup> These interpretations stem from thirteenth-century inquisitors who perceived organized heretical movements as a menace to the stability of society. Scholars from the Reformation onward accept this idea of a coherent heresy and elaborate on it. Moore disagrees with this historical narrative. Therefore, he seeks to reconstruct the overall narrative of the rise and development of heresy, as well as the charges of heresy, in eleventh- and twelfth-century Europe, drawing on new and frequently transformative interpretations of the sources.<sup>7</sup> In addition, he explains why it is important to review these sources:

“It has become necessary to do this because, astonishingly, almost everybody who has written on the subject until very recently, myself included, has overlooked the elementary principle that historical research must begin by establishing the order and circumstances in which the sources were produced.”<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> I am aware of the fact that the period R.I. Moore is investigating is before the period I am researching. Still, I thought it was necessary to mention the discussion of the Cathars and thus R.I. Moore, because one cannot research heretics without knowing who the Cathars were and knowing the views surrounding them.

<sup>7</sup> R.I. Moore, *The War on Heresy* (Cambridge 2012) 333.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*.

Building and expanding on Moore, Mark Pegg argues that the 'Cathars' never really existed as a unified religious entity. Rather, 'Cathars' is the name given to some heretics (who were not connected by shared ideas) by Latin Christian intellectuals. It is because of negligence of contemporary historians, that still almost all heretics before the fourteenth century are referred to as Cathars.<sup>9</sup> Peter Biller, on the other hand, makes several points in disagreement with Moore and Pegg. The most fundamental point of discussion is whether the Cathars existed as an entity at all, or whether they existed only in the minds of the inquisitors. Biller argues that Moore omits bits of primary source material to sustain his argument that there was no hierarchy among the Good Men, a self-designated reference to the leaders or bishops within the heretical community. In fact, Biller argues that there is indeed evidence that sources from the early thirteenth century speak of the 'bishop of heretics'.<sup>10</sup> Biller's critique of Pegg's work is quite similar.<sup>11</sup> He explains Pegg's method using a metaphor about a painting. According to Biller, Pegg includes in the painting the 'lived religion' of heretics but excludes the organization of the heretics' church, their clergy, their rites of ordination, and their established line of succession.<sup>12</sup> In doing so, Pegg offers a distorted depiction, a painting in which he only paints half the landscape of heretics. Hence, Biller contends that the Cathars were not just a number of disconnected apostate believers, but a religious entity linked by hierarchy and shared ideas.

The main idea that united Cathars was the concept of dualism: the Cathars

---

<sup>9</sup> M.G. Pegg, *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom* (Oxford 2008) 22-23.

<sup>10</sup> P. Biller, 'Goodbye to Catharism?' in: A. Sennis ed., *Cathars in Question* (Martlesham 2016) 274-313, here 301.

<sup>11</sup> In his critique on Pegg, Biller mainly refers to Pegg's book *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245-1246* (Princeton 2005), a book which is not discussed in this essay. Beyond that, as was the case with Moore's work, I am aware that Pegg discusses events that happened before Bernard Gui was appointed inquisitor in 1307. Nevertheless, I decided to discuss Pegg's work because he has made a fundamental contribution to the historiographical discussion of the Cathars. One cannot analyse Gui's methodology without understanding what was going on around the people he persecuted.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 286.

thought there were two Gods: a good God, and a bad God. The bad God was the creator of all matter. This premise led the Cathars to deny that Mary and Jesus existed from real human flesh, and so the Cathars also did not believe that Jesus was crucified because he never physically existed.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, there was a hierarchy among the Cathars. The Good Men divided themselves into two main categories: *perfecti* and *credentes*.<sup>14</sup> The first were the Cathar's spiritual leaders who devoted their life to what they thought was true teaching. They lived a life of abstinence, characterized by not eating animal products and the absence of sex. They did so because they thought these things originated from the bad, material God. One could become a *perfectus* by completing the *consolamentum*, the Cathar equivalent of the Catholic sacrament of baptism. As the *perfecti* lived an itinerant existence, the believers' (*credentes*) role was to provide the *perfecti* with food and shelter in the first place, and to create a location where they could hold sermons, since Cathars had no churches of their own. Kras has divided the *credentes* into sub-categories, namely supporters of the heretics (*fautores*), people who received heretics into their homes (*receptatores*) and people who defended the *perfecti* (*defensores*).<sup>15</sup> Of course, a *credentus* (singular of *credentes*) could belong to several of these sub-categories. Note that in the *sermo*, we do not see Cathar dogma, i.e.: the contents and doctrines of the Cathars, such as embracing the idea that there were two Gods, and denying that the physical person Jesus Christ existed. Only we read that some condemned had heard the elite Cathars, *perfecti*, preaching. The absence of the dogmatic doctrines of the Cathars in the *sermo* will be discussed during the close reading and in the conclusion.

Second of all, Waldensians, also called the Poor of Lyons, who originally were not heretics in the strict sense, but rather schismatics. The critique of the Catholic Church on

---

<sup>13</sup> Biller, 'Cathars and the Material World', *Studies in Church History* vol.46 (2010) 89-110, here 90.

<sup>14</sup> P. Kras, *The system of the inquisition in medieval Europe*, trans. M. Panz-Sochacka (Lausanne 2020) 96.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibidem*, 146.

the Waldenses focused on their disobedience to the laws of the Church much more than on their teachings or dogmatic doctrines. The main issue was that the founder of the Poor of Lyons, Vaudès, let women who had been converted speak in public.<sup>16</sup> Because of this disobedience in terms of hierarchy, rather than content, the Waldenses nevertheless posed a danger to the Catholic Church, leading to their excommunication in 1184.<sup>17</sup> In the following years, the Poor of Lyons hardened some of their views adopting dogmas of other religious oppositions. In 1215, the Catholic Church extended their excommunication and, in addition, they were convicted of heresy: by now not only their form was incorrect, but also their content, as a result of which they were now labelled heretics.<sup>18</sup>

The first chapter of this thesis turns to a broader historiography. In particular, it handles what has already been written about the inquisition in relation to the Languedoc region, and what has already been written about Bernard Gui. The second chapter explains the methodology applied in this essay and provides a quantitative analysis of the sermon of March 7, 1316. Moreover, it provides a quantitative analysis of the trials of the *perfecti* Pierre Autier, Amiel de Perles, and Pierre Raimond de Hugous. The third chapter contains a qualitative analysis of the *sermo generalis* of 7 March 1316 via close reading. Besides, this chapter treats the discussion of actions versus beliefs. The fourth and final chapter investigates the *sermones* (plural) of the three *perfecti* and provides a close reading of their trials. It does so by comparison.

---

<sup>16</sup> A. Gabriel, *The Waldensian Dissent: Persecution and Survival, c.1170-c.1570* (Cambridge 1999) 15.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibidem*, 15-16.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 21-22.

# 1. Historiography

On the seventh of March 1316, the Dominican Inquisitors Bernard Gui (1261-1331) and Geoffroy d'Ablis (-1316) gave a sermon in Toulouse, situated in the region of Languedoc in France. Throughout the sermon, the inquisitors read aloud who received what punishment. The suspects had to wear yellow crosses, were given prison sentences, or were condemned as (obstinate) heretics.<sup>19</sup> In some cases, the punishment was increased. Such increases in a punishment include wearing double the amount of crosses or imprisonment in solitary confinement.

Essentially, the inquisition was a court of the Catholic Church dispensing justice and administering justice according to ecclesiastical law, charged with detecting, investigating and punishing people who held opinions different from those held by the church to be correct.<sup>20</sup> The two men, Bernard Gui and Geoffroy d'Ablis, were thus appointed to track and prosecute people who did not conform to the orthodox (Catholic) faith. The inquisition has yet received considerable scholarly attention. A good starting point in investigating the Inquisition is Paul Kras' *The System of the Inquisition in Medieval Europe*.<sup>21</sup> He takes a look at the origins and the growth of the medieval inquisition. Viewed comparatively, he examines the political, social, and religious

---

<sup>19</sup> For background information on wearing yellow crosses, see, for example: B. Kienzle, 'The Clash Between Catholics and Cathars over Veneration of the Cross' in: W. van Asselt, P. van Geest, D. Müller, T. Salemink eds., *Iconoclasm and Iconoclasm : Struggle for Religious Identity*, in: *Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series* Vol.14 (2007) 263-278, here 263, 276. Mandating heretics to wear yellow crosses was a measure used by Inquisitors to make a clear visual distinction between heretics and Catholics.

<sup>20</sup> One has to keep in mind however, that there was no such thing as a uniform, top-down, centrally controlled "Inquisition" of the Catholic church, even though the term "The Inquisition" is often used by scholars. Furthermore, Edward Peters has proposed that the term 'inquisition' carries a threefold meaning. According to him, it may signify the inquisitor's legal role (inquisition), refer to a particular legal institution like the Venetian or Roman Inquisition (Inquisition), or denote a mythical entity constructed by critical literature (the Inquisition). The form referred to most of the time in this essay is the second. See: E. Peters, *Inquisition* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1989), 7; R. Kieckhefer, 'The Office of Inquisition and Medieval Heresy: The Transition from Personal to Institutional Jurisdiction,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (1995) 36-61.

<sup>21</sup> P. Kras, *The system of the inquisition in medieval Europe*, trans. M. Panz-Sochacka (Lausanne 2020).

changes during the High Middle Ages that led to the emergence of systems of repression and religious violence overseen by the papacy. In the wake of much earlier work, including James Given's, he concludes, inter alia, that the surviving records of the Languedoc Inquisitors demonstrate both the effectiveness of their efforts in pursuing heretics and the sophistication of the documentation system they established.<sup>22</sup> Thus, in doing so, he actually makes an implicit comparison with other regions in Europe, arguing that the Inquisitors in the Languedoc were ahead of their time. Moreover, one can find numerous publications on the Inquisition in Spain and Portugal.<sup>23</sup> Another important publication is Sullivan's book *The Inner Lives of Medieval Inquisitors*.<sup>24</sup> Sullivan takes a number of medieval inquisitors, including Bernard Gui, analysing them according to their personal choices. She has demonstrated that each inquisitor can be seen making individual, morally driven decisions about how to proceed. Medieval clergy broadly agreed that the Church ought to begin by attempting to reform heretics through repeated warnings, and only resort to exclusion from the community if such efforts failed. However, more compassionate clerics tended to allow time for conversion, whereas more fervent ones were inclined to act swiftly, often opting not to postpone consigning heretics to the stake. Sullivan argues that Bernard Gui cannot be placed strictly under the first or second category; he is somewhere in between. She argues that Gui justified his violent approach toward heretics by emphasizing that the ideas of heretics posed a danger to the structure and doctrines of the church.<sup>25</sup> Since the heretic is violent toward the fundamental principles of the church, it is necessary to counter this aggression with appropriate violence. She argues that this more personal choice-oriented format makes

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibidem, 433-434.

<sup>23</sup> See for example: H.C. Lea, *A history of the Inquisition of Spain* (London 1906); B. Netanyahu, *The Origins of the Inquisition In Fifteenth Century Spain* (New York 1995).

<sup>24</sup> K. Sullivan, *The Inner Lives of Medieval Inquisitors* (Chicago 2011).

<sup>25</sup> Ibidem, 198.

her work substantially different from most books on the medieval Inquisition, which highlight the significance of the historical context in which the inquisitor operated. She cites Christine Caldwell Ames, John H. Arnold, James B. Given, Henry Ansgar Kelly, Richard Kieckhefer, R.I. Moore, Mark Gregory Pegg, and Edward Peters as examples of scholars who highlighted the significance of the historical context in which this individual operated.<sup>26</sup>

Next, Sullivan goes on to highlight a few of these authors' arguments, and she analyses where their arguments touch hers and where they differ, the first of which is Edward Peters. Also following in this piece is an explanation of the overall arguments that the authors in question make, regardless of whether Sullivan considers the arguments that way, let alone cites them at all.<sup>27</sup> Edward Peters indicates that there is a certain tension between the myth and the history of the Inquisition. Although the inquisition (meaning: the legal procedures and personnel that helped to shape the inquisitorial tribunals) at some point disappeared, the myth of *The Inquisition* did not (meaning: the practices, organizations, and individuals that polemical writings and fictional accounts reshaped into a legend). Peters proposes that the Inquisition can be understood through three distinct interpretations or historical narratives.<sup>28</sup> The first pertains to the legal processes, officials, and institutions that formed the inquisitorial tribunals of early modern Europe. The second is the constructed myth of *The Inquisition*. The third traces the development of historiography itself—how accounts of the

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>27</sup> Following Sullivan's status quaestionis sure is starting point in doing research, but by no means adequate. For one cannot simply read what Sullivan writes about another author and be under the assumption that her interpretation is not coloured. She too is not completely objective since she uses the works of the other authors in a particular way to present her argument, which differs from mainstream historiography. This is why I thought it was important to read for myself the works of the authors being cited, in order to best understand the main argument being put forward by the author in question, rather than just one of their side arguments being used by another author.

