

SECURITY AND COMPETITION: CONFISCATION IN EARLY SOUTHERN FRENCH INQUISITIONS

Lucy J. Sackville*

Security and Competition: Confiscation in Early Southern French Inquisitions

Inquisition legislation devoted a significant amount of attention to the division and distribution of confiscated property. Although this expectation was built into it by the late twelfth-century episcopal anti-heretical measures, it took on particular significance in the context of the impoverished dioceses of southern France. The involvement of the regional episcopate in the early heresy tribunals provided them with an opportunity to shore up their position and authority, and control of goods was a central part of that. This helped cement confiscation as a tool in anti-heretical action, not only as a straightforwardly coercive measure, but also as way to express the authority behind that coercion.

Keywords: Bishops, Inquisition procedure, Councils, Languedoc.

Parole chiave: Vescovi, Procedura inquisitoriale, Concili, Linguadoca.

By the middle of the thirteenth century, the threat that an accusation of heresy posed to personal property was well-established as part of the repressive machinery available to inquisitors. The effectiveness of that threat was grounded not only in the severity of confiscation, but in the variety of ways in which property and wealth were implicated in every stage in the prosecution of heresy. Over the first few decades of tribunals, a range of measures that relied on applying financial pressure to the accused had been established, the scope of which is neatly captured in the consultation handed down to inquisitors by the bishops who had gathered at the council of Béziers in 1246¹. The legate, Peter of Albano, had written to William, archbishop of Narbonne, asking him to «enjoin the aforesaid inquisitors not to desist from proceeding in the business of heresy, in consultation with

* Department of History, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD; lucy.sackville@york.ac.uk.

¹ R. Parmeggiani, *I consilia procedurali per l'Inquisizione medievale (1235-1330)*, Bologna, Bononia University Press, 2011, pp. 34-46.

you, diocesan bishops». Peter's letter made it clear that the archbishop was to provide for the inquisitors' expenses (as per the council of Montpellier). The resulting consultation was handed down in the names of the episcopate of the archdiocese, namely Raymond of Toulouse, Clarin of Carcassonne, William of Lodève, Peter of Agde, Raymond of Béziers, Raymond of Nîmes, and Pons of Uzès².

Goods and the liability of the accused or condemned with regard to their goods are laced through the whole process, as it is laid out here. The immunity from the most severe penalties, including prison and confiscation of goods, that was offered to those presenting themselves during the period of grace, was the first stage of a tribunal. This had been proven an effective measure over the preceding decade, offering a way to avoid a sentence that would deprive the accused of their land and property³. Confiscation was, in theory, automatic for a sentence of heresy, as was the destruction of property in which heretical gatherings had knowingly been allowed. Confiscation was also used to reinforce the authority of the process, making visible the penalty for failure to comply with corrective measures: public confession that was not followed by penance when the accused had the bad form to die before its conferral or completion resulted in loss of property⁴. And property also acted to underpin the penitential system of anti-heretical action, to provide a living for those condemned to prison, and to provide funds and materials for those prisons⁵.

As with all such documents, this consultation was repeating and collecting a lot of earlier provisions, but was also reflecting practice as it had been developing in the proving ground that the early southern French tribunals provided. Those first large-scale attempts to employ inquisition against heresy were the arena in which many of the methods that would become standard were tried and refined and codified. An accusation of heresy had of course brought the risk of confiscation since the promulgation of *Vergentis in senium* in 1199⁶. Financial penalties were also tied up with notions of the

² *Heresy and Inquisition in France, 1200-1300*, ed. and trans. by J.H. Arnold, P. Biller, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2016, pp. 250-261: 251 n. 67.

³ J. Feuchter, *Ketzer, Konsuln und Büßer: die städtischen Eliten von Montauban vor dem Inquisitor Petrus Cellani (1236/1241)*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2007, p. 287.

⁴ Parmeggiani, *I consilia*, cit., capp. XXXV, XIX, pp. 45, 41.

⁵ Ivi, capp. V, XV, XXIII, pp. 38, 40-42.

⁶ K. Pennington, «*Pro Peccatis Patrum Puniri*»: A Moral and Legal Problem of the Inquisition, in «Church History», XLVII, 1978, 2, pp. 137-154; P. Timbal, *La Confiscation dans le droit*

moral value of money, and concerted action against usury as part of spiritual reform in this period, a movement that led to the foundation of anti-usury confraternities by bishops of the region⁷. More, while the formal alignment of heresy with *lèse majesté* and the automatic confiscation of goods that went along with such a sentence was at the root of this approach, the use of confiscation in the south of France also picked up a longer tradition of such measures in local laws and customs.

Secular law-making in the region operated according to similar principles⁸. Raymond of Toulouse's 1233 edict mirrored the central role of property in the punishment and control of dissenting behaviour, not only removing property from those accused, but extending the reach of this through time, disinheriting heirs, disinheriting the dead, and setting a standard for disinheritance that would pertain in the future⁹. Goods were held in surety for an oath to support anti-heretical measures, for the completion of penance, for the adherence to standards of orthodoxy. Goods were leveraged in terms of ensuring or coercing support or at the least discouraging resistance, in the name of the institutions of repression as well as of orthodoxy. More than this, more than a hostage to ensure compliance with censure and sentence, goods were also tainted by association. Anything held on behalf of others, against confiscation, was also liable to be taken. Again, it is clear that control over the disposition of goods had much wider use than just in the case of a sentence for heresy.

français des XIII^e et de XIV^e siècles, in «Revue historique de droit français et étranger», XXII, 1944, pp. 35-60. Vergentis' provision that the goods of supporters also be seized was toned down in its later iterations in the Fourth Lateran Council and the *Liber extra*: O. Hageneder, *Il sole e la luna: papato, impero e regni nella teoria e nella prassi dei secoli XII e XIII*, Milano, Vita e Pensiero, 2000 («Cultura e storia», 20), pp. 141-162.

⁷ L.W. Marvin, *The White and Black Confraternities of Toulouse and the Albigensian Crusade, 1210-1211*, in «Viator», XL, 2009, 1, pp. 133-150. As Rusconi argues, the provisions of the Fourth Lateran Council were in several places concerned with episcopal prerogatives and jurisdiction, and with the proper definition of these, and therefore also with their necessary reform, especially with regard to usury and public penance: R. Rusconi, «*Hoc salutare statutum*»: la politica sacramentale di Innocenzo III, in *Innocenzo III, Urbs et Orbis*, Atti del Congresso internazionale, Roma, 9-15 settembre 1998, a cura di A. Sommerlechner, Roma, Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 2003 («Nuovi studi storici», 55), pp. 383-416.

