**Historical Background**

Between 1 May 1245 and 1 August 1246, 5,471 (“over five thousand?”) people from the Lauragais — a slim fertile plain in what is now southern France — were summoned to Toulouse by the Dominican inquisitors Bernart de Caux and Jean [or Jo[h]an] de Saint Pierre.[[1]](#footnote-1) They were interrogated in the abbey of the church of Saint-Sernin about heresy.[[2]](#footnote-2) They were questioned if they had ever seen, heard, or interacted with heretics. Some memories were no older than two weeks, a few were more than half a century. Unlike the Spanish and Roman Inquisitions of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the medieval inquisitions into heretical depravity were not institutions (and are not to be capitalized). It was only in 1231 and 1233 that Pope Gregory IX called upon Dominicans to root out the serpent of heresy in the lands of the count of Toulouse by inquisitones heretice pravitatis. The “great inquisition” of 1245-1246 — in which the largest number of men, women, and children were questioned in any investigation in the Middle Ages — provides invaluable insight into the ways in which ordinary medieval people lived and thought about their lives.

Four decades before the great inquisition, the papal legate and Cistercian, Peire de Castelnau, was murdered as he was about to cross the Rhône River on 14 January 1208.[[3]](#footnote-3) On 10 March 1208 Pope Innocent III accused Raimon VI, count of Toulouse, of complicity in the assassination.[[4]](#footnote-4) Considering that less than a year before the assassination Peire de Castelnau, Raimon VI was excommunicated by the pope for refusing to suppress heresy, the notion that he was somehow complicit in the assassination was not a particularly far-fetched one. Innocent III, convinced that Raimon VI aided the killer of Peire de Castelnau, declared a crusade against the count and the heretics infesting his lands.[[5]](#footnote-5)

The crusade, now known as the “Albigensian Crusade,” against the heretics and the nobles between the Garonne and Rhône Rivers began in July 1209 when a large, mostly northern French, army gathered at Lyon, before coming south.[[6]](#footnote-6) The ensuing crusade was a violent and bloody conflict lasting two decades. At the battle of Beziers on 21 July 1209 an estimated 15,000 people were slaughtered, and the city was burned to the ground.[[7]](#footnote-7) Early in September 1209, Raimon VI, who had successfully diverted the conflict away from Toulouse by reconciling himself with the Church on 18 July 18 1209 received a delegation sent by Simon de Montfort (who had become the lay leader of the crusade) and Arnaud Amalric (the papal legate and abbot of Cîteaux) ordering him to hand over all heretics living in Toulouse for judgement.[[8]](#footnote-8) Raimon VI refused, and was later excommunicated for a second time.[[9]](#footnote-9) Simon de Montfort, believing that he could rightfully seize the lands of any excommunicated man, invaded Toulouse in June of 1211. Though, he found it difficult to conquer Toulouse, he swiftly took the lands surrounding the city.[[10]](#footnote-10) Pere II of Aragon, who had grown increasingly concerned over the violence directly to his north, tried to broker a peace agreement between Raimon VI, the pope, and the crusaders. He did not succeed in securing Raimon VI a peace agreement with the pope, but he did make a truce with Raimon VI and other southern French nobles, which had the effect of isolating Toulouse from the rest of the French regnum.[[11]](#footnote-11) Simon de Montfort found Toulouse to be a much more difficult city to conquer than he had anticipated, and on 25 June 1218 he was killed by a rock that had been flung from a catapulted operated by a group of little girls.[[12]](#footnote-12) By 1224 it appeared that the Toulousains had successfully driven out the northern intruders from their borders.[[13]](#footnote-13) For a time it seemed as though life in the Languedoc region had gone back to normal. This period of relative independence and normalcy would not last for long, however.

On 30 November 1225, 14 archbishops, 113 bishops, and 150 abbots met in Bourges to excommunicate Raimon VII, Raimon VI’s son, who had managed to fend off the northern invader’s from his father’s lands, and committed to continuing the crusade.[[14]](#footnote-14) Following the death of Louis VIII in on 8 November 1226, the crusade became a war of attrition under the leadership of the late king’s cousin, Imbert de Beaujeu.[[15]](#footnote-15) Raimon VII was left heavily in debt and fighting an increasingly unsuccessful battle against the French crown.[[16]](#footnote-16) When he was offered the chance to make peace with the Church and the Crown in 1229, he gladly accepted.[[17]](#footnote-17) On 12 April 1229, the Peace of Paris was signed, and the Albigensian crusade finally came to a close after two decades of fighting. In exchange for peace, Raimon VII swore submission to the Church and Louis IX, agreed dismiss all mercenaries and remove any Jews in his service, and promised to confiscate the property of anyone who remained excommunicated for more than a year. He also had to forfeit a lot of land, and gave his daughter’s hand in marriage to one of the king’s brothers.[[18]](#footnote-18) Finally, Raimon VII and his local magistrates were required to ardently try and eliminate heresy in Languedoc. All subjects of Raimon VII and Louis IX in the south had to take an oath aid the Church in the pursuit of heresy.[[19]](#footnote-19)

However, the years between the signing of Peace of Paris in 1229 and the beginning of the Great Inquisition in 1245 did not end up being particularly peaceful. The 1240s, in particular, saw many rebellions in the south against the new order imposed after the Albigensian Crusade. In 1240, the vescomte of Beziers staged a coup against Louis IX’s nobles in the Carcasses, but was quickly thwarted.[[20]](#footnote-20) In 1242, Raimon VII allied with the count of La Marche and Henry III, the king of England, to fight the French crown. The campaign was a resounding failure for Raimon VII, and he surrendered that same year.[[21]](#footnote-21) However, possibly the most consequential act of rebellion by disgruntled Occitans, was the murder of Dominican inquisitor Guilhem Arnaut and the Franciscan Esteve de Saint-Thibery at Avignonet in 1242.[[22]](#footnote-22) Raimon VII was not explicitly accused of being complicit in the murders at Avignonet, unlike his father was with Peire Castelnau’s murder 34 years earlier, but the murder did cause him and his local officials to begin systematically cracking down on heresy in Toulouse.[[23]](#footnote-23) Prior to the Albigensian Crusade, the local bayles of Toulouse were remembered as being indifferent, sympathetic, or even supportive of heretics. After the crusade, their attitude towards heresy became less sympathetic, but the Avignonet incident was the turning point that caused the local bayles to begin vigorously pursuing heresy.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Having the support of the local bayles would prove to be important for Bernart de Caux and Jean de Saint-Pierre, as well as other Dominican inquisitors. They required the support of the local magistrates to be able to carry out their inquisitions, but they also received most of their funding from the goods confiscated from convicted heretics by the local officials. When property confiscation was imposed on people convicted of heresy, the confiscated goods did not go directly to the Church. Rather, the confiscated property would first go to the local lord of the convicted heretic, then the lord would endow some of that property to the inquisitors.[[25]](#footnote-25) Given the decades that Toulousain nobles spent resisting the Church’s campaigns against heresy, the fact that Bernart de Caux and Jean de Saint-Pierre began their questioning on 1 May 1245 with the support of the local government is emblematic of just how much the medieval world had changed given the course of the Albigensian Crusade and the years that followed.
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**Description of Manuscript**

Anecdote

During earlier inquisitions undertaken in Lauragais, inquisitors would travel from town to town, summoning the townsfolk to their local parishes to conduct the inquisitions. Bernart de Caux and Jean de Saint-Pierre, however, did the opposite. The Dominicans set up shop in the Saint-Sernin Abbey and summoned the villagers in the surrounding area to it. They were thus able to conduct the inquisition in just one familiar location, rather than travel to lots of different small parishes.[[26]](#footnote-26) This change was prompted by the murders of Guilhem Arnaut and Esteve de Saint-Thibéry at Avignonet in 1242. The two Dominican inquisitors thought that traveling through the Lauragais was far too risky and decided to stay put instead.[[27]](#footnote-27)

Two years after the inquisitions at Saint-Sernin, Bernart de Caux and Jean de Saint-Pierre wrote down their procedure for conducting the inquisition in a pamphlet now known as the *Processus inquisitionis*.[[28]](#footnote-28) The pamphlet began by dictating that the first thing inquisitors should do before conducting an inquisition is to find a safe location to carry out their inquisition – a recommendation certainly inspired by the Avignonet murders.[[29]](#footnote-29) After a safe location was chosen, the friar-inquisitors would give a sermon and read letters from the pope authorizing them to conduct the investigation in their chosen space. The sermon was given in front of an assembly of people, including lay-people and clergy, and was partially intended to help convert heretics in the audience.[[30]](#footnote-30) After the sermon came the summons. Those that had attended the sermon were summoned orally on the spot, and those that had not attended the sermon were summoned by letter.[[31]](#footnote-31) The summons letter would be sent to either a particular village or an individual person.[[32]](#footnote-32) Summons that were sent to whole villages would summon every man over the age of 14 and woman over the age of 12, which were the ages of majority generally accepted within Toulousain society and also within the Church.[[33]](#footnote-33) The summons ushered in a period of time known as the *tempus gratie sive indulgentie*, a sort of grace period where those who voluntarily came forward before the inquisitors and truthfully testified in front of them would be spared imprisonment.[[34]](#footnote-34) However, in the end only two people actually took the inquisitors up on their grace period by coming forward during the *tempus gratie*.[[35]](#footnote-35) Finally, every man and woman who did not appear before the friar-inquisitors during the *tempus gratie* was marched down to Saint-Sernin to give their testimony. There was no excuse for not coming down to Saint-Sernin either. Whereas previously inquisitors would make exceptions for the pregnant or infirm, Bernart de Caux and Jean de Saint-Pierre demanded that even they make the trip – a trip that could oftentimes take most of the day.[[36]](#footnote-36)

During an inquisition trial, the person being questioned would begin by abjuring all heresy and swearing to tell the truth to their inquisitors. Then the inquisitor would begin the questioning. The first question always asked was “[d]id you ever see a good man or good woman?”[[37]](#footnote-37) After that question was out of the way, the inquisitors would ask about their actions and interactions regarding heretics. Deponents were asked questions such as: “Did you ever give food to heretics” or “Did you ever give heretics lodging?”[[38]](#footnote-38) Possibly the most common question, however, was: “Did you ever adore heretics?” The deponent would give their answers, and the questioning would stop once the inquisitor felt that the deponent had truthfully admitted to the extent of their involvement in heresy. Oftentimes, a trial would end when the deponent answered no to the question “[d]id you ever see a good man or good woman?”[[39]](#footnote-39) During the course of a trial, a scribe transcribed the whole deposition.

Very few medieval heresy deposition documents survived into the modern era. The original deposition manuscript transcribed during the great inquisition was, unfortunately, lost. Luckily for us, however, the original documents were copied by Dominican inquisitors Guilhem Bernart de Dax and Renaud de Chartres sometime between October 1258 and August 1263.[[40]](#footnote-40) This copy has miraculously survived all these years, and has been stored at the municipal library of Toulouse since 1790.[[41]](#footnote-41) The collection of inquisitorial documents is today known as manuscript (MS) 609 and stands as the most complete document we have from the early medieval inquisitions into heresy. The manuscript is made up of 260 folios, which were made by bifoliating 70 sheets of paper that were made from linen and cotton rags.[[42]](#footnote-42) This manuscript one of the oldest paper manuscripts from Europe.[[43]](#footnote-43) Although the copied manuscript that survived today was produced on paper, the original document was written on parchment. Scholars in the Middle Ages frequently called paper’s morality into question. Peter the Venerable, for example, considered paper to be “ethically vile” in the twelfth century.[[44]](#footnote-44) The choice to use parchment in inquisitorial proceedings rather than paper was likely because parchment was simply the more practical choice. Parchment is thicker and more durable, which means that mistakes can be scratched out more easily.[[45]](#footnote-45) The ability to scratch out mistakes would have been indispensable for a scribe trying to write down countless depositions a day as quickly as possible. Parchment can also be recycled into a palimpsest and used again later by scratching away the original writing, whereas paper was a single use material.[[46]](#footnote-46)

The manuscript was written by at least two scribes, who had an obvious fondness for abbreviations, paragraphs, and relatively modern punctuation.[[47]](#footnote-47) Each folio had a title at the top with the name of the local parish that was being questioned.[[48]](#footnote-48) Significantly, the protocols that dictated the legality of these documents were recorded during the copying.[[49]](#footnote-49) The testimonies were initially written by the scribe or notary, then witnessed by him and another person, then received legal authorization when the testimony was rewritten by the same scribe or notary and signed.[[50]](#footnote-50) The person being question then allowed their testimony to become a public record when the document was notarized.[[51]](#footnote-51)

The copy of the original manuscript that survives today only comprises two of the ten books that Bernart de Caux and Jean Saint-Pierre originally compiled.[[52]](#footnote-52) What information could we be missing from those eight books is impossible to say, and makes analyzing the folios that remain as a comprehensive source on the Great Inquisition difficult. Analyzing MS 609 and trying to draw meaningful conclusions inevitably begs the question “is it ethical to draw conclusions from incomplete sources,” but unfortunately such is the case with pre-early modern sources.

