

SIMON TUGWELL O. P., *Notes on the life of St Dominic*, in «Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum» (ISSN 0391-7320), 73, (2003), pp. 5-141.

Url: <https://heyjoe.fbk.eu/index.php/afp>

Questo articolo è stato digitalizzato della Biblioteca Fondazione Bruno Kessler, in collaborazione con l'Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum all'interno del portale [HeyJoe](#) - *History, Religion and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe è un progetto di digitalizzazione di riviste storiche, delle discipline filosofico-religiose e affini per le quali non esiste una versione elettronica.

This article was digitized by the Bruno Kessler Foundation Library in collaboration with the Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum as part of the [HeyJoe](#) portal - *History, Religion, and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe is a project dedicated to digitizing historical journals in the fields of philosophy, religion, and related disciplines for which no electronic version exists.



Nota copyright

Tutto il materiale contenuto nel sito [HeyJoe](#), compreso il presente PDF, è rilasciato sotto licenza [Creative Commons](#) [Attribuzione-Non commerciale-Non opere derivate 4.0 Internazionale](#). Pertanto è possibile liberamente scaricare, stampare, fotocopiare e distribuire questo articolo e gli altri presenti nel sito, purché si attribuisca in maniera corretta la paternità dell'opera, non la si utilizzi per fini commerciali e non la si trasformi o modifichi.

Copyright notice

All materials on the [HeyJoe](#) website, including the present PDF file, are made available under a [Creative Commons](#) [Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](#). You are free to download, print, copy, and share this file and any other on this website, as long as you give appropriate credit. You may not use this material for commercial purposes. If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you may not distribute the modified material.



NOTES ON THE LIFE OF ST DOMINIC¹

BY
SIMON TUGWELL OP

VII: WHERE WAS DOMINIC FROM 1208 TO MID 1211?

Without the involvement of Bishop Diego of Osma and his sub-prior, Dominic, in the anti-heretical preaching campaign in the South of France the Order of Preachers would probably not have come into being; the period between 1206 and 1215 is therefore of considerable importance to Dominican historians. We are relatively well informed about the events which fell within Diego's short time in Languedoc,² but for the years after his death we have to make do with

¹ I am grateful to Prof. Rebecca Posnan and Prof. Peter Ricketts for their help with medieval Occitan, and to Dr John Maddicott for looking at my comments on Simon de Montfort. For previous 'Notes' see AFP 65 (1995) 5-169, 66 (1996) 5-200, 67 (1997) 27-59, 68 (1998) 5-116. I quote early Dominican texts on the basis of my own study of the manuscripts, but with reference to standard editions: MOPH I for the *Vitas fratrum*; MOPH XVI for Jordan's *Libellus*, the Bologna and Languedoc canonization processes ('ACB' and 'ACL') and related documents, and the legends of Ferrandus, Constantine and Humbert; *Acta Sanctorum, Aug. I*, Antwerp 1733, 562-632 for the *Libellus* of Dietrich of Apolda. I cite my own edition of the section of Bernard Gui's *Catalogus Magistrorum* concerning Dominic (MOPH XXVII). I cite V.J.Koudelka's edition of the *Monumenta diplomatica* (MOPH XXV), but in most cases I have also consulted the manuscripts for myself. For the *Hystoria Albigenis* of Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernai ('Cernai') I use the edition by P.Guébin - E.Lyon, Paris 1926-1939; for the *Cronica* of Guillaume de Puylaurens ('Puylaurens') I use the edition by J.Duvernoy, Paris 1976. For the *Chanson de la croisade albigeoise*, I use the edition by E.Martin-Chabot in the Belles Lettres series, Paris, of which there have been several printings. Other frequently cited works are: T.Mamachi, ed., *Annalium Ordinis Praedicatorum volumen primum*, Rome 1756 ('Mamachi'); Cl.Devic - J.Vaissete, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, Toulouse 1874-1892 ('Devic-Vaissete'); F.Balme - P.Lelaidier, *Cartulaire ou histoire diplomatique de saint Dominique*, Paris 1893-1901 ('Balme-Lelaidier'); J.Guiraud, *Cartulaire de Notre-Dame de Prouille*, Paris 1907; M.H.Vicaire, *Histoire de saint Dominique*, 1st ed. Paris 1957, 2nd ed. Paris 1982, cited as '*Histoire*' (where no edition is specified, the reference is to the 2nd ed.; otherwise the editions are distinguished as *Histoire*¹ and *Histoire*²).

² On the chronology of Diego's involvement in the Languedoc mission; see below, VIII 1.

much patchier evidence; contemporary chroniclers transferred their attention to the Albigensian crusade, and there is a documentary void, as far as Dominic is concerned, between August 1207 and June 1211.³

According to Jordan of Saxony, when news of Diego's death reached the anti-heretical preachers in the Midi 'singuli ad propria redierunt, frater uero Dominicus solus ibidem in predicationis iugitate permansit ... A tempore obitus episcopi Oxomensis usque ad Lateranense concilium anni fluxerunt fere decem, quo tempore quasi solus permansit ibidem' (*Lib.* §31, 37). On the strength of this it has customarily been assumed that Dominic stayed in the region continuously throughout this period, and his biographers have found ways of keeping him occupied, though 'anni fere decem' cannot be right since Diego died on 30 Dec. 1207 (cf. below, VIII 1) and the Lateran council was held in Nov. 1215.

Jordan's similar statement about Diego is certainly inexact: according to him, Diego, having become involved in the anti-heretical mission, 'in huiusmodi predicationis exercitio permansit' for two years until he returned to Osma and died (*Lib.* §28), and Cernai gives the same impression of his continuous presence in the region (Cernai §20-26, 47-49); but, as Gallén pointed out, his documented attendance at royal councils in Castile shows that he was not continuously present in the Midi.⁴

Jordan had better information about Diego than he had about Dominic, probably because the story which reached him in Paris was based on what Dominic had told his recruits in Toulouse about the beginnings of the institution they had joined (AFP 68 [1998] 60-63). The story was concerned with the *predicatio*, not with anyone's

³ We shall deal with MOPH XXV no. 6 (8 Aug. 1207) shortly. On 20 June 1211 'frater Dominicus predicator' witnessed the bishop of Cahors's submission to Simon de Montfort (MOPH XXV no. 12); from Dec. 1211 until mid 1214 Dominic is mentioned with sufficient regularity in connection with Prouille to show that he had a permanent responsibility for the place (MOPH XXV nos. 13, 27-29, 33-37, 39, 46-50, 56-7, 60), and there can be little doubt that he was in Languedoc in 1212-1215 (cf. below, VIII 2). The gap in the evidence thus falls between Diego's final return to Osma (towards the end of 1207) and 20 June 1211. On 19 March 1209 William Claret alone took possession of St Martin's, Limoux, for the nuns of Prouille (MOPH XXV no. 9), though he and Dominic jointly received the original gift on 17 April 1207 (MOPH XXV no. 5).

⁴ The acts were published in J.González, *El reino de Castilla en la época de Alfonso VIII*, vol. III, Madrid 1960; their significance for the life of Dominic was pointed out in J.Gallén, 'Les voyages de S.Dominique au Danemark', in R.Creytens - P.Künzle, edd., *Xenia medii aevi historiam illustrantia oblata Thomae Kaeppli OP*, Rome 1978, 74-84.

life history, and Dominic evidently played up Diego's rôle at the expense of his own; if he did not think it worth mentioning Diego's periodic absences, a fortiori we cannot presume that he talked about his own comings and goings. If Jordan got a wrong impression about the continuity of Diego's presence, he is even more likely to be wrong about Dominic.⁵

Later writers, even those who could add extra Spanish or Languedocian details to other parts of the story, repeat Jordan's statements about Diego remaining in the Midi for two years and Dominic remaining there for the next ten years;⁶ clearly none of them had independent information on this point.

Since the whole tradition of Dominic's continuous presence in the Midi between Diego's death and Lateran IV derives from Jordan and there is a real possibility that Jordan was wrong, the question must be asked whether Dominic was actually there in the period for which there is no documentary evidence.

1. *Dominic's canonical position*

We must first consider Dominic's canonical situation.

