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THE ORDO PROCESSUS NARBONENSIS: THE EARLIEST INQUISITOR’S HANDBOOK, LOST AND REFOUND*

SUMMARY: Handbooks were fundamental to the development of medieval inquisition procedure from the mid-thirteenth century on. The earliest of these handbooks to survive, the 1244 Ordo processus Narbonensis, speaks to this early stage of development, but until now it has only been known in a nineteenth-century transcription. This article presents the rediscovered manuscript, which also contains a more substantial and hitherto unknown Lombard inquisitorial collection. The presence of the Ordo in this larger collection is evidence of an inquisitorial culture shared across regional and institutional boundaries. An edition of the Ordo, and of several otherwise unknown items, are included in appendix.
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Inquisition in the medieval period operated in large part through reciprocity and exchange. That inquirors of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries did their work without an overarching institutional framework to guide them is now a commonplace of scholarship: there was neither a central office nor a single point of authority, beyond the papal curia. There was, though, an increasingly coherent technology of investigation and record, one that was able to produce comparable data across several geographical and political regions, and that was equally able to share that data between those regions, as people moved to escape the growing pressure on publicly lived disbelief. The texts that contained and disseminated this data were recognised at the time, and have been recognised by scholars since, as the real basis for the inquisitors’ power. The production and curation of these texts were possible through the sharing of copies, both as evidence and as models for the production of new texts. The careful collection and circulation of material, as evidence and as model, was built into the process from its inception. Of equal significance was the sharing

* For their patient reading of, and wise commentary on this article I am indebted to Pete Biller, Catriona Kennedy, Amy Sackville, Harry Munt, Simon Ditchfield, Stuart Carroll, and the reviewers for Aevum.
of practice between inquisitors. From the earliest years of medieval inquisition, there was a habit of discussing the mechanical realities of its implementation.

In its first decades, the nature and scope of the inquisition process was given form in papal and episcopal legislation, above all in the regional councils of southern France. From the second quarter of the thirteenth century, as inquisition increasingly became the church’s principal method of combating religious dissent, those regional councils, led by papal legates and the more reformist bishops, laid much of the foundation for the examination of heretical activity – the powers of the inquisitors, the types of error to be established, the punishments that accrued to those errors – each aspect of which was refined and elaborated by the legal consilia sought by inquisitors from canon legal experts.¹

In this first phase, inquisitors’ discussion of process rested on this legal and conciliar output. Early inquisitors were reliant on the texts produced by ecclesiastical councils and canon lawyers for guidance – and the ongoing legislation of the councils and the curia through the forties and fifties, and in particular the proliferation of legal consilia on questions of anti-heresy law from the thirties on, are testament to the dialectical relationship between inquisition practice and law. The continuous accumulation and sharing of these texts, though, was accompanied by an increasingly self-conscious gathering of knowledge and expertise by inquisitors. By the 1240s, the system had begun to achieve a sort of momentum. The tribunals produced texts (depositions, sentences, penances) that circulated as models for other inquisitors to use. The application of anti-heretical measures to the practice of the tribunals generated further questions, and made clear where there were areas of legislation left unconsidered. Navigating this growing body of law and tradition demanded an awareness of the role of the inquisitor in that process. All the while, an enormous volume of business was passing before the tribunals. The routinizing effect of that business, which streamlined and entrenched emerging habits of practice, meant that the reproduction of statements of official authority gradually ceded ground to the discussion of that authority in the texts inquisitors wrote for themselves. An inquisitorial voice, rooted in shared experience, was laid over the use and reuse of formule and models, and the collection of material was more and more accompanied by commentary. From this emerged the dedicated handbook literature.

Inquisitorial handbooks were very much part of, and built from, earlier and ongoing discourse. They distilled and reflected upon the procedure that had been developing in the early years of anti-heretical inquisition. They were also an increasingly active part of that development, not only collecting but also directing process. Often incorporating copies or excerpts from the conciliar and legal texts, as well as reference copies of sentences and penances drawn directly from the tribunals, alongside their own reflections, the handbooks were written and compiled by inquisitors for the benefit of their fellow inquisitors, and from the 1240s became one of the main forums in which inquisitors thought about the nature of their role and the limits of

their authority. The handbook tradition lay at the heart of inquisitorial self-perception, and of thought about the office.

The text known as the *Ordo processus Narbonensis* is usually understood to be among the earliest of these handbooks produced for the inquisition of heresy. Though a relatively brief text, the *Ordo* occupies a central place in the history of the inquisition of heresy because it captures something of the character of the early tribunals. Essentially a how-to guide to the inquisition of heresy, it outlines, with remarkable economy, the stages of the tribunal in order of process, and provides a question list and sample documents for the production of the registers that were to accompany that process. Its precise date and authorship have been a matter of some debate since its discovery. Although the possible date range for the *Ordo processus Narbonensis* is luxuriously narrow for an inquisitor’s handbook – 1244 x 1254 in its widest expression – there has nonetheless been a small but persistent debate about its precise date, which has significance mainly for how we view its authorship.

Antoine Dondaine, the first to properly draw attention to the importance of the handbooks as a group of texts, believed that the *Ordo* was compiled in 1244 by William Raymond and Peter Durand, the inquisitors for Provence, a conclusion based on their letter of commission, which serves as its preface and which is dated to 21 October of that year. That conclusion was questioned by Dossat, who instead argued that the *Ordo* was put together by William and Peter’s immediate successors, Bernard of Caux and John of Saint Pierre, in 1248 or 1249. Dossat’s revision rested on an argument that the text was prepared after Aragonese territory in Narbonne was removed from the jurisdiction of the Carcassonne inquisitors. In Dossat’s view, a papal order of 1248 to send instructions to the Aragonese inquisitors provided the likely impetus for the compilation of the *Ordo*, making Bernard and John the likely authors of the text. That hypothesis was confirmed, in his view, by a comparison with the sentences of the latter two (in the register preserved in Toulouse MS 609). For Dossat, the text was compiled by Bernard of Caux and John of St Pierre, using the older letter of commission because their own position was provisional.

Dossat was perhaps influenced by the text’s survival in a Spanish library. He was also following Douais, who similarly believed that the *Ordo* was made for inquisitors in Aragon, and who pointed to the exchange of consultations between Aragon and Languedoc in support of this, especially the canons of the council of Tarrago-

---

2 Published by Adolphe Tardif in *Tardif* 1883, 669-78. The transcription, by Balme, as published by Tardif, achieved a wider circulation through its reproduction in *Vacandard* 1907, ‘Appendix A’, 313-21, and in Conway’s 1908 translation of Vacandard (258-69). The same text is reproduced in *Selge* 1967, 70-77. It is translated in *Wakefield* 1974, 250-58, and this is reprinted in *Peters* 1980, 200-06. See also *Molinier* 1888, 184; *Douais* 1900, I, 233-36; *Dondaine* 1947, 85-194; *Dossat* 1952, 33-37, and *Dossat* 1959, 167; *Maisonneuve* 1960, 331-32; *Parmeggiani* 2012, xii-xvii; *Sackville* 2013, 207-08.

3 *Dondaine* 1947, 97-101. Tanon also takes the 1244 date of the letter of commission as a guide to the date of the text, which he sees as being composed towards 1245, *Tanon* 1893.

4 Without access to the manuscript, there was no way for him to know that it is Italian, as argued below.
Dossat’s revision was challenged in turn by Kolmer, however, who took the position that the formulae included in the Ordo deviate too significantly from Bernard and John’s registers to support their authorship. Kolmer suggested that the Ordo’s model texts in fact correlate much more closely with those of Peter Durand and Ferrier, a close associate of William Raymond. More recently, Parmeggiani has again pointed to the striking similarities between the Ordo’s formulae and the surviving texts of William and Peter, which are, in truth, much closer than any similarities between the Ordo and those of Bernard and John. In fact, the resemblance that Dossat emphasized between the work of the latter two and the Ordo lies mainly in the process they employ (when to issue the general sermon, in what circumstances the period of grace should be applied, the transcription of names, and so on), and in the questions they ask. There is nothing in that resemblance that is precluded by the use by Bernard and John of an earlier text—perhaps indeed this text—and there is no particular reason to suppose that this was not also sent on to the Aragonese inquisitors in 1248. If William Raymond and Peter Durand are understood as the authors of the text, then the voice in the first section of the Ordo (‘within the limits of inquisition entrusted to and defined for us by the prior of the province under the authority stated above’) can be read in a much more straightforward way. The earlier date of 1244 therefore seems the most plausible.

The Ordo certainly emerged, then, from the busy tribunals of southern France in the 1240s. It was also influential on later handbooks, providing a base that was expanded upon and elaborated by one French handbook, the Doctrina de modo procedendi and one Italian, the Explicatio super officio inquisitionis. For this reason, Dondaine regarded its historical value as “exceptional”, a window into the period in which inquisition was taking on the juridical form it would have throughout the following decades. It is therefore a vitally important text for the development of procedure and handbook literature, though manuscript witnesses are very limited: indeed it has only been available to modern scholarship through the edition published by Alphonse Tardif in 1883.