⁸ Similar parallels can be drawn between papal and imperial/royal legislation in this period, Hageneder, *Il sole e la luna*, cit., pp. 143, 158, 16-62.

⁹ *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. J.D. Mansi, 53 vols, Florence, 1759-1927, reprinted Graz, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1961, vol. XXXIII, pp. 265-268.

1. *Resource and jurisdiction.* Goods were, then, in the early southern French inquisitions, deeply implicated at all stages of the threat posed by repressive action. In part this was to do with the condition of dioceses and the position of the episcopate in the south of France, in this period. Bishops in the region had spent much of the twelfth century working towards freedom from secular influence, acquiring to themselves greater jurisdictional rights at the expense of the local seigneurie, whilst also more firmly establishing their independence from it¹⁰. Interventions in the region by the papacy at the turn of the thirteenth century threatened to undo this progress. The use of crusade by Innocent III to subdue the region's aristocracy, and the disruption of the power balance following the intrusion of royal power, threatened to hand control over that territory to a new seigneurial competitor, and on the basis of something that ought to be the bishops' own preserve, namely heresy¹¹. The papacy's reform agenda was also to some degree at odds with the local episcopate, where Innocent expected a degree of action against heresy that was not always practical or appealing¹². The push by Innocent III to reform the southern French episcopate meant that bishops embracing a reform agenda, and support for anti-heretical measures, could align themselves with the legatine presence in the region. Innocent had already used failure to support his legates against the Count of Toulouse as justification for deposing bishops, and issued a letter warning the others to accept the measures he wanted put in place¹³. In either case, the responsibility and pressure of reform and crusade fell on the episcopate. As Bird has pointed out, «despite the increasing spiritual and legal influence of the papal curia in western Europe, even papal legates and judges delegate depended upon local authorities», and though continued legatine presence in the south of France meant that the wider papal agenda of reform

¹⁰ For example, for Toulouse, see L. Macé, *Les comtes de Toulouse et leur entourage: XII^e-XIII^e siècles: rivalités, alliances et jeux de pouvoir*, Toulouse, Privat, 2000, pp. 340-343.

¹¹ M. Meschini, *Innocenzo III e il 'Negotium pacis et fidei' in Linguadoca tra il 1198 e il 1215*, Roma, Bardi, 2007. See also *The Fourth Lateran Council and the Crusade Movement: The Impact of the Council of 1215 on Latin Christendom and the East*, ed. by J.L. Bird, D. J. Smith, Turnhout, Brepols, 2018, part II. As Hageneder points out, although the penalty of confiscation for supporters of heresy was removed from legislation, the use of crusade in the region meant that it was effectively still in force, Hageneder, *Il sole e la luna*, cit., p. 155.

¹² M. Soria, *Des évêques malmenés. Innocent III et les violences anti-épiscopales en Languedoc*, in *Innocenzo III, Urbs et Orbis*, cit., pp. 1008-1030.

¹³ E. Graham-Leigh, *The Southern French Nobility and the Albigensian Crusade*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2005, pp. 77-83.

and crusade remained important, local interests remained in the mix¹⁴. Heresy became a flashpoint in this situation, partly because it allowed for confiscation, and jurisdictional rights were one of the principal arenas in which conflict was conducted, especially in the context of an increasingly juridical approach to episcopal rule¹⁵. That meant an investment in the development of effective prosecution of heresy, which fed into and was fed by the councils that met in the region over these years¹⁶.

In the late 1220s, as the crusade drew to a close, anti-heretical measures were put in place by successive regional councils, cementing the move away from the more pastoral measures signalled at the council of Montpellier of the start of the century¹⁷. In these we see more robust measures being put in place to investigate and identify heretics. In 1227, two years after he became archbishop of Narbonne, Peter Amelius called a regional council¹⁸. With the «counsel of his brothers and suffragans», Amelius set out to address a series of transgressions and transgressors against the church and against his authority. Naturally, this included the treatment and control of heretics¹⁹. In part this involved the usual reiteration and underpinning of previous legislation – the coercion of secular powers remained central, these latter again required to abjure heretics and their supporters, or face censure. The council also confirmed the provisions made in the Statutes of Pamiers that precluded heretical believers, even those reconciled,

¹⁴ J. Bird, *Reform or Crusade? Anti-Usury and Crusade Preaching during the Pontificate of Innocent III*, in *Pope Innocent III and His World*, ed. by J.C. Moore, Aldershot, Ashgate, 1999, pp. 165-185: 184.

¹⁵ R.L. Benson, *The Bishop-Elect: A Study in Medieval Ecclesiastical Office*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1968; Y. Dossat, *L'inquisiteur Bernard de Caux et l'Agenais*, in «Annales du Midi: revue archéologique, historique et philologique de la France méridionale», LXIII, 1951, 13, pp. 75-79.

¹⁶ J.H. Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001, pp. 33-38. L.J. Sackville, *Heresy and Heretics in the Thirteenth Century*, York, York Medieval Press, 2011, pp. 93-100. H. Maisonneuve, *Études sur les origines de l'Inquisition*, 2nd éd., Paris, J. Vrin, 1960 («L'Église et l'État au Moyen Âge», 7), pp. 287-307.

¹⁷ *Sacrorum conciliorum*, cit., XXII, pp. 785-786. At the 1209 council of Avignon, the bishop, Riez, and the papal legate, together with a large group of bishops and abbots, set out a series of anti-heretical measures with the bishop at their core. In order to counter the misinformation and error of the heretics, bishops are to preach, or to ensure preaching, in their diocese.

¹⁸ On Amelius see R.W. Emery, *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. 66-76.