<sup>28</sup> Peters, *Inquisition*, 7.

inquisitions evolved from the myths surrounding *The Inquisition*. By doing so, Peters looks at the inquisition more from an etymological perspective, while Sullivan examines the actions of the individual, namely the inquisitor. Secondly, Sullivan names James B. Given.<sup>29</sup> Given states that most books dealing with medieval politics tell a top-down story from the perspective of an inquisitor. We know very little however, about how politics were received by those over whom rulers claimed authority. The main reason for the absence of records from the medieval masses over whom rulers ruled is their illiteracy. In this case, Languedoc inquisitors offer a way out. They kept track of how many suspects they interrogated and kept their depositions.<sup>30</sup> It was this primary source material that enabled Given to construct a case study in which he could get behind the sociology and mechanisms of medieval politics. The argument Given presents is twofold. On the one hand, the inquisitors of Languedoc had refined methods that allowed them to reshape perceived reality. They possessed the power, if they chose to use it, to assign a specific role to nearly anyone brought before them, compelling that individual to conform to a largely predetermined narrative. However, as Given points out, their effectiveness should not be overstated. To accomplish their objectives, the inquisitors continued to depend on the cooperation of other administrative bodies within a framework that remained decentralised and somewhat disorganized.<sup>31</sup> In the third instance, Sullivan mentions John H. Arnold. He discusses the question of what to do with the voices of the dead.<sup>32</sup> By that he means the following: the information we have of heretics and those suspected of heresy, we have because the inquisitors wrote it down and documented it. As historians, we are looking for answers to our questions. To

---

<sup>29</sup> J. Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline, and Resistance in Languedoc* (Ithaca 1997).

<sup>30</sup> *Ibidem*, 2.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, 214-215.

<sup>32</sup> J.H. Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Pennsylvania 2001).

illustrate his point, Arnold mentions a heretic who wished to commit suicide, and he wonders why the person in question was out of touch with life.<sup>33</sup> It becomes complicated to answer such a question, however, when one must do so through the systems that allowed the heretic to speak and remain silent. In doing this, Arnold engages with ongoing theoretical discussions regarding subjectivity and the nature of power, in order to create reading strategies that allow for a more subtle re-examination of these interrogation documents. Remarkably, Arnold does not raise in the conclusion a number of arguments that he supports with any certainty. Instead, he asks the reader three questions. To begin with, he invites the reader to reflect on whether all forms of discourse are identical.<sup>34</sup> He came across other discursive fields than just the discourse of inquisition. As examples he names the polemical language against heresy and the societal value placed on the concept of literacy. These discourses can at times support one another, but can also produce tensions. Arnold wants the reader to be aware of this dynamic. Second, he calls on the reader to ask how discourses change over time. Indeed, with this publication, he analysed how the inquisition in Languedoc changed from the 13th to the 14th century. Finally, he states that you owe the reader an explanation when you have stated that a change has occurred over a period of time. According to Arnold, one has to examine human actions and agency of individuals, because people are the ones who make history and discourses. Another author who has touched upon the work and life of Bernard Gui is Caldwell Ames.<sup>35</sup> She engages with the paradox of a life based on that of Christ on the one hand, and engagement in repressive persecution on the other hand. How could Dominican inquisitors – so also Gui and d’Ablis - who claim to

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibidem, 1-2.

<sup>34</sup> Ibidem, 227-228.

<sup>35</sup> C. Caldwell Ames, *Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia 2009).

propagate charity on the basis of Jesus' teachings, persecute others who believe something else? Caldwell Ames has argued that Dominican inquisitors did not engage in persecution despite their faith, but rather because of it, as they helped shape a form of medieval Christianity that either allowed or required persecution. Hill too has managed to get inside the head of the inquisitors. He did so on the basis of two inquisitors' manuals.<sup>36</sup> In the introduction of his book, he states that most scholarly attention on the inquisition has gone to the thirteenth century, instead of the fourteenth century.<sup>37</sup> Hill takes a look at the latter on the basis of Gui and Eymerich's manuals for inquisitors: what questions was an inquisitor ought to ask at what moment? Hill seems to be of the view that here is no contemporary historiographical debate about the inquisition in fourteenth century Languedoc, in the sense that the authors would disagree with each other. Rather, it seems that the scholars see the value of each other's work, seeing it as complementary to the historiographical body, rather than as antagonistic to each other. This notion is reinforced by the fact that in his introduction, Hill says: "There is no necessary contradiction between, say, Given's approach and Ames's."<sup>38</sup>

Hill may be right, in that the different approaches do not constitute a contradiction, but it is true that these different approaches lead to different outcomes, which in turn trigger a historiographical debate. The debate has to do with the agency of the inquisitor versus historical and cultural conditions at the time of which the inquisitor acted. In essence, the question is whether one, to some extent, should ascribe agency to the inquisitor or look at the historical and cultural circumstances in which the inquisitor acted, in trying to explain the source of the medieval inquisitions. Most historians, such

---

<sup>36</sup> D. Hill, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century: The Manuals of Bernard Gui and Nicholas Eymerich* (Martlesham 2019).

<sup>37</sup> *Ibidem*, 1.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem*, 11-12.

as Arnold, Given and Peters hold that the inquisitor could prosecute heretics because of the historical narrative which he was part of. Sullivan, on the other hand, holds that inquisitors were to a large extent defined by their historical circumstances, but within these conditions they could still exercise their personal freedom of choice.<sup>39</sup>

While Hill has investigated what questions an inquisitor was ought to ask at a certain moment, Given answers to some extent the question of why people received the punishments imposed on them by the inquisitors. He states that individuals received the punishments assigned by the inquisitors for a range of different reasons which in turn were polysemic, meaning the punishments could serve multiple purposes at the same time.<sup>40</sup> As examples, he mentions conveying a moral message, controlling crime, therapy, chasing away observers. Turning to our “sermon”, Given suggests that it is more appropriate to view the punishments imposed by the inquisitors through a Gramscian lens—as elements of a broader effort to establish cultural and spiritual dominance over the people of Languedoc, aiming to secure their willing acceptance of the narratives that legitimized the current structures of power and authority.<sup>41</sup> Given has already done a quantitative analysis of the types of punishments people received with numbers and percentages of the total number per type of punishment.<sup>42</sup> He may have investigated this, but he did not investigate what mistakes people received what punishment for. What sequence of things an individual has done wrong leads to what punishment?

The “sermon” that was held on 7 March 1316, can be analysed for an answer to this question. Why did some people have to wear crosses and others had to serve time in prison in the first place? Why did some people have to serve a prison sentence, whereas

---

<sup>39</sup> Sullivan, *The Inner Lives of Medieval Inquisitors*, 19.

<sup>40</sup> Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society*, 66.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem*, 72.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibidem*, 69-70.

other people were referred to the *murus strictus* (a prison that meant solitary confinement)? And why did some people, as a sentence, have to wear two yellow crosses, whereas other people had to wear four? This essay attempts to answer these questions. Even though scholars have yet studied such inquisitorial documents, including in some cases this one, they have done so with a different angle.<sup>43</sup> This essay will analyse what types and how many errors the individuals in the “sermon” of 7 March 1316 made.

Anyhow, to get a good idea of what Gui and d’Ablis punished and how they did it, one cannot just look at a *sermo generalis* and make a statement about the inquisitor’s entire decision-making process. In a *sermo generalis* only the *credentes* were discussed, the people who had not undergone Cathar baptism (*consolamentum*), but who had been in contact with Cathar spiritual leaders. In such a *sermo* it was not about the religious content, dogma, of the persons in question, but about their (supportive) actions with regard to heresy. To analyse the Dominicans’ agency as a whole, one would have to look at a *sermo specialis*, or multiple *sermones speciales* (plural), to investigate how they would punish fully-fledged Cathars, the spiritual *consolamentum*-dispensing elite. It is a fact that *perfecti* were delivered to the secular arm, and that this meant their death. Much more interesting is the question of how the inquisitors came to this choice. What arguments do they use before they come to that sentence? The question also arises

---

<sup>43</sup> The leading primary source for this thesis, the sermon of the seventh of March 1316, has yet been featured in multiple publications: Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society*, 73. Given cited this sermon to make a generic point about *sermones generales*. His point was that these were large, public affairs in which Bernard Gui imposed sentences on large numbers of people. Given wanted to touch on this contrast because before that he had said that inquisitorial trials, on the other hand, were private; D.I. Nieto-Isabel, ‘Introduction All but Marginal: The Co-Constructions of Otherness in the Middle Ages’ in: L.M. Milian and D.I. Nieto-Isabel eds., *Living on the Edge: Transgression, Exclusion, and Persecution in the Middle Ages* (Boston 2022) 3-22, here 6. Nieto-Isabel cited this sermon, specifically the case of Jean Brayssan, to make a point about heresy. She uses this source to argue that from the thirteenth to the early fourteenth century, the concepts of “heresy” and “heretic” underwent changes to include a growing range of religious beliefs and practices.

whether such a *sermo specialis* did indeed deal with Cathar dogma, since we are dealing with the religious Cathar elite.

## 2. Methodology and quantitative analysis

### Methodology

This thesis uses both quantitative and qualitative analysis. Even though Vacandard has already applied quantitative analysis on convictions made by Gui, this thesis will turn to a quantitative analysis in a different way. Vacandard did focus in particular on the sermon of 7 March 1316.<sup>44</sup> What we see in his analysis is the dates of sermons or condemnations horizontally, and vertically the different types of sentences. Moreover, the table provides subtotals per dates, subtotals per category, and a grand total. Even though this application of quantitative analysis is sure useful, it does not deal with the accusations and the faults of the individual. The document itself gives an indication of penalties, not directly and explicitly of faults. This essay aspires to fill in exactly that gap. It does so by dividing the different types of errors into categories.<sup>45</sup> It then checks off for each individual which type of charge or error applies to him or her. This form of analysis answers in much greater detail the questions posed in the previous chapter, such as why people received what punishment for what fault. Furthermore, the primary informations are accessed through close reading. This is the qualitative part. The essay will provide one clear example for each configuration.

In terms of source criticism, one has to keep in mind that medieval inquisitors, including Bernard Gui, sometime used torture to elicit desired answers from

---

<sup>44</sup> E. Vacandard, *The Inquisition: A Critical and Historical Study of the Coercive Power of the Church* (New York 1908). For an online graph, see: The Universal Compendium - Condemnations of the Inquisitor Bernard Gui 1308-1323, <https://www.universalcompendium.com/tables/rel/gui.htm> (used 4 April 2025).

<sup>45</sup> I am aware of the notion that by merging the errors into categories of errors, one might miss out on differences between unique cases. This is the flip side of quantitative analysis. If one wants to construct a thesis based on a relatively large source set, one has to generalise to some extent, in order to state something about the whole set of sources. The price one pays for that is that not every unique aspect of each accused is perfectly represented.

interviewees.<sup>46</sup> In fact, Gui even admitted this himself.<sup>47</sup> This means that at least some interviewees made commitments, not because they had actually done what they had been questioned for, but because they were tortured at the time of their questioning. This in turn does not mean that inquisitorial primary sources such as this sermon have become useless. However, it is important to carefully consider with which question in mind one is going to test the source. For instance, if one investigates what kind of answers the inquisitors were looking for, or the punishment the Inquisitors gave to the interviewees, it basically does not matter for that question whether the interviewees were tortured in the process.

As far as style is concerned, this thesis puts the Latin translation in italics. Sometimes it is necessary or desirable to include the original source in Latin, to get an idea of what message or nuance the author wanted to convey. This is a matter of style that you see reflected in other contemporary authors, but in addition, with this methodology the difference is clear of what the reader is presented with: information on the primary source or untranslated information directly from the primary source. Only in a few cases of ambiguity, the French translation is sometimes given, in addition to the Latin, for example in the elaboration of *Amiel de Perles*. Moreover, the names of the historical figures from the primary sources are given in French and are not put in italics. This too is a matter of style, but it is a generally accepted convention within historiography on the inquisition. Usually, people's *culpa*e (faults) were given in Occitan, but their sentences (*sententiae*) in Latin.<sup>48</sup> Scholars nowadays have to access the sources through mostly Latin, and sometimes French if they have been translated (see for

---

<sup>46</sup> Arnold, *Inquisition and Power*, 6; R.E. Lerner, *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (Berkeley and London 1972), 4-5.