Jordan tells us that, when Diego left Languedoc to return to Osma, he placed Dominic and William Claret in charge (*Lib.* §29):

Eis autem qui remanserant fratrem Dominicum in spiritualium cura tamquam spiritu dei uere plenum preposuit, in temporalibus uero

⁵ On Jordan's account of the period from 1206-1215, see below, VIII 3.

⁶ Ferrandus had extra information about Dominic's time in the Midi (*Ferr.* §22-23), but he reproduces Jordan's statements about Diego's two years in the Midi and the ten years Dominic spent there between Diego's death and Lateran IV (*Ferr.* §17-18, 25), as do Constantine (*Const.* §16, 20) and Humbert (*Humb.* §20-21, 28). Rodrigo was able to incorporate information from Caleruega in the final version of his *legenda* (§4 in the edition in Mamachi, App. 312-334), but he repeats the usual story of Diego's two years in the Midi (extended to three in the final text, §6; cf. below, p. 123) and the ten years which Dominic then spent there up to Lateran IV (§10-11). Gerald de Frachet knew, presumably from the tradition of his province, that Diego and Dominic were returning 'de marchia Dacie' when they arrived in the Midi, but he tells the usual story about Diego's two years and Dominic's ten (*MOPH* I 321). Dietrich appears to have had information about the date of Dominic's parents' marriage (*Diet.* §11, cf. *AFP* 67 [1997] 28-29), but he leaves unaltered the story of Diego's two years in the Midi (§32) and Dominic's ensuing ten years (§45). Gui had extra information from Spain, some of it concerning Osma (cf. *MOPH* XXVII 36), including the fact that Diego died in 1207; he accordingly reduced Dominic's stay in Languedoc from 'nearly ten years' to 'quasi per X annos', but otherwise he left the conventional story intact (*Cat. mag., Dom.* §3-4, 6).

Guilielmum Clareti Appamiensem, ita dumtaxat ut ad fratrem Dominicum referret omnium que ageret rationem.

Jordan did not know that Diego came and went several times, and MOPH XXV nos. 5 and Appendix II 2⁷ show that Dominic and William were already empowered to act, at least on behalf of Prouille, in March and April 1207. In both deeds gifts were made 'priorisse et monialibus nouiter conuersis monitis et exemplis fratris Dominici Oxomensis sociorumque eius', which has the further implication that Dominic was already the leader of a group of preachers. Since the Cistercian mission did not begin until April 1207 (cf. below, VIII 1), Dominic's *socii* must be members of a separate team, and there can surely be no doubt that this was a team mustered by Diego and that Dominic was their leader by delegation from Diego.

Dominic's rôle is further illustrated by a deed of 8 Aug. 1207 in which, in rather shaky Latin,⁸ Ermengards Godolina and her husband gave themselves and their goods, including their house at Villasavary, 'domino Deo et beatae Mariae et omnibus sanctis Dei et sanctam praedicationem et domino Dominico de Oscua (*sic*) et omnibus fratribus et sororibus qui hodie sunt uel in futuro erint ...'; their act was supported by the lords of Villasavary: 'Et ego Vilarius et frater meus Galardus nos simul per nos et per omnem nostram posteritatem laudamus et concedimus domino Deo et sanctam praedicationem praedictam domum, iure nostro saluo ... et affrancamus iamdictam Ermengard et uiro suo Sancio et omnes alios de Pictam Villam qui ad sanctam praedicationem donauerunt ...'.

By 8 Aug. 1207 the 'sancta praedictio' to which the deed refers was evidently an institution capable of receiving benefactions and *donati*, so, even without Vilarius's reference to 'omnis nostra posteritas', we must infer that it was expected to have a long-term future; and Dominic was plainly the senior person in it. The original of the deed was kept in the archives of Prouille,⁹ so Prouille

⁷ Below, in Appendix I, I argue that there is a genuine deed lurking behind the false one.

⁸ The original is lost, so we have to rely on BNF Doat 98 ff.3^r-4^r; in his edition in MOPH XXV no. 6 Koudelka improves the grammar, but so many nouns are in the wrong case that I have thought it best to leave the text as it is.

⁹ It was one of a batch of 20 documents transcribed for Doat from 'originaux écrits en parchemin trouués en l'Abbaye de filles de l'ordre de Saint Dominique a Prouille' (Doat 98 f.26^v).

must in some way have been its headquarters (and where else did it have *sorores*?).

Vicaire points out correctly that 'sancta praedicatio' does not designate the nuns of Prouille, but his contention that 'c'est le nom de la succursale de Dominique dont le groupe des converties ne se distinguait pas encore' (*Histoire* I 233) is patently wrong, since both *fratres* and *sorores* are mentioned separately. The primary beneficiary was the *sancta praedicatio* itself; Dominic and the *fratres et sorores* were included because of their rôle in it.¹⁰

A misunderstanding of MOPH XXV no. 6 has led to the claim that Dominican houses were originally called 'predicationes';¹¹ the evidence cited in support of this actually proves something quite different, that in the area where the order came to birth the 'fratres Ordinis Predicatorum' were known as 'fratres Predicationis';¹²

¹⁰ The institution took its name from the activity for which it existed; words like *consilium*, *hospicium*, *elemosina* behave in the same way, designating particular kinds of activity and institutions devoted to those activities.

¹¹ The allegation is already found in J.J.Percin, *Monumenta conventus Tolosani*, Toulouse 1693, I 16-17, but the modern claim rests on the interpretation of MOPH XXV no. 6 by Balme (Balme-Lelaidier I 164), P.Mandonnet (*Saint Dominique*, Gent 1921, 130) and Vicaire (*Histoire* I 233-234); the 1967 Dominican constitutions asserted that 'in origine conventus "sacra praedicatio" vocabatur' (LCO 100-1), though the phrase 'sacra praedicatio' is not found in any early document and is presumably a retroversion of French commentators' 'sainte prédication'.

¹² MOPH XXV no. 82 (31 March 1217) refers to a settlement between the monks of Saint-Hilaire 'et fratrem Dominicum, priorem ecclesiae Sancti Romani, et G.Clareti et alios fratres Praedicationis ecclesiae sancti Romani'; a false analysis of this yields a 'praedicatio ecclesiae sancti Romani', but *praedicationis* goes with *fratres*, not *ecclesiae sancti Romani*, as can be seen from 'iamdicti fratres Praedicationis' in the same deed and 'fratrum Predicationis' in MOPH XXV no. 83. In a deed of 9 Oct. 1225 the brethren of Prouille styled themselves 'fratres Predicationis' (Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 51-52 no. 298). When Poncius Stephanus and his wife undertook to act as agents of Prouille in Toulouse in 1230 (Archives dép. de l'Aude H 472/5; there are editions of the deed in E. de Teule, *Annales du Prieuré de Notre-Dame de Prouille*, Carcassonne 1902, 17, and Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 3-5 no. 237), they agreed, in the case of any dispute, to stand by the verdict 'prioris domus predicationis Tolose et maioris domus fratrum minorum Tolose'; 'domus predicationis' is parallel to 'domus fratrum minorum'. This usage must not be confused with the different sense of *predicatio* found, for instance, in Gui's statements that the tenth prior of Prouille was 'de predicatione conventus Amiliavi' and that the ninth prior of Limoges was 'Lemovicensis dyocesis, de predicatione Brivensi' (MOPH XXIV 26, 63), where *predicatio* refers to the territory of a convent (the area within which it exercised its ministry and its right to beg). Thus the chronicle of S.Maria Novella is said to contain the names of Dominicans 'qui de civitate Florentie sive de eius predicatione originem contraxerunt' (S.Orlandi, *Necrologio di S.Maria Novella*, Florence 1955, I 3), i.e. people born in the city of Florence or in the territory of the Florence convent.

Dominic and Fulk similarly used the phrase 'ordo Predicationis' (MOPH XXV nos. 94, 99, 153), and, on the seal he had as head of the order, Dominic apparently styled himself 'minister predicationis' (AFP 65 [1995] 24-25).

This terminology is undoubtedly a survival from the mission which existed before the Order of Preachers: in an official letter which certainly antedates the founding of the Order Dominic called himself 'predicationis humilis minister', and the seal which he used bore the inscription 'sigillum Christi et predicationis' (MOPH XXV no. 62).¹³ *Predicatio* in MOPH XXV no. 6 already has the same meaning.