¹⁹ *Sacrorum conciliorum*, cit., XXIII, pp. 19-26, in canons fourteen to seventeen (of twenty).

from occupying public offices, but redirects this to those known to be, or suspected of being, «vested heretics»²⁰. The real departure came when the council arrived at the *boni viri*, the parochial delegates of the bishop established by the council of Avignon for the purpose of alerting the bishop to any religious deviance in their parish. Now called by the old name of *testes synodales* – synodal witnesses had been an adjunct of ecclesiastical jurisdiction since Carolingian times – these men are now to be established in each parish, by the bishop, in order to diligently inquire («diligenter inquirant») into heresy and other manifest crimes, afterwards to relate what they have discovered to the bishop. This represents a marked difference from the relatively passive formulation of previous legislation («si quos ibi repererint [sic] [...] ipsi archiepiscopo (et alia) [...] cum omni studueant festinantia intimare»), which demanded that any information possessed by the reputable individuals be passed on, according to the loyalty owed to a bishop. Now the *testes synodales* are to function more as investigators, as police, for the bishop, and this is now a much more active seeking out of knowledge, not just of heretics²¹. It is possible that this represents a shift that had already happened on the ground, but it is significant that it is under Amelius's council that it hardens into legal principle.

Amelius spent most of his episcopate involved in disagreements with the principal powers of the area: the viscounts, the abbots of St Paul, the leaders of the bourg, and his own cathedral chapter. Even when not in open dispute, relations between the archbishop and his rivals existed in a more or less constant state of tension. The common denominator in all of these struggles seems to have been Amelius's desire to tighten his grip on the prerogatives and possessions accruing to his position²². His interest in the opportunities offered by anti-heretical action was not coincidental.

The council of Toulouse two years after Narbonne picked up the work of that council and set it out in a set of canons that would be recopied by all inquisitorial literature for the next century²³. Though led by the legate, the council of Toulouse – one of the major anti-heretical councils of the

²⁰ Ivi, pp. 23, 25. This was in line with Raymond of Peñafort's view of confiscation in the first recension of his *Summa de penitentia*: Hageneder, *Il sole e la luna*, cit., p. 160.

²¹ Maisonneuve, *Études*, cit., pp. 152-154.

²² Emery, *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne*, cit., pp. 66-76.

²³ *Sacrorum conciliorum*, cit., XXIII, pp. 191-204. On Fulk see *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, éd. par A. Baudrillart, A. de Meyer, R. Aubert, Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1912-2007, vol. 17, pp. 777-780.

period – can also be seen as reflecting intentions and concerns of the local episcopate, in part because it was attended by the majority of the region's prelates, but more particularly because of the close involvement of Peter Amelius, and Fulk, the bishop of Toulouse²⁴. The council was directed to the establishment and preservation of peace in the wake of the crusade, and all its provisions have this aim in mind to a greater or lesser degree. The seeking out and repression of heresy was to be one of the principal methods for engineering this peace – the first seventeen of its forty-five canons dealt with this subject. Much of what was laid down was repeating previous legislation. First among these provisions was a reiteration of the canon from the council of Narbonne two years earlier that set up the system of synodal witnesses. As before, they were to be established by the bishop in each parish under his care, and to comprise a priest and two or three laymen of good opinion who were to be sworn to inquire carefully after heresy in their parish, and to relate what they uncovered to the bishop or the authorities. The fourth canon of Toulouse makes it clear that any person found to be knowingly sheltering or aiding a heretic is to have his lands confiscated²⁵. The treaty of Paris was the context for the council, but it was still influenced by local concerns. Fulk of Toulouse was a rather more reform-minded bishop than Amelius. His enthusiasm for anti-heretical action, most immediately noticeable through his support of Diego and St. Dominic's preaching campaign, was rooted in a commitment to a reform agenda, both practically, in his diocese, and in principle, before the curia. But diocesan concerns still had a hand in shaping his outlook and his preoccupations. The bishopric of Toulouse was very property poor by the time Fulk came to the see in 1205. So much so, in fact, that William of Puylaurens devoted a chapter of his *Chronicle* to the «wretched state of the See» of Toulouse. He describes a lamentable state of affairs in which the bishops are unable to collect any tithes, and have to rely on the charity of their neighbours for an escort²⁶. The bishops of Toulouse had been able to acquire some

²⁴ *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens: The Albigensian Crusade and its Aftermath*, trans. by W.A. Sibly, M.D. Sibly, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2003, p. 83.

²⁵ This is clearly aimed largely at the nobility, though still a concern for other members of the community – one deponent before an inquisition claims emphatically not to have known that the person living in his house for a month was a heretic until she was captured and reconciled by the bishop of Toulouse, Raymond du Falga, Fulk's successor (Toulouse, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 609, fol. 1v).

²⁶ *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens*, cit., pp. 19-20, 22, n. 83. Fulk was elected as

greater jurisdiction in the area as comital power broke down during the second half of the twelfth century, partly because of the conflict with the Trencavels and the Counts of Foix, partly as a result of English and Aragonese victories. The city, likewise, became increasingly independent of the secular lords²⁷. Unlike the other episcopal seigneuries of the area, though, such as Narbonne, where the prelates had serious temporal and jurisdictional power, the poverty of the see meant that its bishop lacked the same political and coercive authority²⁸. Under Fulk's predecessor, Raymond of Rabastens (1200/1-1205), the fortunes of the bishops reached their lowest point, according to Mundy, partly as a result of this inheritance, and partly as a result of Raymond's (mercifully short) episcopate, during which he was accused of simony, and spent most of his time in ineffective lawsuits trying to recover ecclesiastical property, before Innocent III suggested that he resign²⁹.

The fact that much of the bishopric's property was in pledge to creditors, then, lay behind at least part of Fulk's early campaign against heresy and usury. Robert Courson had encouraged bishops to take action against usury via inquisitorial tribunals, and Fulk was one of those that implemented this idea³⁰. «Sometime after his installation in 1206» Fulk formed, or renewed, a confraternity against heresy and usury. This, «white» confraternity was mostly composed of men from the City, the old centre of Toulouse, while a rival «black» confraternity was set up in the old suburb of the neighbouring Bourg, resulting in increased tension between the two³¹. This move

someone who could be relied upon by legates. Puylaurens also draws explicit comparison with Diego, and points to poverty as the appropriate corrective to heresy.

²⁷ J.H. Mundy, *The Repression of Catharism at Toulouse: The Royal Diploma of 1279*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1985, pp. 74-75. Mundy suggests that Raymond had hoped to re-establish something of his former power by acting against heresy, as his father had, but misjudged the situation, which was unlike the legatine mission of 1181, Arnaud-Amaury and bishop Fulk had crusaders elect de Montfort, and power passed to north. Mundy suggests also that, because the count had lost rights over episcopal election in the twelfth century, he now had little interest in its protection. See G.E.M. Lippiatt, *Simon V of Montfort and Baronial Government, 1195-1218*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2017, pp. 161-162.