<sup>47</sup> C. Caldwell Ames, *Righteous Persecution*, 202-203.


<sup>48</sup> Hill, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century*, 148.

example the processes of famous *perfecti* such as Pierre Autier and Amiel de Perles whose processes have been translated into French by Pales-Gobilliard).<sup>49</sup> In very few cases, the material has been translated into English, e.g. the sermon of 7 March has been translated by James Given. Moreover, using the Latin (or Latinised) names of the historical actors would lead to unnecessary confusion. People versed in the subject recognise names such as Bernard Gui and Geoffroy d'Ablis. Hardly anyone from this target audience would still recognise the individuals if one were to refer to them by their Latin names in the text: *Bernardus Guidonis* and *Gaufridus de Ablusiis*.

---


<sup>49</sup> B. Gui, *Le livre des sentences de l'inquisiteur Bernard Gui, 1308-1323*, trans. A. Pales-Gobilliard (Paris 2002).

# Quantitative analysis



**Graph 1.1**

### Distribution of Punishment in Heresy Cases



**Graph 1.2**

In graph 1.1 one can see, on the basis of the sermon of 7 March 1316, how many times a certain sentence has been given for different faults.<sup>50</sup> Graph 1.2 shows, on the basis of the same data as graph 1.1, per sentence given how many percent of the sentenced had performed which fault. Graph 1.1 gives an impression of how often a particular punishment occurred. Looking at perpetual imprisonment, for example, one can read that it was proportionately common compared to the other punishments. Of those who received this imprisonment, very few were also referred to the *murus strictus* (column next to perpetual imprisonment). Graph 1.2 shows basically the same as Graph 1.1, only with percentages instead of absolute values. It shows the proportions of what punishment was given for what error. This demonstrates that there were not at all so many extremely guilty individuals. At the same time, there were more very guilty individuals than mildly guilty individuals. Those people who were very guilty can be because of belief, but so are those mildly guilty, the simple crossed. This means that the determining factor distinguishing these two groups was praise of the perfecti's way of life.

---

<sup>50</sup> This paper does not address the specific values within the graph. The excel file in which it was created can be found in the appendices of this thesis, Appendix A: Sermon of March 7 Quantitative Analysis.

x' means the said statement was applicable		Faults																		
Names		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	
Pierre Autier		x		x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x	x			
Amiel de Perles				x	x		x	x	x	x			x	x		x				
Pierre Raimond des Hugous			x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	
		Faults index																		
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> Green= said fault occurs only once  Yellow= said fault occurs twice  Red= said fault occurs in all three instances </div>		A. Deceasing and perverting others into Catharism (Pierre Autier) B. Relapsing into heresy after having received penitence (Pierre Raimond) C. Belief in two Gods (Pierre Autier, Amiel de Perles, Pierre Raimond) D. Holding that the creation of visible things was done by the bad God (Pierre Autier, Amiel de Perles, Pierre Raimond) E. Inventing two churches (Pierre Autier) F. Asserting that one can only be saved by the Church of Jesus Christ (Pierre Autier, Amiel de Perles, Pierre Raimond) G. Denial of the Eucharist (Pierre Autier, Amiel de Perles) H. Condemnation of carnal marriage (Pierre Autier, Amiel de Perles, Pierre Raimond) I. Baptism in physical water is of no value (Amiel de Perles, Pierre Raimond) J. Refusing to take an oath (Pierre Raimond) K. Refusing to sign with the holy cross (Pierre Raimond) L. The altar does not contain the true body of Christ (Pierre Raimond) M. Denial that Jesus was a physical person and that he rose from the dead (Pierre Autier, Amiel de Perles) N. Denial that Maria was a physical person and that God entered her womb (Pierre Autier, Pierre Raimond) O. Confession of sins in front of priests is of no value (Pierre Autier, Amiel de Perles, Pierre Raimond) P. Denial of resurrection of human bodies (on the Day of Judgement) (Pierre Autier, Pierre Raimond) Q. Imposing on oneself the abstinence of <i>endura</i> (Pierre Raimond) R. Denial of the Last Sacrament (Pierre Raimond)																		

**Table 1**

Turing to the real heretics, the Cathar leaders, Table 1 shows how often a certain accusation or fault occurred: green means that only one of the three heretics was accused of the said fault, yellow means that the fault in question occurred twice, red means that all three men were accused of the said fault. The 'x's in the table point out that the said statement or fault was applicable. The outcomes or punishments of the trials are not integrated into a graphical display, as all three men received the same sentence: being abandoned to the secular court, which in turn meant their death. The columns categorise the faults the heretics are being accused of.<sup>51</sup> What is striking to see is that the charges against these three men are substantially different than the faults of the *credentes*. Moreover, these faults do address Cathar dogma, unlike the errors of which the *credentes* were accused. In all three cases, for example, the inquisitors addressed the dualistic aspect of Catharism: the belief in two Gods, one good and one

<sup>51</sup> I have categorised the types of mistakes the inquisitors accused the heretics of, as I have done with the *sermo generalis* of 7 March 1316. Again, it could be that the unique differences between the three men's charges, do not become perfectly readable, thanks to this categorisation. What interests me, however, is that certain categories emerge in all three heretics. Beyond that, unlike the *credentes*, Cathar dogmas are now discussed. My aim with this quantitative analysis was to highlight the bigger picture and the interrelationship between the three cases.

bad. As a consequence of their theology, all three Cathars maintained that the creation of all visible things was done by the bad God, the devil. In addition, the inquisitors dealt with sacraments that the heretics did not believe in. In fact, all three *perfecti* rejected at least three of the total seven sacraments. Thus, it can be argued that a *sermo specialis* was arranged substantially differently from a *sermo generalis*. In the case of the latter, it was usually mentioned in what ways the person in question had supported heretics, be it by providing shelter, be it by providing food, etc. In the case of a *sermo specialis*, on the other hand, the Cathar faith content was really addressed. Based on the threat they posed to the Catholic Church, they were handed over to secular governing bodies, only to end up burned at the stake. Above all, the rock-hard theological contradictions make the inquisitors' decision understandable. Failure to intervene could have led to the Church's hitherto unassailable, spiritual power being eroded.

### 3. Close reading sermon of 7 march 1316

The source under discussion here is the “Sermon of march 7, 1316”, which was an official harangue delivered by the inquisitors Bernard Gui and Geoffroy d’Ablis.<sup>52</sup> As we have seen in the introduction, this source must be placed within the broader context of the Inquisition, in which the Catholic Church tracked down, investigated and tried people who held views different from those the Church deemed correct. This “sermon” is a solemn, official speech to a chosen audience, namely people who were to receive their punishment as a result of things they had done wrong in the eyes of the inquisitors. However, people did not receive mere punishment, some people were also given mercy.

This essay will examine this sermon in the following way: first, it will present examples of each type of misdeed and its punishment. These misdeeds were praising the way of life of the heretics, eating with fugitives of heresy, giving fugitives of heresy food, belief in heresy (meaning: sincere belief in their doctrines), not stopping the process of heretication (during illness), speaking with fugitives of heresy, and lastly failing to reveal heretics to be arrested. Sentences were: having to wear two yellow crosses, having to wear a double amount of crosses, perpetual imprisonment and perpetual imprisonment in solitary confinement, also referred to as *murus strictus*. In doing so, it will go in detail in the analysis of one case for each configuration. Secondly, it presents and clarifies quantitative analysis of the sermon. This part examines patterns in the process of punishment (if any). Questions that will be addressed include: can anything be said

---

<sup>52</sup> Originally in Latin, the source is translated into English by James Given. The theologian Philipp van Limborch managed to decipher the original handwriting, after which he promulgated it in legible Latin in a publication from 1692. I am using here this edition of Philipp van Limborch: *Philippi a Limborch, Historia Inquisitionis. : Cui subjungitur Liber sententiarum inquisitionis Tholosanæ, ab anno Christi CIJCCCVII ad annum CIJCCXXIII* (Amsterdam 1692), here 183-208.

about who received what punishment for a particular offense, and when? Did the inquisitors consider each offense equally serious? Lastly, it will try to interpret some features arising from this analysis. For instance why some people had to wear crosses whereas others had to go to prison in the first place, and why some people had to wear double crosses while some had to go to a prison in solitary confinement.

One has to keep in mind that when the inquisitors decided someone had to wear crosses as punishment, by default they had to wear two, meaning one on the chest and the other between the shoulders. See that for the first category, the people who were pardoned by the inquisitors, the plural is already used: *cruces*.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, if one examines the category of sentences and penances of those signed with the cross, *Sentencia & Penetencia Cruccesignatorum*, it says the following: “...*duas cruces de filtro crocei coloris portandas, unam antierius ante pectus & alteram posterius inter spatulas in omni veste vestra preter camisiam interiorem*..”<sup>54</sup> This in turn means wearing two crosses of yellow felt, one placed in front on the chest and the other behind between the shoulders on all the clothing except the inner shirt. Further down the same page, a group of eight people is mentioned for which the crosses were double. Ambiguous as this may seem, when the source tells someone had to wear double crosses, it means they had to wear four.

The first group of people the document addresses were people who were pardoned by the inquisitors. They formulated it as follows:

“We remove the crosses from the persons named below, changing nothing else in the other penances imposed on them, as is contained in their penitential letters.”<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis*, 184.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibidem*, 191.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 184-185. An example of this rollback is *Jeanne wife of Bernard Vasconis of Varennes* (row six in the excel sheet) whose crosses were removed.

A total of 20 people's crosses were removed of the seventy-three people in total discussed in the paper. The inquisitors did keep a big stick however: should the behaviour of the persons in question unexpectedly deteriorate, the pardon could always be reversed or the punishment to be received could even be worse than it was initially.

Secondly, the inquisitors cited people who were released from prison, the *murus*. Edward Peters is here very helpful: "In monastic usage the term *murus* ("a wall") came to be used as a designation for the room - appropriate for imprisonment - that the Benedictine Rule called for."<sup>56</sup> This sermon discusses five persons for whom this configuration applies. The only *explicitly* distinguishing factor between these five persons released from the *murus* and the graces with respect to crosses is in these people *four* crosses were removed instead of *two*. The document presents the five persons of the second group alongside with their misdeeds and details, whereas for the first group, the document only provides their names. As an example one could take Jean Mercadier de Taix of Montgaillard (row 28 in the excel document).<sup>57</sup>

"Jean Mercadier de Taix of Montgaillard, with double crosses, minor pilgrimages, visitations of churches in Toulouse, and other *generalia*."<sup>58</sup>

As was the case with the previous group, the inquisitors mentioned in concluding that the pardon could always be reversed and punishment could still be given, should the behaviour of the persons in question deteriorate.

Third, the sermon details the faults of those who were marked with the cross, *Culpe Crucessignatorum*.<sup>59</sup> Unlike for the two configurations including pardons, each accused person is now presented in a short narrative what recounts what exactly he or

---

<sup>56</sup> Peters, "Prison before the Prison: The Ancient and Medieval Worlds" in: N. Morris, D.J. Rothman eds., *Oxford History of the Prison* (Oxford 1995) 28. So literally the word *murus* means "wall", but over time it was used to denote a room that we would now call a "cell."