By 8 Aug. 1207, then, there was a long-term institution entitled 'Predicatio', with its *fratres* and *sorores*, based at Prouille. Prouille was Diego's foundation, it was his idea to establish a durable anti-heretical mission with its own manpower, and there were people under his authority in Languedoc over whom he could place Dominic and William Claret in charge (Jordan, *Lib.* §27-28).¹⁴ On the face of it, then, this *predicatio* must have been Diego's institution; and it certainly does not seem to have been anyone else's.

It is possible that the over-all preaching-campaign of 1206-1207 was generally thought of as a 'predicatio', but this does not mean that the 'predicatio' was thought of as an institution.¹⁵ In any case, there is no evidence that Prouille played any part in the mission of the Cistercian abbots in 1207,¹⁶ and their operation was only planned to last for a limited time (cf. below, VIII 1) and as such could not have been the intended beneficiary of MOPH XXV no. 6.

¹³ No actual seal survives, but its inscription is reported in several manuscripts (Barcelona Bibl. Univ. 218 f.717^r, Dôle 109 f.80^r, BNF lat. 4348 f.155^v). The Doat transcription has 'J. Christi et predicationis' (BNF Doat 31 f.3^v) which is plainly wrong, but Vicaire believed it to be the transmitted text and, by emending *et* to *s(i)gillum*, he arrived at the unwarranted title which he gave to the whole anti-heretical preaching operation, 'La prédication de Jésus Christ' (*Histoire*¹ I 226).

¹⁴ In as much as this is all part of the story of Diego, and Jordan's information on it came ultimately from Dominic's prehistory of the order, the *Libellus*'s account is in principle dependable.

¹⁵ Cernai refers to Diego and two of the legates, Peter of Castelnau and Raoul, as having been 'predicationis ... principes et magistri', but he goes on immediately to refer to the 'predicatio' having nearly run its course ('animadvertentes quod eadem predicatio iam peregerit ex parte maxima cursum suum') (Cernai §67), which would make no sense if *predicatio* was understood to refer to an institution rather than a campaign.

¹⁶ Cernai, who represents a well-informed contemporary Cistercian view of the events of these years and of Diego's rôle in them, never even mentions Prouille.

The legates' commission was more open-ended, but it is very doubtful that would have regarded themselves, or been regarded, as constituting a 'predicatio';¹⁷ nor is there the slightest indication that they had anything to do with Prouille, let alone that they considered it in any sense their headquarters.

On the evidence so far examined, it is clear that Dominic held a position of authority within Diego's operation in Languedoc; but, of course, whatever powers he had received by personal delegation from his bishop lapsed when his bishop died.¹⁸

The only document which might suggest that Dominic had faculties directly from the legate is his reconciliation of a converted heretic 'auctoritate domini abbatis Cisterciensis apostolice sedis legati' (MOPH XXV no. 8). When Bernard Gui saw the original in 1305, 'littere sigilli non poterant bene legi', but the description of the seal (cf. MOPH XXV p.18) tallies with that of the one which Dominic used later as 'predicationis minister' (MOPH XXV no. 61), so we may presume the inscription to have been the same, 'sigillum Christi et predicationis'.

Unfortunately the letter is undated and, as we shall see, it cannot be dated except vaguely within the period 1206-1212; nor is there any known evidence for the use of this seal by anyone except Dominic, which means that we cannot be sure exactly whose seal it was. Later inquisition records, to which we shall turn in due course, suggest that Dominic had faculties to reconcile heretics during Diego's time in Languedoc, which he had presumably been granted by the senior legate, the abbot of Cîteaux, and it is quite possible that any letters of reconciliation which he issued at this time were sealed with the 'sigillum Christi et predicationis'; but this does not help us answer the question whose seal it was and what the relationship was between Dominic's use of it and the faculties he had received from the legate.

¹⁷ The task enjoined on all the Cistercian emissaries whom Innocent sent to the region was to combat heresy both by trying to convert heretics and by getting penal measures applied against the recalcitrant; this was as true in 1204 (MOPH XXV no. 3) as it was in 1198 (O.Hageneder - A.Haidacher, edd., *Die Register Innocenz' III I*, Graz-Cologne 1964, 136-137). Not without reason did Cernai distinguish between the legates' mission (Cernai §6-7) and the 'coming of the preachers' in 1206 (§20).

¹⁸ I hope to deal elsewhere with the canonical basis for Diego's own activities in Languedoc.

One thing is clear, however: the fact that Dominic could reconcile heretics on the authority of the legate does not constitute evidence that he had any mandate to operate independently of Diego, since he could have been licensed to act precisely as a member of Diego's team. We know that Diego's operation had taken institutional form with the title 'Predicatio', so it is at least possible that this was the 'Predicatio' whose seal Dominic used.¹⁹

There is one final point which suggests that Dominic had no authority in the Languedoc mission except that which Diego gave him.

Jordan was apparently under the impression that Diego was the 'superior' of the whole preaching campaign against heresy, including that of the Cistercian abbots (*Lib.* §22), so, when he says that when Diego returned to Osma he 'eis qui remanserant fratrem Dominicum ... preposuit', and that, on reception of the news that Diego was dead, 'hii qui in partibus Tholosanis remanserant singuli ad propria redierunt' (*Lib.* §29, 31), he may well have had the Cistercians in mind. Cernai's account of the Cistercian mission is undoubtedly more accurate: Abbot Arnaud was in command of it, and, by the time news arrived of Diego's death, the abbots and their monks were almost due to go home anyway (Cernai §47, 67).

However, Cernai gives the same impression as Jordan, that, with Diego's death, the preaching campaign came to an end (§55, 67). If, in deference to him, we subtract the Cistercians from *Lib.* §31, we are left precisely with Diego's team, the people who had genuinely been placed under Dominic's command; if they 'ad propria redierunt' when they heard of Diego's death, the probable implication must be that Dominic had no authority to continue their mission independently of Diego.²⁰

If, as seems to be the case, Dominic was involved in the Languedoc mission entirely on the authority of Diego, then he had

¹⁹ It was essentially Diego's *predicatio* which was later revived under Dominic's leadership, so there was no reason why its seal should not still be used in 1214/1215 (MOPH XXV no. 61); by then, though, it should not have had any validity if it was originally created for the Cistercian mission in 1207. Since there is no evidence of its use except in connection with Dominic's two letters, both of which concern people in the diocese of Toulouse, it is also possible that, if it does not go back to Diego, it was the seal of a diocesan *predicatio* operating on the authority of Bishop Fulk.

²⁰ William Claret's continued presence at Prouille, attested by MOPH XXV no. 9, thus needs explaining. He seems to have been a monk of Boulbonne (cf. Vicaire, *Histoire* I 252), so he must have been deputed by his own abbot to assist Diego, and his abbot presumably allowed him to remain at Prouille.

no warrant to operate or even to remain in the region once Diego was dead.

In his comments on Dominic's meeting with Archbishop Rodrigo of Toledo in 1218, Vicaire contends that it was Rodrigo who had 'regularized' Dominic's position in the Midi (*Histoire* II 120): Rodrigo 'a été deux ans son évêque avant de se voir transférer au premier siège des Espagnes. Élu en effet à Osma au lendemain de la mort de Diègue (1208), quoique non consacré, c'est lui qui a réglé le cas de Dominique et l'a autorisé à demeurer loin de ses frères chanoines et à poursuivre son ministère en Narbonnaise ... Comme il a naguère accueilli frère Gomez et frère Pierre de Madrid, Rodrigue Ximénès accueille généreusement Dominique'.