²⁸ J.K. Bulman, *The Court Book of Mende and the Secular Lordship of the Bishop: Recollecting the Past in Thirteenth-Century Gévaudan*, Toronto-London, University of Toronto Press, 2008, pp. 8, 11.

²⁹ Mundy, *The Repression*, cit., pp. 81-82.

³⁰ Bird, *Reform or Crusade?*, cit., pp. 168-171.

³¹ *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens*, cit., 35-37; Sibly and Sibly point out that Fulk was exploiting an existing tension in forming it in first place: Mundy, *The Repression*, cit., p. 76.

immediately gained Fulk a lot of local patrician support for his episcopal authority, since they too were struggling financially in this period. Fulk used the episcopal court to hear the resulting usury cases, alongside those for heresy³².

The action against heresy and, in particular, against usury was to prove a turning point in the renewal of the bishop's powers, and of his influence within the see. Through his effective use of the episcopal court, the «first extant example of a reformed episcopal tribunal modelled upon the official's courts of northern France», Fulk was able effectively to restore his jurisdiction. From 1215, he had successfully detached his court from the consular influence that had grown up over the preceding decades³³. It was also Fulk who was responsible for the introduction of the office of Official into the episcopal court, possibly by 1215, and certainly by 1229³⁴.

These years also saw a revival of the bishopric's material fortunes, when Simon de Montfort granted Verfeil to the bishop in recognition of his support in the ongoing crusade³⁵. This gift was effectively a re-founding of the temporal holdings of the see, and meant that, with the support of the patriciate ensured by Fulk's anti-usury policies, the see was now out of financial difficulty for the first time³⁶. The new-found jurisdictional and financial independence was not secure, however. After the revolt of Toulouse against Montfort in 1217, and his death besieging city in 1218, the consulate was in a position to ask whatever they wanted from the count as the price of loyalty³⁷. By the time of the peace in 1229, then, with the situation again in flux, the bishop, was again fighting to retain his hold on whatever rights he could, along with everybody else. In the Treaty of Paris, de Montfort's gift of Verfeil was confirmed, but the bishopric of Toulouse itself was taken into the king's gift. Count Raymond, holding it of the king, was to have «full legal powers and free rights of lordship in the territories left to us, on the conditions stated above, in regard to the city

³² Mundy, *The Repression*, cit., pp. 164, 83.

³³ Ivi, pp. 138-141, 164-165. In 1215 the court also had no secular assessors, and marked move away from quasi-secular courts of twelfth-century bishops. The formal office of Official of Toulouse appears in 1229.

³⁴ Ivi, pp. 379-380.

³⁵ Lippiatt, *Simon V of Montfort*, cit., pp. 186.

³⁶ Mundy, *The Repression*, cit., pp. 81-82.

³⁷ Ivi, pp. 88. «With the price of war so high, then, it is no wonder that Raymond VII made peace. It is also not surprising that he never again lost an opportunity to attack the consuls' prerogatives» (ivi, p. 89).

and bishopric of Toulouse» until his death. This meant that Raymond was bound into continued support for anti-heretical action³⁸. It also meant that Fulk's enthusiasm for anti-heretical action was given added motivation, as a way in which to maintain a hold on jurisdictional power in the area. Fulk, then, had his own reasons to want control of anti-heresy in his region, and his interest was directed as much by the balance of power in his region, and the tensions between competing jurisdictions, as it was by his reforming principles. It meant, too, that he had a system up and running against heresy, through the exploitation and fortified episcopal court, which expertise he could bring to the conciliar table.

2. Legislation and authority. If Romanus and Fulk meant the canons of this council to be carried out, they also meant to give the assembled bishops a head start in the matter of efficient anti-heretical action. After the main business of the council, the cardinal and Fulk brought in a number of witnesses, including one former heretic, William Solier, to be questioned about heresy in the region. We know that Fulk had been prosecuting and reconciling heretics in the decades prior to the council, and it is not surprising that he is now able to produce not only the star turn, but also a number of witnesses without apparent difficulty, suggesting the presence of an already effective machinery³⁹. The mendicant tribunals that began in earnest in the following decade had models already in place.

The councils that took place in the immediate wake of the establishment of mendicant inquisitions continue to emphasize the role of the bishop, although the legatine council of Béziers in 1232 casts this role in terms of pastoral oversight of the priests in his area⁴⁰. The 1234 council of Arles, led by the archbishop, is more in line with the canons of Narbonne and Toulouse in that it places the control and investigation of heresy squarely amongst the bishops' normal duties⁴¹.

³⁸ *The Chronicle of William of Puylaurens*, cit., appendix C.

³⁹ Ivi, pp. 84-85.

⁴⁰ *Sacrorum conciliorum*, cit., XXIII, pp. 269-278 (dated 1233 in Mansi, see Y. Dossat, *Les crises de l'inquisition toulousaine au XIIIe siècle [1233-1273]*, Bordeaux, Biere, 1959, p. 109). Notable that this council includes the provision that anybody can capture a heretic and deliver them to the bishop for a reward.

⁴¹ *Sacrorum conciliorum*, cit., XXIII, pp. 335-342. The council also aimed to control other potentially dangerous groups – e.g. unlicensed confraternities – and to administer fines to those remaining under excommunication.

Amelius in particular made sure to exploit his diocesan anti-heretical powers to the full against his rivals. He seems to have quickly established systems that allowed him to reap the full benefits of prosecutions for heresy. He used his bailiffs to seek out and arrest suspects, and brought in an inquisitor, a Dominican friar named Ferrier, who was later to become one of the most prolific inquisitors of the mid-century⁴². In 1229, Ferrier was commissioned by the archbishop to examine and reconcile two heretics who had been active in the Narbonne region⁴³. As with those reconciliations performed by bishop Fulk, we see this activity only in retrospect. Ferrier, in his later activity as an inquisitor in the region, interviews the two women again, and it is through their memory that we can see the earlier interaction of 1229. The depositions make the careful distinction that Ferrier was acting as «inquisitor auctoritate domini archiepiscopi», and though this may be his voice, rather than theirs, what is clear is that Ferrier was acting in a different capacity in those years. His authority derives from the ordinary power of the archbishop, rather than his status as a delegate of the apostolic see in his own right, as it did in his later investigations. Amelius continued to use Ferrier into the next decade, and effectively so, given the resistance to action by Ferrier and the archbishop's agents in the early thirties, culminating in outright revolt in the Bourg 1234⁴⁴.