<sup>57</sup> Ibidem, 185.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

she did wrong. Each of these narratives follows a particular structure. First, the inquisitors made clear with a time clause that the person in question had actually made a confession in court. This fact acted as evidence that the person in question was aware of his or her actions. Consequently the interrogators described in quite some detail what exactly the person in question had done that they are concerned about. There are a number of accusations that appear repeatedly in the charges, charted in the excel document.<sup>60</sup> A few examples are praising the way of life of the heretics, eating with fugitives of heresy, not stopping the process of heretication (during a person's potentially fatal illness), failing to reveal heretics to be arrested. Finally, the document indicates how many years before his confession the person in question committed the aforementioned charges. In addition, the inquisitors reveal under what circumstances the suspect made his confession. Many of the people here discussed only confessed after a certain event had taken place, for example after people involved in the conspiracy had also confessed (and there was practically no escape). Pierre Fils' punishment, along with those of the other fourteen offenders, is presented under the header "Sentences and Penances of Those Signed with the Cross", *Sentencia & Penetencia Cruccesignatorum*.<sup>61</sup>

"Pierre Fils junior of Bunac, son of the late Pierre Fils senior of Bunac in the parish of Tarabel, as legitimately proven to us in court by his confession on June 14, 1315, saw Pierre Fils his cousin, who was hiding in the *solarium* of Guillemette de More's house; he ate and drank there with him, whom he knew to be a fugitive on account of heresy, concerning which fact there was public report and fame. Item, later one night on another occasion he saw the fugitive Pierre Fils, and spoke with him. On his behalf he went to a certain person, whom he named, to ask him to come speak with the fugitive. Item, on another occasion he saw the fugitive on account of heresy and gave him something to eat and on his behalf went to a certain person whom he named, and brought back to the fugitive a small sack in which there were folded cloths which had been given to him by that person. On his behalf he went to a

---

<sup>60</sup> These charges are: praising the way of life of the heretics, eating with fugitives of heresy, giving fugitives of heresy food, belief in heresy, not stopping the process of heretication (during illness), speaking with fugitives of heresy, failing to reveal (known) heretics to be arrested. For an elaboration of which charge applied to which person, see the excel document.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 190.

certain person whom he named and asked him to come speak by night with the fugitive in a certain place which he named. Afterwards he gave the fugitive something to eat. This last deed took place after the sermon of the inquisitors at Toulouse in which some people who had been involved with heresy with Pierre Fils were punished, in the year of our Lord 1312. The aforesaid deeds he committed three to four years before he revealed them; nor did he come to confess until two other persons who knew about the fugitive along with Pierre Fils were arrested on account of heresy.”<sup>62</sup>

Pierre Fils Junior of Bunac: B, C, F.<sup>63</sup>

First of all the inquisitors announced when Pierre (row 38) had made his confession, in his case on June 14, 1315.<sup>64</sup> Then they explained what he had done wrong in their eyes. In this case it was eating with people who were on the run because of heresy and speaking with them. He committed both acts several times. Finally, it is told that Pierre committed the aforesaid misdeeds three to four years before he revealed them, and it is indicated that Pierre did not come to confess before two other people, who just like Pierre knew that the person they spoke to was a fugitive on account of his heresy, had been arrested. For punishment he had to wear two yellow crosses (so that everyone passing him by could see he had offended against God and the holy Church). A group of six people however, were sentenced to wear a double amount of crosses, because they had perjured themselves. This meant they had lied under oath to the inquisitors, even though they had promised them that they would tell the truth. The people in question were Petrona wife of Arnaud d’Artigues, Pierre d’Artigues (row 39) Guillaume de Cumba Guilha (row 41) Helys of Azas (row 42) Pierre Burgada (row 43) and Jeanne his wife

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 186-187.

<sup>63</sup> In the excel document I made of the sermon of March 7, 1316 (found in the appendices, Appendix A: Sermon of March 7 Quantitative Analysis) I categorized the types of errors into columns. I labelled these categories of errors with letters to make them easier to read. A: praising the way of life of the heretics, B: eating with fugitives of heresy, C: giving fugitives of heresy food, D: belief in heresy, E: not stopping the process of heretication during a potential fatal illness, F: speaking with fugitives of heresy, G: failing to reveal heretics to be arrested.

<sup>64</sup> Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis*, 186.

(row 44). This difference can largely be explained by looking at the third component of the narrative, which has to do with the person's confession and the time in which this person made the confession. In all of their processes, except *Petrona's* one, at the end it says they first denied the truth contrary to their oath. This measure shows that an explicit lie, meaning a lie by omission over something important, was something that was very high on the 'order ladder' of the inquisitors, i.e., this behaviour was something they punished with extra severity.

Fourth, we can turn to those who had been imprisoned, *Culpe inmuratorum*. The narratives for this category proceed in the same three steps. Again, it is the same types of errors that recur in the discussion of individuals, e.g., speaking to fugitives of heresy, giving fugitives of heresy food, not stopping the process of heretication (during illness). The question is thus: if it is the same types of errors that recur in the discussion of individuals (as with those signed with the cross), then why did these not receive the same types of penalties as the people who were signed with the cross? To get an answer, one must analyse at the word level the paragraphs that deal with punishment. Under the header of sentences and penances of those signed with the cross, after the names of the persons were once again summed up, it says the following: "... [list of names] have very gravely deviated into heresy, as read and recited to you intelligibly in the vernacular."<sup>65</sup> Whereas under the header of sentence of those to be imprisoned, it says the following: "So gravely and so *frequently* have you offended in the damnable crime of heresy, as read and recited to you intelligibly in the vernacular..."<sup>66</sup> Thus, the distinguishing factor for the inquisitors in their decision to have someone wear crosses or imprison them seems to have to do with the frequency with which the person in question offended in the crime

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 191.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 202.

of heresy. As a typical example of the category of *Culpe inmuratorum*, one might look at Pons Raynes, son of the late Pons Raynes of Saint-Sulpice (row number 52). He made his confession in court on January 21, 1310.

“Pons Raynes, son of the late Pons Raynes of Saint-sulpice, as legitimately proven to us in court by his confession on January 21, 1310, heard a certain person whom he named frequently commend to him the way of life, sect, and acts of the heretics, inducing him to love and believe in them (*credenciam ipsorum*). Item, he received in his house Pierre Autier and his son Jacques, heretics, and gave them food and drink for several days and nights, and waited on them, and heard the preaching and doctrine of these heretics (*audivit predicationem & doctrinam ipsorum hereticorum*). Item, he visited the heretics in the house of Baranhona his mother-in-law, where he several times heard their preaching and doctrine. Item, there he saw another heretics, whose name he did not know. Item, he agreed that Guillemette, his mother, should be hereticated (*hereticaretur*), and persuaded her to do this, and went to search out a heretic at Lugan, and from there brought Amelius the heretic (*hereticum*) to hereticate (*hereticanda*) Guillemette his mother. He kept the heretic there for a night, and he was present at the heretication. Item, he accompanied Pierre Autier and either Jacques or Amelius, heretics, from Lugan to the *boria* of Raimond de Lanta near Buzet. Item, on another occasion he accompanied the two heretics from Saint-Sulpice to Lugan. Item, at one time he bought fish for the heretics. Item, he believed the heretics to be good men and truthful (*credidit hereticos esse bonos homines & veraces*) and that one could be saved in their faith and sect (*posse salvari in fide & fecta ipsorum*); and he believed this for about one and a half years. Item, he heard the errors of the heretics against the faith of the Roman Church, against baptism, the sacrament of the altar, against matrimony, and the veneration of the cross. Item, at first he denied the truth contrary to his oath; and he agreed with others of his house that they would in no way confess to anything concerning heresy. The aforesaid he committed six years before he confessed; nor did he wish to confess until he was arrested and detained in the *mur* and accused by others.”<sup>67</sup>

Pons Raynes, son of the late Pons Raynes of Saint-Sulpice: A, C, D, E.

First, the inquisitors recount that he invited heretics to his home. Secondly he ate with them and bought food for them. Third, he heard and believed their teachings and doctrines. Fourth, he did not stop the process of heretication (in his case concerning his mother Guillemette), meaning he did not stop the process of his mother being turned

---

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 191.

into a heretic, believing their doctrines and praising them, etc. Fifth, he accompanied the heretics multiple times. Sixth, he heard the objections of the heretics against the orthodox faith. Next the document says that he only came to confess until he was arrested and detained in the *mur* (prison) and accused by others. Under the heading 'Sentence of Those to Be Imprisoned' (*Sentencia inmuratorum*) the inquisitors then explain what punishment these offenders received.<sup>68</sup> In Pons's case, like the majority of the convicts, this meant perpetual imprisonment on bread and water. There were two people however, Petrona wife of Raimond Michel of Saint-Papoul (row 68) and Adhémar Pierre of Bannières (row 70) who were sentenced to the *murus strictus*, which meant solitary confinement.<sup>69</sup> The source comprehensively tells why they received the *murus strictus* on top of their perpetual imprisonment. The people who solely received perpetual imprisonment, did so because they had "so gravely and so frequently (...) offended in the damnable crime of heresy." Petrona wife of Raimond Michel (daughter of the late Guillaume Alric (row 66), and Adhémar were sentenced to the *murus strictus* first of all because they had perjured themselves, secondly they later had abused the pardon given to them (implying they had been prosecuted before for heresy). Adhémar, thirdly, knowingly suppressed the truth concerning several guilty people (guilty of heresy). The three reasons listed above are the distinguishing elements between Petrona and Adhémar, and the rest of the convicts. Petrona and Adhémar appear to have received this additional punishment because they had been previously convicted, then pardoned, but are now making the same mistakes again. Now if these two had received the same sentence as the rest of the convicts, there would have been no difference. It is very plausible that Petrona and Adhémar were sentenced to the *murus strictus* because a

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 201.

<sup>69</sup> Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society*, 31.

sentence like the previous one would not have sufficed. Then they would keep committing mistakes and repeatedly receive the same punishment for it. Ultimately, this would attempt to bring people back to the true faith.

Moreover, two individuals are adjudicated who died as supporters of the heretics, under *Sentencia deffunctorum in fautoria hereticorum*.<sup>70</sup> As these people were dead, they couldn't be told their punishment, so the inquisitors stated what should be done with their dead bodies and bones. The structure of the narrative also differs from previous categories. Instead of using the already known three stages, it is now stated that through the eyes of witnesses, certain crimes for Beatrice and Guillaume are proven. As an example one could take Beatrice (row 75).

“Item, Beatrice, wife of the late Pons d’Artigues of Saint-Jean near Verfeil committed many things in heresy while she lived, and in her house received and maintained Pierre Autier and Pierre Sanche heretics, and there, in her sight, and with her knowledge and consent the heretics were visited by other persons; concerning these things she, having been summoned, cited, and asked under oath, denied and concealed the truth; nor did she wish to confess; and after we had waited for her for eight months she died in the mur, without seeking the sacraments of the Church, nor showing any sign of devotion or contrition, from which it appears that she finally died impenitent concerning the aforesaid.”<sup>71</sup>

As the text states, she received and maintained heretics in her house while she lived, she visited them at other places, and she let other people visit them even though she knew they were heretics. The punishment of both Beatrice and Guillaume (row 74) was that their bones be exhumed from holy ground. However, their bones did not need to be burned. The anomalous, shorter structure of this text can be explained by the following fact. Since the persons in question were already deceased, there was no reason for conducting an entire (criminal) trial. What matters, however, is that for the inquisitors, it

---

<sup>70</sup> Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis*, 203.

<sup>71</sup> Ibidem.

felt as if they were accountable to God, as if they had God before their eyes.<sup>72</sup> So despite the fact that the persons that were being discussed had already passed away, the inquisitors saw God looking at them in anticipation of a definitive sentence.

Sixth, the *sermo generalis* presents a category similar in structure to those who died as supporters of the heretics, namely the sentence of those deceased in heresy, *Sentencia deffunctorum in heresi*.<sup>73</sup> As with the previous group, the seven individuals in this group were given their faults and sentence under the same header. The headline states at the top that the inquisitors and commissioner proved by investigation what the persons in question did wrong: *Nos prefati inquisitores & commissarius in hac parte, per inquisitionem factam invenimus ac per testes receptos in iudicio legitime nobis constat*.<sup>74</sup> To get a picture of what these people had done wrong one can look at Montolina wife of the late Martin Francisci of Limoux (row 79).

“Item, Montolina, wife of the late Martin Francisci of Limoux committed many things in heresy while she lived, receiving heretics in her house, hearing there the heretics’ words, preaching, and errors, and induced many people to love and believe in the heretics by commending their way of life and sect, adoring the heretics after the heretical fashion; and with the heretics Pierre Autier and Amelius she fled from Limoux and in many places and houses and in many places and houses she saw and visited many heretics, and heard their preaching, and adored them, and at her last hour put herself in the heretics’ *endura*, persisting for many days in this *endura*, without any other illness, she was hereticated and received into the damnable sect of the heretics at Le Born in the *cap-de-mas* of the Espanhols; her body the heretics’ believers hid and, lest anyone know of it, buried at night.”<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> To have a good impression of the context in which the inquisitors made their decision, one has to read the whole sentence of the quotation: *Renunciatoque tandem & concluso in causa deffensionis predictorum deffunctorum per filios & heredes feu bonorum detentores eorundem, & in aliis ficut decuit juris ordine observato communicato & prehabito consilio sapentum & peritorum in iure hac presenti die & loco ad diffinitivam sententiam super premissis perhemtorie assignatis habentes Deum pre oculis, & sacrosanctis Dei euangelis positus coram nobis sedentes pro tribunal per diffinitivam sententiam dicimus & declaramus, predictum Guilielmum & predictam Beatricem fuisse fautores & receptatores hereticorum dum viverent & tales decessisse, & penas contra tales à jure positas & statutas incurrisse in vita pariter & in morte, precipentes ossa predicti Guilielmi & predictae Beatricis de facris cimiteriis exhumanda, fet ex hoc non ea decernimus conburenda. Ibid.*

<sup>73</sup> Ibid., 204.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

Montolina wife of the late Martin Francisci of Limoux: A, D, F.