Tardif, who published the Ordo in a short article as a “document for the history of the process of inquisition and the inquisition of heretical depravity”, was primarily interested in the development of trial procedures in the high medieval period, and their contemporary resonance in late nineteenth century France. He was not working from the manuscript, but from a transcription that had been sent to him by M. François Balme, who had found the text in a manuscript preserved in the University Library of Madrid. Working at one remove from the original, Tardif gave the call...
number as “MS no. 53”, presumably the reference given to him by Balme. That is how it has been cited since, in scholarship and in the copy of Tardif’s text included in Selge’s collection of inquisition texts. Usually, the citation is accompanied by a note to the effect that the text cannot be found in that manuscript. And sure enough, MS 53 of the Complutense is a collection of church councils, and the Ordo processus Narbonensis appears nowhere in it. Modern scholars, therefore, have always been working without access to the original manuscript of the text. The original is to be found in the Complutense, however. Owing, presumably, to the sort of note-taking error of which we are all guilty from time to time, the manuscript of the Ordo is extant in manuscript 55 rather than 53.\footnote{11}

BH MSS 55 is a paper manuscript, 193 folios in length in six gatherings, measuring 30 x 21 cm.\footnote{12} It came into the Complutense’s collection via its incorporation of the library of the Colegio Mayor de San Ildefonso. It may have been in this library since its foundation in the late-fifteenth century, since the first inventory of the Colegio in 1512 lists a “reportorium inquisiciones”, though there is no way to know whether or not this is our manuscript.\footnote{13} The manuscript is made up of several discrete items bound together. The first item is the one of interest here: a group of texts, all in the same hand, and labelled by the inventories as the “Statutes of the Council of Toulouse accompanied by various papal letters” (of which more shortly).\footnote{14} The Ordo is included as part of the first group of texts, and, bar transcription errors, this is the text used by Balme. It includes the initial letter of commission and the entire text, though not all the subtitles supplied by Tardif/Balme are present in the manuscript. Having the manuscript of the Ordo does not add much to our knowledge of the content of the text, beyond a degree of reassurance that the form in which it turned in earnest in the last three decades of his life, in Lyon. http://www.dominicains.fr/le-frere-francois-balme.

\footnote{11} Madrid, Universidad Complutense [BCM], BH MSS 55 [BH 55]. I am indebted to Pete Biller for the suggestion to hunt further in Madrid collection, just in case. Study of the manuscript has been made from the Complutense’s excellent digitalization, which makes it easily accessible online, without, alas, the need to visit Madrid. A more detailed study will follow, which will use the manuscript directly.

\footnote{12} Sánchez Mariana 1995, 366. I am immensely grateful to Mercedes Cabello Martín at the Biblioteca Histórica de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid for supplying me with the reference to this article and with details of the library’s historic catalogues.

\footnote{13} The 1512 inventory also lists, in the same bookcase, an ‘Apaurus notularum de hereticis’ and a ‘Directorium inquisicionis’, BCM MS BH MM 790, f. 53v. See also BCM MS BH MM 840, f. 18r. On the historic inventories and catalogues of the library see CABELO MARTIN 2015, esp. 3-4. See also Villa-Amil y Castro 1878, 18-19; Ewald 1881, 322; Sánchez Mariana 1995.

\footnote{14} The contents of BH 55 are as follows: 1r-57v: Statuta concilii tolosani etc.; 59r-104r: Regula cancellariae diversorum pontificum, with legal texts, preceded by some stray medical recipes (59r-60v); 105ra-12ra: Margarita Decretalium, ‘Summa ad omnes materias canonicas que recte margarita comuniter appellantur’; 112rb-13ra: De dispensationibus by Bonaguida de Arétio; 115rb-16vb: Super alimentis by Martinus de Fano; 117r-28r: Utlis doctrina circa diversas formulas electionum, by Laurentius de Sumptione (1254), with eight other opuscula (122r-28r) heavily annotated and in places glossed; 129r-90v: Summa dictaminis breviter, by Laurentius de Aquilegia; 191v-94v: Bernard of Clairvaux’s letter to Raymond of Saint-Ambroise, (‘de modo regendi se et familiam suam’ is how Villa-Amil y Castro lists it), along with a short treatise on how confession is to be made; 195r-v: a fragment of the Liber secretis secretorum. See Villa-Amil y Castro 1878, 18-19, and Sánchez Mariana 1995, 366.
has been used hitherto is essentially correct.\textsuperscript{15} The context provided by the manuscript, however, is more enlightening. The initial group of texts, the “Statutes of the Council of Toulouse accompanied by various papal letters”, is in fact a collection of inquisitorial materials, including two handbooks.\textsuperscript{16}

The inquisition handbooks that survive to us from the high medieval period take a variety of forms. They are usually understood to fall into one of four broad categories, as outlined by Dondaine: collections; manuals without formularies (and in this category Dondaine includes the \textit{Ordo}); manuals with formularies; and treatises. The generic distinctions, and the chronological relationships, between these forms are fuzzy, and in their manuscript witnesses those distinctions are further blurred by the fact that handbooks are often copied into larger collections that may contain exemplars of several of these types. The Madrid collection adds two. The first item is a copy of the \textit{De auctoritate et forma inquisitionis}, a handbook of Dondaine’s “treatise” variety, which was used in the early-fourteenth century by the inquisitor Bernard Gui in his own handbook (1323-1324). It presents a discussion of the authority of inquisitors and the correct practice of inquisition. It is followed in BH 55 by two additional paragraphs on \textit{Rebelles} and \textit{Relapsi} that also follow the \textit{De auctoritate} in the Vatican library’s copy of that text, and which are included in two other Italian handbooks, which are found in the Casanatense and Laurenziana libraries.\textsuperscript{17} As well as this, additional witness to the \textit{De auctoritate}, BH 55 also adds a previously unknown example of Dondaine’s “collections” to the surviving corpus of inquisition handbooks.

There are several surviving handbooks that take the form of these collections. They are compilations or anthologies of texts pertinent to the practice and conduct of inquisition, which circulated as discrete compendia, and which were often copied into manuscripts containing other inquisition handbooks and treatises. A number of these compilation handbooks survive, from the mid-thirteenth century onwards, almost all of them of Italian provenance, almost all surviving in Italian collections. Dondaine grouped them together as “manuels avec formulaire”, but their character as a group has been properly elaborated by Parmeggiani, who has demonstrated the adaptation of an originally French model that took place in the Italian peninsula in the second half of the century. So, the compilation put together by southern French Dominican inquisitors, now represented by MS Vat. lat. 3978, was the basis for a similar handbook, usually called the \textit{Libellus}. The \textit{Libellus} developed the original French archetype along the lines of what Parmeggiani calls the “Italian” model, i.e. a

\textsuperscript{15} Although Douais remarks that the text is ‘not irreproachable’, \textsc{Douais} 1900, I, 235. Corrections to Balme and Tardif’s version are noted in the appended transcription in Appendix I.
\textsuperscript{16} The later catalogues list BH 55 under the heading \textit{Statuta concilii tolosani} etc., but the first text in the collection is a copy of the \textit{De auctoritate et forma inquisitionis}. Villa-Amil y Castro lists the \textit{consilium} of Gui Foulques as a separate item of seven folios, which would include Foulques and the remaining items in the first section. \textsc{Villa-Amil y Castro} 1878, 18, n. 1, notes that these ‘may be those printed in Cremona, 1641, according to Lipenio’, i.e. \textit{Tractatus de Officio Sanctissimae Inquisitionis et modo procedendi in causis fidei}, Cesare Carena (Cremona, 1641).
\textsuperscript{17} \textsc{Parmeggiani} 2002, 253-54. Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. lat. 2648, f. 59va; Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, MS Cas. 1730, ff. 171vb-72ra; Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS Plut. VII sin. 2, ff. 176rb-vb.
tripartite compilation comprising papal letters and other legislative authorities, consilia, and formulae. That model seems to have been disseminated in Italy, primarily in Franciscan circles, on the basis of a text used in the ambit of the Franciscan inquisition of the Roman province, of which Beinecke MS 1063 is our earliest exemplar.\footnote{Dondaine 1947, 105-112; Parmeggiani 2002, and Parmeggiani 2012, LXVII-LII.}

Between these Italian compilations there is therefore a broad generic similarity, since all of them are comprised of materials drawn from the same three groups of texts. There are also direct relationships between them. The “twin” of Beinecke MS 1063 is the compilation preserved in a Florentine manuscript in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (MS Plut. 7 sin. 2), also Franciscan, also used in the Roman province, between Tuscany, Lazio, and Umbria (this particular manuscript witness belonged to the Franciscan convent of Santa Croce in Florence). The Laurentian manuscript is also closely related to the handbook preserved in Rome in the Casanatense (MS 1730), similarly pertinent to the Roman province, though again of Florentine provenance. Another compilation, preserved in Mantua in the Biblioteca Comunale Teresiana (MS 465), and used by Franciscan inquisitors in the Veneto also has a “twin”, in Venice, in the Biblioteca Marciana (MS Lat. IV, 22 [= 2745]), although this latter has documents pertaining to the Franciscan inquisition of Treviso and to the Dominican inquisition in Lombardy, and the Mantua and Venice manuscripts are independent copies from a common ancestor. Finally, there is also a compilation from the turn of the fourteenth century used by the Franciscan inquisitors in Rimini preserved in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale of Florence (Conv. Sopp. C 9 1127) and copied in a Milanese manuscript preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (MS Lat. 3373).\footnote{On the relationship between these compilations see Parmeggiani 2002; Dondaine 1947, 105-12.}

The intricacies of these relationships have been carefully traced and laid out by others and do not need extensive repetition here. Here, the salient point that emerges from those relationships is that there was clearly a common compilatory habit amongst the inquisitors of northern and central Italy, and in particular amongst the Franciscan inquisitors (from whom the majority of these compilations survive). The shared basic framework was adapted easily to local conditions. The basic core of important papal letters was reasonably stable: each inquisitorial province merely inserted the versions of those letters that had been addressed to them, and added other letters and authorities pertinent to their particular jurisdiction. The consilia could likewise be adjusted according to local authorities. In essence, the compilation handbooks collected the principal documents that established the authority of the inquisitor to run a tribunal, and combined them with formulae for the documents produced by the tribunal. They brought these all together in a single, portable volume that could be adapted to fit the province in which it was being used, and that provided the inquisitor with the basic tools he needed in the execution of his office. The handbook in BH 55 follows the same format. It comprises: a long series of papal letters concerned with inquisition and inquisitorial authority; conciliar texts (a selection from the 1229 council of Toulouse and the full text of the canons of the
1243/1244 council of Narbonne); the *Ordo processus Narbonensis*; several more papal letters; a series of legal texts or *consilia* (Pierre de Collemieu’s *Cum nuper*, a selection from the Piacenzan *consilia* of the 1270s, and the long version of the important *consilium* by the French canon lawyer Gui Foulques); and, finally, some sample texts and *formulae*.  