Vicaire exaggerates the generosity with which Rodrigo welcomed Dominic in 1218; all he is actually known to have given Dominic is some houses of which he did not have outright possession and which he retained the right to reclaim once the actual owner was dead (MOPH XXV no. 94). Nor do we have any information concerning his reception of Sueiro Gomes and Peter of Madrid beyond the fact that the Dominicans were able to establish a house in Madrid (Jordan, *Lib.* §59).²¹ He appears to have been more interested in lining his own coffers than in supporting preachers.²²

Nor was Rodrigo bishop of Osma for two years. His attendance at royal councils as electus of Osma is only attested between 23 Sept. 1208 and 13 March 1209,²³ and, although he is called 'bishop' rather than 'electus' on 11 and 17 Nov. 1208 and on 13 March 1209, he is referred to as electus on 24 Jan. 1209, and it is clear from the letter in which Innocent announced his translation to Toledo on 27 Feb. 1209 (Mansilla, *Documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio III*, 416 no. 398) that he had never been either confirmed as bishop of Osma or ordained: Innocent refers to him as 'Oxomensis electus' and tells the suffragans of Toledo that he is 'ab aliquo vestrum oportuno tempore in presbyterum ordinandus'.

²¹ Madrid was in the diocese of Toledo: cf. D.Mansilla, *La documentación pontificia hasta Inocencio III*, Rome 1955, 441; id., *La documentación pontificia de Honorio III*, Rome 1965, 282 (where the archdeacon of Madrid is one of the people representing Toledo).

²² For an exposé of Rodrigo's worldly pre-occupations, see P.Linehan, *The Spanish church and the papacy in the thirteenth century*, Cambridge 1971, 7-16.

²³ González docs. 824-839. No bishop of Osma attended royal councils between 31 Jan. and 29 May 1208 (docs. 816-820).

In the lists of prelates attending royal councils he features as electus of Toledo from 17 May onwards, and as archbishop from 10 March 1210 (González docs. 839-862). Strictly speaking, then, he had never been Dominic's bishop at all.

What is more, it was contrary to canon law for an electus to start administering his diocese without waiting to be confirmed. Henry II's illegitimate son, Geoffrey Plantagenet, got into trouble for attempting to grant prebends when he was electus of Lincoln, and Alexander III laid down the fundamental principle very clearly in the letter in which he told the bishop of Worcester to intervene: 'Nosti, sicut vir prudens et sapiens, quomodo dilectus filius noster G. Linconensis electus concedendi honores vel praebendas aut alias disponendi de rebus ecclesiae, quum sua non sit electio confirmata, non habeat facultatem'.²⁴ The first reason which Innocent III gave in 1199 for cassating the election of a bishop of Penne was that 'electus ... ante confirmationem obtentam amministrationi episcopatus se irreverenter immiscuit et tam a clericis quam a laicis iuramenta recepit, non attendens quod secundum apostolum nemo sibi debeat honorem assumere'.²⁵ It would surely be *ultra vires* for an electus to let a professed canon of his chapter undertake a prolonged mission in someone else's diocese.

No bishop of Osma attended royal councils between 27 May 1209 and 20 March 1210; Menendo is listed as electus of Avila on 5 April 1210, which is presumably a mistake, and as electus of Osma between 29 June and 12 Sept., and as bishop of Osma from 28 Feb. 1211 onwards (González docs. 842-876). He must have been confirmed and consecrated between 12 Sept. 1210 and 28 Feb. 1211, and only then could he have lawfully authorized Dominic to return to the Midi.

Since there is no trace of any papal directive ordering or permitting Dominic to continue or resume his work there, or of any

²⁴ *Compilatio I* 1.4.18 (Friedberg¹ 3), X.1.6.9 (Friedberg² II 52-53). According to the *chronicon Thomae Wykes*, Geoffrey 'ad digniorem aspirans celsitudinem munus consecrationis suscipere recusavit, temporalibus commodis eiusdem episcopatus nomine electi totus incumbens' (*Annales Monastici* IV, ed. H.R.Luard, Rolls Series, London 1869, 37). He was never confirmed as bishop of Lincoln, but he subsequently went on to become chancellor of the kingdom (*Ann. Mon.* II, London 1865, 242), and on 18 Aug. 1191 he was consecrated archbishop of York; he died on 18 Dec. 1212 (HC I 233).

²⁵ O.Hageneder - W.Maleczek - A.A.Strnad, edd., *Die Register Innocenz' III* II, Rome-Vienna 1979, 340; X.1.6.17, Friedberg² II 58.

mandate allowing a papal legate to recruit preachers for the Midi in Castilian dioceses, there is a definite presumption that Dominic had no canonical right to be anywhere other than Osma between Diego's death and Menendo's confirmation.

J.Loperráez Corvalán, *Descripción histórica del obispado de Osma*, Madrid 1788, contains no list of resident canons from the period in question, and I am not aware of any other evidence to show who was or was not there; it seems, then, that we cannot prove either Dominic's presence at or his absence from Osma. But William of Monferrato heard from a bishop of Osma about Dominic's virginity,²⁶ and this probably refers to Menendo, whom William could have met in the summer of 1217 when the bishop visited Rome (cf. AFP 66 [1996] 120-121). In 1211 Menendo sold a house in Palencia and, since he is referred to as 'master', it is possible that he was teaching there before he became bishop of Osma;²⁷ but William's testimony implies that he knew Dominic as 'his canon', and it is difficult to see how this could be true unless Dominic had spent at least some time in Osma after he took possession of the see in 1210/1211.

Since the period for which there is no documentary evidence of Dominic's presence in the Midi coincides fairly exactly with the time during which there was no one in Osma with authority to grant him leave of absence, there is a strong *prima facie* case for supposing that he returned to Osma early in 1208 when he learned of Diego's death,²⁸ and that he remained there until the spring of 1211; but it needs to be tested against various claims that have been made about Dominic's activities in the Midi during this period.

²⁶ 'Item dixit quod firmiter credit quod idem frater Dominicus semper seruauit uirginitatem ... quia hoc audiuit a multis uiris religiosis et ab aliis fide dignis qui cum eo longo tempore fuerunt conuersati; interrogatus a quibus hoc audiuit respondit, Ab episcopo Oxomensi cuius canonicus fuerat et a canonicis suis cum quibus fuerat in seculo conuersatus et ab aliis de quorum nominibus non recordatur' (ACB §14).

²⁷ J.González, *El reino de Castilla en la época de Alfonso VIII*, Madrid 1960, I 429.

²⁸ The combined evidence of MOPH XXV no. 6 and *Lib.* §29 shows that Dominic was left in charge of Diego's team in the Midi; there can be no question of him accompanying Diego to Spain on what turned out to be the bishop's final journey to his diocese.

2. *Dominic's reconciliation of Pons Roger*

In 1305 Bernard Gui saw and transcribed the original of an undated letter ('datum non erat in littera') in which Dominic laid down the terms of Pons Roger's reconciliation (MOPH XXV no. 8);²⁹ the text was also copied, with another of Dominic's letters (MOPH XXV no. 61), into a compilation made for the Carcassonne inquisition in about 1322.³⁰

There was evidently a note on the date of Pons's reconciliation in the Carcassonne compilation; its text is known from two manuscripts (A.Dondaine, AFP 17 [1947] 135), and it entered the public domain, in a slightly inaccurate form, via Campeggi, op. cit. 149:

Carcassonne	Campeggi
<p>Predictus abbas Cisterciensis apostolice sedis legatus vocabatur Arnaldus, qui fuit postmodum archiepiscopus Narbonensis, erat autem legatus apostolice sedis anno domini M^oCC^oVI^o. Item VII^o et VIII^o usque ad nonum, in quo tempore predicta littera et contenta in ea fuerunt facta ... Cardinalis legatus post prefatum abbatem Cisterciensem fuit dominus magister Petrus dyachonus cardinalis usque ad generale consilium Lateranense quod celebratum fuit sub anno domini M^oCC^oXV^o. Dominus vero Bertrandus presbyter cardinalis successit in legatione prefato legato ...</p>	<p>Abbas iste vocabatur Arnaldus, & una cum undecim aliis Abbatibus contra Albigenses legationis munus obiuit, auctoritate tamen penes ipsum solum residente. Id autem extitit anno D. 1206 & 1207. & 1208. Huic Petrus Diaconus Cardinalis in legatione successit, qui eam exercuit usque ad annum 1215, quo Lateranense Concilium celebratum fuit. ... Concilio itaque absoluto Bernardus presbyter Cardinalis ipsum legationis officium obtinuit ...</p>

Malvenda correctly pointed out that Arnaud was still legate when he was elected archbishop of Narbonne in 1212,³¹ 'unde cer-

²⁹ Koudelka quotes Gui's note on p.18; 'MCCV' is clearly a misprint for 'MCCCV'.