The statement concerning her says that she received heretics in her house, she heard their words and preaching, she induced many people to love and believe in the heretics by commending their way of life, she adored the heretics, and finally she was hereticated during illness. As a penalty, these bones of these seven people, just like the two individuals from the previous category, had to be exhumed from holy ground. Unlike the previous category, these peoples' bones did have to be burned. The reason the inquisitors give for this decision is that the bones of Catholics and heretics should not be confused. Instead, the bones of heretics should be damned: "...ordering that as a sign of their damnation their [the seven convicts in question] bones, if they can be differentiated from the bones of Catholics, be exhumed from holy ground and burned in detestation of such a horrible crime."<sup>76</sup>

The second-to-last category featured a group of three men who had fled because of heresy, *Sentencia fugitivorum pro heresi*.<sup>77</sup> The inquisitors told the faults of these people and gave their sentence under the same header. The group consisted of two brothers and one man outside of this family. One of the brothers, Arnaud Mercadier son of the late Jacques Mercadier of Le Born (row 88) confessed in 1305 that he had frequently seen six heretics.

"Arnaud Mercadier, son of the late Jacques Mercadier of Le Born confessed on Friday on the morrow of the Epiphany in 1305 that he had frequently seen six heretics, viz. Pierre Autier, his son Jacques, Guillaume Autier brother of Pierre, Pierre Raimond, Amelius, and Andreas, not all at once, but now some, now others; and he maintained and received the heretics in his house and that of his brothers at Le Born at different times, now some, now others. Item, he visited the heretics elsewhere in various houses, which he named in his confession, and he at times accompanied them from place to place; and he ate and drank with them. Item, he frequently heard their words, preaching, and

---

<sup>76</sup> Ibid., 205.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid.

erroneous doctrine against the faith. Item, he frequently adored the heretics in the heretical fashion, bending his knees, joining his hands, and seeking their blessing; and he saw other people whom he named similarly adore them. Item, he ate bread blessed by the heretics. Item, he frequently greeted the heretics in the heretical fashion. Item, he made a pact or promise, which they call a *conveniencia*, with the heretics that at his end he wished to be received by them into their sect and order. Arnaud, having confessed concerning the aforesaid and abjured heresy, was reconciled.”<sup>78</sup>

Arnaud Mercadier son of the late Jacques Mercadier of Le Born: A, B, D, E.

The inquisitors say that he received the heretics in his house, he visited the heretics at other places, he accompanied them, he ate and drank with them, he frequently heard their words and preaching, he adored the heretics, he sought their blessing, he ate bread blessed by the heretics, and he frequently greeted the heretics in heretical fashion.

Following is a small indentation in the text which is about both Arnaud and his brother.

The source says that they had already been called to the inquisitors’ sermon at Toulouse in 1309, but they had failed to appear. As a consequence of their absence, they were peremptorily cited as suspects in heresy to appear on certain days at a certain place, which they failed to do. As a result, they were excommunicated in 1309 which they sustained for several years and at the time of writing of the source they still sustained. At the bottom of the text the inquisitors gave the definitive sentences of both Arnaud and his brother, as well as the other individual, Pierre Raimond Dominique (row 89). Even though they were absent through contumacy (*absentes per contumaciam*) they were pronounced, declared and condemned as heretics.<sup>79</sup> The fact that he was absent while his sentence was being read means that Arnaud was a fugitive at the time the source was written.

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., 206.

<sup>79</sup> What was meant by this conviction in the first place, and what its implications in the personal lives of these three men would ultimately mean, the inquisitors offer no clear explanation. However, it is plausible that they, like those mentioned earlier (for example Pierre Autier and Pierre Raimond), were given the stamp of heretic, allowing them to be detected as apostates.

Last of all follows a category consisting of only one man, Jean Brayssan (row 91), a Waldensian. At the beginning of the section, the Inquisitors state that it has been legitimately proven to them in court that Jean Brayssan is a Waldensian, an individual from a heretical sect.<sup>80</sup> What follows is quite an extensive piece of analysis listing all that the man in question had done wrong, and what the sect in itself did wrong.<sup>81</sup> The sect in itself for example asserts that its members cannot be excommunicated by the Roman pontiff, and that the Roman Church acts unlawfully and unjustly in persecuting and condemning them. Of course, what matters in this context is not so much what this cult stands for, but more that the person in question believes in it and adheres to it. This notion is confirmed by the sentence that follows it, in which the Inquisitors say that they have heard from Jean's own mouth that he believes and maintains this: *hoc ipsum ore tuo adivimus*.<sup>82</sup> Jean himself had done wrong many more things. First of all he began to maintain, praise and serve the Waldensians and he still does. Secondly the sect (and thus Jean) says that all oaths are prohibited by God. Third, Jean refused to tell the truth. Fourth, Jean maintains that all judgement is prohibited by God thus it is a sin to be a judge. Fifth, Waldensians say they have the power of hearing the confessions of sinners from God instead of the Roman Church. Sixth, Jean claims that the indulgences established by the bishops of the Roman Church hold no worth. Seventh, he rejects the existence of purgatory after death and, as a result, contends that the prayers and devout actions performed by the living for the deceased have no impact. Eight, the sect Jean adheres differs in way of life and customs from normal behaviour faithful people should have. Despite not being listed as a reason, the ninth thing in which Jean is wrong is that he does not wish to return to the unity of the Church. As a sentence Jean was

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., 207.

<sup>81</sup> See: Appendix B: Sentence against Jean Brayssan.

<sup>82</sup> Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis*, 207.

relinquished as an impenitent and obstinate heretic. At the end of the piece about Jean, the names of the officials of this sermon were mentioned once more, just as at the beginning of the sermon. So this concerned not only the two Dominican inquisitors, but also the rector of the church, the public notary, etc.

One might wonder why one man, proportionally, received so much attention from the inquisitors. The first step in answering this question, is to notice that Jean was a Waldensian and not a Cathar. Note that the introduction of this essay roughly explains the differences between Cathars and Waldensians. The inquisitors precisely narrate their objections toward Brayssan's beliefs, but thus also toward Brayssan himself, since it is he who holds that form of belief. There are a number of issues that the Waldensian insists that cause friction: he maintains that he is not subject to the Roman pontiff which in turn means he maintains that he cannot be excommunicated by the Roman Church, he states that he does not have to obey the pope, he holds that the inquisitors are unlawfully persecuting him, and he maintains that all judgement is prohibited by God, which in turn means he maintains that therefore, it is a sin to judge. This is only a fraction of the doctrines held by the man, but amply enough to demonstrate the point that with his manner of belief, Brayssan posed an eminent danger to the infallible status of the Catholic Church. Moreover, Brayssan was an educated and smart man, as he based his positions on Bible passages. See for example the point about judgement, where he held: *Nolite judicare & non judicabimini*, meaning: Judge not lest you be judged.<sup>83</sup> This is a direct reference to Matthew 7:1 where the author of the book tries to make clear that the standard by which you judge others will be used for you as well. By maintaining this position, Brayssan tries to hold a mirror up to the inquisitors. He tries to show them that

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid.

they are not doing as Jesus intended by persecuting people. In turn, they will ultimately be judged by the rigorous standard they impose on heretics. The fact that Brayssan could read Bible at all and, moreover, could establish a link from a passage of Scripture to a contemporary social situation shows that he was an educated man. Viewed from this position, it is understandable why this individual received special, extensive treatment from the inquisitors. It was important for them to root out this problem so that his ideas would not spread and pose a potential danger to their authority.

Of all the people treated in the *sermo*, a few things can be stated with some certainty. First of all improvement in behaviour was rewarded. The first group addressed was pardoned and their (yellow) crosses were removed. However, the grant of pardon could always be reversed in the event of deterioration of behaviour. Second, the sermon presents several people released from prison. As was the case with the previous category, these people's pardons too could be reversed. Moreover, the dead received a different kind of penalty than the living: the bones from the dead were exhumed from holy ground. In the case of those deceased in heresy, their bones had to be burned too. The bones of those who died as supporters of the heretics did not have to be burned. Turning to those signed with the cross and those to be imprisoned, some nuances are in order. Close reading offers insights into the distinguishing factor between these two categories. People from both categories had gravely deviated into heresy, the nuance being that people who were to be imprisoned also *so frequently* deviated into heresy. So the distinguishing factor in the different types of punishment is frequency. In addition, as to those men and women signed with the cross, it can be explained why some people had to wear two crosses instead of one. This had to do with the fact that all six people for whom this was the case (except *Petrona wife of Arnaud d'Artigues*) first had denied the truth contrary to their oath. Thus lying was punished with extra severity by the

inquisitors. Moreover, the inquisitors listed a few reasons for Petrona and Adhémar to be referred to the *murus strictus* instead of the 'normal' prison. First of all, being listed in the category of those to be imprisoned, they gravely and frequently deviated into the crime of heresy. Secondly, the *sermo* says these people had: "...more fully and seriously (...) offended in perjuring "themselves" - and later abusing the grace given to you..."<sup>84</sup> So, among the people who gravely and frequently deviated into heresy, these ones more fully and seriously lied to the inquisitors and abused the grace awarded.

While the difference between Brayssan and the other convicts in this sermon may be clear, the question still remains as to why, with respect to the other convicts, we hear nothing about the content of Catharism? This has to do with the fact that, for the most part, we are dealing with *credentes* in this sermon: not the Cathar spiritual leaders, but their followers who enabled them to continue the *perfecti*'s itinerant existence. Note that both Pierre Fils, and Pons Raynes, and Beatrice, and Montolina, helped the heretics (meaning: *perfecti*) in some way, shape or form. Be it by giving food, be it by providing shelter, be it by the heretics prescribing their way of life to others. One can argue that this concerns a question of agency vis-à-vis belief. These people were not primarily punished because of their faith, but because of their actions. The inquisitors had to eliminate these *credentes* in order for the religious output of the Cathars to diminish and eventually be destroyed.

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., 202.

## 4. Heretics processes

“Petrona wife of Arnaud d’Artigues of Saint-Jean near Verfeil, daughter of the late Pierre Sanche and Sibille of Prunet, as legitimately proven to us in court by her confession on July 13, 1312, saw two men in the house in which she was living with her brother Pierre Guillaume at Prunet; one of these she heard and knew to be Pierre Autier and the other Jacques, son of Pierre; and that they were some of those good men who are called heretics; and she greeted them.”<sup>85</sup>

The *sermo* of 7 March 1316 is full of such confessions of *credentes*. Often, as in this case too, it mentioned which heretics, *perfecti*, the person in question had dealt with. In this confession, these heretics in question were Pierre Autier and his son. On the basis of the *sermo generalis*, we now know how Bernard Gui and Geoffroy d’Ablis handled affairs with *credentes*. The question that remains, however, is how these inquisitors would try real, full-fledged heretics, such as Pierre Autier. The outcome is not the most intriguing thing about this trial, because we know for a fact that Autier was ultimately burnt at the stake. What is much more relevant is how the inquisitors came to this decision. How did this ruling come about and was it argued? Did cases such as Pierre’s one address Cathar dogma? Pierre Autier’s process can serve as an excellent example to overcome this issue for two reasons. First, he was tried by Bernard Gui and Geoffroy d’Ablis, on 9 April 1310.<sup>86</sup> This fact ensures that there can be no possible discussion that another inquisitor, despite following Gui’s manual, would have tried the man differently. Secondly, Pierre Autier is often mentioned in the *sermo* of 7 March 1316. This aligns his trial as closely as

---

<sup>85</sup> Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis*, 187.

<sup>86</sup> I would argue that there is not necessary a problem in the fact that Pierre Autier was tried in 1310, whereas the *sermo* in question was held in 1316. The *credentes* in the *sermo* were sentenced for acts they had long committed. Recall that at the beginning of a ruling, it said at what time the person in question made his or her confession, oftentimes years before 1316. It is thus quite plausible that the persons in question had actually seen Pierre Autier and his followers in the years before the *sermo*, while they were only convicted in 1316 for their dealings with this perfectus.

possible with the content of the *sermo*, because the people condemned there were mostly condemned for having dealt with Pierre. Thus Pierre's agency comes to the fore.