Over 750 years after the inquisition of 1245-1246 was conducted in the verandahs of Saint-Sernin, the depositions have been copied once again, and without the use of paper *or* parchment this time. As part of his doctoral thesis, Jean Paul Rehr, a technology executive turned medieval history PhD candidate, has been encoding MS 609 using XML-TEI, a markup language specifically designed to handle the encoding of texts used in the digital humanities field. Rehr’s work is nothing short of extraordinary. He has not only encoded these depositions into XML and uploaded them onto his website for anyone to access, but in each deposition he has included a ton of extractable metadata. For example, if a deponent stated that they adored heretics in someone’s home or believed that the heretics were good men and women, the identifying pieces of information in this deposition would be tagged. In this example, the event location would be tagged as “#home\_of\_[homeowner's name],” and the belief type would be tagged as “pos\_bonos\_homines”.[[53]](#footnote-53) When extracted and analyzed this metadata has the potential to provide historians with an abundance of information that could not be revealed through a close reading alone. MS 609 is a document that is uniquely suited for a quantitative analysis. The depositions in this document are rich, colorful, and varied, but also very formulaic. Most depositions longer than a sentence takes has a similar structure. These depositions include events, the dates these events took place, what the deponent believed, and how long they held these beliefs for. The formulaic nature of MS 609 allows for these depositions to be broken down into parts that can then be analyzed. That is not to say that a close reading of the manuscript cannot provide any useful information, on the contrary a close reading of the manuscript is crucial before undertaking any kind of quantitative approach, but it is a document that is well suited to the digital humanities.

**Historiography**

If there was one word that could sum up the recent historiography surrounding the existence of Cathars it would be *contentious*. Since the publication of Mark Pegg’s *The Corruption of Angels* in 2001, medieval historians have been locked in a low-stakes civil war over whether or not the Cathars–a supposed medieval dualist sect with roots in ancient Manichaeism–ever really existed. The non-believers are led by Pegg and R.I. Moore, and the believers are led John Arnold and Peter Biller. These brave men have been waging their battles in academic journals, where the weapons of choice are footnotes and hurtful words, for the past 17 years. Fortunately, there have been no casualties so far. Although the entire conflict is a perfect example of Sayre’s law, which states that the intensity of an academic conflict is inversely proportional to the actual importance of the conflict, the notion that Cathars never actually existed calls into question over a century of accepted medieval historiography.

The modern study of Catharism began in the nineteenth century with French theologian Charles Schmidt’s 1849 book *Histoire et doctrines de la secte des cathares ou albigeois*. It was the first scholarship on Catharism that was based on a review of primary sources, and has continued to shape the study of heresy ever since.[[54]](#footnote-54) Schmidt concluded that Cathars were a part of a single dualist movement that included the Bogomils in the East.[[55]](#footnote-55) The German scholarship produced on the subject in the late nineteenth century, was heavily influenced by the *Religionsgeschichte* school of thought. This school of thought took a “religious-historical” approach to studying Cathars. *Religionsgeschichte* scholars were preoccupied with trying to find connections between different belief systems. These scholars believed that coincidences did not exist when it came to religion. If beliefs were similar across two different religions, then there must be an ideological connection between the two. This historical-religious school took a scientific approach to studying history, believing that just as natural scientists come to their conclusions based on objective observation, so too should a historian make conclusions based on empirical research. In short, the *Religionsgeschichte* school saw the study of religious history as one that could find some sort of universal truth.[[56]](#footnote-56) Johann Joseph Ignaz, a scholar who was influenced by *Religionsgeschichte*, published his history on Catharism and Waldensianism in 1890 and concluded that Catharism was a world religion that was descended from Gnosticism and Manichaeism.[[57]](#footnote-57) Herbert Grundmann similarly applied *Religionsgeschichte* principles to the study of medieval heresy in his 1935 book, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*. Grundmann compared “the beliefs of individual heretics, wandering preachers, early mendicants and specific religious women in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,” and came to the conclusion that each of these groups were motivated by the drive to adopt an ‘apostolic life.’[[58]](#footnote-58) Grundmann believed that religion had innate quality that was suitable for comparative study and objective conclusions.[[59]](#footnote-59) Grundmann's work on Catharism, and late nineteenth and early twentieth German scholarship on Catharism more generally, proved to be very influential on the study of medieval heresy.

For over a century the belief that Cathars were an organized religious group rooted in Manichaeism, with vague connections to the East went unchallenged. The scholarship that was produced for most of the twentieth century merely replicated the findings of the *Religionsgeschichte* school. Arno Borst’s influential 1953 book *Die Katharer* simply reaffirmed Grundmann’s findings. Borst, who at one time was Grundmann’s assistant, conducted his research by studying writings by Latin Christian intellectuals written between the eleventh and thirteenth century. Borst found an abundance of records of Catharism, because he decided that any reference to “heretics,” “Manichaeans,” “Paterenes,” “Arians,” and other vague references to dualism, were unambiguous references to Cathars.[[60]](#footnote-60) While European schools were reproducing nineteenth century scholarship on heresy, the English-speaking world was ignoring religious history altogether. From the late nineteenth century until the late twentieth century, English-speaking historians were unconcerned with religious history, medieval or otherwise. When British historian, and former Benedictine monk, David Knowles gave his 1968 lecture on trends in medieval scholarship, he referred to constitutional history as the ‘pride in place’ of English scholarship and made little reference to the study of religion.[[61]](#footnote-61) Similarly, when American historian Joseph Strayer gave a lecture on the future of medieval history in the United States in 1971, he warned his audience: “We should never forget we began as antiquarians and we could end again as antiquarians.”[[62]](#footnote-62) Strayer did not see religion as being a part of the future of American medieval scholarship. For most of the twentieth century, religion and heresy were largely ignored by English-speaking medieval scholars. Scholars that did address religion and heresy, such as R.I. Moore in his 1971 book *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, did not question the existence of Cathars.[[63]](#footnote-63)

The first real challenge to the widespread acceptance of the existence of Catharism came in 2001 with Mark Pegg’s book *The Corruption of Angels*. Most of the scholarship produced on Catharism is based on documents written by Latin intellectuals. Rather than study documents produced by Latin intellectuals in the words of Latin intellectuals, Pegg opted instead to study MS 609 to produce *The Corruption of Angels.* Because MS 609 is one of the few surviving records of people accused of heresy by the Latin Church in the thirteenth century recounting their beliefs, it is an important, and strangely underutilized, record in the study of medieval heresy. Pegg concluded that although it was widely accepted at the time that Cathars were a dualist sect that was descended from the ancient world’s Manichaeans, with connections to Bogomils and Paulicians in the East, the actual evidence for a Cathar church is scant.[[64]](#footnote-64) He claimed that the word Cathar has been used in modern scholarship to describe any group of people with dualist ideas, and has been erroneously applied to the good men and good women of Languedoc that were accused of heresy during the inquisition of 1245-1246.[[65]](#footnote-65) Pegg argues that the notion of a Cathar church was a fabrication of the nineteenth century, and the notion of a widespread Languedocian heresy was a fabrication of Latin intellectuals in the eleventh century.[[66]](#footnote-66) He has pointed to the fact that very few people accused of heresy in the Middle Ages were actually called ‘Cathars,’ and that “no one accused of heresy or identifying as a heretic in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries between the Garonne and Rhône rivers, the supposed heartland of Catharism” were ever called Cathars.[[67]](#footnote-67) Pegg has repeatedly criticized the methodologies that he believes gave rise to the mistaken belief in the existence in Catharism. He criticized *Religionsgeschichte*, and historical-religious schools more broadly, for the “flimsy methodological and philosophical assumption that if two ideas look alike to a historian, then there must a link between them.”[[68]](#footnote-68) Furthermore, Pegg has claimed that not only is Catharism a fabrication by nineteenth century scholarship, but the notion of a heresy of ‘good men’ and ‘good women’ in Languedoc was a fabrication by thirteenth century Latin intellectuals. He believes that the inquisitors in Toulouse mistook local traditions of courtliness for acts of heresy. For example, he claims that the comfort dying lords received was often perceived as ‘heretication,’ and what inquisitors perceived as ‘adoration’ was merely local courtesy that they were unfamiliar with.[[69]](#footnote-69) Pegg argues by looking at local traditions as heretical acts, the Church was able to invent a heretical liturgy. However, this hypothesis is, at times, a bit of a stretch. In *The Corruption of Angels*, for example, Pegg claims that oftentimes the reason people had to bend down while saying “bless us” to the good men and women, an act that the inquisitors perceived as adoration of heresy, was because door frames were often too short, which forced people to bend down.[[70]](#footnote-70) I have a hard time believing that inquisitors were unable to understand the difference between bending down to get through a doorway and bending down to sin. However, as Pegg rightly pointed out, there are no records that survived which outline a heretical liturgy, so it could be entirely possible that inquisitors mistook local traditions for codified heretical worship. Which brings us to Pegg’s strongest point: there are there are almost no known documents written before the thirteenth century that were actually written by the supposed Cathars.[[71]](#footnote-71)

Although for many *The Corruption of Angels* ended the Cathar debate in the anglophone world, Pegg is not without his detractors.[[72]](#footnote-72) Biller and Arnold criticized Pegg’s interpretation of MS 609. Biller did not accept Pegg’s interpretation of heretic adoration as misinterpreted acts of courtesy by the inquisitors. Biller believes that deponents were describing a complex and structured ritual involving three genuflects.[[73]](#footnote-73) Furthermore, Biller believes that Pegg kept his readers ignorant of an instance where a deponent lied about having engaged in adoratio and claimed to have only bowed his head at the heretics. which would indicate that adoration of heretics was indeed a structured ritual.[[74]](#footnote-74) Similarly, Arnold thinks that it is unlikely that inquisitors would have invented heretical rituals.[[75]](#footnote-75) Another common critique of Pegg’s scholarship is that the scope of his research is too narrow. Biller claims that because Pegg’s research only focuses on one manuscript he does not put MS 609 in its proper historical context with other documents produced around the same time.[[76]](#footnote-76) Arnold compares medieval scholarship to drawing constellations. He claims that because early medievalists have fewer documents to work with, it is like trying to create constellations with fewer stars. Because there is more blackness between documents, it becomes easier to make connections between them and leads to bolder hypotheses with less evidence.[[77]](#footnote-77) Arnold criticized Pegg for only closely looking at one document, MS 609, and treating MS 609 like a pre-1200s document.[[78]](#footnote-78) Arnold posits that Pegg is trying to make a constellation with only one star.[[79]](#footnote-79) By focusing on one document, Biller and Arnold believe that Pegg is unable to see the bigger picture of heresy in the thirteenth century.[[80]](#footnote-80)

While Biller and Arnold make some excellent points regarding problems within the scholarship of Pegg and his cohort of non-believers, there is a glaringly obvious problem with their own scholarship: the complete dearth of sources from Cathars themselves. When I first read Arnold and Biller’s articles, I kept wondering if they had *any* sources on Cathars that were written actually written by the supposed Cathars themselves. If this Cathar Church did have a structured liturgy that spread across Western Europe, why do we not have any documents? Where are the writings from the Cathar pope? Where are the sermons from Cathar bishops? Where is this lost library of texts? To be fair, Biller and Arnold were able to produce a few records supposedly written by Cathars, but I am in agreement with Pegg that these documents are not sufficiently compelling. Making an argument about the existence of Cathars based almost entirely on Latin Church texts would be akin to studying European anti-semitism without reading documents written by Jews. Having read MS 609, I have a difficult time fully believing Pegg’s hypothesis that Dominican inquisitors simply misinterpreted unfamiliar acts of courtesy. However, given that Arnold and Biller are unable to produce any substantial primary source documents written by Cathars themselves, I find it impossible to come to the conclusion that a Cathar liturgy truly existed.