BH 55 as a whole is difficult to date with certainty, due to its composite character. Sánchez Mariana dates it to the fifteenth century, but Ewald dates it to the fourteenth, which seems more plausible. The script of the first section of the manuscript, which consists of the inquisitorial material, is very reminiscent of the notarial hand of northern Italy of the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries. The fleur-de-lys watermark, visible in that first section (most easily on folios 10 and 56) is also like those of northern Italy in the same period. The date and in particular the origin of the handbook itself, however, can be established with some degree of accuracy. Whatever the date of the manuscript, the handbook seems to be a very late thirteenth, or early fourteenth century compilation. Most of the letters included were issued in the 1250s and 1260s, with three later exceptions dating from 1273, 1276, and 1291. Several of the letters are accompanied by notarial addenda, and of those addenda that are dated, most fall between the years 1264-1273. One note is dated later, by John of Milan OP, writing in 1284 with three other Milanese brothers, and the note to *Illuminet super vos* must necessarily be dated 1291 or later. The *De auctoritate*, which precedes the compilation but is in the same hand, is a difficult text to date precisely, but it is usually given a range of 1280-1288/1292.

As is perhaps by now evident, it is also safe to say that this is a north Italian collection, almost certainly put together by, or for, the Dominican inquisitors who were responsible for inquisitions in Lombardy and the March of Genoa. The selection and availability of the texts that comprise the handbook speak directly to the region in which it was used. The vast majority of the letters are those versions directed to the inquisitorial district of Lombardy, addressed specifically to the Dominican inquisitors of that region. More to the point, the copies of the letters that this manuscript represents were clearly circulating within the learned network of the Lombard office. Annotations to several of the letters make it clear that they have been copied

---

20 On the letters see Bivolarov 2014. Toulouse: canons 1-18, and 25-27. A full list of the handbook’s contents is given at the end in Appendix II. Italian Manuscripts often have the abbreviated version of the *consilia* and council texts, but here they are almost all complete.

21 Sánchez Mariana 1995, 366. This is a general study of the library’s manuscripts with brief entries, so is presumably simply following the dating by Villa-Amil y Castro, who also dates it to the fifteenth century. Ewald 1881, 322.

22 Mosin – Traljić 1957, 65-68 and nos 594 ff., esp. 617-18; Brquet 1907, e.g. II, 380, no. 6714.

23 *Cum super*, 16r, ‘Ego frater Johannes mediolanensis ordinis predicaturor notarius scripsi etc. ... Sub anno MCClxxxiiii. die domino xiii kalends Julii presentibus fratribus Albertino, Philippo et Laurentio mediolanensis ordinis predicaturorum’. On *Illuminet super vos* see below, n. 26.

24 On the *De auctoritate* see Donaine 1947, 113-15, 162; Pirli 2008; Parmeggiani 2012, lvii-lix.

25 On the importance of local networks to the function of inquisition, see Parmeggiani 2013, 57-79. See also Benedetti 2008, especially part two.
(either directly into this handbook, or into the collection from which they are copied) on the orders not only of the inquisitors of Lombardy (Germanus of Conzana’s name features with some regularity), but also of regional prelates and ecclesiastical leaders (including the bishop of Pavia). They also bear traces of the operation of the tribunal, of the exchange of personnel, and of the conversation, counsel, and interpretation that went on within the familia of the inquisitors about these texts.

26 See Appendix II for a list of the letters. The following lists notes appended to them.

[1] *Illuminet super vos*, f. 16v: the note is undated, but it names ‘G.’, bishop of Pavia, which gives this a broad range of possibility, between 1291 (the first issue of the letter) and 1311: ‘G.’ must be either Guido Tacio OSB 1272-1294, or Guido de Langasco 1295-1311 (a very brief Otto, 1294-1295 interrupts the brace of Guidos), EUBEL 1891, I, 389. On Pavia in this period, see BENEDETTI 2002.

[2] *Super extirpatione*, f. 24r-v, copied by order of the bishop in the episcopal palace 08/03/1264, by notary Magister Azo. Azo’s name also appears after *Imminente nobis*, f. 31r-v, though no date is given. There is a substantial marginal annotation on this folio, for the letter above, though it is cropped: ‘Quod inquisitor cum d…/ potest interpreter et d…/ dubia et obscura…/ edita contra hereticos r…/ res, factores et de…/ eorum et privare etam…/ [di]gnitatis personibus…/ officii publicis et…/ ecclesiastics filios…/ potes eorum’.

[3] Ruffinus of Genoa: there are several notes by the notary Ruffinus of Genoa acting, in 1267, on the orders of Peter, archdeacon, and in 1267 and 1273 for Germanus, the inquisitor for Lombardy and March:

(i) *Licet ex omnibus*, f. 32r-34r, ‘Ego frater Ruffinus Ianuensis notarius sacri palatii de mandato domini Petri archidiaec. Alex. in Alex. anno MCClxvii Indictione x. die Iovis ultimo exeunt’ Junii…’; *Super eo*, f. 34r-35v, ‘Ego Ruffinus Ianuensis notarius sacri palatii de mandato fratris Germani Inquisitoris contra hereticam pravitatem anno domini MCClxvii Indictione x die mar. xviii mensis Julii…’.

(ii) *Licet ex omnibus mundi*, f. 34v-35r, copied on the orders of the prior provincial of the Lombard Dominicans in 1267 (‘MCClxvii die xiii intrate Julio’), according to the brief preface. There is also a note at the end to the effect that this was instituted by Germanus as inquisitor, and ordered by Peter from Ruffinus in 1270: ‘Idem Prior volens et cupiens preceptum eiusdem sumni Pontificis iuxta formam predictarum litterarum exequi reverenter, habita diligentie delibratione et consilio plurimum eiusdem ordinis disseritum fratum auctoritate sibi ab ipso mense aperte commissa, Consistuit et ordinavit, fratrem Germanum de Conzano eiusdem ordinis Inquisitoris ex vigore predictarum litterarum contra hereticam pravitatem in provintia Lombardiae et Marchiae Ianuensis. In iungens eodem ut sub obedientie debito, predictum inquisitionis hereticae pravitatis officium in eiusdem Lombardiae et Marchiae Ianuensis exercet et faciat secundum formam etiam Inquisitoribus per ipsum dominum papam, concessam et datam. Denem idem Prior mihi Petrus notarius infrascripto mandavit hac in publicam et autenticam formam redigere. Bononiae in domo fratrum predicatrorum presentibus etc. etc. Ego Petrus condam Raymondi Prioris de vint. imperiali auctoritate notarius de mandato dicti d. Prioris publice scripsi’, followed by ‘Premissum instrumentum constitutionis inquisitoris predicti et autenticae predictarum litterarum, transcriptum fuerit per Ruffinum Ianuensis inquisitoris de mandato domini Petri Archidiaconos Alex. in Alex. MCClxv Ind. xiii. die luna vii ex. novemver.’

(iii) *Noverit devoto*, f. 35r-v, 1273, ‘Transcripte fuerunt et autenticae suprascripte littere per suprascriptum Ruffinum de mandato fratris Germani Inquisitoris MCClxvii Ind. prima die mar. Xi. Julii’.

[4] A note records the orders of the inquisitor Boniface, in 1272, after *Cum fraters predictores*, f. 36r: ‘Transcripte et autenticae fuerunt supradicte due littere apostolice utriusque papae per Manfredum fil’ Ser Petri Cerrati C. m. de mandato fratris Bonifacii inquisitoris MCClxvii. die mar. xiii Aprilis Ind. prima.’

Relatum est nobis, f. 25r, William, bishop and legate to Dominican inquisitors in Lombardy, given at Milan 23/07/1276; beneath there is a further note: ‘Premissa littera habetur Janue in capsia officii, autenticata cum duobus sigillis.’ On the inquisitorial familia see especially BRUSCHI 2013.
These too point specifically to Lombardy. In fact much of the rest of the handbook is built from texts either written in the region or known to have been in use there. The text that precedes the handbook, the De auctoritate, is a Lombard text, and a brief comparison suggests that the version here is closer to another Italian copy of the text (that contained in MS Vat. lat. 2648) than to the one preserved from the Carcassonne inquisition archives via volume 36 of the Doat collection in Paris.

The legal consilia included in the collection similarly speak to a Lombard context. Aside from the consilium written by Gui Foulques, which was very widely reproduced and which appears in some form in most handbooks, the consilia in BH 55 are all pertinent to, or produced in, Lombardy. Of particular relevance are the four texts included from the “sylloge” of six consilia from Piacenza, produced in 1276-1277 at the request of Nicholas of Cremona, one of the Dominican inquisitors for Lombardy. Two things suggest a direct connection to the Lombard inquisitions. The second of the Piacentine texts, dated incorrectly in all the other manuscript witnesses to the 13th of September, is here given the correct date of the 23rd, which date is known both from comparison with the calendar, and from a now lost Piacentine manuscript used by the antiquarian Pier Maria Campi (1569-1649). The consilium of 13 November is also given a year, usually absent. Moreover, the consilia of 19 October and 13 November, both of which deal with the division of heretics’ goods, appear to be annotated with supplementary material from the Cremonese inquisitor’s circle. The former includes a note on Nicholas of Cremona’s further discussion of the interpretation of this principle with the bishop of Cremona, his vicar, Ponzio Ponzibus, and other learned men. The latter adds a further elaboration on the division of goods in the case of tenants.

The handbook ends with a brief selection of formulae and sample documents that could be used as examples when drawing up the documents produced by the tribunal. These are in addition to those included in the Ordo itself, and, as in other handbooks, are taken from existing records of previous inquisitions. There are four model sentences that appear to be drawn, though at what remove it is hard to say, from the registers of the inquisitions carried out in Toulouse by William Bernard of Dax and John of Saint-Benoît between 1258 and c. 1263.