Before diving into Autier's trial, one has to keep in mind a few things. First of all, *Pierre* was not condemned in a *sermo generalis* but in a *sermo specialis*. The distinguishing factor between these two types was that in the case of the latter, only one person came to the table. This fact implies two things. First, the person in question was apparently so special that he had to be addressed in a stand-alone trial. In Autier's case, this was true because he was a *perfectus*, a true heretic. Secondly, this in turn implies that sentencing Autier required a different approach than in the case of the *sermo generalis*, for why else would he have been set apart? Thus, the structure of a *sermo specialis* differs from that of a *sermo generalis*. Second of all, one cannot seriously claim to establish a thesis of how the inquisitors tried *perfecti*, based on one *sermo specialis*. Therefore, we will also look at the trials of two other heretics, Amiel de Perles and Pierre Raimond de Hugous

First, this chapter analyses the *sermo specialis* in which Pierre Autier was treated. Second, it does the same for Amiel de Perles. Third, it investigates how the inquisitors handled the case of Pierre Raimond de Hugous. Fourth, it hypothesises how the inquisitors punished full-fledged heretics.

## Process of Pierre Autier (*sermo specialis* of 9 April 1310)

In the first part of the ceremony, the inquisitors listed all the things Autier had done wrong in their eyes. They state in the name of Jesus Christ that Pierre Autier had committed several offences related to heresy in recent years.<sup>87</sup> Moreover, they divulge that he had deceived many persons, he had perverted many others, and that he had forced them into his errors and so had damaged the Catholic faith by his false precepts. Subsequently, the inquisitors argue that Autier is a convinced heretic (*hereticus manifestus*), that he had observed and followed the way of life, the principles, and the rite of faith of the Good Christians (*bonos christianos*, synonym for Cathars), whom the Catholic Church persecutes.<sup>88</sup> The two Dominicans then address the content of *Autier's* Cathar dogma. Indeed, they cite that Autier affirms and declares that there are two Gods, Lords, a good one and an evil one. Following this, they cite the logical consequence of this theology, namely that the creation of all visible things was not brought about by the good God, but by the evil one, namely the devil and Satan.<sup>89</sup> Consciously or unconsciously, Gui and d'Ablis then hold up a mirror to Autier, but also to themselves. According to them, the Good Man invented two churches. On the one hand a good one he says is the Church of Jesus Christ, in which salvation can be attained. On the other hand there is the Roman Church, which he claims is the mother of fornication, the devil's basilica and Satan's synagogue (*matrem fornicationum et basilicam dyaboli et Sathane*

---

<sup>87</sup> B. Gui, *Le livre des sentences de l'inquisiteur Bernard Gui, 1308-1323*, trans. A. Pales-Gobilliard (Paris 2002) 538. "In nomine Domini nostril Jhesi Christi, amen. Nos, frater Bernardus Guidonis et frater Gaufridus de Ablusiis...nobis constat...quod tu Petre Auterii, notarius quondam et habitator de Axs in Savarteseo Appamiensis dyocesis, qui captus et deprehensus fuisti in dyocesi Tholosana in qua plurima commisisti in heresy istis annis, plures personas deffunctas hereticando et plures personas alias inficiendo et ad tuos errores pertrahendo fidemque catholicam tuis falsis dogmatibus corrumpendo."

<sup>88</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., "Creationem omnium rerum visibilium et corporalium dicens non esse factam a Deo parte celesti et Domini Jhesu Christo, set a diabolo et Sathana malo deo, quem dicis esse deum hujus seculi, artificem et principem hujus mundi."

*sinagogam*).<sup>90</sup> According to Autier, no one can be saved by the faith of the Catholic Church, but only by the faith of his church, the church of Jesus Christ.<sup>91</sup> With a little imagination, one can see the dynamics of a spiritual battlefield come to life in this part of the ceremony. With the same firmness with which the inquisitors claim that the Catholic faith is the one right faith through which one can be saved, Autier argues that his church of Jesus Christ is the only church that can offer salvation to humanity. Precisely because of this progressive disagreement between the inquisitors and Autier, the subsequent erroneous beliefs they accuse Autier of are extremely relevant. The laundry list continues with Autier affirming through the mouths of the inquisitors that all sacraments of the Roman Church are vain and useless. For instance, Autier does not believe in the Eucharist, he condemns carnal marriage and he denies it was conceived and set up by the good God, and he argues that Jesus was not born of the virgin Mary. Furthermore, Autier denies that Jesus had a real human body (*verum corpus humanum*), that he was made of human flesh (*veram carnem hominis*), and that he actually rose (*resurrexisse*) from the dead in that human guise. In addition, he holds that Mary was not a woman made out of flesh (*mulierem carnalem*), but actually that his church is the true penitence (*veram penitentiam*), and that his church is the virgin Mary in the darkness (*Mariam virginem in tenebris*).<sup>92</sup> Consecutively, Autier says that the confession of sins made to priests of the Roman church is without value, since the pope, like every other member of the Catholic Church, is incapable of absolving sins. Instead, only he and his ilk have the power to forgive sins through the laying on of hands. Lastly, Autier completely denies the resurrection of human bodies (*resurrectionem quoque corporum humanorum negas*), which in turn means according to him, Christ did not rise from the dead in the

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 538-541.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 540-541.

way the Catholic Church believes.<sup>93</sup> Instead, he imagines that there are certain spiritual bodies and certain inner man, bodies in which he and his followers should resurrect.

Since the enumeration of errors is over, the inquisitors now move on to the next part of the trial in which they argue that Autier himself does not want to return to the faith of the Roman Church. They contend that he did not want to believe with his heart in their faith. Moreover, they insist that the heretic had been approached by Catholics to abandon his faults, to acknowledge and follow the true faith of the Roman Church (*veram fidem Romane ecclesie*) and to adhere to it.<sup>94</sup> So deep into the trial the Dominicans give Autier the freedom of choice to return to the true faith, in order to at least obtain a sentence mitigation that way. As a result of Autier's unwillingness to return to the Catholic Church and confess his sins, the inquisitors now pronounce a final sentence. As punishment, they hand him over to the secular court. They do mention at this point that there is still a possibility for Pierre to return to the unity of the church if he mends his life and stops committing errors related to heresy. Finally, the inquisitors mention a whole range of individuals who participated in this sermon.

Edward Peters, Henry Charles Lea and Derek Hill are very helpful here to understand why the inquisitors decided to surrender the heretic to the secular authorities. Peters argues: "When faced with a convicted heretic who refused to recant, or who relapsed into heresy, the inquisitors were to turn him over to the temporal authorities – the "secular arm" – for *animadversio debita*, the punishment decreed by local law, usually burning to death."<sup>95</sup> Lea holds: "Obstinate heretics, refusing to abjure and return to the Church with due penance, and those who after abjuration relapsed,

---

<sup>93</sup> Ibid.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 542-543.

<sup>95</sup> Peters, *Inquisition* (Berkeley 1989) 67.

were to be abandoned to the secular arm for fitting punishment."<sup>96</sup> These findings lead to the logical conclusion that inquisitors depended on the cooperation of secular authorities in their inquisitorial activities. This is exactly what Hill argues: "But, even when matters were not at crisis point, the inquisitors needed at least some public support to continue to operate successfully against heretics and to achieve their wider aim of promoting the faith. The inquisition was dependent on the secular power, and the Seneschal in Toulouse and other officials in Gui's time might well have been prepared to use their power to blunt the inquisition's activities, had they felt that the inquisition was losing the support of a substantial or influential section of the Languedoc public."<sup>97</sup> Gui and d'Ablis, like any other inquisitor, did not have the authority to distribute death sentences. At the bottom of the line, when they wished to punish obstinate heretics, they were dependent on the cooperation of secular governing bodies, who in turn had to make do with the information they got from the Dominicans. The inquisitors actually knew the fate of those handed out.<sup>98</sup> So, in effect, the church and local governing bodies kept each other in balance.

---

<sup>96</sup> H.C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (New York 1887) 313.

<sup>97</sup> D. Hill, *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century*, 143.

<sup>98</sup> J. Kirsch, *The Grand Inquisitors Manual: A History of Terror in the Name of God* (San Francisco 2008) 85.

## Process of Amiel de Perles (*sermo specialis* of 23 October 1309)

One might ask why Amiel de Perles is relevant to discuss in this essay. If he was just a fully-fledged heretic like Pierre Autier, that is not enough connection to establish a link. With that goal in mind, fortunately, there is a clearer kinship between de Perles and Pierre Autier, as Amiel was Pierre's companion. For about a decade, Amiel had been following Pierre, alongside a handful of other apostate believers, including Pierre's brother Guillaume.<sup>99</sup> Throughout these years, these men had been spreading their doctrines and belief, and responding to the spiritual needs of their believers in the Languedoc region. In the fall of 1309, both Amiel and Pierre were captured.<sup>100</sup> Amiel's sermon of 23 October 1309 provides insight into why he was arrested in the first place and exactly what faults the inquisitors accused him of. This time Gui proceeded without the assistance of his colleague d'Ablis.

As in Pierre's case, Gui first lists all the things he thinks Amiel did wrong concerning crimes of heresy. First of all, as was the case with Pierre Autier, he cites that according to Cathars, the creation of all visible things is not done by the good God (*bono Deo*), but by the devil and Satan (*diabolo et Sathana*), the bad God (*malo deo*), which they call "evil God and prince of this world (*deum malignum et principem hujus mundi*)."<sup>101</sup> Secondly, Gui argues that the Cathars distort the sacraments and claim that they are impious, meaningless and vain. The examples he mentions are the Eucharist, the baptism of holy water, carnal marriage.<sup>102</sup> Unlike Autier, Amiel was also accused of distorting the sacrament of the altar. Relating to the carnal marriage, Cathars argue that

---

<sup>99</sup> Sullivan, *The Inner Lives of Medieval Inquisitors*, 138.

<sup>100</sup> Ibidem; J. Duvernoy, *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier, évêque de Pamiers* (Paris 1978) 22.

<sup>101</sup> Gui, *Le livre des sentences*, 326-327.

<sup>102</sup> Ibidem.

it was not instituted by God at all (*a Deo minime institutum*). Thirdly, Cathars state that the entire statute of the Roman Church and its degrees neither represent nor support the faith of Jesus Christ. Instead, they assert that all who belong to the Roman Church are heretics and wanderers, and that none of them can be saved in their faith of the Roman Church (*nec aliquem posse salvati in fide Romane ecclesie tam nephande quam impie docmatizant*).<sup>103</sup> Identical to Autier, Amiel follows the claim that their own church is good, that their church is the Church of Jesus Christ, and that it possesses the faith in which and without which no one can attain salvation (*et ecclesiam Jhesu Christi et habere fidem in qua omnis et sine qua nullus pervenit ad salutem*). Just like Autier, Amiel totally denies the resurrection of the body (of Jesus Christ), imagining spiritual bodies in which he says Cathars will be revived (*confingentes quedam spiritualia corpora in quibus resurrecturos se dicunt*). This revival of non-material entities is fairly good theological solution, as according to Cathars, the creation of all material originates from the bad God. Fifth, Cathars hold that the confession of sins, made to the priests of the Roman Church, is without value. Similar to Autier, Amiel de Perles sustains that nor the pope nor anyone else cannot absolve someone of their sins (*posse aliquem absolvere a peccatis*). Only *perfecti*, Cathar spiritual leaders, have the power to absolve all of their sins (*habere potestatem absolvendi a peccatis omnibus*). This applies to those who wish to follow and adopt Cathar principles and their faith and remain faithful to them.