³⁰ It was transcribed from 'no. CCC aux archives de l'Inquisition de Carcassonne' in BNF Doat 31 (f.4'); on this compilation cf. Y.Dossat, *Les crises de l'inquisition Toulousaine*, Bordeaux 1959, 52. Directly or indirectly it passed from there to Camillo Campeggi, who included it in his edition of Zanchinus Ugolinus, *De haereticis*, Rome 1579, 148-149 (I have not seen the first edition, Rome 1568).

³¹ He continued to serve as legate even after he became archbishop (e.g. Mansilla, *Documentación pontificia hasta Innocencio III* 567 no. 478).

tum est praefatas litteras datas a S.Dominico ante annum 1212 vel eius anni initio',³² but the earlier date continued to haunt the most influential Dominican historiography. Échard conjectured that the letter was issued in 1208 'quo nempe Arnaldus abbas & legatus Occitaniam relinquens in Franciam ad regem Philippum conveniendum ivit, & priusquam discederet suam auctoritatem Dominico delegavit' (QE I 9); it was reprinted from QE in Mamachi App. 36 with 'ann. 1208 circ.' in the margin. Balme dated it 'vers 1208' with a note saying 'le document est sans date, mais les historiens sont unanimes à lui assigner comme date l'année 1208 où l'abbé de Cîteaux, qui délégua saint Dominique, était en France'; in his commentary he suggested that Arnaud 'délégua au saint prédicateur les pouvoirs dont il va bientôt faire un si précieux usage' when he himself went to Rome after the assassination of Peter of Castelnau in January 1208 (Balme-Lelaidier I 188-191).³³

In spite of the 'unanimity' of historians, Malvenda was right: all that we know is that Dominic's letter must have been written while Arnaud was still abbot of Cîteaux; the only legitimate reason for dating it 'c.1208' is the one given by Koudelka (MOPH XXV pp.16-17): 1208 is the mid point between Arnaud's appointment as legate in 1204³⁴ and his election as archbishop of Narbonne on 12 March 1212 (*Gallia Christiana* VI 62).

³² T.Malvenda, *Annalium sacri ordinis Praedicatorum centuria prima*, Naples 1627, 122.

³³ Only William of Tudela mentions Arnaud's journey to Rome (*Chanson* laisses 5-7). According to Cernai §67 it was bishops Fulk and Navarre who went to the pope after Peter's assassination, and Innocent's letter of March 1208 (PL 215:1361) makes it very doubtful whether Arnaud had gone to him in person: he had evidently written to the pope to inform him of Peter's death and to tell him that he himself was preparing to go 'in Provinciam'; Innocent bids him do so together with his fellow-legate, Navarre, who was probably the bearer of the letter. It looks as if William of Tudela turned an exchange of letters into a more dramatic personal encounter at the papal court.

³⁴ In his appeal against the legates on 26 Nov. 1204 Archbishop Bérenger of Narbonne distinguishes between the *prima legatio* of Peter and Raoul, and the *secunda legatio* of these two plus Arnaud (Devic-Vaissète VIII 509). The only papal *nuntii* said to have been present at the debate organized by King Peter of Aragón between Catholics and heretics in February 1204 are Peter and Raoul (the king's report on the debate is edited in M.Cl.Compayré, *Études historiques et documents inédits sur l'Albigeois, le Castrais et l'ancien diocèse de Lavaur*, Albi 1841, 227-228 no. LIV). Arnaud, already named as legate on 28 May 1204 in connection with the short-comings of the archbishop of Narbonne, was formally told to join Peter and Raoul in the campaign against heresy on 31 May 1204 (A.Sommerlechner - H.Weigl, *Die Register Innocenz' III* VII, Vienna 1997, 118-125; MOPH XXV no. 3).

As part of his penance, Pons was obliged to remain at Tréville, under the supervision of the parish priest; this might suggest that Pons's home was at Tréville, or at least that it was a place with which he had connections.³⁵

Since Tréville is only a few miles from Les Cassès, it is not unlikely that the Pons whom Dominic reconciled can be identified with the Poncius Rogerii whose brother, Petrus Rogerii, confessed twice to Bernard of Caux in 1245 (Toulouse 609 ff.226^v-227^r).³⁶ On 19 November Peter said that 'habuit quendam fratrem qui dicebatur Poncius Rogerii, et ipse dictus Poncius Rogerii intrauit Tholosam ad addiscendum artem pellicerie, et ibi fecit se hereticum sicut credidit, et sunt .xl. anni uel circa; item dixit quod postquam frater suus fecit se hereticum non uidit eum nec misit ei aliquid nec sciuit aliquid de fratre suo'. However, on 14 December he admitted that he had lied, and in his new deposition he acknowledged that he had had much more contact with Pons; 'dixit etiam quod uidit Bernardum Clerici diachonum hereticum et soc(ium) s(uum) hereticantes Poncium Rogerii fratrem ipsius testis in domo P.Bofilh apud Cassers in sanitate, et sunt .xxx. anni'. He also confessed that he had himself been a frequent visitor to the house of Bofilh, a Cathar deacon, and that, between 'forty years ago' and the peace of 1229, he had believed the heretics to be 'boni homines'.

If Peter's brother is identical with Dominic's Pons, and if it is true that he was hereticated twice, once in Toulouse c.1205, once at Les Cassès c.1215, it is chronologically possible to date his reconciliation any time between 1206 and 1212.

The penance which Dominic imposed on Pons was provisional: 'Hec omnia diligenter obseruet donec abbas super hiis suam nobis exprimat uoluntatem';³⁷ this shows that Dominic expected to receive further instructions. However, the penance includes long-term elements, such as three Lents per annum, so it does not look as if he foresaw any immediate encounter with the legate. We do not know

³⁵ According to Balme, 'il habite Tréville' (Balme-Lelaidier I 191); according to Vicaire, by contrast, 'la localité de Tréville ... n'est que la paroisse assignée au converti pour accomplir sa pénitence' (*Dominique et ses Prêcheurs*, Fribourg - Paris 1977, 43); but even on the latter assumption he or Dominic must have been able to make arrangements for his accommodation at Tréville, so either he already had contacts there, or his reconciliation took place somewhere in the neighbourhood so that Dominic could fix him up there.

³⁶ The identification is considered probable by É.Griffe, *Le Languedoc cathare de 1190 à 1210*, Paris 1971, 139.

³⁷ The text is not absolutely certain, but its drift is not in doubt.

when Arnaud gave Dominic faculties to reconcile heretics, but, if he did so before leaving the legates' meeting with Diego at Montpellier early in 1206 (Cernai §20-21), the terms of Dominic's letter would fit the situation between then and Arnaud's return to the scene in April 1207 with his team of Cistercian abbots (Cernai §47); if it was only in April 1207 that Dominic received his powers, they would also fit the situation later in the year, when Arnaud was called away from the preaching mission on other business.³⁸ At some stage in 1206 or 1207 Diego debated with heretics at Verfeil and Lavaur (Puylaurens VIII 46; Jordan, *Lib.* §23); if Dominic was with him, this could have provided the occasion for him to reconcile Pons on the way, at Tréville or Les Cassès.³⁹

This is by no means the only conceivable scenario, though; let us consider another possibility. In May 1211 the crusaders besieged Les Cassès; the defenders were allowed to escape with their lives on condition that they handed over all heretics. There were between fifty and sixty perfecti there, and the bishops in the army did their best to convert them; but, according to Cernai, not one of them succumbed, so the crusaders burned them all (Cernai §233).⁴⁰ Since the crusade, by its very nature, was ultimately under the authority of the church, and that authority was vested in the legate, it would presumably have been for him to decide what should be done with converted perfecti, had there been any.

If Pons Roger was living at Les Cassès as a perfectus at this time, he evidently did not declare himself; when he heard or saw what happened there, though, he might have been shocked or scared into seeking reconciliation with the church. Abbot Arnaud was not with the army,⁴¹ but he still took an active interest in the affairs of

³⁸ The pope sent him letters on 29 May and 21 August giving him other jobs to do (PL 215:1164-1165, 1206-1207). Then there was the Cistercian general chapter in mid September (these chapters were held on the Exaltation of the Cross: cf., for example, J.M.Canivez, *Statuta capitulorum generalium ordinis Cisterciensis* I, Louvain 1933, 2, 30, 104, 368; Jacques de Vitry, *Historia Occidentalis*, ed. J.F.Hinnebusch, Fribourg 1972, 112-113; *Chanson* 8.4-5.).