This is the same collection of documents from which the Doctrina de modo procedendi borrowed, though the French material in BH 55 was perhaps derived more

28 Cum nuper, the consilium from Pierre de Collemieu, f. 46r (99), was addressed to the Dominicans of Lombardy. Parmeggiani 2011, 51-54, no. 10. The Narbonne consultation survives mostly in Italian MSS, as well, see Parmeggiani 2011, 22-32, no. 5 (page 23 for MSS).

29 BH 55, ff. 47r-50r. On this group of consilia see Parmeggiani 2011, 107-21, nos. 24-29. BH 55 contains nos. 24-27, in the same order as other manuscript witnesses, i.e. 25, 24, 26, 27, see Parmeggiani, Parmeggiani 2011, 109.

30 The date is corrected in Kaeppeli – Panella 1970, IV, 205, and see Parmeggiani 2011, 111. Campi, working from an old register of the Holy Inquisition of Piacenza kept in the archive of Dominican church of S. Giovanni, ‘registrum vetus S. Inquisitionis Plac. in arch. Fratrum S. Ioannis’, also dates it to 23 September, Campi 1651, II, 308-09, see Ditchfield 1995, 291-328 on the Historia. It is unlikely that this is Campi’s manuscript, since he mentions in his discussion of the consilium of 7 July the names of notaries that are not included in the BH 55 copy. It is not impossible, but the fact that he also only mentions nos. 24, 25, 27 again suggests not.
directly from the original, rather than from the *Doctrina*, given that there are some differences in both form and content.  

31 These are followed by an interrogatory, interesting in its fairly consistent inclusion of both male and female heretics in its questions, and in the unusual checklist that it provides at the end.  

32 An abjuration, taken in all likelihood from a Lombard formulary, and the beginning of a 1268 sentence from the Orvieto *Liber inquisitionis*, close the handbook.

Compiled at the end of the thirteenth century or the turn of the fourteenth, certainly in the context of the Lombard inquisition, the BH 55 handbook joins other Italian compilation handbooks put together by inquisitors in these decades.  

34 Similar in date and format to its cousins, it also conforms to the Italianate pattern of inquisitorial collections identified by Parmeggiani, which brings together decretal material, legal *consilia*, and formularies, in that order, though BH 55 is collected together with a treatise, the *De auctoritate*.  

35 Also, like the other cognate Italian collections, BH 55 demonstrates the transmission of material from the southern French inquisitions to northern Italy during the thirteenth century, more widely attested by the copies and adaptations of southern French inquisition handbooks and records made by Italian inquisitors that appeared in the second half of the century, once inquisitions were more firmly established in the peninsula.  

36 The Madrid handbook, which includes southern French texts and sample documents, adds to this tradition.

---

31 *Omnibus Christi fidelibus*, from William Bernard OP inquisitor of Toulouse (55v), which is essentially, though not exactly, the penance in the *Doctrina de modo procedendi contra hereticos*, c. 1271, an anonymous, Dominican text from Languedoc, edited MARTÈNE – DURAND 1717, V, 1795-1822, col. 1808. The principal differences are that, in the Madrid manuscript version, only William Bernard is named, there is extra information on the deponent, and extra pilgrimages to Rome and Canterbury in the penance. *Omnibus Christi* etc. (56r), without names, also overlaps with the *Doctrina* penance col. 1808. *Noverint universi presentes* (56r), without names, is very close to the concession for the deposition of crosses contained in the *Doctrina*, col. 1809. *In nomine d. nostri* (56r), from the inquisitors of Toulouse, though issued against somebody from Cremona; it is similar to the first *formula* in the *Doctrina*, col. 1806. On William Bernard see DOUAIS 1900, I, cxxxii, clxvi; DOSSAT 1959, 192-5; BILLER – BRUSCHI – SNIFF 2011, 40, 67-70; SPARKS 2014, 12.

32 Most of the questions differentiate ‘hereticus’ and ‘heretica’, e.g. ‘Si unquam fecit reverentiam alcui heretico vel heretice’. After the questions, there is a note that suggests the interrogator asks in each case: ‘Ad omne quotiens dicatur et non plus; Ad omne ubi et non alibi; Ad omnem personam et non alienam; Ad omem rem et non alienam; Ad omem causam et non alienam’, BH 55, ff. 56r-56v. See Appendix III.iv.

33 BH 55, f. 57v. One Lombard abjuration, closely resembling but not identical to one in a Tuscan formulary, edited by D’ALATRI 1996, 204-05, no. 41. It is in fact is much closer to the version transcribed from the Dominican, Lombard formulary copied into the Franciscan handbook used in the March of Treviso, Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, MS Lat. IV.22 [= 2745], edited by PARMEGGIANI 2012, 21-23. It is more or less same length, and has similar omissions, though some different inclusions that would suggest that they are from a common exemplar. This abjuration also appears in BML, Plut. VII sin. 2. One sentence from the Orvieto register, the sentence of Filippo Busse (30 May 1268), also edited in D’ALATRI 1996, 232-34.

34 E.g. the Dominican compilation in MS Vat. lat. 2648, the Franciscan compilation in BML, Plut. VII sin. 2.


It is no surprise, therefore, to find the *Ordo* in an Italian inquisitorial collection, but the handbook does tell us a bit more about the transmission and use of the *Ordo*. It confirms the presence of the *Ordo* in Italy, already visible in its influence on later handbooks: we know that it was one of the principal models for the *Explicatio super officio inquisitionis*, which emerged from the Franciscan inquisitions of Tuscany.\(^{37}\) Clearly, the *Ordo* was circulating in Italy from an early stage and, moreover, it was operating in the context of both Franciscan and Dominican inquisitions. Aside from the Madrid manuscript, the only other, partial, manuscript witness of the *Ordo* is preserved in the same manuscript as the *Explicatio*, MS Casanatense 1730. That example cannot be related to the Madrid manuscript, given that the copyist of the Casanatense manuscript thought that the excerpt from the *Ordo* was a Lombard text.\(^{38}\) The independence of these two witnesses reinforces the impression that the *Ordo* was circulating more widely than its later survival would suggest.

Most historiographical discussion of the *Ordo* is concerned with its origins and the circumstances of its production, and also with what it can tell us about the emergence of procedure in the early years of mendicant inquisitions, both of which are important questions. In the first few decades of inquisitions into heresy, the format and scope of these tribunals were discussed by ecclesiastical councils, papal legatine missions, and legal consultants, and the texts produced by those discussions formed a crucial part of the development of anti-heretical inquisitions. In that context, the *Ordo* represents an early commentary on inquisitorial process from those conducting the tribunals, one that sits alongside the legal and episcopal and legatine texts that predominate in that early period. The *Ordo*’s presence in the Madrid handbook, though, also reminds us that its lasting influence is equally important in our understanding of it. That it was still being copied at the end of the century, along with a selection of legal and ecclesiastical texts and the very recent inquisitorial discussion of process provided by the *De auctoritate*, suggests its ongoing usefulness. It continued to function as part of a wider, cumulative tradition of texts that formed the basis for the inquisition of heresy, which were used and reused over the rest of the century, and that were operating not only as individual items but also as part of an interlocking complex of authority and experience.

\(^{37}\) Parmeggiani 2012, *passim*.

\(^{38}\) ‘Modus et forma quam idem inquisitores tenuerunt in officio inquisitionis in provincia Lombardie, ut credo’, MS Cas 1730, f. 144vb, corrected by a later reader ‘immo in provincia Tholosana sive in inquisitione Carcaxonensi’, Dondaine 1947, 101; Parmeggiani 2012, LXXXIV.
APPENDIX I

Ordo processus Narbonensis

Below is a transcription of text of the Ordo processus Narbonensis, as it appears in BH 55. The transcription largely follows the manuscript’s layout, though some intervention has been made for clarity. Capitalization is not exactly reproduced, but is close to what the manuscript presents, and more liberal use has been made of punctuation. In particular, paragraph breaks have been used to distinguish sections: though the manuscript makes liberal use of capitulae, and some marginal running titles, the text is otherwise undifferentiated. Marginal annotations are indicated by square brackets; angle brackets indicate where text lost by clipped margins has been replaced. The more substantial differences from Tardif’s edition – aside from spelling conventions (i for j etc.) – are signalled by italicized text. The manuscript is easily available for comparison online.

/Literae commissionis./

▌ Viris religiosis et discretis dilectis in Christo fratribus Guilelmo Raymondi et Petro Duranti ordinis predicatorem, frater Pontius fratrum eiusdem ordinis in provincia Provintie servus inutilis et indignus, salutem et spiritum caritatis. De zelo discretionis ac devotionis vestre plurimum confidentes, vos in provincia Narbonensi exceptis Ville longe et Villemuriensi archidiaconatibus dioecesis Tholosane, et in Albiensi, Ruthenensi, Mimathensi et Aniciensi dioecesis, ad inquirendum de hereticis auctoritate domini pape nobis in hac parte commissa in remissionem peccatorum vestrorum duximus transmittendos, eadem vobis auctoritate mandantes quatenus juxta mandatum et ordinationem sedis apostolice in negotio procedatis eodem viriliter et prudenter. Quod si ambo his exequendis interesse non potueritis, alter vestrum ea nichilominus exequatur. Datum Narbone, xii kalendas novembris. Anno domini MCCXLIII.

/Processus talis./

▌ Infra terminos inquisitionis nobis per priorem Provintie auctoritate predicta commissemus ac limitate locum eligimus, qui ad hoc comodior esse videtur, de quo vel in quo de locis aliis inquisitionem faciamus, ubi Clero et populo convocatis generalem faciamus predicacionem, litteris tam domini pape quam prioris provintialis de inquisitionis forma et commissione publice legimus, et sicut convenit explanamus. Et exinde generaliter citamus vel verbo presentes vel absentes per litteras in hunc modum.