The modern scholarship surrounding Cathars is a little like ghost hunting. There are skeptics and believers, and the believers claim that the skeptics are willfully ignoring evidence, and the skeptics claim that the believers are jumping to conclusions without any outward evidence of the paranormal (or Cathars in this case). Both sides make some great points. Arnold and Biller are correct that there are certain pieces of evidence that Pegg does not give an adequate explanation for. However, in a debate about Cathars, just like in a debate about ghosts, the onus of proof will always be on the believers, and unfortunately for Arnold and Biller their evidence is, at present, unconvincing. While I am not wholly convinced that accusations of heresy were entirely the result of the Latin Church misinterpreting local customs, I am even less convinced that they were a result of Manichaeans who snuck into France. I feel that neither side of the debate has particularly strong evidence, but unfortunately for the believers they need much stronger evidence to prove their point. As long as Pegg can convincingly say “the current evidence for Catharism is not concrete enough,” which I believe he can, then he has won the debate. Pegg, like a skeptic in any field, has the luxury of being able to dismiss the convictions of the believers without offering a better explanation. At the end of the day, I remain unconvinced.

**Methodology**

RESEARCH ABOUT DIGITAL HUMANITIES PRINCIPLES

**Application and Findings NOTE: ## OF ENCODED DEPOSTIONS!!**

Jean-Paul Rehr was a French-Canadian tech executive when he made what might quite possibly the strangest career change of all time. After decades working in the tech sector, Rehr decided to get his PhD in medieval history. As mentioned previously, Rehr’s digital encoding of MS 609 is a remarkable feat in and of itself, but it has much broader implications in the field of medieval history. By making his markup files accessible to download online, he has made it possible for anyone in the world to study MS 609 and to study them in a uniquely quantitative way.

Rehr encoded his digital edition of MS 609 using the Extensible Markup Language-Text Encoding Initiative (XML-TEI), a markup technique commonly used in the digital humanities field. An extraordinary feature of Rehr’s work is the tremendous amount of descriptive data he included in his markup of the depositions. The depositions themselves were originally divided into paragraphs, a remarkably modern feature of the transcriptions, based on new information being presented to inquisitors. For example, a person may have described two separate events involving heretics and then described his or her own beliefs regarding heresy. In this instance, the deposition would be divided into three paragraphs. Rehr encoded these paragraphs by giving each paragraph their own segment tag within the body of the XML. Each segment tag includes the paragraph subtype and a unique XML ID. Rehr classified the paragraphs into three primary subtypes: sightings, events, and beliefs – with events and beliefs being by far the most common subtypes. The following lines are examples of segment tags from the first deposition in MS 609:

<seg type="dep\_event" subtype="event" xml:id="MS609-0001-1">latin deposition</seg>[[81]](#footnote-81)

<seg type="dep\_event" subtype="belief" xml:id="MS609-0001-6">latin deposition</seg>

The latin deposition is then encoded inside the segment tags. However, Rehr did not simply copy and paste the latin text into his XML. Every inch of the latin depositions has been tagged with descriptive information in Rehr’s encoding of MS 609. In the following code snippet from MS 609-0001, which is the XML ID for the first deposition in MS 609, Peire Cap-de-Porc held an event involving heresy in his own home, which was encoded as such:

<placeName type="event\_loc" nymRef="#home\_of\_Cap-de-Porc">domo   
                  <persName nymRef="#Peire\_Cap-de-Porc\_MSP-AU" role="own">Petri de

Sancto Andrea</persName>  
</placeName>

Both the event location and the people involved in events were tagged in this example. Nearly every conceivable piece of descriptive information from the depositions has been tagged in Rehr’s XML documents. Each event’s location, date, and register of people involved has been tagged. Descriptive information associated with people’s confessed beliefs has been similarly tagged. A person who confessed to believing that heretics were good men, had good faith, were truthful, and were friends of God would have their deposition tagged as such:

<seg type="conf" ana="#pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_bonam\_fidem #pos\_veraces #pos\_amicos\_dei">

The dates that the deponent held their beliefs about heretics and the errors that they heard from heretics were also tagged. Rehr’s work is nothing short of remarkable. His encoding of MS 609 is so filled to the brim with descriptive metadata that it has broadened the scope of study for MS 609 and has, thankfully for my sake, made the work of anyone who wants to take a quantitative approach to studying these depositions much easier. (For a longer example of Rehr’s XML, see appendices J and I).[[82]](#footnote-82)

Possibly the biggest challenge I faced during the course of this project was data extraction. To extract the metadata from Rehr’s XML documents, I created three different XSLT stylesheets. Creating three separate stylesheets allowed me to extract data from the three main paragraph subtypes in Rehr’s XML documents: sightings, events, and beliefs. (See Appendices A, B, and C).[[83]](#footnote-83) Within the stylesheets I used a for-each loop to iterate over the paragraph subtypes:

<xsl:for-each select="//tei:body//tei:seg[@subtype='sighting']">

<xsl:for-each select="//tei:body//tei:seg[@subtype='event']">

<xsl:for-each select="//tei:body//tei:seg[@subtype='belief']">

What this essentially means is that in each stylesheet the for-each loop would extract data *for each* of the segment tags with the subtype that corresponded with that stylesheet. In the events stylesheet for example, the for-each loop would ensure that data was only extracted from segment tags where the subtype was labelled as an “event.” Every for-each loop included code that extracted specific data using the XPath of its tags.[[84]](#footnote-84) To extract a segment of a Latin deposition that stated when a specific event took place, I used the following code in the events stylesheet:  
            <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  
            <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  
                <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:date[@type='event\_date'])"/>  
            </xsl:call-template>

In this code segment, the XPath is “tei:date[@type='event\_date'])".” This segment of code indicates that data should be extracted where there is a tag whose type is equal to “event\_date.” I also used XPath to extract the data within tags themselves. To extract the data held inside a tag indicating when an event took place, I used the following code in the events stylesheet:  
            <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  
            <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  
                <xsl:with-param name="select" select="tei:date[@type='event\_date']/@when"/>  
            </xsl:call-template>

In this code segment, the XPath is "tei:date[@type='event\_date']/@when".” This code segment indicates that the information inside a “when” tag should be extracted when there is a data tag whose type is equal to “event\_date.” Using XPath within XSLT stylesheets, I was able to extract a significant amount of data from Rehr’s XML documents. The sightings stylesheet extracted the XML ID of the deposition, the Latin deposition and its English translation, the date of the sighting in Latin and the equivalent numeric date, and the location of the sighting in Latin and its English location tag for every paragraph whose subtype was labelled as a “sighting.” The events stylesheet extracted the exact same information, but extracted it from every paragraph whose subtype was labelled as an “event.” The beliefs stylesheet extracted slightly different data. For every paragraph whose subtype was labelled as a “belief,” the beliefs stylesheet extracted the XML ID of the deposition, the Latin deposition and its English translation, the dates in latin that the deponent’s beliefs began and ended and the equivalent numeric dates, the beliefs that the deponent held about heretics in Latin and the belief tags in English, and the errors that the deponent heard from heretics in Latin and the heard errors tags in English.

To apply the stylesheets to Rehr’s XML documents, I created shell scripts that would output the extracted data to Tab Separated Values (TSV) files. (See Appendices D, E, and F). A shell script is a program that is run using a computer’s command-line interface. The shell scripts I made work by iterating through every XML deposition document and producing a TSV file based on a XSLT stylesheet. The following code sample is the events shell script:

rm exampleOutEVENTS.tsv;  
**for** f **in** MS\*.xml;  
    **do**  
         xmlstarlet tr exampleStylesheetEVENTS.xsl $f >> exampleOutEVENTS.tsv;  
          
          
**done**;

To run the shell scripts I first had to download xmlstarlet, which is a command line XML toolkit that enabled me to apply XSLT stylesheets to XML documents. After running the shell scripts in my computer’s command-line interface, three TSV files were produced that contained the extracted data from the XML documents. I then converted the TSV files into excel workbook files (XLSX), in order to format and analyze the data.[[85]](#footnote-85) Below is a sample of the extracted data from the events spreadsheet:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XML ID** | **Latin Deposition** | **English Translation** | **Latin Date** | **Date** | **Latin Location** | **Location Tag** |
| MS609-0001.xml | Anno Domini MÂ° CCÂ° XLÂ° quinto VI Kalendas Iunii. Arnaldus Garnerii testis iuratus dixit quod vidit in domo Petri de Sancto Andrea Bernardum de Sancto Andrea, fratrem dicti Petri, et socium eius, hereticos. Et vidit ibi cum eis dictum Petrum de Sancto Andrea et uxor dictiPetri. Et ipse testis adoravit ibi dictos hereticos, sed non vidit alios adorare. Et sunt VI anni vel circa. Et quando ipse testis exivitdomum invenit Willelmus de Rozergue intrantem ad dictos hereticos. | The year of our Lord 1245, 6th Kalends of June. The sworn witness Arnald Garnier said that he saw in the house of Peire de Saint-Andrea Bernard de Saint-Andrea - brother of the aforesaid Peire - and his companion, heretics, and he saw there the aforesaid Peire and his wife. The witness adored the aforementioned heretics, but he did not see others adore. This was about 6 years ago. And when the witness left the house he encountered Guilhem de Rosengue coming toward the aforesaid heretics. | sunt VI anni vel circa | 1239 | domo Petri de Sancto Andrea | #home\_of\_Cap-de-Porc |

After extracting Rehr’s XML data, I was left with two spreadsheets­ – one filled with data from paragraphs describing events, the other filled with data from paragraphs describing beliefs – ready for analysis. (See appendices G and H). However, data on its own is not enough. Once my data was extracted and organized into two spreadsheets, I then had to query my data to be able to make sense of it. Querying data simply means to request specific information from a database. For example, if I wanted to select all of the depositions where an event occurred between 1231 and 1243, I would have to query my data to obtain this information. Initially, I had planned on querying my data by uploading my spreadsheets into a Structured Language Query (SQL) database and running queries using the SQL programming language. However, I found that I was able to adequately query my data using Microsoft Excel pivot tables and a student edition of the data visualization software Tableau.

Before getting into the data analysis, it is important to understand the current scholarship surrounding MS 609. MS 609 is a document often cited in the ongoing debate over the existence of Cathars. Cathar believers and non-believers alike point to the depositions contained in MS 609 and claim that their own ideas are supported by these documents. Whereas Mark Pegg read MS 609 and concluded that these depositions definitively prove that no Cathar heresy ever existed, Peter Biller and John Arnold read MS 609 and came to the exact opposite conclusion. Biller, in particular, views the depositions contained in MS 609 as strong evidence for a widespread and structured Cathar heresy. It is important to note that studying MS 609 using a quantitative approach cannot definitively end this decades long debate – how one perceives the data will be determined by personal interpretation – but it can certainly be used to examine the most common arguments in the ongoing debate.