A 1241 letter from the canons of Narbonne to the pope, written during one of the periods of open hostility between the chapter and the archbishop, gives some impression of his priorities. Amelius's abuse of authority is the principal theme and complaint of the letter, which decries his exploitation of vacancies and benefices, his unreasonable financial demands, and his habit of imposing sentences of excommunication in order to demand payment for their removal⁴⁵. Amelius clearly wanted to make secure the episcopal income and prestige, and the fact that he was more than prepared to use his ecclesiastical powers to do so has obvious implications for the

⁴² On Ferrier see W.L. Wakefield, *Friar Ferrier, Inquisitor*, in «Heresis», VII, 1980, pp. 33-41; *Dizionario storico dell'inquisizione*, dir. A. Prosperi, 5 voll., Pisa, Edizioni della Normale, 2010, vol. II, p. 590; <<https://www.york.ac.uk/res/doat/biographies/ferrier.html>>.

⁴³ Toulouse, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 609, fol. 5b.

⁴⁴ Emery, *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne*, cit., reconstruct these events in chapter 4, based on an account by Catel, who was working with material no longer extant.

⁴⁵ *Histoire Générale du Languedoc*, éd. par C. Devic, J. Vaissète, 16 vols., Toulouse, Privat, 1872-1904, reprinted Osnabrück, Zeller, 1973, vol. 8, pp. 1077-1180; Emery, *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne*, cit., pp. 67-68.

anti-heretical aspect of his office. As Emery points out, with regard to the suppression of heresy a complicating factor was the fact that Amelius was a major landholder in the area – a position he was continually attempting to reinforce. With the intrusion of royal power in the course of the crusade, confiscations for heresy would naturally fall to the king, and leave him with heavy losses. It was therefore in Amelius's interest to maintain control over the prosecution of heresy so far as he could. In 1226, he had managed to negotiate an agreement with Louis VIII that confiscations in the Narbonne area would fall to the archbishop, even while the right to them would be reserved to the king. Importantly, this including the viscount's lands, in the event that he was convicted⁴⁶. This now meant that Amelius had positive reason to exploit his anti-heretical prerogatives as fully as he did all his others, and he was proactive in doing so. All available anti-heretical powers were used here by Amelius as leverage in his own affairs. Emery points out that the political motivations underlying Amelius's use of inquisition are made clearest in his refusal to allow investigations in the city that might upset the alliances he had made there against the Bourg⁴⁷.

In the prosecution of heresy the archbishop had found an effective method to entrench his own power in the area at the expense of his rivals. It is not surprising, then, that the systematic seeking out and punishment of heretics was implemented at a council under the direction of Amelius, within a year of his having secured the rights to confiscated property in his jurisdiction – which by extension also secured his jurisdiction over the viscount and the bourg. The degree to which Amelius saw the prosecution of heresy not only as his right but also as a useful tool in his political machinations is also visible in his own investigative activities. In the middle years of the 1230s, Amelius appeared himself as a deponent before a tribunal, to give testimony against some of the nobles in his jurisdiction. This inquiry, held by the bishop of Toulouse and the archdeacon of Carcassonne, is a well-known case against a local nobleman, Bernard Othon de Niort, who, with his family, had by this time a long history of involvement with heretics⁴⁸.

⁴⁶ Emery, *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne*, cit., pp. 69-71.

⁴⁷ Ivi, p. 100.

⁴⁸ W.L. Wakefield, *The Family of Niort in the Albigensian Crusade and before the Inquisition*, in «Names», XVIII, 1970, 2, pp. 97-117. The testimony of William Solier before the council of Toulouse had included Bernard's name amongst those that William had encountered in his time as a heretic. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Collection Doat, vol. 21, 81v-102v, used here in the forthcoming edition by P. Biller, S. Sneddon and L.J. Sackville,

The archbishop again had reasons for testifying against the Niort family that were motivated by competing jurisdictional and territorial interests. The second council of Narbonne, again called by Amelius, in 1243. Amelius's second council is addressed to the Dominican inquisitors in the region. The council was apparently called in order to provide general principles for the conduct of inquisition, and the tone is surprising, and superior. Amelius seems here concerned principally to protect his access to the profits of inquisition – given what we have seen of Amelius already, perhaps this is to be expected, and it also confirms the impression of the mercenary nature of the earlier council. However, it is also a store of episcopal experience in a field which, by this stage, the bishops, and Amelius in particular, had some background. This is reflected in the degree of emphasis placed by the canons of the council on discernment – a concern later reflected in inquisitors' own texts, which emphasize the importance and intangibility of this quality in the conduct of a tribunal. Coming hot on the heels of the council of Tarragona, the regional council of inquisition *par excellence*, it seems odd that Amelius and other bishops felt it necessary to offer their own wisdom to the inquisitors⁴⁹. They can offer none of the legal sophistication that characterizes Tarragona's provisions – though there is an offering on the perennial (at this stage of inquisition) question of what makes a *credens* – but the fact that there is a much greater emphasis on jurisdiction is probably significant. One of the (many) complaints of the canons of Narbonne cathedral in their letter of 1241, was that Amelius was wrestling prerogatives over sentencing from the papal legates, and lifting sentences imposed by them on heretics and enemies of the church⁵⁰. Competition over jurisdiction, when the inquisitors are by now no longer under his control, is clearly something on Amelius's mind.

Throughout this early phase of conciliar legislation, then, bishops guarded their prerogative to definitively identify heretics very closely⁵¹. This was usually in combination with inquisitors. They had some responsibility for sentences and penances, though they do take the lead in several investigations, when the Dominicans were unable. The primary role in

The Genesis of Inquisition in Languedoc: Edition and Translation of the Earliest Inquisition Records, Leiden, Brill («Studies in the History of Christian Tradition»), with kind permission.

⁴⁹ On the council and its importance, see Parmeggiani, *I consilia*, cit., pp. 13–22.

⁵⁰ *Histoire Générale du Languedoc*, cit., vol. 8, pp. 1077–1080.