40 MS: ‘servus’ deleted after ‘ordinis’.
[Modus citandi]
¶ Inquisitores heretice pravitatis etc. Capellano tali Salutem in domino. Auctoritate qua fungimur districte vobis precipiendo mandamus, quatenus parrochianos sive habitatores omnes illius ecclesie sive loci, masculos a xiiii, feminas a xii et etiam inferioris etatis si forte delinquerint, et ex parte et auctoritate nostra citetis, ut tali die, tali loco responsuri de hii que contra fidem commiserunt, et heresim abiuraturi compareant coram nobis. Et si de loco illo alia inquisitio facta non fuerint, omnibus de ipso loco, qui nominatim citati vel aliter venia digni non essent, immunitatem carceris indulgemus, si infra tempus assignatum sponte venientes et penitentes, tam de se, quam de aliiis, puram et plenam dixerint veritatem, quod et tempus gratie sive indulgentie appellamus.

[Modus abjur<andi> et forma iuran<di>]
¶ Unum quemque vero cum se ad confitendum presentat facimus abjurare omnem heresim et iurare quod dicat plenam et puram veritatem de se et aliis vivis et mortuis super facto seu crime heresis, et Valdesie, et quod fidem catholicam servabit ac defendet et hereticos, cuiuscumque secte, non solum non recipiet aut defendet, eisve favebit aut credet, quin potius eos, eorumve nuntios bona fide persequeretur et capiet vel saltem\(^{41}\) ecclesie aut principibus, eorumve bailivis, qui eos capere velint /42v/ et valeant, revellabit, et inquisitionem non impediet, immo eam impeditibus se opponet.

Deinde requiritur si vidit hereticum vel Valdensem, et ubi, et quando, et quotiens, et cum quibus et de aliis circumstantiis diligenter. Si eorum predicationes aut monitiones\(^{42}\) audivit. Si eos hospitio recepit vel recipi fecit. Si de loco ad locum duxit seu aliter assiotavit, aut duci vel assiotari fecit. Si cum eis comedit aut bibit vel de pane beneficet ab eis. Si dedit vel misit ei\(^{43}\) aliquid. Si fuit eorum questor aut nuntius, aut minister. Si eorum depositum, vel quid\(^{44}\) aliud habuit. Si ab eorum libro aut ore, aut humero aut cubito pacem accepit. Si hereticum adoravit vel caput inclinavit, vel genua flexit, vel dixit benedicite coram eis vel si eorum consolamentis, aut appa-reillamentis interfuit. Si cene Valdensi affuit. Si peccata sua fuit eas confessus, vel accipit penitentiam vel didicit aliquid ab eisdem. Si aliter habuit familiaritatem seu participationem cum hereticis vel Valdensibus quoquomodo. Si pactum vel preces vel\(^{45}\) minas recepit aut fecit super veritate de se aut de aliis non dicenda. Si quemquam monuit, vel induxit, seu induci fecit ad aliquid de predictis. Si scit alium vel aliam fecisse aliquid de premissis. Si creditid heretico seu Valdensi, aut erroribus eorumdem.

Tandem de hiis omnibus, et quandoque de pluribus, non sine causa rationabili re-

---

\(^{41}\) MS Cas. 1730: prelato.
\(^{42}\) MS Cas. 1730: predicationem aut monitionem.
\(^{43}\) MS Cas. 1730: eis.
\(^{44}\) MS Cas. 1730: aliquid.
\(^{45}\) ‘munera’ in Tardif, but ‘minas’ in BH 55 and in MS Cas. 1730.
quisitus, scriptis fideliter que de se confessus fuerit vel deposuerit de aliis coram nobis ambobus vel altero et aliis duobus ad minus viris ydoneis ad hec sollicitius exequenda adiunctis, universa que scribi fecerit recognoscit. Atque hoc modo acta inquisitionis ad confessiones et depositiones sive per notarium⁴⁶ confecta⁴⁷, sive per scriptorem alium roboramus. Et quoniam terra generaliter est corrupta, generaliter de omnibus inquisitionem secundum modum facimus pretaxatum, nomina omnium redigentes in actis, etiam illorum qui se nichil scire de aliis, vel in nullo se asserunt delinquisse, ut sive mentiti fuerint, sive postea deliquerint, sicut⁴⁸ frequenter de pluribus reperitur, et eos abiurasse constet et de singulis requisitos⁴⁹.

Quando autem citamus aliquem singulariter, scribimus sub hac forma.

¶ Talem ex parte et auctoritate nostra uno pro omnibus peremptorio citetis edicto⁵⁰, ut tali die, tali loco, de fide sua, vel de tali culpa compareat, responsurus vel recepturus carceris⁵¹ aut simplicer penitentiam pro commissis, vel defensurus parentem mortuum, vel sententiam de se aut de mortuo cuius heres extitit⁵² auditurus.

In singulis quippe citationibus exprimentes auctoritatem, ex qua citamus et que notoria est in terra, et in dignitate positis deferentes personas et loca et citationes, declaramus causam et loca tuta, ut contemptos dilatationes sive terminos assignamus; et nulli defensiones negamus, nisi quod testium non publicamus nomina, propter ordinationem sedis apostolice sub domino Gregorio providefactam et ab Innocentio beatiissimo papa nostro postmodum innovatam, in privilegium et necessitatem fidei evidentem, super quo habemus testimoniales litteras Cardinalium aliquorum. Circa hoc tamen sufficienter providemus et caute tam eis contra quos inquisitio fit, quam testibus, iuxta sanctum consilium prelatorum.

[Modus et forma rec<onciliandi> et puniendi redeun<tes> ad ecclesiasticam uni<ta<te>m>]

¶ Hanc autem formam servamus in iniungendis penitentiis, et condemnationibus faciendis. Eos qui redire volunt ad ecclesiasticam unitatem, ex causa iterum facimus heresim abiuare, et ad fidei observationem ac defensionem, et hereticorum persecutionem, atque inquisitionis promotionem ut supra, et penitentie pro nostro arbitrio iniungende receptionem et implentionem sollemniter, et cum instrumentis publicis obligare, ac deinde iuxta formam ecclesie, beneficio absolutionis impenso, iniungimus presenti et recipienti penitentiam carceris in hunc modum.

---

⁴⁶ MS: notarius. Tardif corrects this to ‘notarium’.
⁴⁷ MS Cas. 1730: confectas.
⁴⁸ MS: ‘sive’ deleted.
⁴⁹ Here Tardif inserts ‘fuisse’.
⁵⁰ MS Cas. 1730: omnibus peremptoriooe citetis dicto.
⁵¹ MS Cas. 1730: carcerem. Here Tardif inserts ‘poenam’.
⁵² MS: existit. MS Cas. 1730: extitit.
⁵³ MS Cas. 1730: scriptum.
In nomine domini nostri yhesu Christi, etc. Quoniam nos inquisitores heretice pravitatis etc. per inquisitionem, quam de hereticis et etiam infamatis ex mandato facimus apostolico, invenimus quod tu talis, sicut confessus es in iudicio coram nobis, hereticos plures adorasti, receptasti, visitasti et eorum erroribus credidisti. Idcirco tibi taliter deprehendo, ad ecclesiasticam tamen unitatem de corde bono et fide non ficta prout asseris revertenti et abiusanti ut supra, et te si contra feceris ad penam hereticis debitam sponte obliganti et recognoscenti, quod ab excommunicatione, qua tenebaris pro premissis astrictus absolutus es sub ea conditione et retentione, quod si veritatem vel de te vel de alio inventus fueris suppresisse, et si penitentiam ac mandata que tibi iniunxerimus non servaveris et impleveris, ex tunc tibi absolutionis non pro sit, sed pro non facta penitus haberat: adiunctis et assidentibus nobis talibus prelatis virisque discretis, de ipsorum et aliorum consilio, ad agendum penitentiam de premissis, quibus deum et ecclesiam nequiter offendisti, tibi in virtute praestum iuxta mandatum precipimus apostolicum, ut te in carcerem tolerabilem et humanum tibi civitate illa para tum sine mora intendas, facturus ibidem salutarem et perpetuam mansionem. Sane si hoc mandatum nostrum implere nolueris, aut ingredi differendo, aut post ingressum ex eundo, aut alias contra superius a te abiusata et iurata sive promissa quocumque tempore veniendo, ac per hoc factam conversionem tuam et impenitentiam declarando, te in carcerem solemnem absolvi, et omnes qui te scienter aut receperint aut defenderint, aut tibi nostra non implenti mandata, vel aliter, sanctum auxilium, auxilium /43v/ qualitercumque impenderint vel favorem tanquam hereticorum fautores, decernentes reconciliationem et misericordiam tibi factam ulterius prodesse non posse, et te iustissime pariter ex tunc seculari iudicio velut hereticum relinquentes.

[<Mo>dus et forma imponendi <i>niungendi penitentias illis <qui> non sunt immu randi +]

De penitentiis vero quas non immurandis injungimus damus litteras sub hac forma. ¶ Universis Christi fidelibus presentes litteras inspecturis tales inquisitores etc. Quoniam talis lator presentium, sic ut ex ipsius confessione coram nobis in iudicio facta in crimine labis hereticis sic deliquit, nos eidem sponte atque humiliter ad sinum sancte matris ecclesie revertenti et labem prorsus hereticam abiusantem ac demum ab excommunicationis vinculo iuxta formam ecclesie absolute, iniunximus, ut in detestationem veteris erroris duas cruces coloris crocei longitudinis duorum palmorum latitudinisque duorum, et in se trium digitorum amplitudinem habentes portet in superiore veste perpetuo, unam anterius in pectore, et alteram postierius inter spatulias; vestem in qua cruces portaverit coloris crocei nunquam habens. Intersit diebus dominicis et festivis dum vixerit misse ac vespis et sermoni generali, si fiat in villa in qua fuerit, nisi impeditum habuerit sine fraude. Processiones per tot annos sequatur, virgas longas in manu inter clerum et populum alte portantes, et ei qui processionem prefuerit presentans se in statione aliqua, ut exponat populo, quod hic

54 MS: ‘favores’ deleted.
55 MS: nonquam.
propter illa que contra fidem commisit, penitentiam istam agit. Visitet quoque per tot annos limina tot sanctorum. Et in singulis peregrinationibus suprascriptis presentes litteras nostras quas ipsum habere volumus et portare ostendatur prelato ecclesia, quam visitaverit et eiusdem de sua peregrinatione debito modo perfecta ibidem testimoniales nobis litteras reportare. Ea propter, karissimi, vos rogamus, quatenus si prefatum talem, has nostras habentem litteras crucesque portantem et ea servandem que iniunximus eidem, ac per omnia catholice conversantem inveneritis occasione illorum, que ipsum contra fidem superius commississe invenimus, nullatenus molestes, nec sustineatis ab alii molestari, vestras ei testimoniales litteras liberaliter concedendo. Sin autem secus eum facientem, aut etiam attemptantem videritis, ipsum tanquam periurum, excommunicatum, et culpis astrictum prioribus habeatis. Ex tunc enim ei et reconciliacionem et misericordiam sibi factam eidem profittere non posse decernimus, et tam ipsum velut hereticum quam omnes qui eum scienter aut receperint aut defenderint, aut aliter ei consilium vel favorem impenderint velut hereticorum fautores, receptatores, seu defensores excommunicationis vinculo auctoritate qua fungimur inmodamus.