³⁹ Not that we should necessarily assume that that is where Pons met Dominic, let alone that he was living there; if he had learned his trade in Toulouse in 1205, he could have been practising it anywhere in 1206-1207.

⁴⁰ Puylaurens also says that about 60 were burned (XVII 72); William of Tudela claims that there were 94 heretics there, but does not say anything about their fate (*Chanson* 84.8-9).

⁴¹ At this time, no doubt because of Arnaud's other legatine business (e.g. PL 216:410-411), another Cistercian abbot was acting as his deputy in the army (Cernai §226).

the crusade,⁴² and he turned up from time to time — he was, for instance, present at the siege of Toulouse to witness the bishop of Cahors's oath of fealty to Simon on 20 June 1211, as was 'frater Dominicus predicator' (MOPH XXV no. 12); however, his comings and goings meant that Dominic could not know when he was likely to see him again. The terms of Pons's reconciliation would make perfectly good sense in the latter part of 1211.

In sum, we cannot date Dominic's letter except vaguely between his own arrival in the region in 1206 and Arnaud's elevation to the see of Narbonne in 1212; there is no reason to situate it specifically within the period which concerns us, between the end of 1207 and mid 1211.

3. *Inquisition records.*

Some depositions from inquisition records which mention Dominic have been used to bridge the gap between 1207 and 1211,⁴³ and they are obviously a source worth exploiting though the dates they provide are approximative, and it must be borne in mind that people being interviewed by inquisitors might have reasons for not being completely honest, and even complete honesty cannot guarantee an accurate memory of exactly how long ago things happened.

All but one of the relevant depositions come in the famous codex 690 of the Bibliothèque Municipale of Toulouse,⁴⁴ the original manuscript of part of a dossier compiled shortly after the sys-

⁴² According to William of Tudela, he was said to have persuaded the barons of Quercy to make their submission to Simon de Montfort (*Chanson* 85.6-7). After the capture of Les Cassès and the occupation of various other towns, Simon apparently asked Arnaud what he should do next, and it was on Arnaud's advice that he went and besieged Saint-Marcel (Cernai §294-295).

⁴³ E.g. Balme-Lelaidier I 174; Vicair, *Histoire* I 301. In Appendix I of MOPH XXV Koudelka edited extracts from all the depositions which are known to mention Dominic. I doubt if there are more references to Dominic waiting to be discovered, but I have not scoured all the surviving records to make sure of this; I have, however, examined the relevant depositions in their entirety, not just the meagre extracts which have been published.

⁴⁴ On this manuscript, see Y.Dossat, *Les crises de l'inquisition Toulousaine au XIII^e siècle* 56-86; R.Abels – E.Harrison, 'The participation of women in Languedocian Catharism', *Mediaeval Studies* 41 (1979) 215-251, at 220-221. A recent book, M.G.Pegg, *The corruption of angels*, Princeton 2001, is based almost entirely on Toulouse 609, but it sheds little light on the questions with which we are here concerned (for some critical comments on it, see DHN 11 [2002] 50-51).

tematic inquisition conducted by Bernard of Caux in 1245-1247. Many depositions are dated by reference to those which precede them ('anno et die predictis', 'anno quo supra', etc.), and the arrangement of the dossier makes it easy to misinterpret such dates: it is necessary to identify and discount extraneous matter which was edited into the text, such as supplementary confessions and records of confessions being read back and confirmed.⁴⁵ The *stylus incarnationis* is used (so that 1 Jan. to 24 March '1245' fall within what we should call 1246);⁴⁶ but allowance has to be made for occasional errors.⁴⁷ In my quotations I use brackets to indicate possibly doubtful filling out of abbreviations.

The ladies of Le Mas-Saintes-Puelles

Toulouse 609 contains a particularly rich set of depositions from Le Mas-Saintes-Puelles, which introduce us to what Wakefield calls 'a coterie of families ... bound together by a common faith and marriages'.⁴⁸ Three women stated that they had been 'hereticated' as children and then reconciled by Dominic, and their testimonies

⁴⁵ Cf. Dossat, *Crises de l'inquisition* 60-61; some of the depositions quoted in MOPH XXV are misdated because of a failure to appreciate this point. The manuscript itself sometimes implies a wrong date: for instance, on f.64' the final deposition from Goudourville is dated 'anno domini m^occ^oxl^ovi .xv. kalendas iulii', and the first deposition from Montgiscard is dated 'anno domini m^occ^o quo supra .xii. kalendas iulii' (f.64') which ought to mean 20 June 1246, but this is impossible since it was read back and confirmed on 25 May 1246 (f.65'); a confession made 'anno quo supra pridie ydus iulii', which ought to mean 14 July 1246, was read back on 23 May 1246 (f.65').

⁴⁶ This is undoubtedly true of added confessions: for instance, R.Faber de Milhars made his original confession on 12 June 1245, and added to it 'anno quo supra .iiii. kalendas marcii', which must be interpreted as 26 Feb. 1246 (f.12'); Esclaramonda Bret gave evidence on 6 July 1245, and added to it 'v idus marcii anno quo supra', which must mean 11 March 1246 (f.62^v). The original depositions are not in strict chronological order, but there are sequences which strongly suggest that they are dated in the same way: for example, the witnesses from Montgiscard appear in order (except for a final list of those who testified that they knew nothing) and the dates run from 26 Feb. to 10 March '1245', then pass to May '1246', then back to 17 March '1245' (ff.66'-68').

⁴⁷ For example, the depositions from Fanjeaux contain a sequence moving from 28 Feb. - 23 March '1245' and then on to '1246'; then there is a deposition dated 10 March '1246' followed by one dated 'anno quo supra vi nonas marcii', which ought to mean, by our reckoning, 2 March 1247, but it was read back and confirmed on 12 May 1246 (ff.159'-166'). The repetition of '1246' was presumably a mistake, and the copyist should have indicated a return to '1245'.

⁴⁸ W.L.Wakefield, 'Heretics and inquisitors: the case of Le Mas-Saintes-Puelles', *The Catholic Historical Review* 69 (1983) 209-226, at 224.

overlap with those of some others who were perfectae for a time when they were young (ff.20^r-22^v):

(a) On 19 May 1245, Ramunda, wife of the late Willelmus Germa, testified 'quod uidit plures hereticos publice manentes apud Mansum, sed nullam familiaritatem habuit cum eis, et sunt .lx. anni. ... Postea dixit quod ipsa testis fuit heretica manifesta per .iii. annos uel circa tunc temporis quando heretici manebant publice apud Montem Maurum,⁴⁹ et sunt .lx. anni uel circa, et fuit reconciliata per dominum episcopum Tholosanum .x. anni sunt, et dedit ei dominus episcopus duas cruces'.

(b) On the same day, Na Segura, wife of Willelmus Vitalis, admitted an association with heretics extending over many years, the most recent episodes being 'about eight years ago'. She also said that 'quando erat puella circa .x. annos fuit heretica induta et stetit heretica bene per quinquennium et postea exiuit inde, et sunt .xl. anni, et tunc stabant heretici publice apud Mansum'. Later on, with no fresh indication of time, she said that 'beatus Dominicus reconciliauit ipsam testem de heresi; dominus⁵⁰ episcopus Tholosanus dedit ipsi testi duas cruces'.