⁵¹ As the English episcopate would later do; I. Forrest, *The Detection of Heresy in Late Medieval England*, Oxford–New York, Clarendon Press–Oxford University Press, 2005, p. 147.

which we see bishops in this period is as advisor to, and ultimate authority in the tribunal. The bishop was nominally still in charge of sentences, and imprisonment (and in Toulouse, in charge of confiscations). Their interest in identification and prosecution and therefore financial sanctions was undoubtedly tied up with local territorial rivalries. Control over the goods of the accused also featured heavily in ways in which local authorities and inquisitors used the process of inquisition to entrench the rights they had, and to exert power where they had none.

3. *Counsel and judgement.* Confiscation was the most obvious way in which goods could be used as a weapon. Confiscations for heresy are not obviously visible in the sentences that survive from the early southern French inquisitions, principally because the confiscation of property was something to be carried out by the secular authorities. More, the Dominican inquisitors were to some degree absent from this part of the action⁵². Although they can be hard to see, we do know that confiscation was used to make inquisition measures effective, and that it was used against prominent rivals. This offered ecclesiastics an effective sanction to retain jurisdiction in local competition. The importance of this ability to effect a disposition of goods and to influence local affinities, to support reforming initiatives or to punish rivals or both, underlay a lot of the ongoing concern of regional councils with anti-heretical measures. It is also one of reasons that bishops remain present in the process throughout these decades.

The application of confiscation as a penalty can be seen in later restitutions, especially for Toulouse, for which we are lucky enough to have the 1279 act of restitution⁵³. What is clear from following Mundy's careful study of that list of names back to the earlier registers is that confiscation was used fairly consistently for cases of contumacy and disobedience. Those who had relapsed into their association with convicted heretics after being reconciled to the church; those who had been called but failed to appear; those who were found to have given false testimony before the court; those who had refused to undertake their assigned penance; those convicted after dying unreconciled: all were subject to confiscation of their property. This

⁵² The provincial chapter at Montpellier in 1242 forbade Dominican brothers from imposing or receiving monetary penalties, and from involving themselves in «the implementation of sentences», including the construction of prisons: *Heresy and Inquisition in France*, cit., p. 209.

⁵³ Mundy, *The Repression*, cit.

is less clear in Narbonne, where the use of confiscation is more nakedly political. The sentence of the seneschal in which restitution of property between city and bourg makes it clear that the original confiscations were driven by the then jurisdictional dispute between the two⁵⁴.

Mundy's study of the names listed in the 1279 document gives a sense of the chronology of confiscations in the region. More than half of the 278 confiscations listed took place before 1237; some of these date back to condemnations by Conrad in 1221 and to the council of Toulouse. It is important to note that this was a period during which the Dominican inquisitors could only work sporadically, and the bishops were therefore deeply involved in anti-heretical activity⁵⁵. Thirty-eight of the remaining confiscations were made in 1237, and the remainder in the 1246-48 inquisitions⁵⁶. Based on those numbers, there seems to have been a peak in confiscations, which Mundy believes fell away after the 1230s⁵⁷. This is presumably in part because the more prominent citizens of the region, who seem to have been the principal targets of these early confiscations, had become more wary of entanglement in activity that would lead to confiscation, and the prominence of those sentences of confiscation would have made the danger of a heresy conviction very visible. But it can also be tied to the regular use of the period of grace at the start of an inquisition. Pelhissou records the inquisitors using the period of grace in 1235, by the permission of Count Raymond, into whose gift confiscation technically fell. Appearance during this period of course insulated the individual from imprisonment, exile, or loss of property⁵⁸. The use of the period of grace, from this point on, as a way to apply pressure to a potential witnesses or deponent has been amply outlined by Feuchter, who suggests that the period of grace was more effective in breaking up «conspiracies of silence», after early measures made few inroads⁵⁹. That

⁵⁴ Emery, *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne*, cit., pp. 85-88.

⁵⁵ Dossat, *Crises*, cit., pp. 118-130, 137. He also points out that from 1236 on, the conflict in Italy with the Emperor meant that Gregory IX's attention was turned away from inquisition in the south of France across these «critical years». See also *The Chronicle of William of Puy-laurens*, cit., p. 95.

⁵⁶ Mundy, *The Repression*, cit., pp. 40-49.

⁵⁷ Ivi, p. 66.

⁵⁸ W. Pelhissou, *Chronique (1229-1244) suivie du récit des troubles d'Albi (1229-1244)*, éd. par J. Duvernoy, Paris, Cnrs Éditions, 1994 («Sources d'Histoire Médiévales publiées par l'Institut de Recherches et d'Histoire des Textes»), pp. 69-70.

⁵⁹ Feuchter, *Ketzer, Konsuln und Büsser*, cit., 281.

early use clearly established a collective public association of heresy charges with material loss.

4. *Leverage*. In fact, confiscation was at least as effective as a threat than as a reality, its effectiveness having been demonstrated in the region in those first decades. It bears some resemblance to the mechanism of trust and reciprocity that Forrest has shown at work in the interplay between formal and informal aspects of legal culture and action. That interplay allowed potential legal sanctions to act as a weight in lateral agreements without needing to be brought to bear⁶⁰. The remembered potential for severe financial penalty, or the destruction of houses, constrained people to comply with anti-heretical measures. The advertisement of protection from punishment, against what must have been a very public set of heavy confiscations for heresy, was powerfully persuasive. Feuchter argues, convincingly, that this lay behind the capitulation of Toulouse's prominent citizens, taking back the inquisitors so soon after ejecting them from the city, and behind the decision of neighbouring Montauban to come forward voluntarily⁶¹. We see that bargain being underscored where sentences of confiscation were delivered for violating it, where goods are forfeit because the deponent was later found to have lied to the tribunal during the time of grace⁶².

There is an agility to the application of confiscation to compel obedience as well. As awareness of how confiscation was used grew, attempts to circumvent it also grew, particularly through the transfer of property. So, the threat of confiscation was extended to those attempting to protect their goods by entrusting it to another. The 1246 council of Béziers' emphasis that ignorance of heretical status should protect those contracting with heretics from loss of property confirms this⁶³. This is presumably the reason for the ongoing emphasis on a deponent's awareness of heretical status in those

⁶⁰ I. Forrest, *Trustworthy Men: How Inequality and Faith Made the Medieval Church*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2018, pp. 53-62.

⁶¹ Feuchter also suggests also that Sella's innovation in this is made a little invisible because so few sanctions survive: *Ketzer, Konsuln und Büsser*, cit., pp. 315-317.