[Forma sententie relinquendi brachio seculari]
¶ Hereticos eorumque credentes\textsuperscript{56}, premisim et expressis culpis, et erroribus et alii que in huiusmodi processu solent sententiis /44r/ sic dampnamus. ¶ Nos inquisitores prefati, auditis et diligenter attentis culpis et demeritis dicti talis et illis precipue circumstantiis, que ad extirpandam de terra labem hereticam fidemque plantandum, sive plectendo sive ignoscendo debet potissime nos movere: adiunctis et assidentibus nobis reverendis patribus etc., supradictum talem, quia hereticorum vel erroribus credidit et adhuc crede<re> convincitur, cum examinitus atque convictus sive confessus reverti et absolute mandatis ecclesie obedire contempnabat, per sententiam diffinitivam hereticum iudicamus; rellinquentes ex nunc iudicio seculari, et tam ipsum velut hereticum condempnatum, quam omnes qui eum scienter de cetero aut receperint, aut defenderint, aut eidem consilium, auxilium vel favorem impenderint, velut hereticorum fautores receptatores et defensores excommunicationis vinculo auctoritate qua fungimur inmodamus.

[Forma sententie contra i<los> qui heretici decesserunt]
Mortuos quoque hereticos et credentes, expressis eorum culpis et erroribus et alii, dampnamus similiter isto modo. Nos inquisitores visis ac diligenter inspectis et attentis culpis ac demeritis talis superius nominati et defensionibus pro eodem et circumstantiis quas circa personas et dicta testium et alia considerari oportuit et attendi, adiunctis et assidentibus nobis talibus, eundem talem diffinitive pronuntiando iudicamus hereticum decessisse, atque ipsum et ipsius memoriam pari seritate damnantes, ossa eius, si ab aliis discerni poterunt de cimiterio ecclesiasticum exhumari, simulque comburri decernimus in detestationem criminis tam nefandi.

\textsuperscript{56} MS: ‘fautores’ deleted.
Condempnationes et penitentias memoratas facimus et iniungimus clero et populo convocatis sollemniter et mature, facientes eos quibus penitentias iniungimus memoratas prius ibidem abiturare atque iurare prout superius continetur. Et de huiusmodi condempnationibus et carcerum penitentiis fiunt publica instrumenta, sigillorum nostrorum et assessorum testimoniis roborata. Forma vero litterarum que de aliis penitentiis conceduntur, retinetur in actis. Ad nullius vero condempnationem, sine lucidis et apertis probationibus vel confessione propria processimus nec, dante domino, procedemus. Et omnes condempnationes penitentiasque maiores fecimus et facere proponimus, non solum de generali, sed etiam de speciali sigillato consilio prelatorum. Plura quidem et alia facimus in processu et alii que scripto non possent facile comprehendi, per omnia iuris tenentes ordinem, aut sedis ordinationem apostolice specialem. Bona hereticorum tam dampnatorum, quam immuratorum publicari facimus et compellimus ut debemus, et per hoc est, quod specialiter confundit hereticos et credentes. Et si bene fieret iustitia de dampnatis et relapsis et bona publicarentur fideliter et incarceratis provideretur in necessariis competenter, in fructu inquisitionis gloriosus dominus et mirabilis apparet.
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Catholice fidei negotium, Alexander IV, Lateran, 11/12/1260, 29r-29v [114]
Consultationi vestre, Alexander IV, Anagni, 28/05/1260, 29v-30r [106]
Consuluit nos, Alexander IV, Anagni, 10/10/1260, 30r [120 is this letter to the OFM, 09/02/61, Lateran year 7]
Quesivistis, Alexander IV, Anagni, 28/05/1260, 30r-30v [107]
Ad capiendum, Alexander IV, Lateran, 11/01/1257, 30v-31r [66]
Ne catholice fidei, Alexander IV, Lateran, 18/12/1260, 31r [115]
Imminente nobis, Alexander IV, Lateran, 21/01/1257, 31r-31v [68]
Licet ex omnibus, Clement IV, Perugia, 26/09/1265, 32r-34r [146]
Super eo, Alexander IV, Lateran, 14/03/1257, 34r-34v [72]
Licet ex omnibus mundi, Clement IV, Perugia, 18/10/1265, 34v-35r [148, which is a repeat of Urban IV’s letter, no. 132, to OP of Lombardy, Viterbo, 23/3/1262]
Noverit devoteo, John cardinal deacon to OP inquisitors in France, Orvieto, 19/05/1273, 35r-35v
Ne inquisitionis negotium, Urban IV, Orvieto, 25/10/1262, 35v-36r [134]
Cum frater predicatores, Innocent IV, Perugia, 11/05/1252, 36r [7]
Cum vos inquisitores, Innocent IV, Perugia, 15/05/1252, 36v [13]
Council texts:
Toulouse 1229, 36v-38v (preface and canons 1-18, 25-27)
Narbonne 1243/1244, 38v-41v (whole text)
*Ordo processus Narbonensis*, 42r-44r

Letters:
*Cum adversus hereticam pravitatem*, Innocent IV, Anagni, 07/07/1254, 44v [38]
*Volentes ut adversus*, Innocent IV, Anagni, 07/07/1254, 44v [39]
*Ne commisses vobis*, Alexander IV, Anagni, 09/10/1260, 45r [108]
*Cupientes, ut inquisitionis*, Alexander IV, Anagni, 28/05/1260, 45v [109]
*Orthodoxe fidei*, Innocent IV, Perugia, 16/05/1252, 45v-46r [15]
*Prohibemus omnino*, extract from letter of Clement IV to OP and OFM 1266, 46r57

Legal consilia:
*Cum nuper*, Pierre Collemieu 46r-47r {10}
*Consilium* Piacenza 1276, 47r-48v {25}
*Consilium* Piacenza 07/07/1276, 48v {24}
*Consilium* Piacenza 19/10/1276, 48v-49v {26}
*Consilium* Piacenza 13/11/1276, 49v-50r {27}
*Consilium* of Gui Foulques, 51r-55v {12}

Formulae:
*Omnibus Christi fidelibus*, William Bernard OP inquisitor for Toulouse, 55v
*Omnibus Christi* etc., 55v-56r
*Noverint universi presentes*, 56r
*In nomine d. nostri* etc., 56r
Interrogatory, 56r-56v

Legal consilium:
*Crimen hereseos*, 57r
*Formule*
Abjuration, OP Lombard (see above, n. 30), 57 v
Sentence, OP Orvieto (Filippo Busse, 30/05/1268, see above, n. 30), 57v

57 Extracted from a letter of 1266 sent to the mendicants of southern France during a period of tension, *Sbaralea* 1759, III, 85b-86a, no. 83. See on this GRIECO 2008, 285-86.
Other unedited texts from the handbook

i - Discussions of Piacentine Consilia
These seem to represent roughly contemporary commentaries on two of the Piacentine consilia, interesting because they show a working interpretation of the texts and some consideration of the nature of the office as the texts were used in Cremona. The comment below is presumably relatively contemporary because Cacciaconte da Somma is bishop at this point (1261-1288); Ponzio Ponzoni who succeeded him (1288-1290) is here still the episcopal vicar. It also shows us the work of the advisory team and its role, including the bishop, in the business of inquisition. In the second of these, we see the application of the consilium to the specific case of aliens and the division of property.

Consilium Piacenza 19 October 1276 (49r-v)
Cum in constitutionibus contineatur unum tale capitulum – quod bona que inventa fuerint in domo illa et in domibus illi adherentibus publicentur, et fiant auferentium nisi auferentes fuerint in officio constituti – nec ibi determinetur per quem fieri debeat hec publicatio, nec etiam alibi in constitutionibus expressim inventur, quod inquisitores possint publicare bona hereticorum et deputare ea officio inquisitionis, et propter hoc in dubium apud aliquos venire possit, utrum inquisitor alius ex auctoritate officii inquisitionis possit de iure bona tam mobilia quam immobilia publicare et deputare officio inquisitionis. Idcirco frater Nicholaus Testa inquisitor etc. una cum domino Ponzino de Ponzonibus vicarius venerabilis patris domini C. episcopi Cremonensis, et ipse de Ponzius una cum ipso inquisitor, arcisitis etiam viris sapientibus et viris peritis, videlicet dominis Bernardo de Vicedominis Archipresbytero plebis pla<cen>tine ac canonico Cremonensis, et Matheo de Boseno et Ioldo de Sydolis eorum consilio, interpretati sunt declarando et declaraverunt interpretando, /49v/ quod ipse inquisitor ex auctoritate sibi comissa a se<de> apostolica potest de iure libere et debite bona hereticorum omnia tam mobilia quam immobilia publicare et deputare officio inquisitionis et quod quilibet inquisitor persona publica est et officium inquisitionis res publica est exceptis hiis bonis que per ipsas constitutiones deputantur determinate devolvenda ad alia(s) certas personas, sive ut dividantur, sive ut permaneant apud illlos. Hanc interpretationem seu declarationem fecerunt su praedicti Inquisitor et vicarius, freti auctoritate apostolica qua funguntur in hac parte de qua auctoritate constat ex privilegium Innocentii, quod sic incipit, ut commissum vobis officium etc.