(c) On the same day, Ermengart, wife of Petrus Boer, said that 'in domo Bernardi de Canasta uidit Hysarnum de Castras et soc(ium) s(uum) hereticos et non recolit si uiderit aliquos cum eis, et ipsa testis adorauit eos ibi et fuit hereticata, et dictus Hysarnus hereticauit eam ibi, et tunc heretici manebant publice per terram, et sunt .xl. anni uel circa; et reconciliauit eam beatus Dominicus', though she admitted harbouring heretics thereafter and was viewed with suspicion by the inquisitors.⁵¹

(d) On 20 May 1245, Ramunda, wife of Willelmus Gasc, testified 'quod uidit plures hereticos publice manentes apud Mansum et sunt .l. anni uel circa, et tunc ipsa testis fuit facta heretica et hereticauit eam Ysarnus de Castras, et fuit ibi cum hereticis heretica induta per duos annos, et postea fuit gratis conuersa ad fidem catholicam; dixit etiam quod R(amun)da Germana fuit heretica et Na Segura et Armengart Boera et Ermengart Aycharda'. 'Item dixit quod cre(debat) hereticos esse bonos homines et ueraces et amicos dei, licet sciret quod ecclesia persequeretur eos, et sunt .l. anni quod

⁴⁹ Montmaur, about 10 km. to the North of Le Mas.

⁵⁰ The manuscript has *dictus*, but this cannot be correct.

⁵¹ There is a marginal note saying 'Suspecta est ista et posset multa dicere'.

hoc cre(debat) et sunt .xii. quod non cre(dit)'. With no indication of time, she also said that 'reconciliauit eam beatus Dominicus, sed postea uidit, ado(rauit) et cre(debat) hereticos esse bonos homines; et habuit cruces ab episcopo Tholosano'.

(e) On the same day, Ermengarz Aycharda said 'quod uidit plures hereticos publice manentes apud Mansum, et fuit ibi facta heretica et stetit heretica per .vi. septimanas, et sunt .l. anni uel circa, et postea exiuit inde, et non uidit postmodum hereticos ... Et habuit penitentiam de portandis crucibus'.

The testimony of Ramunda Gasc makes it probable that all five girls were heretics at much the same time, though their estimates of how long ago it was range from 'about sixty years ago'⁵² to 'about forty years ago'.

In an earlier confession made on 17 Aug. 1243 Na Segura admitted that after she 'abjured and deserted the sect of the heretics' she listened to their addresses and preaching, adored them 'in the manner of the heretics' and in others ways fell back into heresy, being intimate with heretics and for forty years believing in them and their errors.⁵³ This implies that she made a formal renunciation of heresy when she stopped being a perfecta, and we may presume that this is when she was reconciled by Dominic; her two confessions taken together suggest that, both in 1243 and in 1245, she reckoned that it happened 'about forty years ago'. The depositions of Ermengard Boer and Ramunda Gasc point to approximately the same time.

It is clear that none of Dominic's temporary converts can give us a precise indication of when they were reconciled by him; taken at its face value, 'forty years ago' would mean a date before he and his bishop even became involved in the anti-heretical mission in the Midi. We may cautiously infer that Dominic visited Le Mas in an early phase of his engagement in the mission; we may certainly not infer anything about his activities after 1207.

⁵² This is certainly not due to scribal error: the copyist originally wrote 'xl', then crossed it out and wrote 'lx' beside it.

⁵³ 'Postquam abiurauit et deseruit sectam hereticorum sermones et <predicationem eorum audisse? ...> eosque secundum modum hereticorum dicendo Benedicite ... adorasse ... ac alias in abiuratam heresim recidendo familiari<tatem cum hereticis?> nichilominus habuisse et per quadraginta annos hereticis ac eorum erroribus credidisse'; see J. Duvernoy, 'Confirmation d'aveux devant les inquisiteurs Ferrier et Pons Gary (Juillet-Août 1243)', *Heresis* 1 (1983) 9-23, at 19. I have been more adventurous than Duvernoy in suggesting ways of completing the text.

P. Baudriga of Lasbordes

On 22 November 1245 P(etrus) Baudriga of Lasbordes deposed (f.114^v) that 'uidit hereticos stantes publice apud Laurac et apud Las Bordas, sed numquam ado(rauit) nec uidit ado(rare), et sunt .xxxv. anni uel circa. Dixit tamen quod Ar(naldus) Baudriga pater ipsius testis fuit hereticus per .vii. annos et intrauit Montem Securum, sed postea fuit reconciliatus a fratre Dominico ordinis predicatorum et rediit ad gremium matris ecclesie, sed ipse testis numquam ado(rauit) eum nec uidit ado(rare) nec aliquid dedit nec misit ex quo fuit hereticus, et sunt .xxv. anni uel circa'.

Petrus claimed that he had never had any other dealings with heretics or believed in their doctrines, but a marginal note reports that 'Iste recessit sine licentia et abiuratione', and it looks as if his confession was rather selective, unless there was someone else of the same name at Lasbordes.⁵⁴

Dominic cannot have reconciled Arnaldus 'about twenty-five years ago', i.e. c.1220; but we may presume that he did so towards the end of his time in the Midi.⁵⁵

Saura of Villeneuve-la-Comtal

Saura, wife of Willelmus Bonet, testified on 15 April 1245 (ff.143^v-144^r) 'quod dum esset .vii. annorum fecit se hereticam et stetit heretica induta per tres annos, et stabat apud Villamnouam et cum Alazaisia de Cuguro et sociis suis hereticabus, sed nullum uidit ibi uenientem ad dictas hereticas quod recolat, et fuit recon-

⁵⁴ On 14 February 1246 Ramundus Arrufat of Castelnaudary made a long deposition, in the course of which he said that, about twenty-five years ago, 'uidit apud Bordas in domo Petri Baudriga matrem eiusdem Petri et sororem hereticas, et uidit ibi cum eis Guiraudam neptem ipsius testis uxorem dicti P. Baudriga et familiam domus' (Toulouse 609 f.250^v). Ramundus himself seems to have had no time for Catharism, but his family was evidently riddled with it, including a female relative who lived at Lasbordes; Arnaldus Arrufat was one of the 'heresiarchs' with whom Diego debated. at Verfeil (Puylaurens VIII 46). So Petrus Baudriga married into a family with a pronounced penchant for heresy, his mother and sister were heretics as well as his father, and in about 1221 his house was open to them, and we may suspect that they were actually living there. In 1233, having remarried into another family with heretical propensities, he allowed a heretication to take place in his house, though he was apparently not present at it (Doat 23 ff.94^r-96^r).

⁵⁵ Dominic probably left for Rome in mid December 1217 (AFP 65 [1995] 62-69); after that, it looks as if he only visited the Midi briefly on his way from Spain to Paris in 1219 (ibid. 90-95).

ciliata a fratre Dominico de ordine predicatorum, et sunt .xlvi. anni quod ipsa fuit reconciliata ... Dixit quod mater eius fuit similiter hereticata'.

Saura's husband, William Bonet, who made his first deposition on the same day (f.143^v), 'dixit quod uidit hereticos Poncium del Molin et W. de Laroca et P. de Larroca et Alazaisiam de Cucuro stantes publice apud Villamnouam, et sunt .xxx. anni uel plus, sed non ado(ravit) nec uidit ado(rare) ... Dixit etiam quod iuit apud Montem Securum et uidit ibi multos hereticos et adduxit inde R(amun)dam de Riuas soceram eius hereticam et fecit eam reconciliari'. In his later, rather more frank, confession on 3 July 1246 he said that this trip to Montségur to fetch his mother-in-law occurred thirty years ago 'uel circa' (f.183^v).

We know that heretics from Fanjeaux as well as Villeneuve withdrew to Montségur, and there can be little doubt that at Villeneuve, as at Fanjeaux, the reason for the exodus was fear of the crusaders; it is more than likely that Montségur had been rebuilt, at the instigation of the heretics, precisely to serve as a Cathar asylum.⁵⁶ Shortly after he was chosen to rule the viscounty of Béziers and Carcassonne in August 1209, Simon de Montfort was able to take Fanjeaux without a struggle, its inhabitants, like those of other towns in the neighbourhood, having fled; not long afterwards, it seems, the count of Toulouse burned Castelnaudary, leaving it empty for Simon to occupy (Cernai §98, 101-102, 110, 170, 233, with the editors' notes). The towns in between, like Villeneuve, had reason to feel threatened by mid 1210, if not before.