⁶² *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'inquisition dans le Languedoc*, éd. par C. Douais, 2 vols., Paris, Librairie Renouard, 1900, vol. II, *Textes*, no. XIV, 1246 sentence of Bernard de Roqueville; no. XXXV, 1248 sentence Pons Alaman; no. XXXVIII, 1248 sentence Bernard de Gourville.

⁶³ *Sacrorum conciliorum*, cit., XXIII, p. 692.

depositions that deal with the exchange of goods. A consistent interest in the knowing holding and transfer of money for those involved in heretical activity is evident throughout the depositions of the thirties and forties⁶⁴. Similarly, the attention to the leasing and holding of land attempts to shut down avenues by which property could be protected⁶⁵. Roach has shown how inquisition had long-term effects on heretical landholding, since those in danger of conviction were dependent on goodwill and inquisitors' encouragement of secret denunciations undermined this trust⁶⁶. It also embedded that financial line of questioning into the deposition process⁶⁷. The power over an accused's property had a coercive function beyond confiscation; it provided similar leverage in other aspects of the process. The ability to confiscate goods was technically a gift of the secular power of their respective region: the inquisitors in Toulouse were in theory only allowed to do this because the count of Toulouse allowed it; the archbishops of Narbonne were granted this power by the king. Both were able, though, to manipulate this ability in such a way as to present the retention or loss of property as their gift, and to use that to apply pressure to conform to the demands of the tribunal and inquisition laws. Goods may have been forfeit in the case of a sentence for heresy, but they were also at risk for the penitent. What is clear from the confiscations made for non-compliance is that resistance to penitential prison sentences for heresy was common. To have done penance and sought reconciliation meant that the accused could avoid confiscation, but perpetual imprisonment also had significant implications for an individual's wealth since they those imprisoned were required to surrender their goods and were liable for their own upkeep. In this instance, confiscation and liberty may well have seemed like the better deal. Even without imprisonment, a penitent's goods were to stand surety for the completion of that penance – in the event of non-completion, goods were again forfeit⁶⁸. And many penances called for contributions to the material upkeep of the prisons and built context of inquisition, and

⁶⁴ Collection Doat, vol. 21, fol. 144v, deposition of Alaman of Rouaix, 1237, fol. 184v, deposition of Bernard of Cesseras of the Minervois, 1244.

⁶⁵ Collection Doat, vol. 23, fol. 117v, deposition of Raymond Hugh, 1244.

⁶⁶ A. Roach, *The Cathar Economy*, in «Reading Medieval Studies», XII, 1986, pp. 51-71.

⁶⁷ See for example the extensive record of the movement of goods in the deposition of Imbert of Salles 1244, Collection Doat, vol. 24, fols. 174r-v.

⁶⁸ Collection Doat, vol. 21, fol. 151v, Sentence on Jordan of Villeneuve and others, 19 February 1237.

for the support of inmates, whether in terms of monetary donations or donations of necessary materials. The letters of safe-conduct give details of building supplies that form part of the penance: bricks, sand, lime, to go towards the building of «prisons for heretics»⁶⁹. Those goods also of course supplied income to fund the ongoing activities of the tribunal.

The process was of course set up to be self-sustaining (though presumably also soon self-perpetuating), cycling confiscations back into the running of the tribunal, but the way in which the control and management of property was presented by the bishops and inquisitors also allowed them to position that property as being in their gift. The actual management of the property confiscated made this partially true: the expectation was that the bishop, as part of his ordinary role, would take and store all goods pledged as guarantee or in lieu of penance not completed in life. Penances and letters of safe conduct both underscore the implication of this. For those returning to the church, and undertaking their prescribed penance, the power of the inquisitors extended to protection of their goods. The property of the penitent was not to be touched. As in the case of confiscation, this was a measure that maintained the bishop's role in the process, at least nominally, since the imposition of monetary punishments were thought by to be inappropriate to the Dominicans' reputation⁷⁰. In any case, the weight of a sentence of confiscation meant that the passing of such a sentence usually involved the wider consultation of the wider body of counsel – or it was at least important to record it as such⁷¹.

5. *Jurisdiction*. Despite this presentation, however, confiscation was technically the duty of the secular powers. Compelling them to comply was a significant source of the tension between inquisitors and local authorities in this early phase. Innocent III had needed to explain this to Raymond VI at the start of the crusade; it was better understood or at least conceded by Raymond VII, who included the duty to confiscation in his statutes of

⁶⁹ Collection Doat, vol. 21, fol. 173r, Safe-conduct for Raymond Arnold of Villeneuve, 22 May 1241; fol. 174v, Safe-conduct for A. R. Boumont, 30 July 1241; fol. 177r, Penance A. of Lugan, 28 May 1238.

⁷⁰ *Texte zur Inquisition*, hrsg. v. K.-V. Selge, Gütersloh, G. Mohn, 1967 («Texte zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte», 4), pp. 60–69, 66, canon 17: the imposition of monetary penance is to be referred to the legate because it is against the reputation of the order and the business would overwhelm them.

⁷¹ Collection Doat, vol. 21, fol. 144v–145r, Alaman of Rouaix, 1237.

1236⁷². In Toulouse, indeed, there was a gradual wearing down, as Feuchter shows. From an initial position in which they felt able to prevent capture, the reversal on the operation of the inquisitors signalled a capitulation⁷³. There were similar tensions initially in the Agenais, over the relative jurisdictions of the bishop and the count and the inquisitors⁷⁴. Tensions were lesser where there was greater imbalance in power, as Graham Leigh points out, in Béziers and Carcassonne, for instance, where the Trencavels were mostly cooperative⁷⁵. Similarly, in Narbonne, the archbishop operated under fewer restrictions, since the viscount was not in a position to offer much pushback. Nevertheless, the confiscation of goods (and therefore also the disbursement of funds to pay for tribunal expenses), remained a source of tension⁷⁶. And in that context both turned to confiscation for leverage. Early attempts to compel secular authorities where they would not comply with inquisitors' requests to effect a confiscation were unsurprisingly made via the same mechanism of inquisitorial sanctions. The mid-thirties saw a number of sentences of excommunication and confiscation for obstructing or not aiding inquisitors in their task⁷⁷. The secular authorities equally made use of the threat of confiscation threat to oppose inquisitors, less against the inquisitors themselves, since the Dominicans had nothing of real value, but more against the citizens, forbidding them to accept the sentences and penances on pain of seizure⁷⁸. More directly, the consuls seized archiepiscopal property in Narbonne in retaliation for Ferrier's actions in the Bourg, while the viscounts of Narbonne used the same threat to discourage loyalty to the archbishop⁷⁹.