The connection between Amiel de Perles and Pierre Autier becomes even more apparent when Gui mentions the latter. The inquisitor describes that Amiel recognized (*recognovit*) Pierre, as Amiel was an elder in the sect of the Cathars. Both of them worshipped each other, bowing to the ground according to their rite. Moreover, they said

---

<sup>103</sup> Ibidem, 328-329.

they belonged to the same sect and there they admitted to having worshipped each other at other times, several times and in the same way (*pluries adorasse modo consimili ibidem recognaverunt*). He did not want to separate (*discedere*) from their sect, nor did he want to believe in the faith of the Roman Church (*nec fidem Romane ecclesie credere*).<sup>104</sup> He did not want to acknowledge nor deny the existence of the Roman Church. Subsequently, Gui mentions that from the day he was captured, Amiel did not want to eat or drink anymore, and in doing so, "he woke up his own murderer."<sup>105</sup> It was for these reasons concerning heresy that Amiel was apprehended (*deprehensus*). Sullivan argues that Gui did so because he did not want to let Amiel take his own life. To avoid this scenario, the inquisitor accelerated Amiel's process and he had the heretic sentenced in public. Gui managed to induce a scarecrow effect, "by bringing Amiel in chains before the crowd".<sup>106</sup> Lastly, Amiel had been urged by many individuals to abandon (*dimitteret*) the sect and to believe in the Catholic faith, but he persisted (*perseverat*) in his own faith. It was because of this reason, taken together with the fact that he was slowly dying due to his hunger strike, that Gui declared that Amiel did not want to convert to the Catholic faith. He declared him a heretic and he abandoned him to the secular court (*curie seculari*).<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> Ibid.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid. "... *noluit comedere nec bibere tanquam sui ipsius proprius homicida.*" In the French translation, it says "il n'a voulu ni manger ni boire depuis le jour de sa capture et il s'est révélé son propre meurtrier." I am not quite sure how Annette Pales-Gobilliard came up with the verb "to wake up (révélé)", but either way it is clear that by doing so Amiel knowingly consented to his own death.

<sup>106</sup> Sullivan, *The Inner lives of Medieval Inquisitors*, 138.

<sup>107</sup> Gui, *Le livre des sentences*, 331.

## Process of Pierre Raimond de Hugous (*sermo specialis* of 20 September 1313)

We know, partly through Duvernoy's and Anne Brenon's work, that Pierre Autier travelled around Southern France in the early 14th century.<sup>108</sup> During the trips he made in this period, he had several people converted to the church of the Cathars and created a dozen perfects. One of these *perfecti* was Pierre Raimond de Hugous. The fact that Gui wanted to address his case in a *sermo specialis*, reveals that there were distinguishing factors between him and other Cathar believers. The *sermo specialis* of 20 September 1313 offers insight into why he was set apart.

First of all, Gui describes that at the time of the *sermo*, Pierre Raimond had yet been punished and he had yet received penitence (*de hiis fueras punitus et penitentiam receperas*), because of the things he had committed with regard to heresy (*de hiis que commiseras in heresi*).<sup>109</sup> He had promised to correct himself and amend, and he had abjured heresy (*correctionem promiseras et emendam et heresim ubjuraveras in iudicio*). The things Gui listed that Pierre Raimond had done wrong were comprehensive. First, he had received heretics. In the second place, he had escorted these heretics from place to place multiple times. Thirdly, he had adored them following the heretical rite. Fourth, he had heard their preaching and their doctrines. Lastly, he had believed their mistakes.<sup>110</sup> The problem is that after all of this, Pierre Raimond had returned to heresy, "like a dog returns to his vomit."<sup>111</sup> So for Gui it was as if Pierre Raimond, after confessing and abjuring the sins he had committed concerning heresy, had spit out the bad substances

---

<sup>108</sup> Duvernoy, *Le registre d'inquisition*, 14; A. Brenon, 'Père Autier (c. 1245-1310). Le bon homme cathare de la dernière chance?', *Archives Ariégoises* Vol. 1 (2009) 63-92, here 70.

<sup>109</sup> Gui, *Le livre des sentences*, 846-847.

<sup>110</sup> Ibidem. "...receptando hereticos associando eos de loco ad locum pluries et modo hereticali adorando et audiendo predicationem et doctrinam pestiferam eorumdem et credendo eorum erroribus et alia committendo que in confessione tua laciis continentur."

<sup>111</sup> Ibid. "...extunc sicut canis rediens ad vomitum culpīs veteribus."

in his body that made him spiritually ill. But by returning to these reprehensible practices, it was as if Pierre Raimond was retaking the poison called heresy.

Subsequently, Gui discusses the sacraments that Pierre Raimond does not support. Alike Autier and Amiel de Perles, Raimond argues that a marriage between a man and a woman is not a real marriage, and that God has not instituted it. Instead, Pierre Raimond believes in a spiritual marriage (*spirituale matrimonium*).<sup>112</sup> Similar to Amiel, the heretic claims that baptism in physical water (*baptismus factus in aqua materiali*), as performed by the Roman Church, does absolutely nothing. Third, Pierre Raimond argues that the sacrament of the altar does not contain the true body of Christ (*verum corpus Christi*), but only simple bread.<sup>113</sup> Likewise, he holds, similar to Autier, that there will not be a resurrection of the bodies on the Day of Judgement.<sup>114</sup> No one will be resurrected in his visible and material body. Similarly, the *perfectus* thinks that the Good God made all things invisible and incorruptible (*fecit omnia invisibilia et incorruptibilia*), whereas the Bad God, namely Lucifer, made all things visible and corruptible, even the bodies of men. In the same way, Pierre Raimond figures that the confession made in front of the priests of the Roman Church and the absolution they give to penitents, is of no value (*nichil valet*). He is followed by Autier and Amiel in this position. Because taking an oath, whether true or false, is a sin and illegal (*peccatum et illicitum*) in Pierre Raimond's eyes, he refused several times to do so. Equivalently, he sustains that the sign of the Holy Cross (*signaculum sancte crucis*) is of no value and he

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., 848-849.

<sup>114</sup> This is a direct reference to John 5:28-29 (KJV) where Jesus says: "Do not marvel at this, for an hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come out, those who have done good to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil to the resurrection of judgment." Because of the dualistic worldview that Pierre Raimond sustains, it is quite logical that he denies the resurrection of physical bodies. According to his theology, this would imply that the bodies in question are derived from the Bad God, the devil or Satan, because he created all matter. Therefore it is not surprising that Pierre Raimond is pushing for an argument in the direction of non-material, spiritual bodies.

does not want to sign himself with this sign. Instead, he rejects (*renuis*) it completely and he denies it (*recusas*). Gui then explains the connection Pierre Raimond has with Pierre Autier. Pierre Raimond says and affirms that Pierre Autier and all of his friends, followers of the faith and principles of the same Pierre, are Good Men and Good Christians. Moreover, he contends that Pierre Autier's followers have the true faith and good principles in which he says he wants to live and die (*vivere atque mori*). Besides, Pierre Raimond affirms (*asseris*) that all people who do not adhere to the faith of Pierre Autier, but instead adopt the faith of the Roman Church, do not have the way of salvation (*viam salvationis*). Lastly, Raimond says that Pierre Autier was saved (*dicis te credere esse salvum*). Equally, Pierre Raimond denies the Last Sacrament (*sacramentum extreme unctionis*) and he says it is of no worth for one's salvation.<sup>115</sup> Similar to Autier, the heretic denies the incarnation of the Son of God, that God never entered the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary (in a physical way).<sup>116</sup> Nevertheless, Raimond contends that he (here referring to Jesus) is still the Mother, the Brother and the Sister of God (*mater et frater et soror Dei*), and that he observes the orders of God the Father (*servat mandata Dei Patris*). Furthermore, by imposing on himself the abstinence of *endura*, Raimond subtracts himself from the life of the body and he inflicts death on himself.<sup>117</sup> By doing so, Raimond was "heading for eternal death with the damned", according to Gui.<sup>118</sup> Second to last, Gui states that Raimond would want to be received into the order and sect (of the Cathars) in their way and according to their rites (*secundum modum et ritum*

---

<sup>115</sup> 'The Last Sacrament' refers to the rituals a believer receives from a clergyman just before his death. Typically, three customs are performed here, namely confession (of sins), anointing of the sick and the Last Communion.

<sup>116</sup> Again, because of the dualistic worldview in which all physical matter originates from the Devil, it is understandable why Pierre Raimond argues that there has been no incarnation of the son of God.

<sup>117</sup> The term *endura* refers to a form of spiritual suicide, in which a Cathar who was on his deathbed abstained from food and drink to purify his or her soul and ensure a place in heaven, after receiving the *consolamentum*.

<sup>118</sup> Gui, *Le livre des sentences*, 848-849, "...ad mortem eternam properas cum dampnatis."

*eorum*), if he could have the free disposal from someone from the sect. Lastly, the Dominican asserts that Raimond does not want to move away from his perfidious (*perfidia*) faith, but instead wants to persevere in it, he wants to live and die for it (*vivere atque mori*).<sup>119</sup>

After this long list of mistakes, the inquisitor and his officials finally turn to Raimond's punishment. They declare that he is a notorious heretic and that he is also relapsed into heresy (*relapsus in heresim*). Since the holy mother of the Church (*sancta mater ecclesia*) could not do anything anymore about his mistakes, they abandoned (*relinquimus*) him to the secular court and arm (*curie et brachio seculari*). As in the other cases, at the end the inquisitor names all the people who collaborated on the *sermo specialis*.

This chapter has shown that Pierre Autier was the spiritual leader who influenced and drew Amiel de Perles and Pierre Raimond into his Cathar beliefs. This notion is reinforced by the fact that only Pierre Autier is accused of inventing two churches. The fact that numerous of the charges match those of Pierre Autier demonstrates the influence Autier was able to exert on fellow Cathar leaders. A significant proportion of these errors had to do with existential dogmatic sticking points where the Cathars were diametrically opposed to the Catholic Church. Since these differences were so great, it is understandable that the inquisitors made the Cathars' spiritual leaders suffer the consequences. Unlike the *sermo generalis*, the matter of these processes focused on Cathar dogma, i.e. faith content vis-à-vis actions. Charges that emerged in all three cases are: belief in two Gods, believing that the creation of all visible things was done by the bad God, asserting that one can only be saved by the Church of Jesus Christ (the Church

---

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 850-851.

of the Cathars), condemnation of carnal marriage, and arguing that the confession of sins performed in front of priests is of no value. There were also a number of reprimands that occurred in two of the three cases, namely the denial of the Eucharist, asserting that baptism in physical water is of no value, denying that Jesus Christ rose from the dead, denying that Maria was a physical person and that God entered her womb, and denying that human bodies will resurrect on the Day of Judgement. Obviously, these men had performed (or failed to perform) physical actions for which they were punished, such as refusing to strike a cross. However, one can see that a significant proportion of the indictments focus on the sacraments, or rather having a wrong view of them. The content of their trials is more about non-tangible matters such as their theology and the accompanying sacraments, which were diametrically opposed to that of the Catholic Church. Given the threat these beliefs posed to the hitherto infallible position of the Catholic Church, it is not surprising that the inquisitors decided to have the three heretics in question removed from this earth's surface (with the help of secular governing bodies because they were not allowed to hand out death sentences themselves). The Catholic Church had a spiritual monopoly and it was unwilling to share it with any other interpretation of the faith. Returning to the historiographical debate of agency versus historical circumstances, the explanation is twofold. On the one hand, as Given and Arnold have argued, the inquisitors can be seen making personal choices, and they possessed the power to impose a particular narrative on someone brought before them in which that person's fate was largely sealed beforehand. On the other hand, as Sullivan and Given have argued, within this framework of power, inquisitors could not do without the cooperation of secular governing bodies, especially in the case of death penalties.

## Conclusion

Based on the sources studied, a thesis can be drawn up of what offence people received what punishment for, and what was comparatively a big mistake for the inquisitors. One can tell that the *sermo* of 7 March presented several dozen of religious violators that received punishment for their actions. However, of those culprits, very few were extremely guilty. One can tell so by the fact that the vast majority of punishments handed out was imprisonment, but of those who received this punishment, very few had to go to *murus strictus* (strict prison in solitary confinement). Looking at the quantitative analysis of the *perfecti*, one can see straight away the biggest difference between them and *credentes*: the *perfecti* were interrogated and punishment on the basis of substantially different faults than the Cathar followers, as the first were punished based on their Cathar theology, e.g. denial of the sacraments, their dualistic worldview (belief in two Gods). The latter, on the other hand, were punished because of their actions, such as providing Cathar leaders with food and eating with them. So the *credentes* were punished on the basis of their actions, whereas the *perfecti* were penalized based on their dogmatic doctrines. Knowing this, it is quite understandable why the inquisitors used *sermones generales* and *sermones speciales*: the content of both processes was completely different.

Concerning the *credentes*, a number of types of offences were punished extra harshly by the inquisitors, frequency being the first. People who not only gravely but also frequently deviated into heresy were given prison sentences, while people who only gravely deviated into heresy had to wear crosses. In addition, lying was punished extra harshly, since of those who had to wear crosses, those persons who had lied, had to wear four crosses instead of two. Of those who received imprisonment, the inquisitors

additionally tell why Adhémar and Petrona had to go to the *murus strictus*. This was the case because these two individuals had not only frequently and gravely deviated into heresy; in addition, they had also abused the grace previously given to them, by falling into acts of heresy.