58 EUBEL 1891, I, 214.
59 MS: ‘possit’ deleted.
In hoc conueniunt inquisitores, quod quando dominus domus in qua heretici reperiuntur est fidelis et locavit domum suam ad pensionem bona fide, et inquilinus culpabilis inventitur, quod tunc puniatur inquilinus in bonis suis que in illa domo reperiuntur et in libras L. imperiales, et non puniatur dominus domus nisi sit in culpa, quia inquilinus videtur esse dominus domus quantum ad usum, et ideo etiam est puniendus, et privandus usu domus illius, quando reperitur in domo aliqua hereticus vel heretica, et parum stetit ibi et ita occulte quod vicinia ... scire non potuit nec aliqui de vicinia: tunc vicinia non est in libris L. imperialibus punienda, quoniam vicinia penitus ignoravit. Si vero aliqui de vicinia scire putaverint, licet dicant se ignorasse, quia illa ignorantia fuit crassa et suprina, quoniam tanto tempore ibi steterint heretici, quod scire merito potuerint, vel quia fuerint ibi satis manifeste vel visitati a pluribus, tunc vicinia est merito punienda, nisi infra tertium diem representaverint ipsum receptatorem hereticorum. Quando aliqui non officiales ecclesie nec captores capiunt hereticum vel hereticam in domo aliqua, dominus domus est similiter puniendus, ac si captores illum hereticum vel hereticam reperissent, sed et bona illius receptatoris omnia que in illa domo reperiuntur sunt illorum qui illum hereticum vel hereticam ceperunt. Si tamen heretici presentaverint in manibus potestatis vel inquisitoris, sed pretium totum lignaminum et lapidum et tegularum cum domus fuerit dissipata, et banna tam vicinie et ... [de modo divi.../ bona heretic/], quam bannum receptatoris de libris L. imperialibus debi dividit in duas partes, videlicet unam partem communitas civitatis vel loci debet habere et aliqui inquisitores. Sed quando aliqui non captores associaverint captoribus tunc debent habere illi qui non sunt captores secundum discretionem inquisitoris, secundum pretium illi plus iuverint captores, et adeo essent potentes quod per eorum favorem et auxilium quasi totum negotium fieret, placet inquisitoribus quod dividant equaliter cum captoribus bona hereticorum et bona receptatoris, que in illa domo sunt inventa, sed de pretio lignaminum et lapidum et tegularum et de bannis, ad eos nichil debeat pervenire.

Consilium of Narbonne 1243/1244

The BH 55 handbook, like most inquisitorial collections, includes texts from the major anti-heretical councils that took place in southern France in the first half of the thirteenth century, in this instance those of Toulouse 1229 and Narbonne 1243/1244. The texts of both of these councils are usually treated as legal consilia by the handbook literature, and that seems also to be the case here. The Toulouse text is abbreviated to those (first eighteen) canons that deal with heresy, and three that are concerned with the observation of feast days (25-27). Of the Narbonne meeting, however, the full text is included (though the initial address is omitted). The BH 55 version of the Narbonne consilium is interesting in that it includes some differences

60 That is, it is not the ‘Italian’ abbreviated version, although the full version of the text survives mostly in Italian MSS as well, see Parmeggiani 2011, 22-32. The text here begins ‘incipiunt concilia prelatorum’ and then moves straight into ‘dubitationes’.
from the standard edition in Mansi’s Sacrorum conciliorum.\textsuperscript{61} These consist of the minor variations one might expect, and some more substantial differences to several of the chapters – the latter are tabled below. These differences do not radically alter the content of the consilium, or add to the corpus of inquisitorial legislation – several of the additions are excerpts from the consilium issued by the prelates at the council of Béziers in 1246.\textsuperscript{62} The variant chapters do, however, reinforce the more general picture of the free circulation of text between France and Italy, and of the transmission of texts between tribunals.

In the first instance, we know that this variant version of the text was circulating in France, because it is included in volume 31 of the Doat collection.\textsuperscript{63} The note from Capot at the end of the text tells us that this copy of Narbonne was extracted and collated from a parchment book of two hundred and forty seven leaves, found in the archive of the inquisition of the city of Carcassonne.\textsuperscript{64} The version in BH 55 is more or less identical to the one copied into volume 31.\textsuperscript{65} The marginal rubric for this text in the Madrid manuscript, which is mostly missing, certainly seems to think that this is directed to inquisitors of Toulouse, though there is no way to know who the dei gratia archiepiscopis is or of what see he is archbishop. In the second instance, we know that the alternative Narbonne text was also circulating amongst Italian inquisitors. Aside from its inclusion in the BH 55 handbook, parts of the variant chapters are reproduced by two other Italian handbooks: the early fourteenth century text of the Dominican, Lombard inquisition, the \textit{De Officio}, and the collection of the Tuscan, Franciscan office contained in MS Casanatense 1730.\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{61} Mansi 1759, XXIII, 355-66. Mansi’s version of the Narbonne text is also reproduced in SeLge 1967, 60-69, and Parmeggiani 2011, 22-32.  
\textsuperscript{62} Mansi 1759, XXIII, 689-704, and Parmeggiani 2011, 34-46.  
\textsuperscript{63} Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Collection Doat 31, ff. 155r-68v. Douais also quoted from the Doat version, Douais 1900, II, 126, n. 1.  
\textsuperscript{64} Devic and Vaissète, working half a century later, also quoted the Narbonne text from ‘un manuscrit de l’inquisition de Carcassone’ in their discussion of the council in the Histoire générale de Languedoc, though by this time the manuscript had made its way to the library of Colbert, the patron of Doat’s mission. That coincidence, and comparison with the Doat 31 text, strongly suggest that the manuscript used by the Doat copyists was the same one used by Devic and Vaissète. Devic – Vaissète 1872, VII, 94-95.  
\textsuperscript{65} Doat 31 has the same additional text as BH 55 in chapters 9, 10, and 19, the same abbreviated text of chapter 13, and also omits chapter 17. Elsewhere, the text very close throughout, and where BH 55 differs from the Mansi edition, Doat 31 will often share the same variation. Where the Doat version differs from the BH 55 text, variants are footnoted in the transcriptions below.  
\textsuperscript{66} Finke also argues that the variations are not only textual, but constitute a substantive difference in the authority they describe.
Chapter IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mansi edition</th>
<th>BH 55 f. 39r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De haereticis autem seu credentibus praefata immunitate, quia veritatem de se vel de aliis suppresserunt, vel quia infra tempus indulgentie non venerunt, seu alias indiginis, paratis tamen absolutis mandatis ecclesiae obedient, et recognoscere quam vel suppresserant, vel negaverant veritatem: quamvis tales proculdubio sint secundum statuta domini papae in perpetuo carcere detrudendi: quia tamen intelleximus vos de his tantam in pluribus partibus multitudinem invenisse, ut nundem expensae, sed vix etiam lapides aut caementa sufficere possint ad carceres construendos: consulimus ut eorum immuratio Responsa sit eorum aliquando, aliorum, merito timeretur: tales enim sine ulla prorsus dilatatione firmo et opportuno carceri deputetis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De hereticis autem seu credentibus, prefata immunitate, quia veritatem, vel de se vel de aliis contra iuramentum proprium suppresserunt, aut prohibuerunt, seu procuraverunt ne ab aliis dicetur, aut tempore gratie oblate contemperseret etiam compararet, aut crimen suum, prius per alios quam per se detegi expectantes, non aliter quam nominatim citati venire curarent, seu alias indignis, paratis tamen absolute mandatis ecclesiae obedient, et recognoscere quam vel suppresserant vel negaverant veritatem: consulimus, ut tales secundum domini pape statuta sint proculdubio in perpetuo carcere detrudendi. Et si vobis, aliquorum, sive propter multitudinem sive propter aliam rationalem causam, videatur fortasse ad tempus immunatio differenda, illorum tamen, qui tam facinorosi sunt ut de ipsorum penitentia vel fuga vel lapsu vel corruptione seu turbatione aliorum timeri posset, nullatenus differatur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doat 31, ff. 159r-v
## Chapter X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mansi edition</th>
<th>BH 55 f. 39v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porro illos haereticos seu credentes, qui postquam juraverint mandatis ecclesiae obedient, absolutionis beneficiun fuerint, vel non fuerint consecuti, injunctam sibi poenitentiam carceris vel non intrando, vel post ingressum exeundo, seu quamcumque aliam servare, seu perficere renuentes, vel se ab ea recipienda contumaciter absentantes, rebellis existunt, et sic suam impoenientiam, fictamque conversionem aperte ostendunt, [XI] et illos qui post abjurationem errores seu purgationem, reprehensi fuerint in abjuratum haeresim recidisse: saeculari judicio sine ullo penitus audientia relinququat, animadversione debita puniendo: cum sufficiat tales per falsam conversionem semel ecclesiam decepisse, praesertim ubi tanta eorum invaluit multitudo: licet eis poenitentibus, nequaquam poenitentia sit neganda.</td>
<td>Porro illos haereticos seu credentes, qui postquam juraverint mandatis ecclesiae obedient, absolutionis beneficiun fuerint vel non1 fuerint consecuti2, injunctam sibi carceris vel non3 intrando, vel post ingressum non tamen propter inhumanam et intollerable carceris duritiam exeundo, seu quamcumque4 aliam5 penitentiam servare seu6 perficere renuentes, vel se ab ea recipienda contumaciter absentantes, rebellis existunt7 et sic suam impoenientiam fictamque8 conversionem aperte9 ostendunt, et illos qui post abjurationem errores seu purgationem reprehensi fuerint in abjuratum haeresim recidisse: saeculari judicio sine ullo penitus audientia relinququat, animadversione10 debita puniendo, cum sufficiat tales per falsam conversionem semel ecclesiam decepisse, praesertim ubi tanta eorum invaluit multitudo, et multis crassantibus11 sit opus exemplo; licet eis penitentibus, nequaquam penitentia sit neganda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Doat 31, ff. 159v-60r**