The prevalent use of confiscation as a deterrent, as a lever, in these early years, and the effectiveness of it as a measure, inevitably gave rise to some abuse. We can see legislation of the forties attempting to counter this,

⁷² H.C. Lea, *Confiscation for Heresy in the Middle Ages*, in «The English Historical Review», II, 1887, 6, pp. 235-259: 236.

⁷³ Feuchter, *Ketzer, Konsuln und Büsser*, cit., pp. 290-291.

⁷⁴ Dossat, *L'inquisiteur Bernard de Caux et l'Agenais*, cit.

⁷⁵ Graham-Leigh, *The Southern French Nobility*, cit., p. 72.

⁷⁶ The council of Béziers 46 states that the goods of heretics held from churches should revert to churches (rather than secular lords): canon 4, *Sacrorum conciliorum*, cit., XXIII, p. 692.

⁷⁷ Collection Doat, vol. 21, fol. 160r, Excommunication of the consuls of Toulouse, 10 November 1235; fols. 146v-147v, Peter of Toulouse and the consuls, 24 July 1237.

⁷⁸ Collection Doat, vol. 22, fols. 45v-46r, deposition of Oth of Barèges, 1244.

⁷⁹ Emery, *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne*, cit., pp. 84, 80.

prohibiting, twice, the confiscation of goods until formal sentence has been passed – the immediate seizure of goods upon accusation being a not infrequent complaint against inquisitorial operations⁸⁰. Emery points out that, in Narbonne at any rate, the inquisition of heresy operated in direct opposition to local custom. The customs of Narbonne (as recorded in 1232) prohibited the imposition of monetary punishment alongside corporal except in the case of treason or heresy. It also guaranteed that criminal cases would be tried before *probi homines*⁸¹. Emery sees inquisition as having violated these principles, in particular with regard to the freedom from punishment that they granted to heirs. Complaints about abuse of inquisitorial powers, principally that they were being used without due process and without any real legal justification, including confiscation without condemnation – seizure being made at the point of accusation rather than after sentence had been handed down⁸².

Faced with abuse of inquisitorial powers by the archbishop, the consuls' demand was that the tribunal be held to the standards and principles outlined in Toulouse 1229. Institutional and organised resistance to the financial abuses generated by the success of financial sanctions therefore went some way to entrenching legislation, as inquisitorial legislation was also used to hold those exercising inquisitorial power to account. The resistance that these measures inevitably and not unreasonably provoked, for the same reason that it was a powerful incentive when it worked, in turn produced patterns in the legislation and bedded that legislation in.

6. *Conclusions*. In 1244, two inquisitors wrote a short handbook outlining the essential stages of running an inquisition tribunal. Their final word to their fellow inquisitors is to emphasise the effectiveness of confiscation. «It is in this way that heretics and believers are particularly confounded»⁸³. The control of property, and the opportunities that it provided for leverage and the performance of authority, was a significant motivation for way

⁸⁰ Béziers 46, canon 3, Béziers 4,6 canon 11, repeats Narbonne's and council's prohibition of seizing goods before condemnation – are these both council?

⁸¹ Emery, *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne*, cit., pp. 48, 53-54.

⁸² Ivi, p. 83.

⁸³ L.J. Sackville, *The Ordo Processus Narbonensis: The Earliest Inquisitor's Handbook, Lost and Refound*, in «Aevum», XCIII, 2019, 2, pp. 359-391; W.L. Wakefield, *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Southern France, 1100-1250*, Berkeley-Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1974, p. 257.

that inquisitorial action developed over these early years. Goods were central to so much of this legislation, and to so many aspects of the process, because the control over them offered the best opportunity to underline and maintain the position of those handing down sentences for heresy, and because so much of this latter was done not only by inquisitors but also by local authorities. It was this blend of agents working to impose anti-heretical measures that was partly responsible for the primacy of goods in their implementation. Already under pressure from legatine missions to carry out reform in this region, the relative poverty of these sees meant that the incumbents were actively seeking ways to protect their own assets and to find ways to prevent further loss. Control over goods also offered ways to entrench jurisdictional power and relative authority: the leverage that could be gained from oversight of the disposition of property made it too appealing not to exploit. The focus on high status targets that Mundy identifies in that early glut of confiscations attests to this. It allowed a solid underpinning for ecclesiastical claims in contested jurisdictions. That is further reinforced by Rehr's recent re-reading of the tribunals of 1245-46, which sees the consuls as the primary target of that investigation⁸⁴.

Confiscation and control over property was used as much as a way of compelling appearance at, or cooperation with the tribunal, though, as it was used for punishment. The threat of the latter proved an effective way to entrench the former as a habit. The use of goods as surety for the completion of penance, for upkeep in prison, meant that threat to property was closely bound up not only with the punishment of those charged with heresy but also with reconciliation of the penitent as well. Mundy argued that the 1279 diploma was important to understanding the history of repression, since it showed that «churchmen and their lay allies» were able to effectively repress heresy in the decades before the mature machinery of inquisition was in place⁸⁵. Confiscation was crucial to the success of those early prosecutions.

In the early phase of inquisitions into heresy, goods and the control over them played a pivotal role. The prospect of confiscations meant that the prosecution of heresy provided bishops with the means to secure the position of their sees, and to compete with their rivals for regional power. The role

⁸⁴ J.-P. Rehr, *Re-mapping the «Great Inquisition» of 1245-46: The Case of Mas-Saintes-Puelles and Saint-Martin-Lalande*, in «Open Library of Humanities», V(I), 2019, 28, p. 152.

⁸⁵ Mundy, *The Repression*, cit., pp. 2, 8-9.

that goods played more generally in the administration of inquisition, in terms of the everyday functioning and funding of the office, in terms of the leverage that they offered, and in terms of jurisdictional competition, bound the function of inquisition to local concerns. The relationship between that function and the control of goods underpinned the expression of authority in and around the tribunal. The legislative productivity of the region in these years, shaped by these local dynamics, wove that relationship into the fabric of the inquisition process.