One can see the inquisitors found the theology of the Waldensians objectionable, on the basis of the treatment of Jean Brayssan. Despite being about Jean Brayssan, the *sermo* makes it clear that the condemnation is not so much about him as a person but the Waldensian theology. In other words: had it been another person holding the same thoughts, the inquisitors would have likely treated him (or her) the same way and presented him in the same manner. The inquisitors had to give him disproportionate attention because it appeared that he was an educated and intelligent heretic, compared to the other Cathar *credentes* in the *sermo*. With this taught theology different from that of the Catholics, he formed an interesting target for the inquisitors.

In somewhat similar fashion to Jean Brayssan, the three *perfecti* covered in this thesis were treated in a *sermo specialis*. Just like Brayssan, these men were educated in their deviant belief and they were persistent in it. One can tell so by the fact that they referred to Bible passages multiple times. In the period under discussion, it is a sign of intelligence that one can read the Bible in the first place, and that one is able to link Biblical stories to contemporary phenomena, as they did. Because of this knowledge and these skills, in comparison, these men received significantly more attention than the Cathar believers. The fact that they were learned in their deviant doctrines made them a danger to the infallible theological and societal position of the Catholic Church. From this perspective, it is understandable why the *perfecti* were tried separately and received extensive attention. The inquisitors, as representatives appointed by the Catholic Church, were by no means willing to divide the spoils. There was to some extent a dialogue

where the inquisitors told what beliefs the Cathar in question stood behind, but this was purely formal and didactic. In all this, the inquisitors knew they disagreed with the *perfectus*, and they knew they wanted to give him the death penalty. Anyway, in all this, the inquisitors were dependent on local governing bodies, as they were not allowed to give death sentences themselves. The inquisitors can thus be seen making personal choices (agency), but at the same time, within this historical configuration of power, they depended on the collaboration of secular authorities to carry out their functions effectively (historical circumstances), in particular in the case of death sentences.

All these phenomena, including the differentiations in punishment distribution and the separate trial of *perfecti*, shows that the inquisitors were learned people aware of their agency. This notion is reinforced by the fact that the inquisitors did not unexpectedly have the *perfecti* killed themselves. They were aware of the limits of their power, and knew that they depended on the cooperation of the secular governing bodies when it came to death sentences.

For follow-up research, it would be interesting to cover more *sermones* through the same format. Each *sermo* examined in this way (looking at what punishments people received for which fault) will tell us more about how Gui and d'Ablis proceeded and what were major faults for them. In addition, it would be interesting to draw up a comparative study between the inquisitors' trial of Cathar *perfecti* and Waldensians like Jean Brayssan. This thesis showed that there were similarities in the two types of trials, but the space available for this essay was not sufficient to establish a hypothesis on this.

# Bibliography

## Primary sources

J. Duvernoy, *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier, évêque de Pamiers* (Paris 1978).

Gui, B., *Le livre des sentences de l'inquisiteur Bernard Gui, 1308-1323*, trans. A. Pales-Gobilliard (Paris 2002).

Limborch, Philippi a, *Historia Inquisitionis. : Cui subjungitur Liber sententiarum inquisitionis Tholosanæ, ab anno Christi MDCCCVII ad annum MDCCCXXIII* (Amsterdam 1692).

## Secondary sources

Arnold, J.H., *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Pennsylvania 2001).

Biller, P., 'Cathars and the Material World', *Studies in Church History* vol.46 (2010) 89-110.

Biller, P., 'Goodbye to Catharism?' in: A. Sennis ed., *Cathars in Question* (Martlesham 2016) 274-313.

Brenon, A., 'Père Autier (c. 1245-1310). Le bon homme cathare de la dernière chance?', *Archives Ariégoises* Vol. 1 (2009) 63-92.

Caldwell Ames, C., *Righteous Persecution: Inquisition, Dominicans, and Christianity in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia 2009).

Gabriel, A., *The Waldensian Dissent: Persecution and Survival, c.1170-c.1570* (Cambridge 1999).

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

Hill, D., *Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century: The Manuals of Bernard Gui and Nicholas Eymerich* (Martlesham 2019).

Kienzle, B., 'The Clash Between Catholics and Cathars over Veneration of the Cross' in: W. van Asselt, P. van Geest, D. Müller, T. Salemink eds., *Iconoclasm and Iconoclasm : Struggle for Religious Identity*, in: *Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series Vol.14* (2007) 263-278,

Kienzle, B., 'Introduction', in *The Sermon*, ed. B. Kienzle, *Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental*, 81-83 (2000) 141-74.

Kras, P., *The system of the inquisition in medieval Europe*, trans. M. Panz-Sochacka (Lausanne 2020).

Kieckhefer, R., 'The Office of Inquisition and Medieval Heresy: The Transition from Personal to Institutional Jurisdiction,' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (1995) 36-61.

Kirsch, J., *The Grand Inquisitors Manual: A History of Terror in the Name of God* (San Francisco 2008).

Lea, H.C., *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (New York 1887).

Lea, H.C., *A history of the Inquisition of Spain* (London 1906).

Lerner, R.E., *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (Berkeley and London 1972).

Moore, R.I., *The War on Heresy* (Cambridge 2012).

Netanyahu, B., *The Origins of the Inquisition In Fifteenth Century Spain* (New York 1995).

Nieto-Isabel, D.I., 'Introduction All but Marginal: The Co-Constructions of Otherness in the Middle Ages' in: L.M. Milian and D.I. Nieto-Isabel eds., *Living on the Edge: Transgression, Exclusion, and Persecution in the Middle Ages* (Boston 2022) 3-22.

Pegg, M.G., *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle for Christendom* (Oxford 2008).

Pegg, M.G., *The Corruption of Angels: The Great Inquisition of 1245-1246* (Princeton 2005).

Peters, E., *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe* (Pennsylvania 1980).

Peters, E., *Inquisition* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1989).

Peters, E., "Prison before the Prison: The Ancient and Medieval Worlds" in: N. Morris, D.J. Rothman eds., *Oxford History of the Prison* (Oxford 1995).

Sullivan, K., *The Inner Lives of Medieval Inquisitors* (Chicago 2011).

Vacandard, E., *The Inquisition: A Critical and Historical Study of the Coercive Power of the Church* (New York 1908). For an online graph, see: The Universal Cyclopedia -

Condemnations of the Inquisitor Bernard Gui 1308-1323,  
<https://www.universalcompendium.com/tables/rel/gui.htm> (used 4 April 2025).

# Appendix A: Sermon of March 7 Quantitative Analysis



Sermon%20of%207%  
20March%201316%20

## Appendix B: Sentence against Jean Brayssan

“In the name of the lord Jesus Christ, amen. We, Brother Bernard and Brother Geoffroy the aforesaid inquisitors and Pierre Dellac official of Toulouse the said commissioner: since it has been clearly and legitimately proven to us in court by witnesses received in inquisition as well as by those things we have seen and heard from your own mouth, which we have diligently examined in accordance with the office of inquisition entrusted to us, that you, Jean Brayssan son of the late Poncet Baudet, arrested and apprehended in that heresy which is called the sect of the Waldensians or Poor of Lyons, which the holy Roman Church the mother and teacher of all has long since condemned as heretical and as such persecutes and condemns; that you many years ago began to serve and maintain the heretical sect, and you continue to serve, maintain, approve, and praise the same. The deviant adherents and profane servitors of this sect, of whose number you confessed yourself to be one, falsely and impiously teach that they are not subject to the Roman pontiff nor the prelates of the Roman Church, asserting that they cannot be excommunicated by the same Roman pontiff or by other prelates of the Church, nor that they ought to obey the pope or Roman pontiff who orders the adherents of the sect to leave and abjure it as a sect damned by the Church; indeed they boldly assert that the same holy Roman Church sins and acts against them unlawfully and unjustly in persecuting and condemning them. Item, the sect and heresy boldly teaches and maintains that all oaths without any exceptions are prohibited by God, and are illicit and sinful. And we have heard from your very mouth that you believe and maintain this, applying the words of the Holy Gospel and Saint James the Apostle, but in a twisted sense, since according to the sound doctrine of the saints and doctors of the Church, and the faith and tradition of the same holy catholic Church, an oath may be taken legally and fittingly for the purpose of asserting the truth in a court; and against the aforesaid error the Church has long since decreed that if people on account of this damnable superstition refuse to swear, they are to be judged heretics and smitten with the penalties proclaimed in the canons. Item, you have frequently in the presence of many people, canonically required by us to swear to tell the truth, refused to do so; you have always refused and still, in the presence of the entire populace, refuse. Item, from the same turbulent and fetid font of error and twisted understanding you and your fellows erroneously assert that all judgment is prohibited by God and that therefore it is a sin and against God’s prohibition to be a judge in any case whatsoever and for any cause whatsoever to judge a man to be punished or put to death, understanding in this sense the words of the Holy Gospel where it is written, Judge not lest you be judged, without the due exposition of these words, neither understanding them nor receiving them as the Holy Roman Church soundly understands them and entrusts them to its faithful according to the

canonical sanctions, which canonical sanctions the sect neither receives nor thinks to have any force, but spurns, denigrates, and contemns. Item, objecting to the sacrament of penance they say, maintain, and teach that they have the power from God alone, just as the Apostles had it, of hearing the confessions of sin of the men and women who believe in them and wish to confess to them; and they hear the confessions of such people and enjoin on those confessing to them penances for their sins, even though those who hear these confessions are not ordained by the Church and are neither priests nor clerics but laymen, not do they acknowledge but rather deny that they have this power from the Roman Church, when in reality they have it neither from God nor from the Church since they are outside the Church and indeed cut off from that Church, outside of which there is no true penance or salvation. Item, the sect of Waldensians asserts that the indulgences decreed by the prelates of the Roman Church are without value. Item, it denies that there is a purgatory after this life and consequently asserts that prayers and pious acts done by the faithful for the dead have no effect. Item, the sect in many other things concerning its way of life and its customs differs from the common behaviour of the faithful, as has frequently been revealed and made manifest to us by the confessions of many converts from that sect and heresy and by other things learned through inquisition. The sect and heresy of the Waldensians you in our presence, both in court and elsewhere, have often approved and praised, and you still approve and commend it, nor do you wish to leave or set it aside, but rather persevere in it with a pertinacious spirit although you have often been requested by us and many other good men, and warned canonically and judicially required by us to abandon that sect both in heart and deed and abjure it with your mouth and mind. Therefore, because you do not wish to convert from that sect and heresy and return to the unity of the Church, although the longer we waited for you to do this the more you persisted in your perfidy with an obdurate spirit: We, the aforesaid inquisitors and commissioner, having taken counsel of many wise men, both regulars and seculars, skilled in both canon law and civil law, lest as a sick sheep you further infect the healthy sheep of the Lord's flock, we, with God and the purity of the orthodox faith before our eyes, and with the Holy Gospels of God placed before us, that our judgment may be in accordance with the divine will and our eyes may behold His justice, sitting as a tribunal by this definitive sentence set down here in writing, declare and pronounce you, Jean, present in court on this day and in this place assigned to you peremptorily by us in accordance with the authority with which we are endowed to hear your definitive sentence, to be a heretic of the sect of Waldensians or Poor of Lyons, and we relinquish you as an impenitent and obstinate heretic to the secular court, assiduously asking the same that it preserve your life and limbs as the canonical sanctions urge; saving the fact that, if you wish to turn from the sect and heresy and convert, and return to the unity of the Church, you will preserve your life; in which case we retain for ourselves the full and free power of imposing on you for the deeds you have committed in the sect and heresy so often mentioned above a penalty and salutary penance.

This sentence was decreed along with the preceding in the year, day,

and place, and in the presence and with the assistance of those named in the beginning of the present sermon whose end is here.

And I, Jacques Marquès rector of the church of Saint Peter of Anicio in the diocese of Albi, notary of the office of the inquisition, was present at the imposition of all the preceding penances and sentences, and graces, and other acts performed in the present sermon; and I received them and here with my own hand I have subscribed them and marked them with my sign.

And I, Pierre de Claviers, public notary of Toulouse, sworn to the office of the inquisition, was present for all the acts, imposition of penances, and decrees of sentences in the present sermon; and at the command of the religious man, Brother Bernad Gui, inquisitor of Toulouse, I have written down and engrossed them in the present book of penances, and signed them with my accustomed sign.”