One of the most contentious aspects of the scholarly feud over Catharism is when heresy took root in Southern France. Mark Pegg asserts that individuals did not think of themselves as heretics until well after the Albigensian crusade (1209-1229), whereas scholars who believe in the existence of the Cathars often believe that heresy existed as early as the late eleventh century. The data extracted from MS 609 gives a really good overall picture of when and where deponents claimed to have participated in heretical events and held heretical beliefs. It is clear just from reading the depositions that a large proportion of the events that people described happened sometime within the twelve years preceding 1245, which was the year that they were being interrogated. However, by using data extracted from Rehr’s XML it is possible to actually visualize when these events supposedly took place:



Just by looking at this chart it is clear that there was a massive spike in people reporting events that took place in 1233, twelve years before the interrogations began. Another mildly interesting, but not all that illuminating, aspect of this chart is that there are huge spikes and dips in the frequency of reported events that happen every other year. What this shows is that people were much more likely to report that events occurred an even number of years ago. For whatever reason, and it is really not possible to know for certain why, people were significantly more likely to say that an event had occurred ten years ago than eleven years ago. Visualizing when people claimed to have held beliefs about heretics produces similar findings:



This graph charts when people claimed to have started and stopped holding positive beliefs about heretics. It clearly indicates that people claimed to have held beliefs about heretics closer to the year 1245, with a significant uptick in the number of deponents stating they held these beliefs after the year 1233. While it is interesting to actually be able to see when people claimed to have engaged with heresy, it is rather obvious just by reading MS 609 that most people reported holding beliefs about heretics or engaging in heretical actions closer to the time of the inquisition in 1245. Although it may seem insignificant, bordering on pointless, to say that visualizing the spreadsheet data proves conclusions most people can come to on their own just by reading the depositions in MS 609, these findings do have broader implications. Much of the modern scholarship surrounding Catharism focuses on when people began to think of themselves as heretics based on the Church’s understanding of heterodoxy. Pegg contends that he does believe that at some point people did begin to think of themselves as heretics, but only after the outbreak of the Albigensian Crusade, at the very earliest.[[86]](#footnote-86) He asserts that people only began to think of their action’s as heretical once the Church began to pursue heresy more vigorously. Therefore, the fact that the graphs above seem to indicate that the deponents of this inquisition claim to not have really engaged in heresy before the year 1233, indicates that Pegg is correct in his estimation that these individuals did not understand their actions and beliefs as heretical until after the end of the Albigensian Crusade. Furthermore, in the year 1233 an inquisition was conducted by the inquisitor friar Ferrier in the same towns that Bernart de Caux and Jean de Saint Pierre conducted their inquisition in 1245. Many of the depositions in MS 609 even reference this earlier inquisition. It is conceivable, though ultimately unprovable, that because of friar Ferrier’s inquisition in 1233, individuals began to understand their actions and beliefs as heretical. However, the fact that most deponents claimed to have engaged with heresy after the year 1233 could also very well simply be because most of the deponents were too young to remember a time before the Albigensian Crusade and the subsequent inquisitions. Whatever the case, the data certainly indicates that deponents did not really engage in heresy until after the year 1233. However, the crux of the debate over Cathars is not over when people held heretical beliefs, but what it was these people actually believed.

The fundamental question historians have been asking about Cathars and heresy in medieval Toulouse for nearly two centuries has been what did the people of southern France really believe? Unfortunately for historians studying MS 609 to answer this question, Bernart de Caux and Jean de Saint Pierre were much more concerned with learning about people’s actions. Whereas a single deposition could contain five paragraphs or more on supposed heretical events, no deposition had more than one paragraph that addressed the deponent’s beliefs – which is the reason why my events spreadsheet is 508 lines longer than my beliefs spreadsheet. Nonetheless, MS 609 is one of the few surviving documents from the thirteenth century where people accused of heresy in the Languedoc region recount what they actually believed and is, therefore, an invaluable resource in the study of heretical belief and Catharism. Scholars who continue to believe in the existence of a Cathar heresy in thirteenth century France, believe that there was an organized Cathar church with its own liturgy and doctrine. In essence, they believe that Catharism had its own orthodoxy. The exact definition of “orthodoxy” is a debate best left to religious scholars, but a hallmark of orthodoxy is consistency. For Catharism to have existed as a structured heretical “Church,” then it would have had to have its own doctrine with consistent, authoritative beliefs. MS 609 may have comparatively little to say about the beliefs of its deponents relative to their actions, but it is a collection of documents that can still provide valuable insight into the beliefs of thirteenth-century individuals living in Languedoc.

Using the extracted data, I was able to get a better picture of the consistency, or potentially the lack of consistency, of the deponents’ heretical beliefs. In my beliefs spreadsheet I created two pivot tables, which are tables based on the entirety of the extracted data that can be filtered and reorganized. In the first pivot table I filtered my data to include all of the depositions where a person stated what they believed *about* heretics. (See Appendix ??). In the second pivot tabled I filtered my data to include all of the depositions where a person stated what errors they had heard *from* heretics. (See Appendix ??). The first pivot table did not really provide particularly groundbreaking information. Of the depositions that Rehr encoded (710 out of nearly 6,000), there are 88 depositions where the deponent claimed to have believed in heretics to some extent. Out of those 88 depositions, 76 believed that heretics were good men, 60 believed that heretics had good faith, and 53 belied that heretics were friends of God­ – approximately 86 percent, 68 percent, and 60 percent respectively. Approximately 45 percent of these same deponents that claimed to have believed they could be saved by the heretics, and approximately 42 percent said that they believed heretics were truthful.[[87]](#footnote-87) For anyone who has read MS 609, these percentages are not particularly surprising. It is clear just by reading the depositions that deponents who reported to have believed in heretics overwhelmingly said they believed that heretics were good men, had good faith, and were friends of God. Furthermore, understanding what deponents believed about heretics alone does not allow one to come to conclusions about what the supposed heretics themselves actually believed. To understand what people accused of heresy believed, it is more important to look at the heterodox errors deponents claimed to have heard. When reading the depositions it was clear to me that the errors people claimed to have heard were much less consistent than what people believed about heretic, and the data supports that impression. There were 43 depositions where the deponent claimed to have heard doctrinal errors from heretics. Of those 43 depositions, 32 deponents claimed to have heard the error that God did not create visible things, 28 claimed to have heard the error that denied salvation in marriage and that the holy host was the body of Christ, 21 claimed to have heard the error that the dead do not rise, and 17 claimed to have heard the error that denied salvation in baptism– approximately 74 percent, 65 percent, 49 percent, and 30 percent respectively. The data indicates that there is some consistency in the beliefs that people accused of heresy held. An overwhelming majority of deponents who claimed to have heard heretics talk about their beliefs, claimed that they had heard heretics talk about three different errors: that God did not create visible things, that there was no salvation in matrimony, and that the holy host was not the body of Christ. However, the specific set of errors that deponents claimed to have heard were vastly different. There were 43 deponents who claimed to have heard heretical errors, and 32 different sets of errors that they claimed to have heard. Even Biller acknowledged that there was a huge variation in responses deponents gave to inquisitors about errors they had heard.[[88]](#footnote-88) Furthermore, while the beliefs are somewhat consistent in certain aspects, though highly variable in others, they are certainly not widespread. Rehr encoded 710 depositions, and only 43 of those deponents reported hearing heretical errors. If the Cathar believers want to convince the world of a widespread Cathar heresy that swept Southern France in the mid-thirteenth century using MS 609, they are going to need more than a paltry six percent of deponents claiming to have heard any heretical beliefs. The data is even more abysmal for believers when looking at how many deponents actually claimed to have believed in heretical errors. Of the 43 deponents who claimed to have heard heretical errors, 20 also claimed to have believed in those errors – less than three percent of all encoded depositions. While the data does indicate that there is some degree of consistency among heretical beliefs contained in the depositions of MS 609, it is impossible to draw the conclusion that heretical beliefs existed with any sort of ubiquity based on these documents. However, Cathar believers do not merely contend that the heretics of Toulouse held consistent beliefs but that they often held dualist beliefs.

It is somewhat difficult to quantify how many deponents claimed to hold dualist beliefs, because there are few explicit mentions of dualist beliefs within the depositions. However, several depositions do refer to hearing about the “visibility error.” The visibility error refers to the belief that God did not create the visible world. This error is considered significant because the belief that God did not create the material world is perceived by modern scholars to be a sign of dualism. Scholars that believe in an organized Cathar church claim that Cathars believed that there was a God that created the visible world and a God that created the non-visible world. These scholars also contend that dualist beliefs were relatively widespread across the populace of Southern France – either as a result of the survival of ancient Manichean beliefs or the migration of Bogomil beliefs from the East. Furthermore, those that believe in the existence of Cathars will commonly point to MS 609 as evidence that these dualist beliefs were relatively common. Biller, in particular, points to instances of deponents who claimed to have heard and believed visibility errors as a sign of widespread dualist beliefs in thirteenth-century Languedoc.[[89]](#footnote-89) However, Biller fails to anchor his claims about the ubiquity of dualist beliefs in actual numbers OR fails to state the actual number (proportion?) of deponents who claimed to believe in dualism out of the total depositions. Using my beliefs spreadsheet I was able to filter out all of the depositions where the deponent claimed to have heard the visibility error. (See Appendix ??). While MS 609 does contain records of people claiming to have heard the visibility error, they are few and far between. Of the 710 depositions that Rehr encoded, there are only 32 depositions where a deponent claimed to have heard the error that God did not create visible things. Additionally, of those 32 depositions, only 16 indicated that the deponent believed the heretics to be truthful. (See Appendix ??). Furthermore, of those sixteen deponents, only one claimed that they had held heretical beliefs before the beginning of the Albigensian Crusade in 1209. The deponent in question was an elderly woman named Raimunda, who was recalling events from her childhood. She did not indicate what date that she actually had heard the visibility error, only that she was hereticated as a child fifty some years prior to her confession and had stopped believing in heretics twelve years prior to her confession when she was reconciled by Saint Dominic.[[90]](#footnote-90) The data is very clear: yes, there are some depositions where the deponent claimed to have heard and/or believed in some sort of visibility error, which may indicate dualist beliefs, but there are so few depositions where this is actually the case that it would be intellectually dishonest to claim that MS 609 indicates that there was any sort of widespread belief in a dualist theology in thirteenth-century Languedoc – especially before the Albigensian Crusade.

Despite what Biller and Arnold’s cohort have claimed for years, there is little evidence in MS 609 for REMEMBER TO MENTION THAT THESE NUMBERS ARE REALLY SMALL Ultimately, it is impossible to understand what the people of the Toulousain truly believed based on MS 609. In the overwhelming majority of the depositions, the deponents do not state their actual religious beliefs. Most deponents merely say what they believed about heretics and what they had heard from heretics. Furthermore, it must be noted just how few people reported even hearing heretical beliefs in the first place. Of the 3,826 depositions that Rehr encoded, only 75 reported hearing errors from heretics. Peter Biller claimed that 209 deponents claimed to have heard the error that God did not create visible things.[[91]](#footnote-91) 209 out of nearly 6,000 is still only three percent of all deponents. If three percent of everybody in Languedoc had heard of the visibility error, it is still not a widespread or common belief.