Chapter XIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mansi edition</th>
<th>BH 55 f. 39v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illos autem qui cum tantum receptatores, seu defensores, seu fautores extiterint, et reconciliati fuerint, seu mandatis ecclesiae juraverint obedire, in abjuratam culpam reciderint, seu poenitentias accipere contumaciter refugerint, vel implere, et propterea secundo fuerint excommunicationis vinculo vel ipso iure, vel per sententiam innodati: si redire voluerint, receptis ab ipsis talibus ac tantis securitatibus, praeter juratoriam cau-</td>
<td>Illis autem qui cum receptores, defensores, fautores ne tantum extiterint, et reconciliati fuerint, seu mandatis ecclesie obedire iuraverint, in culpam reciderint abjuratam, seu penitentias contumaciter refugerint accipere vel implere: si postea, moniti vel non moniti, reatum suum humiliter cognoscentes voluerint emendare, receptis ab ipsis talibus et tantis securitatibus, preter iuratoriam cautionem, quod timore pene temporalis debeant cohaereri, talem eis penitentiam iniungatis, que metus esse possit etiam aliorum, alioquin adversus eos quantum de iure poteritis procedatis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tionem, quod timore poenae temporalis ab exessu simili debeant coerceri, eos cum litteris vestris testimonialibus plenam veritatem continentibus, ad dominum papam, pro absolutio trahenda, et recipienda poenitentia, transmittatis.</td>
<td>Doat 31, ff. 160v-61r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1: recipere; 2: pene timore; 3: temporaliter; 4: coerceri
Chapter XIX

Mansi edition

Circa incarcerandos etiam duximus hoc addendum, ut a carcere nec vir propter uxorem licet juvenem, nec uxor propter virum, nec quisquam propter liberos seu parentes, seu aliter necessarios, aut propter debilitatem, vel senium, vel aliam similem causam, excusat ur, absque indulgentia sedis apostolice speciali. Si qui vero culpabiles vel suspecti ad vestram pertinentes inquisitionem, presentes nec sint nec fuerint; et infra competentem terminum eisdem a vobis peremptorie assignatum, et per ecclesias publicatum, non curaverint comparere, vel se legitime excusare: contra eos tanquam contra praesentes non dubie procedatis.

BH 55 40r-40v

Circa incarcerandos etiam duximus1 hec addenda, quatenus iuxta ordinationem apostolicam fiant eisdem separate camerule et occulte, ut alterum se vel alios pervertere nequeant et eos enormis rigor carcerum non extinguant, quas ab ills, qui bona eorum tenearent, fieri, et in necessariis provideri eisdem secundum statuta Tholosani concilii, faciat is.67 Talium siquidem2 bona, quorum, ex die commissi crimini amiserunt dominium, publicanda esse, et eos, ad quos bonus pertinet occupatio ad id exequendum, si forte negligentem exiterint, per censuram ecclesiasticam compellendos dicimus censemus. Nec dubitetis ulterius, nec quod vestrum est facere in huiusmodi pigrietis, ut temporalis saltum pena corripiat, quos spiritualis non corrigit disciplina. A carcere vero nec vir propter uxorem licet iuvenem, nec uxor propter virum, nec quisquam propter liberos seu parentes, seu aliter necessarios, aut propter debilitatem vel senium, vel aliam similem causa excusetur, absque indulgentia sedis apostolice speciali. Sic tamen ut uxor ad virum, et e contrario, sit liber accessus, nec cohabitatio denegetur eisdem, sive ambo immutati fuerint, sive alter.68 Et si forte /40v/ per incarcerandi absentiam evidens mortis periculum liberis vel parentibus immineret69 aut obviare curetis periculo, providere in talibus faciendo, si poteritis aliunde, aut carceris penitentiam, prudenter in aliam commutetis. Oportet enim in talii articulo rigorem mansuetudine mittigari. ¶ Siqui vero culpabiles vel suspecti, ad vestram pertinentes inquisitionem, presentes nec sint nec fuerint, et infra competentem terminum, eisdem a vobis peremptorie assignatis et per ecclesias publicatum, non curaverint comparere vel se legitime excusare, contra eos tanquam contra presentes non dubie procedatis.

Doat 31 ff. 162v-63v


67 ‘iuxta ordinationem… faciatis’ is adapted from the consilium attached to the 1246 council of Béziers, MANSI 1759, XXIII, 697; PARMEGGIANI 2011, 41-42.
68 This sentence is adapted from Béziers 1246, cap. 25. MANSI 1759, XXIII, 697; PARMEGGIANI 2011, 42.
69 ‘absentiam evidens mortis periculum liberis vel parentibus imminet’ is adapted from Béziers 1246, cap. 24. MANSI 1759, XXIII, 697; PARMEGGIANI 2011, 42.
iii – Consilium, Crimen hereseos

A brief consultation, otherwise unknown, that deals with the relationship between heresy and treason from a canon and civil law point of view. It is difficult to date precisely, though Frederick II’s decree Catharos et patarenos, here cited via the Codex, was not included in the that latter text until the end of the thirteenth century. More, it was not regularly cited until the early fourteenth, though the fact that the author here gives the original title of the decree (“catharos”) rather than the corrupted “gazaros” under which it appears in the Codex complicates that slightly.  

/frater et pater karissime consultatione vestre ego G. duxi breviter respondendum,  
videlicet quod:  
Crimen hereseos est simile crimini lese maiestatis in multis et specialiter in hoc, ut utrumque crimine possit accusari et de eo inquiri etiam post mortem criminosi, ut probatur Innocentius c. de hereticis et manicheis l. iiiii. que incipit manicheos.  
Idem est in crimine apostatis ut .c. de apostatis l.iii. que incipit Apostatarum nomen.  
merito eadem immo fortiori ratione, dicendum idem et iudicandum per omnia in crimine hereseos, cum gravius sit eterno quam temporalem offendere maiestatem. ut .c. de hereticis et manicheis.  
in constitutione ibi posita que incipit Catharos et patarenos,  
cum iura tam civilia quam canonica dicant expresse, quod de similibus ad similia procedendum est. ut ff. de legibus et senatus consultulis.  
non possunt. et c. ad legem falcidiam l. ult.  
et Extra, de translatis .c. inter corporalia.  
Cum multis suis concordantiis. ¶ Porro dicunt leges quod mortuo convicto de crime memoria eius est penitus dampnanda. et bona quedam sua sunt eius successoribus auferenda, nam ex quo sceleratissimum quis cepit consilium, exinde quodam modo sua mente convictus, punitus, intelligitur et videtur, ab eo quod ex quo tale crimen contraxit, nec alienare, nec manutenere, nec testamentum potest facere, nec etiam solutionem a debitoribus suis recipere vallet de iure. Omnis enim actus legibus est ei penitus interdictus, ut hoc probatur aperte c. ad legem iuliam maiestatis I. plt. et ult.  
etc. de hereticis et manicheis.  
l. iiiii. preallegata. et c. de apostatis. l. iiiii. superius similiter allegata. Patet igitur ex
premissis evidenter quod omnes questiones vestre, de quibus pridie dubitabatis [sic] sunt vobis determinate et diffinite et per leges et iura superius sumpta et allegata.

iv – Interrogatory
The interrogatory follows a familiar pattern, beginning with questions about adherence to, and belief in, heterodox sects, and then asking for detail on ritual and social behaviours that will locate the deponent within the usual categories of guilt. Interesting is the insistence that questioner ask for information about both male and female heretics throughout (with the exception of abstractions, and food). Also interesting is the unusual coda, which directs the questioner to further elaborate the information being gathered in each instance.

Generales questiones faciende
¶ Primo si habuit unquam fidem seu credentiam hereticorum alicuius secte credendo eos bonos et in bona via.
¶ Si dixerit sic. Cuius et quantum est, et quis instruxit eum.
¶ Si unquam fecit reverentiam alicui heretico vel heretice et si scit\(^{\text{10}}\) visu vel auditu qui fecerit /56v/
¶ Si dixerit sic. Quibus, quotiens, ubi, et qui fuerit presentes et quis instruxit et quantum tempus est.
¶ Si comedit cum aliquo de pane benedicto vel bibit, quotiens, quis dedit sibi, quando et quantum est.
¶ Si fecit aliquod servitium, cui, quibus, quotiens, et ad cuius postulationem et quare.
¶ Si fuit ubi fieret aliquod consolamentum, quis fuit consolatus, ubi, et quantum est, quis consolavit, qui fuerit presentes, quis duxit hereticum et unde venerit.
¶ Si sotiavit vel fecit sotiaru alicuem hereticum vel hereticam, quis et quantum est, unde sociavit et quo, et ad cuius postulationem et quotiens et quare.
¶ Si habet vel habuit aliquid de bonis hereticorum, quid, quantum, et si scit aliquam personam que habeat vel habuerit.
¶ Si vidit hereticum vel hereticam, quos vidit, quotiens et quantum est.
¶ Si fecit aliquam ambaxiatam alicui heretico etc. vel si recepit ab eis, quibus et a quibus, et cuiusmodi ambassiatam et quotiens et quantum est.
¶ Si locutus fuit alicui heretico vel heretice, ubi et quid.
¶ Si comedit et bibit cum aliquo heretico.
¶ Si tenuit in domo alicuem hereticum vel hereticam.
¶ Si duxit vel fecit aliquid in favorem heretici.
¶ Si audivit predicaciones eorum et quotiens et ubi et quibus presentibus.
¶ Si scit scientia vel auditu, quod aliqua persona fecerit aliquid de predictis.
Ad omne quotiens dicatur et non plus.
Ad omne ubi et non alibi.

\(^{\text{10}}\) MS: sit.
Ad omnem personam et non aliam.
Ad omnem rem et non aliam.
Ad omnem causam et non aliam.
Si misit nuntium vel denarium vel recepit et a quibus.
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