**Conclusion**

WHY THIS STUDY – BILLER MISSED, seeing it as a whole
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**Appendix A**

**Sightings Stylesheet:**

|  |
| --- |
| **<?xml version="1.0"?> <xsl:stylesheet xmlns:xsl="http://www.w3.org/1999/XSL/Transform" xmlns:tei="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" xmlns:exslt="http://exslt.org/common" xmlns="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" xmlns:xi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XInclude" xmlns:svg="http://www.w3.org/2000/svg" xmlns:\_="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" xmlns:DEFAULT="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" version="1.0" extension-element-prefixes="exslt">  <xsl:output omit-xml-declaration="yes" indent="no"/>  <xsl:template match="/">  <xsl:for-each select="//tei:body//tei:seg[@subtype='sighting']">    *<!--VARIABLE FOR XMLID-->*  <xsl:variable name="xmlID" select="@xml:id"></xsl:variable>    *<!--OUTPUTS MANUSCRIPT ID-->*  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="/tei:TEI/@xml:id"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS LATIN DEPOSITION-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(.)"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS ENGLISH TRANSLATION-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(//tei:seg[@type='trans' and @corresp=concat('#',$xmlID)])"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS LATIN DATE-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:date[@type='event\_date'])"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS DATE (year)-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="tei:date[@type='event\_date']/@when"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS LATIN LOCATION-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:placeName[@type='event\_loc'])"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS LOCATION TAG-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:placeName[@type='event\_loc']/@nymRef)"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--Note: JPR's documents seem to imply that he tagged the place types, but that doesn't seem to be the case in the actual XML. See his readme/JPR's website: encoding the digital edition  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="/seg/placeName/@type"/>  </xsl:call-template>-->*    <xsl:value-of select="'&#10;'"/>  </xsl:for-each>  </xsl:template>    <xsl:template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:param name="select"/>  <xsl:value-of select="$select"/>  <xsl:for-each select="exslt:node-set($select)[position()&gt;1]">  <xsl:value-of select="'&#10;'"/>  <xsl:value-of select="."/>  </xsl:for-each>  </xsl:template> </xsl:stylesheet>** |

**Appendix B**

**Events Stylesheet:**

|  |
| --- |
| **<?xml version="1.0"?> <xsl:stylesheet xmlns:xsl="http://www.w3.org/1999/XSL/Transform" xmlns:tei="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" xmlns:exslt="http://exslt.org/common" xmlns="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" xmlns:xi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XInclude" xmlns:svg="http://www.w3.org/2000/svg" xmlns:\_="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" xmlns:DEFAULT="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" version="1.0" extension-element-prefixes="exslt">  <xsl:output omit-xml-declaration="yes" indent="no"/>  <xsl:template match="/">  <xsl:for-each select="//tei:body//tei:seg[@subtype='event']">    *<!--VARIABLE FOR XMLID-->*  <xsl:variable name="xmlID" select="@xml:id"></xsl:variable>    *<!--OUTPUTS MANUSCRIPT ID-->*  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="/tei:TEI/@xml:id"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS LATIN DEPOSITION-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(.)"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS ENGLISH TRANSLATION-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(//tei:seg[@type='trans' and @corresp=concat('#',$xmlID)])"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS LATIN DATE-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:date[@type='event\_date'])"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS DATE (year)-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="tei:date[@type='event\_date']/@when"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS LATIN LOCATION-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:placeName[@type='event\_loc'])"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!--OUTPUTS LOCATION TAG-->*  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:placeName[@type='event\_loc']/@nymRef)"/>  </xsl:call-template>    *<!-- Note: JPR's documents seem to imply that he tagged the place types, but that doesn't seem to be the case in the actual XML. See his readme/JPR's website: encoding the digital edition  <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>  <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:with-param name="select" select="/seg/placeName/@type"/>  </xsl:call-template>-->*      <xsl:value-of select="'&#10;'"/>  </xsl:for-each>  </xsl:template>    <xsl:template name="value-of-template">  <xsl:param name="select"/>  <xsl:value-of select="$select"/>  <xsl:for-each select="exslt:node-set($select)[position()&gt;1]">  <xsl:value-of select="'&#10;'"/>  <xsl:value-of select="."/>  </xsl:for-each>  </xsl:template> </xsl:stylesheet>** |

**Appendix C**

**Beliefs Stylesheet:**

|  |
| --- |
| **<?xml version="1.0"?> <xsl:stylesheet xmlns:xsl="http://www.w3.org/1999/XSL/Transform" xmlns:tei="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" xmlns:exslt="http://exslt.org/common" xmlns="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" xmlns:xi="http://www.w3.org/2001/XInclude" xmlns:svg="http://www.w3.org/2000/svg" xmlns:\_="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" xmlns:DEFAULT="http://www.tei-c.org/ns/1.0" version="1.0" extension-element-prefixes="exslt">     <xsl:output omit-xml-declaration="yes" indent="no"/>     <xsl:template match="/">         <xsl:for-each select="//tei:body//tei:seg[@subtype='belief']">                         *<!--VARIABLE FOR XMLID-->*             <xsl:variable name="xmlID" select="@xml:id"></xsl:variable>                         *<!--OUTPUTS MANUSCRIPT ID-->*             <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">                 <xsl:with-param name="select" select="/tei:TEI/@xml:id"/>             </xsl:call-template>                         *<!--OUTPUTS LATIN DEPOSITION-->*             <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>             <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">                 <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(.)"/>             </xsl:call-template>                         *<!--OUTPUTS ENGLISH TRANSLATION-->*             <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>             <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">                 <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(//tei:seg[@type='trans' and @corresp=concat('#',$xmlID)])"/>             </xsl:call-template>                         *<!--OUTPUTS LATIN DATE (start)-->*             <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>             <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">                 <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:seg[@type='hist\_bel']/tei:date[@type='prev\_bel\_start'])"/>             </xsl:call-template>                         *<!--OUTPUTS LATIN DATE (end)-->*             <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>             <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">                 <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:seg[@type='hist\_bel']/tei:date[@type='prev\_bel\_end'])"/>             </xsl:call-template>                         *<!--OUTPUTS DATE (start year)-->*             <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>             <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">                 <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:seg[@type='hist\_bel']/tei:date[@type='prev\_bel\_start']/@when)"/>             </xsl:call-template>                         *<!--OUTPUTS DATE (end year)-->*             <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>             <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">                 <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:seg[@type='hist\_bel']/tei:date[@type='prev\_bel\_end']/@when)"/>             </xsl:call-template>                         *<!--OUTPUTS CONFESSION TAGS (beliefs about heretics)-->*             <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>             <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">                 <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:seg[@type='conf']/@ana)"/>             </xsl:call-template>                         *<!--OUTPUTS LATIN CONFESSION (heard errors)-->*             <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>             <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">                 <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:seg[@type='conf'][@subtype='heard\_error'])"/>             </xsl:call-template>                         *<!--OUTPUTS CONFESSION TAGS (heard errors)-->*             <xsl:text>&#09;</xsl:text>             <xsl:call-template name="value-of-template">                 <xsl:with-param name="select" select="normalize-space(tei:seg[@type='conf'][@subtype='heard\_error']/@ana)"/>             </xsl:call-template>**  **<xsl:value-of select="'&#10;'"/>         </xsl:for-each>     </xsl:template>         <xsl:template name="value-of-template">         <xsl:param name="select"/>         <xsl:value-of select="$select"/>         <xsl:for-each select="exslt:node-set($select)[position()&gt;1]">             <xsl:value-of select="'&#10;'"/>             <xsl:value-of select="."/>         </xsl:for-each>     </xsl:template> </xsl:stylesheet>** |

**Appendix D**

**Sightings Shell Script:**

|  |
| --- |
| *# shell script that runs through all of the manuscript XML files, and applies the exampleStylesheetSIGHTINGS-GIT.xsl stylesheet* rm exampleOutSIGHTINGS-GIT.tsv; for f in MS\*.xml;  do  xmlstarlet tr exampleStylesheetSIGHTINGS-GIT.xsl $f >> exampleOutSIGHTINGS-GIT.tsv;   done; |

**Appendix E**

**Events Shell Script:**

|  |
| --- |
| *# shell script that runs through all of the manuscript XML files, and applies the exampleStylesheetEVENTS-GIT.xsl stylesheet* rm exampleOutEVENTS-GIT.tsv; for f in MS\*.xml;  do  xmlstarlet tr exampleStylesheetEVENTS-GIT.xsl $f >> exampleOutEVENTS-GIT.tsv;   done; |

**Appendix F**

**Beliefs Shell Script:**

|  |
| --- |
| *# shell script that runs through all of the manuscript XML files, and applies the exampleStylesheetBELIEFS-GIT.xsl stylesheet* rm exampleOutBELIEFS-GIT.tsv; for f in MS\*.xml;  do  xmlstarlet tr exampleStylesheetBELIEFS-GIT.xsl $f >> exampleOutBELIEFS-GIT.tsv;   done; |

**Appendix G**

**Beliefs Spreadsheet - Sample**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XML ID** | **Latin Deposition** | **English Translation** | **Latin Start Date** | **Latin End Date** | **Start Date** | **End Date** | **Latin Beliefs** | **Belief Tags** | **Latin Heard Errors** | **Heard Errors Tags** |
| MS609-0001.xml | Et omnia predictafuit confessus fratri Ferrario inquisitori, et post dictum confessionem non vidit hereticos vel hereticas. Item. Dixit quod credebat hereticos esse bonoshomines et habere bonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Dei. Et audivit hereticos dicentes quod Deus non fecerat visibilia, sed ipse testis non credidit predicto errori. De baptismo, de hostia sacrata, de matrimonio, de resurrectione carnis, non audivit hereticos loquentes. Et sunt VII anni quod primo credidit hereticos esse bonos, et sunt V anni quod ultimo dimisit ipsam credulitatem . Et non habuitpenitentiam ab fratre Ferrario et abiuravit heresim et iuravit et cetera. Testes: Arnaldus, prior Sancti Saturnini; Arnaldus Cerda; et frater Willelmus Pelisso OrdoPredicatorum; et frater Bernardus de Caucio, inquisitor. | All of the aforesaid was confessed to brother Ferrier, inquisitor, and since then the witness has not seen male heretics nor female heretics.Item. The witness said that he believed the heretics to be good men and to have good faith and were truthful and friends of God, and he heard the heretics say that God did not create visible things, but the witness did not believe the said error. He did not hear the heretics speak of baptism, of the sacred host, of marriage, of the bodily resurrection. It has been 7 years since he first believed the heretics, and 5 years since he last put faith in them. And brother Ferrier did not assign penance. He abjured heresy and swore, etc. Witnesses: Arnald, Prior of Saint-Sernin; Arnald Cerda, brother Guilhem Pelhisson of the Order of Preachers; and brother Bernard de Caux, inquisitor. | sunt VII anni quod primo credidit hereticos esse bonos | sunt V anni quod ultimo dimisit ipsam credulitatem | 1238 | 1240 | Dixit quod credebat hereticos esse bonoshomines et habere bonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Dei | #pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_bonam\_fidem #pos\_veraces #pos\_amicos\_dei | audivit hereticos dicentes quod Deus non fecerat visibilia, sed ipse testis non credidit predicto errori. De baptismo, de hostia sacrata, de matrimonio, de resurrectione carnis, non audivit hereticos loquentes | #pos\_err\_visibilia #neg\_err\_matrimonio #neg\_err\_baptismo #neg\_err\_resurrectione #neg\_err\_hostia |
| MS609-0002.xml | Item. Dixit quod credidit hereticos esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et esseveraces et amicos Dei. Et audivit hereticos dicentes quod deus non fecerat visibilia et quod in matrimonio non est salus, et ipse testis credidit sicit ipsi dicebant. De hostia sacrata, de baptismo, de resurrecione carnis, non audivit hereticos loquentes. Et sunt XII anni quod primo credidit hereticos esse bonos et sunt IIIIor anni ultimo dimsit illam credulitatem. Et sunt confessus fratri Willelmo Arnaldi et fratri Ferrario inquisitorem. Sed non habuit penitentiam, et postea non vidit hereticos. |  | sunt XII anni | sunt IIIIor anni | 1233 | 1241 | credidit hereticos esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et esseveraces et amicos Dei | #pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_bonam\_fidem #pos\_veraces #pos\_amicos\_dei | audivit hereticos dicentes quod deus non fecerat visibilia et quod in matrimonio non est salus, et ipse testis credidit sicit ipsi dicebant. De hostia sacrata, de baptismo, de resurrecione carnis, non audivit hereticos loquentes | #pos\_err\_visibilia #pos\_err\_matrimonio #neg\_err\_hostia #neg\_err\_baptismo #neg\_err\_resurrectione |
| MS609-0002.xml | credidit hereticos esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et esseveraces et amicos Dei |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS609-0005.xml | Alibi non vidit hereticos quod recolat. Dixit etiam quod credidit hereticos esse bonos homines et habere bonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Die. Sed non audivit hereticos loquentes de visibilibus, de baptismo, de hostia sacrata, nec de matrimonio. Audivit tamen clericos exprimentes errores quos dicunt hereticos. Sed ipse testis nunquam dimi credidit predictis erroribus. Et sunt XV anni quod primo credidit hereticos esse bonos et sunt X anni quod non credidit. Et fuit confessus fratri Ferrario sed non habuit penetentiam ab ipso. Et abiuravit et iuravit, et cetera. Testes: predicti. | He did not recall seeing heretics elsewhere. The witness said as well that he believed that the heretics were good men and had good faith and were true and friends of God, but he did not hear heretics speak of visible things, of baptism, of the holy host nor of marriage. However, he heard clerics speak of the errors that heretics say, but he never believed the aforesaid errors. It was 15 years ago that he first believed heretics to be good, and it was 10 years ago that he stopped such belief. This was confessed to brother Ferrier, but no penanence was given to him. He abjured heresy and swore, etc. Witnesses: as stated above. | sunt XV anni quod primo credidit hereticos esse bonos | sunt X anni quod non credidit. | 1230 | 1235 | Dixit etiam quod credidit hereticos esse bonos homines et habere bonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Die. | #pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_bonam\_fidem #pos\_amicos\_dei #pos\_veraces | Sed non audivit hereticos loquentes de visibilibus, de baptismo, de hostia sacrata, nec de matrimonio. Audivit tamen clericos exprimentes errores quos dicunt hereticos. Sed ipse testis nunquam dimi credidit predictis erroribus. | #neg\_err\_visibilia #neg\_err\_baptismo #neg\_err\_hostia #neg\_err\_matrimonio #pos\_err\_cleric\_say |
| MS609-0006.xml | Item. Dixit quod credidit hereticos esse bonos et haberebonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Dei. Et audivit hereticos dicentes quod Deus non fecerat visibilia, et quod hostiasacrata non est corpus Christi, et quod baptismus aqua nichil valet, et quod in matrimonio non est salus. Et ipse testis credidit sicut ipsi dicebant. Et sunt XIII anni quod primo credidit hereticos et sunt VI anni ultimo dimisit. Et fuit confessus fratri Ferrario sed non habuit ab ipso penitentiam. Et postea non vidit hereticos vel hereticas. | Item. The witness said that he believed the heretics to be good, had good faith, were true, and were friends of God. He heard heretics say that God did not make visible things and that the holy host is not the body of Christ and that baptism by water does nothing and that marriage does not save one and the witness believed what they said. It was 14 years ago that he first believed the heretics and it was 6 years ago that he left [the belief]. This was confessed to brother Ferrier but no penance was given and since then he has not seen heretics. | Et sunt XIII anni quod primo credidit hereticos | et sunt VI anni ultimo dimisit | 1232 | 1239 | credidit hereticos esse bonos et haberebonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Dei. | #pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_bonam\_fidem #pos\_amicos\_dei #pos\_veraces | Et audivit hereticos dicentes quod Deus non fecerat visibilia, et quod hostiasacrata non est corpus Christi, et quod baptismus aqua nichil valet, et quod in matrimonio non est salus. | #pos\_err\_visibilia #pos\_err\_baptismo #pos\_err\_hostia #pos\_err\_matrimonio |
| MS609-0011.xml | Item. Dixit quod credidit hereticos esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Dei. Et audivit hereticos dicentes quod deus nonvisibilia fecit, et quod baptismus aque nichil valet, et quod hostia sacrata non est corpus Christi, et quodin matrimonio non est salus, et quod mortui non resurgent. Et ipse testis credidit tunc sicut ipsi dicebant. Et sunt XXX anni quod primo credidit hereticos et sunt XIX anni quod ultimo dimisit . Et fuit confessus fratri Ferrerio, sed non habuit ab ipso penitentiam neque vidit hereticos XIX anni sunt. Et abiuravit heresim et iuravit et cetera. Testes: predicti. | Item. The witness said that he believed the heretics to be good men, and to have good faith, and were true and friends of God. He heard heretics say that God did not make visible things, and that baptism by water is meaningless, that the holy host is not the body of Christ, that there is no salvation in marriage, that there is no resurrection from death, and the witness believed then what they said. It was 30 years ago that he first believed the heretics and it was 19 years ago that he left such belief behind. This was confessed to brother Ferrier but he did not have penance and the witness has not seen heretics in 19 years. He abjured heresy and swore, etc. Witnesses: as stated before. | sunt XXX anni quod primo credidit hereticos | sunt XIX anni quod ultimo dimisit | 1215 | 1233 | quod credidit hereticos esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Dei | #pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_bonam\_fidem #pos\_veraces #pos\_amicos\_dei | audivit hereticos dicentes quod deus nonvisibilia fecit, et quod baptismus aque nichil valet, et quod hostia sacrata non est corpus Christi, et quodin matrimonio non est salus, et quod mortui non resurgent. Et ipse testis credidit tunc sicut ipsi dicebant | #pos\_err\_visibilia #pos\_err\_baptismo #pos\_err\_hostia #pos\_err\_matrimonio #pos\_err\_hostia |
| MS609-0011.xml | quod credidit hereticos esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Dei |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS609-0012.xml | Itemdixit quod credidit hereticos esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Dei. Et audivit hereticosdicentes quod Diabolus fecerat visibilia, et quod baptismus aque nichil valet, et quod hostia sacrata non est corpus Christi,et quod in matrimonio non est salus, et quod corpora mortuorum non resurgent. Et ipse credidit sicut hereticos dicebant. Et sunt duo anni quod primo credidit et est annus quod ultimo dimisit. | Item. The witness said he believed the heretics to be good men, and to have good faith, and were friends of God. He heard the heretics say that the Devil made visible things, and that baptism by water has no effect, and that the holy host is not the body of Christ, and that there is no salvation in marriage, and that dead bodies do not rise again, and he believed at that time what the heretics said. It was 2 years ago that he first believed [the heretics] and one year ago that he stopped believing. | sunt duo anni quod primo credidit | est annus quod ultimo dimisit | 1243 | 1244 | credidit hereticos esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Dei | #pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_bonam\_fidem #pos\_veraces #pos\_amicos\_dei | audivit hereticosdicentes quod Diabolus fecerat visibilia, et quod baptismus aque nichil valet, et quod hostia sacrata non est corpus Christi,et quod in matrimonio non est salus, et quod corpora mortuorum non resurgent. Et ipse credidit sicut hereticos dicebant | #pos\_err\_visibilia #pos\_err\_baptismo #pos\_err\_hostia #pos\_err\_matrimonio #pos\_err\_resurrectione |
| MS609-0012.xml | credidit hereticos esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et esse veraces et amicos Dei |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS609-0013.xml | Predictos hereticos credidit essebonos homines et amicos Dei et posse salvari per ipsos licet sciret quod ecclesia persequereter eos. Et audiviteos dicentes errores de visibilibus quod Deus non fecerat ea, et quod hostia sacrata non est corpus Christi, et quodin baptismo et matrimonio non est salus erat salus, et quod carnis resurrectio non erat. Et ipse credidit tunc sicut ipsidicebant. Et sunt XVI anni quod primo credidit hereticos esse bonos sed non credidit VIII anni sunt . Et fuit confessus fratriWilhelmo Arnaldi et socium suum, inquisitores, apud Tholosam et venit coram eis non citatus et fratri Ferrario apud Sayssac . Et postea non vidit hereticos et credidit dicta confessiones esse veraces. | The witness believed the aforesaid heretics to be good men and friends of God and that he could be saved by them even though he knew they were pursued by the Church. He heard them speak errors: that visible things were not made by God, that the holy host is not the body of Christ, that there is no salvation in baptism or marriage, and that there is no resurrection of the body, and the witness himself believed that which they said. It was 30 years ago that he first believed the heretics to be good men, and left this belief 8 years ago. This was confessed to brother Guilhem Arnold and his inquisitor associates at Toulouse, and he came to them unsolicited, and brother Ferrier at Saissac, and since then he has not seen heretics, and he believes the aforesaid confessions to be true. | sunt XVI anni quod primo credidit hereticos esse bonos | non credidit VIII anni sunt | 1229 | 1237 | Predictos hereticos credidit essebonos homines et amicos Dei et posse salvari per ipsos licet sciret quod ecclesia persequereter eos | #pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_amicos\_dei #pos\_posse\_salvari |  |  |
| MS609-0013.xml | Predictos hereticos credidit essebonos homines et amicos Dei et posse salvari per ipsos licet sciret quod ecclesia persequereter eos |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS609-0015.xml | Predictos hereticos credit esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et posse salvari per ipsos. Et audiviteos dicentes errores de visibilibus quod deus non fecerat ea, et quod hostia sacrata non est corpus domini, et quod inmatrimonio non est salus. Sed ipsa non credit predictis erroribus. Et sunt XXIII anni quod primo credit hereticos esse bonos, sed non credit postquam fecit confessionem suam de heresi fratri Ferrario et socio suo, inquisitores, apud Saysac . Et fuitconfessa predicta et plura alia de quibus modo non recolit, sed omnia credit esse vera. Dixit etiam quod Hysarnusvir suus mortuus sunt X anni et non fuit hereticatus. Et abiuravit heresim et iuravit et cetera. Testes: Bernardus de Ladinhac; Silvester, capellanus de Viridifolio; Petrus Fresapa. Et frater Bernardus, inquisitor, legit. | The witness believed the aforementioned heretics to be good and had good faith and one could be saved through them. She heard them say the errors of visible things, that God did not create it, and that the holy host is not the body of the Lord, and that marriage does not save, but she herself did not believe in these errors. It was about 23 years ago that she first believed the heretics to be good but did not believe them after confessing to Ferrier and his companion, inquisitors, at Saissac, where she confessed all the aforesaid and much more which she did not recall, but she believed it all to be the truth. The witness said as well that her husband Ysarn de Mont Server died about 10 years ago, and he was not hereticated. The witness abjured heresy and swore, etc. Witnesses: Magister Bernard of Ladinhac; Sylvester, Chaplain of Verfeil; Peire Fresapa, Notary. Brother Bernard, inquisitor, read this. | sunt XXIII anni quod primo credit hereticos esse bonos, | non credit postquam fecit confessionem suam de heresi fratri Ferrario et socio suo, inquisitores, apud Saysac | 1223 | 1242 | Predictos hereticos credit esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et posse salvari per ipsos | #pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_bonam\_fidem #pos\_posse\_salvari | audiviteos dicentes errores de visibilibus quod deus non fecerat ea, et quod hostia sacrata non est corpus domini, et quod inmatrimonio non est salus. Sed ipsa non credit predictis erroribus | #pos\_err\_visibilia #pos\_err\_hostia #pos\_err\_matrimonio |
| MS609-0015.xml | Predictos hereticos credit esse bonos et habere bonam fidem et posse salvari per ipsos |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS609-0017.xml | Predictos hereticos credidit tunc esse bonos homines et habere bonam fidem licet sciret quod Ecclesia persequeretur eos, sed non audivit eos dicentes errores de visibilibus nec de sacramentis nec ipse credidit predictis erroribus. Alibinon vidit hereticos nec credidit nec adoravit nec aliquid dedit nec misit. Et hoc fuit confessus Ferrario inquisitori apud Saysac et abiuravitheresim et iuravit et cetera. Testis: Arnaldus, prior Sancti Saturnini; et magister Petrus de Caramanh; et frater Bernardus, inquisitor. | He used to believe that the aforementioned heretics were good men and had good faith even though he knew that the Church persecuted them, but he had not heard them saying any errors regarding visible things nor the sacraments, nor did he believe the aforementioned errors. He has not seen heretics elsewhere nor believed them, nor adored them, nor gave or sent [them anything]. This was confessed to inquisitor Ferrier at Saissac. He abjured heresy and swore, et cetera. Witnesses: Arnald, Prior of Saint-Sernin; Master P. de Caramanh; and brother Bernard, Inquisitor. |  |  |  |  | Predictos hereticos credidit tunc esse bonos homines et habere bonam fidem licet sciret quod Ecclesia persequeretur eos | #pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_bonam\_fidem | sed non audivit eos dicentes errores de visibilibus nec de sacramentis nec ipse credidit predictis erroribus | #neg\_err\_visibilia #neg\_err\_sacrementis |
| MS609-0017.xml | Predictos hereticos credidit tunc esse bonos homines et habere bonam fidem licet sciret quod Ecclesia persequeretur eos |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS609-0078.xml | credidit hereticos esse bonos homines et habere bonam fidem et esse veraceset amicos Dei. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS609-0079.xml | Alibi nonvidit hereticos nec credidit nunquam esse bonos nec adoravit eos nec audivit predicationem eorum nec aliquid dedit nec misit nec duxit nec duci fecit. Predicta fuit confessa fratri Ferrario apud Saisag . Dixit etiam quod iste Albaric, primus vir suus, non fuit hereticus. Et abiuravit heresium et iuravit et cetera. Testes: Arnaldus de Manso Sanctarum Puellarum; Arnaldus, prior Sancti Saturnini; et frater Bernardus, inquisitor. | She has not seen heretics otherwise, nor ever believed them to be good, nor adored nor listened to their preaching, nor gave or sent them anything, nor led them or caused [them] to be led. The aforesaid was confessed to brother Ferrier at Saissac. The witness also said that her first husband Albaric was not hereticated. And she abjured heresy and swore, etc. Witnesses: Arnald of Mas-Saintes-Puelles; Arnald, Prior of Saint-Sernin; and brother Bernard, inquisitor. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS609-0080.xml | Item. Vidit alia vici in domo ipsius testis Bernardum de Maire Vila et Raimundum de Narriqua. Et vidit ibi cum eis Bernardum de Sant Andreu; Petrum And de Sant Andreu; Roggerium Sartre; Willelmum Tesseire; Bernardum Aichart; Willelmus Poncii de Rocaut; Aimericum de Mola Vila; Bernardum Cogot; et Arnaldum Maiestre, concubinarium ipsius testi,qui iacebat ibi infirmus. Et tunc dicti heretici hereticaverunt dictum Arnaldum Maiestre. Et ipsa testis et omnes alii a adoraverunt ibi dictoshereticos ter flexis genibus dicendo, Boni homines, orate deum pro nobis. Et sunt XII anni vel circa. | Item. Another time the witness saw Bernard de Mairevilla and Raimund de Na Riqua in her house, and saw with them Bernard de Sancto Andrea and Peire de Sancto Andrea, Roger Sartre, Guilhem Teisserre, Bernard Aichart, Guilhem Pons de Recauth, Aymeric de Molavila, Bernard Cogota, and Arnald Maiestre, the witness' husband who was laid low with an illness. And then the aforesaid heretics hereticated Arnald Maiestre, and everyone including the witness adored the aforesaid heretics and bent at the knee three times saying, "Bless us good men, pray to God for us." And this was about 12 years ago. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS609-0080.xml | Predictos hereticos credidit essebonos homines et habere bonam fidem et posse salvari per ipsos licet sciret quod ecclesia persequeret eos. Sed non audivit eos dicen tes errores de visibilibus nec de sacrementis nec ipsa credidit predicitis erroribus. Et sunt XX anni quod primo credidit hereticos essebonos homines sed non credidit X anni q predictam fuit confessa fratri Ferrario apud Limos. Et abiuravit heresim et iuravit et cetera. Testes: predicti et Arnaldus Cerda. | The witness believed the aforementioned heretics to be good men and to have good faith and could be save by them, even though she knew they were persecuted by the Church, but she did not hear them speak of the errors of visible things nor of sacraments, nor did the witness believe in such errors. It was 20 years ago that she first believed the heretics to be good men, and she stopped believing so 10 years ago. The aforesaid she confessed to brother Ferrier at Limoux. She abjured heresy and swore, etc. Witnesses as above and Arnald Cerda. | sunt XX anni quod primo credidit | non credidit X anni | 1225 | 1235 | Predictos hereticos credidit essebonos homines et habere bonam fidem et posse salvari per ipsos licet sciret quod ecclesia persequeret eos | #pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_bonam\_fidem #pos\_posse\_salvari | Sed non audivit eos dicen tes errores de visibilibus nec de sacrementis nec ipsa credidit predicitis erroribus | #neg\_err\_visibilia #neg\_err\_sacrementis |

**Appendix H**

**Events Spreadsheet - Sample**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **XML ID** | **Latin Deposition** | **English Translation** | **Latin Date** | **Date** | **Latin Location** | **Location Tag** |
| MS609-0001.xml | Anno Domini MÂ° CCÂ° XLÂ° quinto VI Kalendas Iunii. Arnaldus Garnerii testis iuratus dixit quod vidit in domo Petri de Sancto Andrea Bernardum de Sancto Andrea, fratrem dicti Petri, et socium eius, hereticos. Et vidit ibi cum eis dictum Petrum de Sancto Andrea et uxor dictiPetri. Et ipse testis adoravit ibi dictos hereticos, sed non vidit alios adorare. Et sunt VI anni vel circa. Et quando ipse testis exivitdomum invenit Willelmus de Rozergue intrantem ad dictos hereticos. | The year of our Lord 1245, 6th Kalends of June. The sworn witness Arnald Garnier said that he saw in the house of Peire de Saint-Andrea Bernard de Saint-Andrea - brother of the aforesaid Peire - and his companion, heretics, and he saw there the aforesaid Peire and his wife. The witness adored the aforementioned heretics, but he did not see others adore. This was about 6 years ago. And when the witness left the house he encountered Guilhem de Rosengue coming toward the aforesaid heretics. | sunt VI anni vel circa | 1239 | domo Petri de Sancto Andrea | #home\_of\_Cap-de-Porc |
| MS609-0001.xml | Item. Vidit in loco qui dicitur Oliver Bernardum de MarreVilla et socium eius, hereticos. Et vidit ibi cum dictis hereticis Guarnerium, patrem ipsius testis; Willelmum Vitalis; Willelmum Barbas; et Jordanetum del Mas; et alios de quibus non recolit. Et omnes et ipse testis adoraverunt ibi dictos hereticos. Et sunt VII annivel circa. | Item. The witness saw Bernard de Mairevilla and his companion, heretics, in a place called Oliver, and he saw there with said heretics Garnier the father of the witness, Guilhem Vidal, Guilhem Barbas Junior, Jordanet del Mas, and others that he cannot recall. The witness and all adored the aforementioned heretics there. This was about 7 years ago. | Et sunt VII annivel circa. | 1238 | loco qui dicitur Oliver | #Oliver\_MSP |
| MS609-0001.xml | Item. Vidit in domo Willelmi Vitalis Arnaldum Prader et socium eius, hereticos. Et vidit ibi cum eis Poncium Barrau; Jordanetumdel Mas; Jordanum de Quiders; et Willelmum Vitalis predictum; et uxor dicti Willelmi Vitalis. Et omnes et ipse testis adoraverunt ibi dictos hereticos. Et sunt VI anni vel circa. | Item. The witness saw Arnald Prader and his companion, heretics, in the house of Guilhem Vidal, and he saw with them Pons Barrau, Jordanet del Mas, Jordan de Quiders, and the aforementioned Guilhem Vidal and the wife of said Guilhem Vidal. The witness and everyone adored said heretics. This was about 7 years ago. | Et sunt VI anni vel circa. | 1239 | domo Willelmi Vitalis | #home\_of\_Guilhem\_Vidal |
| MS609-0001.xml | Item. Vidit in domo Bernardi +Fabri +, filii de na Matheuz , Arnaldum Pradier et socium eius, hereticos.Et vidit ibi cum eis Poncium Barrau; Jordanum de Quiders; Jordanetum del Mas; Willelmum Vitalis; Bernardum Fabri et matrem dicti Bernardi. Et omnes et ipse testis adoraverunt ibi dictos hereticos. Et sunt VI anni vel circa. | Item. The witness saw Arnald Prader and his companion, heretics, in the house of Bernard, the son of Na Matheus, and he saw there with them Pons Barrau, Jordan de Quiders, Jordanet del Mas, Guilhem Vidal, Bernard Faure, and the mother of said Bernard. The witness and everyone adored the aforementioned heretics there. This was about 7 years ago. | Et sunt VI anni vel circa. | 1239 | domo Bernardi +Fabri +, filii de na Matheuz , | #home\_of\_Bernard\_Faure\_de\_Castilho\_MSP-AU |
| MS609-0001.xml | Item. Vidit in domo Willelmide Canast-Brus Donatum et Petrum Willelmi et alios duos hereticos quorum nomina non recolit. Et vidit ibi cum eis dictum Willelmum de Canast; et Bernardum Ademari; Poncium Barrau. Et omnes et ipse testis adoraverunt ibi dicto hereticos. Et sunt VI anni vel circa. | Item. The witness saw Donat and Peire Guilhem and two other heretics whose names he did not remember in the house of Guilhem Canast-Bru, and he saw with them the aforesaid Guilhem Canast-Bru, Bernard Ademar and Peire Barrau. The witness and everyone adored the aforesaid heretics there. This was about 6 years ago. | Et sunt VI anni vel circa. | 1239 | in domo Willelmide Canast-Brus | #home\_of\_Guilhem\_Canast-Brus |
| MS609-0002.xml | Item. Anno et die quo supra. Willelmus de Rozeugue testis iuratus dixit quod ad instanciam Arnaldi Godalh ipse testis et Raimundus Guarnier duxerunt Willelmum Vitalis et socium eius, hereticos, de Porta de Mal Cosseil usque ad Puybusqua et tradiderunt dictos hereticos Petro Cap de Porc. Sed ipse testis non adoravit dictos hereticos nec vidit alios adorare. Et suntVI anni vel circa. |  | Et suntVI anni vel circa. | 1239 | Porta de Mal Cosseil usque ad Puybusqua | #journey |
| MS609-0002.xml | Item. Vidit Willelmum Vitalis et socium eis hereticos in loco qui dicitur Lo Radel, et vidit ibi cum eis Jordanum deQuiders; Poncium Barrau; et Arnaldum Garnier; et Poncium, fratrem dicti Arnaldi; et Poncium Gauta; Guallardum Amelh; et Poncium Rainart; et plures alios de quibus non recolat. Et sunt VI anni vel circa. |  | Et sunt VI anni vel circa. | 1239 | Lo Radel | #Lo\_Radel\_MSP |
| MS609-0002.xml | Item. Vidit in domo Petri Cap de Porc pluries B. Johannis, Petrum Fabri, hereticos. Et vidit ibi cum eis Raimundum den Amiel; Poncium Rainardi; Willelmum Amelh de Solha; Guaillardum Amelh; et pluries plures alios de quibus non recolit. Et omnes et ipse testis adoravit pluriesdictos hereticos. Et sunt VII anni vel circa. |  | Et sunt VII anni vel circa. | 1238 | in domo Petri Cap de Porc | #home\_of\_Cap-de-Porc |
| MS609-0002.xml | Item. dix Vidit B. de Planis et socium eius, hereticos, in domo de Cap de Porc, et vidit ibi Arnaldum de Rozengue, patrem eiustestis, et ambo audierunt predicationem hereticorum et adoraverunt eos. Et sunt IIIIor anni. Et abiuravit heresim et iuravit, et cetera. Testes: predicti. |  |  |  |  |  |
| MS609-0002.xml | Item. Dixit quod quando erat puer vidit hereticos publice stantes apud Mirapeis. Alibi non vidit hereticos quod recolat. |  | quando erat puer |  | Mirapeis | #Mirepoix\_Ariege |
| MS609-0005.xml | Item. Anno et die quo supra. Willelmus de Silva testis iuratus dixit quod vidit in domo Petrum Cap-de-Porc Poncium Bolvena et socium eius, hereticos. Et vidit ibi cum eis P. Bernardum mazeler et ambo adoraverunt ibi dictos hereticos. Et sunt X anni vel circa. | Item year and day as above. The witness Guilhem de la Silva said that he saw Pons Bolvena and his companions, heretics, in the house of Peire Cap-de-Porc and he saw there with them P. Bernard the butcher, and both adored said heretics. This was about 10 years ago. | Et sunt X anni vel circa. | 1235 | in domo Petrum Cap-de-Porc | #home\_of\_Cap-de-Porc |
| MS609-0005.xml | Item. Vidit in domo Willelmi Canast-Bru Bertrandum Marti et socium eius, hereticos, et vidit ibi cum eis Raimundum denAmelh et P. Bernardi d mazel . Et ipse testis adoravit ibi dictos hereticos et vidit alios adoraverunt. Et sunt XII anni vel circa. | Item. The witness saw Bertrand Marti and his companion, heretics, in the house of Guilhem Canast-Bru, and saw there with them Raimund Amelh and P. Bernard the butcher, and the witness adored said heretics, and he saw others adore them. This was about 12 years ago. | Et sunt XII anni vel circa. | 1233 | in domo Willelmi Canast-Bru | #home\_of\_Guilhem\_Canast-Brus |
| MS609-0005.xml | Item. Vidit in domo de Narrica Raimundum filium de Na Riqua et socium eius, hereticos, et vidit ibi cum eis Petrum Gauta Seniorem; P. Bernardi, mazeler ; Willelmum Bru de Canast; Arnaldum Maiestre. Sed non recolat si ipse et alii adoraverunt ibi dictos hereticos. Et sunt XII anni vel circa. | Item. The witness saw Bernard son of na Riqua and his companions, heretics, in the house of na Riqua, and saw there with them Adalbert Noguier, P. Bernard, macellator, Guilhem Canast-Bru, Arnald Maiestre, but did not recall if he himself and others adored said heretics. This was about 12 years ago. | Et sunt XII anni vel circa. | 1233 | in domo de Narrica | #home\_of\_Peirona\_Na\_Riqua\_MSP-AU |
| MS609-0006.xml | Item. Anno et die quo supra. Poncius Rainardi testis iuratus dixit quod vidit in domo Peire de Sancto Andrea Iohannem Cambitorem et sociumeius, hereticos. Et vidit ibi cum eis Willelmum Vital; Bernardum, dominum del Mas; Arnaldum de Rozengue; Raimundum de Causit; et plures alios de quibusnon recolit. Et omnes et ipse testis adoravit ibi dictos hereticos. Et sunt XIIII anni vel circa. | Item. Year and day as above, the sworn witness Pons Rainard said that he saw Johan Cambiaire and his companions, heretics, in the house of Peire de Sancto Andrea, and saw with them Guilhem Vidal, Bernard lord of Mas-Saintes-Puelles, Arnald de Rosengue, B. de Causit and many others he did not recall. And the witness and everyone else adored said heretics. This was about 14 years ago. | sunt XIIII anni vel circa | 1231 | in domo Peire de Sancto Andrea | #home\_of\_Cap-de-Porc |
| MS609-0006.xml | Item. Vidit Willelmum Vital de Gibel et sociumeius, hereticos, in loco qui dicitur lo Radel. Et vidit ibi cum eis Poncium Guarner; Guallardum Amelh; Arnaldum Godal; PonciumGran; Poncium Gauta; et plures alios de quibus non recolit. Et omnes et ipse testis adoravit ibi dictos hereticos. Et sunt VII annivel circa. | Item. The witness saw Guilhem Vitalis de Gibel and his companions, heretics, in a place called Lo Radel, and he saw there with them Pons Garnier, Guallard Amelh, Arnald Godalh, Pons Gran, Pons Gauta and many others he did not recall, and the witness and everyone else adored said heretics there. This was about 7 years ago. | Et sunt VII annivel circa. | 1238 | lo Radel | #Lo\_Radel\_MSP |
| MS609-0006.xml | Item. Vidit in domo Willelmi Vital Bertrandum Marti et socium eius, hereticos. Et vidit ibi cum eis dictam Camonam ipsum Willelmum Vital et uxor eius. Et ipse testis adoravit ibi dictos hereticos et vidit alios adoraverunt. Et sunt XII anni vel circa. | Item. The witness saw Bertrand Marti and his companions, heretics, in the house of Guilhem Vidal, and saw there with them the aforesaid Camona, and the aforesaid Guilhem Vidal and his wife. The witness adored said heretics and he saw the others adore. This was about 12 years ago. | Et sunt XII anni vel circa. | 1233 | in domo Willelmi Vital | #home\_of\_Guilhem\_Vidal |
| MS609-0006.xml | Item. Vidit in domo ipsius testis P. Bonet, sororium ipsius testis, et socium eius, hereticos. Et vidit ibi cum eis Willelmum Vital et Raimundam,uxor ipsius testis, sororem dicti P. Bonet, hereticam. Et ipse testis et alii adoraverunt dictos hereticos. Et sunt VIII anni vel circa. | Item. The witness saw in his own house the witness' sister-in-law P. Bonet and her companions, heretics, and saw there with them Guilhem Vidal and the witness' wife Raimunda, sister of P. Bonet, heretic, and the witness and everyone else adored said heretics. This was about 8 years ago. | Et sunt VIII anni vel circa. | 1237 | in domo ipsius testis | #home\_of\_Guilhem\_Vidal |
| MS609-0006.xml | Item. Vidit in domo de Na Camona Rixenz et sociam eius, hereticas, et vidit ibi cum eis dictam Camonam sed nonadoravit ibi dictos dictas hereticas, nec vidit alios adorare. Et sunt VII anni vel circa. | Item. The witness saw Rixen and her companion, heretics, in the house of Na Camona, and he saw there with them aforesaid Na Camona but he did not adore them nor did he see the others adore. This was about 7 years ago. | Et sunt VII anni vel circa. | 1238 | in domo de Na Camona | #home\_of\_Na\_Camona\_MSP-AU |
| MS609-0006.xml | Item. Vidit in domo Bernardi de Quiders BertrandumMarti et socium eius, hereticos. Et vidit ibi cum eis Raimundum de Causit; Willelmum Vital; et Arnaldum Godalh; et ipsum Bernardum de Quiders. Et omnes et ipse testis adoraverunt ibi dictos hereticos. Alibi non vidit hereticos quod recolat. | Item. The witness saw Bertrand Marti and heretic companions in the house of Bernard de Quiders and saw there with them Raimund de Causit, Guilhem Vidal and Arnald Godalh and Bernard de Quiders himself, and the witness and everyone else adored said heretics. He did not see the heretics elsewhere that he recalled. |  |  | in domo Bernardi de Quiders | #home\_of\_Bernard\_de\_Quiders |

**Appendix I – DETAILED APPENDIX TITLE NEEDED**

|  |
| --- |
| <**seg** type="dep\_event" subtype="event" xml:id="MS609-0001-1">                <**pb** n="1r"/>                <**lb** break="n" n="1"/>                <**date** type="deposition\_date" when="1245-05-27" cert="high">Anno                   Domini M° CC° XL° quinto VI Kalendas Iunii.</**date**>                 <**persName** nymRef="#Arnald\_Garnier\_MSP-AU" role="dep">Arnaldus Garnerii</**persName**>                testis iuratus dixit quod vidit in                <**placeName** type="event\_loc" nymRef="#home\_of\_Cap-de-Porc">domo                   <**persName** nymRef="#Peire\_Cap-de-Porc\_MSP-AU" role="own">Petri de Sancto Andrea</**persName**>                </**placeName**>                <**lb** break="y" n="2"/>                <**persName** nymRef="#Bernard\_Cap-de-Porc\_MSP-AU" role="her">B<**supplied** reason="expname">ernardum</**supplied**> de Sancto Andrea</**persName**>,                fratrem dicti Petri, et socium eius, hereticos. Et vidit ibi cum eis dictum                <**persName** nymRef="#Peire\_Cap-de-Porc\_MSP-AU" ana="#uAdo" role="par">P<**supplied** reason="expname">etrum</**supplied**> de Sancto Andrea</**persName**> et                <**persName** nymRef="#Susanna\_Cap-de-Porc\_MSP-AU" ana="#uAdo" role="par">uxor dicti<**lb** break="y" n="3"/>Petri</**persName**>. Et                <**persName** nymRef="#Arnald\_Garnier\_MSP-AU" ana="#pAdo" role="par"/>ipse                testis adoravit ibi dictos hereticos, sed non vidit alios adorare. Et                <**date** type="event\_date" when="1239">sunt VI anni vel circa</**date**>.                <**seg** type="inq\_int" subtype="specific\_question">Et quando ipse testis exivit<**lb** break="y" n="4"/>domum invenit                      <**persName** nymRef="#Guilhem\_de\_Rosengue\_MSP-AU" key="inqint" ana="#pIntra" role="ref">Willelmus de Rozergue</**persName**> intrantem ad dictos hereticos.</**seg**> </**seg**> |

**Appendix J**

|  |
| --- |
| <**seg** type="dep\_event" subtype="belief" xml:id="MS609-0001-6">Et <**seg** type="prev\_conf" ana="#neg\_penance">omnia predicta<**lb** break="y" n="14"/>fuit confessus                <**persName** nymRef="#Ferrier\_OP" role="pinq">fratri Ferrario inquisitori</**persName**>,                et post dictum confessionem non vidit hereticos vel hereticas</**seg**>. Item.                   <**seg** type="conf" ana="#pos\_bonos\_homines #pos\_bonam\_fidem #pos\_veraces #pos\_amicos\_dei">Dixit quod                      credebat hereticos esse bonos<**lb** break="y" n="15"/>homines et habere bonam fidem et esse                   veraces et amicos Dei</**seg**>. Et <**seg** type="conf" subtype="heard\_error" ana="#pos\_err\_visibilia  #neg\_err\_matrimonio #neg\_err\_baptismo #neg\_err\_resurrectione #neg\_err\_hostia">audivit hereticos dicentes quod Deus non fecerat visibilia, sed ipse<**lb** break="y" n="16"/>                      testis non credidit predicto errori. De baptismo, de hostia sacrata, de                      matrimonio, de resurrectione carnis, non audivit hereticos loquentes</**seg**>. Et <**lb** break="y" n="17"/>                <**seg** type="hist\_bel">                   <**date** type="prev\_bel\_start" when="1238">sunt VII anni quod primo credidit                      hereticos esse bonos</**date**>, et <**date** type="prev\_bel\_end" when="1240">sunt V                      anni quod ultimo dimisit ipsam credulitatem</**date**>                     </**seg**>. Et non habuit<**lb** break="y" n="18"/>penitentiam ab                 <**persName** nymRef="#Ferrier\_OP" role="ref">fratre Ferrario</**persName**> et abiuravit heresim et iuravit et cetera. Testes:                 <**seg** type="witnesses" xml:id="MS609-0001-WIT">                   <**persName** nymRef="#Arnald\_Prior\_StSernin" role="wit">Ar<**supplied** reason="expname">naldus</**supplied**>, prior Sancti Saturnini</**persName**>;                    <**persName** nymRef="#Arnald\_Cerda" role="wit">Ar<**supplied** reason="expname">naldus</**supplied**> Cerda</**persName**>; et                   <**persName** nymRef="#Guilhem\_Pelhisson\_OP" role="wit">frater W<**supplied** reason="expname">illelmus</**supplied**> Pelisso Ordo<**lb** break="y" n="19"/>Predicatorum</**persName**>; et                   <**persName** nymRef="#Bernard\_de\_Caux\_OP" role="inq">frater B<**supplied** reason="expname">ernardus</**supplied**> de Caucio, inquisitor</**persName**>.</**seg**> </**seg**> |
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