We should probably stress *uel plus* in William's estimate of how long ago he saw heretics 'stantes publice' at Villeneuve, and we can perhaps fix the date of their exodus more precisely from the testimony of Bernardus de Fonte on 3 July 1246 (ff.183^v-184^v): 'Ipse testis dum erat etatis .vi. annorum uel circa stetit per .iiii. annos uel circa cum Martino de Fonte auunculo suo et Dominico de Fonte patre suo et soc(io) s(uo) hereticis apud Villamnouam ... et sunt .xxxv. anni et amplius. ... Item dixit quod ipse testis extraxit de secta hereticorum Dominicum de Fonte patrem suum, Martinum de Fonte et Petrum de Fonte auunculos ipsius testis hereticos ... quos ipse testis adduxit de Monte Securo et fecit eos conuerti ad fidem catholicam, et sunt .xxx. anni'.

⁵⁶ Cf. Griffe, *Languedoc cathare de 1190 à 1210* 120-121, 130, 145.

It is unlikely that Bernard was only ten when he went to Montségur, so we may take it that he was six when he started living with his heretical father and uncle, and that he stopped living with them about four years later, thirty-five years ago 'et amplius' (i.e. in 1211 at the latest); this would mean that he was at least fifteen when he went and rescued them from heresy 'thirty years ago' (in 1216). We may surmise that he stopped living with them precisely because they decided to move to Montségur.

Even if Saura, like her husband, was somewhat economical with the truth in what she told the inquisitors, there is nothing in their depositions to justify the suspicion that she went to Montségur with her mother; she had presumably already stopped being a heretic by then. Her claim to have been reconciled by Dominic 'forty-five years ago' is clearly exaggerated — Dominic was not there in 1200 — but not necessarily by more than a few years; if she (and her mother?) joined Alazais's household soon after 1200,⁵⁷ she could have been reconciled in 1206/1207.⁵⁸

Willelma Martina of Fanjeaux

Willelma Martina testified on 12 March 1246 (f.160^v) 'quod dum erat iuuenis uidit plures hereticos et hereticas apud Fanum-iouis et pluries dicti heretici dederunt sibi panem et nuces et (*sic*) amore dei, et pluries ipsa testis portauit canels⁵⁹ hereticorum textoribus et ado(rauit) hereticos pluries sicut ipsi heretici docebant ipsam, et sunt .xl. anni uel circa. Dixit etiam quod predicta fuit confessa fratri Dominico de ordine predicatorum et habuit penitentiam ab ipso ... et habuit litteras de predicta penitentia ab ipso fratre Dominico et amisit eas quando castrum Fanum-iouis fuit combustum per comitem Montis Fortis'.

Willelma's account of how she lost her letter of reconciliation is most unconvincing; when, after all, did a Count de Montfort burn

⁵⁷ Alazais was the lord of Villeneuve's mother; if the chronological indications in other depositions are taken at face value, the existence of her heretical household is also attested c.1205, c.1215, c.1220 and c.1225 (ff.143^r, 144^r).

⁵⁸ Griffé's assertion that she was probably reconciled in 1211 (*Le Languedoc cathare de 1190 à 1210* 128) is unexplained nor is it justified by his reference to Balme-Lelaidier I 173. Conceivably he thought she abandoned heresy when her mother decided to seek refuge at Montségur; perhaps she did, but it would make her figure of '45 years ago' even less correct.

⁵⁹ *Canel*, like Italian *cannello*, means 'quill' (a bit of reed used by weavers for winding thread); cf. Castilian *canilla*, Portuguese *canilha*.

Fanjeaux?⁶⁰ The city that was famously burned was Béziers, which was captured on 22 July 1209 and its inhabitants massacred (Cernai §90-91);⁶¹ this caused such a panic that the people of several towns fled rather than face the crusaders.⁶² Fanjeaux too was deserted and, a month or two later, Simon took possession of it without opposition (Cernai §110, 116; *Chanson* 21.9, 34.3-4).

It is difficult to believe that anyone who was in Fanjeaux at the time could have misremembered what happened so radically as to believe that Simon burned the place. We may suspect that Willelma was being less than frank with the inquisitors and that she actually lost her letter while fleeing from Fanjeaux — she had perhaps not entirely abandoned her friendly relations with the heretics who gave her things to eat and for whom she ran errands.

All the same, however she came to lose her letter of reconciliation, there is no reason why Dominic should not have given it to her 'about forty years ago', i.e. c.1206.

Arnalda de Fremiac of Fanjeaux

Arnalda, wife of the late Arnaldus de Fremiac (or Fremiag), testified on 12 March 1246 (f.160^v) that 'dum erat iuuenis, Hysarnus Bola auunculus ipsius testis compulit ipsam intrare sectam hereticorum et fuit heretica induta per .vi. annos, et dum ipsa testis fuit hereticata interfuerunt dicte hereticationi Saura uxor R(amun)di Amelii del Morter defuncta, et Curta uxor R(amun)di Ferrandi defuncta, et R(amun)dus Ferrandi defunctus ... Et fuit

⁶⁰ 'Nous n'avons trouvé nulle part que Fanjeaux ait été brûlé par un comte de Montfort. Au contraire, ce château fut un des lieux préférés du comte Simon pendant la croisade' (Balme-Lelaidier I 183 n.2).

⁶¹ According to both Cernai §90 and *Chanson* 21-22, the fire was the work of the 'servientes exercitus, qui publica lingua dicuntur ribaldi', not the leaders of the crusade, and so, at first, was the massacre of the inhabitants.

⁶² Cernai §92; *Chanson* 21.7-8; Puylaurens XIV 62. The legates' letter to the pope shows that, even before the destruction of Béziers, some places submitted to the crusaders from fear; as news spread of what had happened at Béziers, 'adeo terri sunt universi ut montana petentes et in via inter Bitterensem et Carcassonam reliquerunt castra nobilia plus quam centum, referta tamen cibariis et reliqua supellectili quam fugientes secum nequiverant asportare'. It also shows that it was contrary to official policy to burn captured towns: one of the reasons why the citizens of Carcassonne were permitted to leave unharmed was the fear 'ne, si vi civitas caperetur, sicut de aliis locis iam contigerat, etiam invitis principibus, sive ab his qui nobiscum erant corpore sed non mente, sive ab ipsis hostibus, omnia incendio vastarentur' (PL 216:139-140).

confessa fratri Dominico et reconciliauit ipsam et habuit penitentiam quod portaret duas cruces a parte ante quousque duceret maritum, et portauit eas per unum annum et postea duxit maritum'.

Arnalda furnishes no chronological details, but, of the people said to have attended her hereticon, 'Domina Saura' was apparently frequenting heretical preaching in Fanjeaux as early as 1193, and a testimony harking back to c.1204 mentions Curta (or Turca) and her husband.⁶³ Curta subsequently became a *perfecta* and left Fanjeaux for Lavelanet, presumably in 1209 when the heretics abandoned Fanjeaux.⁶⁴ If Arnalda was still a heretic in 1209 she would have fled Fanjeaux too, so it was presumably before then that she confessed to Dominic,⁶⁵ and we have no reason to plump for 1208/1209 rather than 1206/1207.

Covinens of Fanjeaux

Covinens⁶⁶ testified on 23 March 1246 (f.161^v) that 'cum ipsa testis esset .x. annorum uel .xii. Petrus Coloma frater ipsius testis erat credens hereticorum et fecit eam dari hereticis, et ipsa testis fuit heretica induta per duos annos, et tunc manebant heretici publice apud Fanumious et per totam aliam (*sic*) terram, et ipsa testis manebat cum dictis hereticis apud Fanumious ... sed postquam recognouit se noluit esse cum hereticis, ymo dimisit sectam hereticorum eorum et accepit uirum et stetit in fide catholica postea sicut bona christiana, et sunt .xxxiiii. anni uel circa. ... Et fuit reconciliata per sanctum Dominicum'.

Since Covinens was a heretic at a time when Cathars lived openly at Fanjeaux, she must have left them before 1209, rather more than 'about thirty-four years ago' (c.1212); but it is possible that she got married in about 1212, and that she sought formal reconciliation to the church then.

⁶³ Cf. Griffe, *Le Languedoc cathare de 1190 à 1210* 115-116.

⁶⁴ Her husband can perhaps be identified with the perfectus called Ramundus Ferrandi who was seen at Montolieu in about 1221 (f.160^v).

⁶⁵ The seemingly arbitrary date given in Balme-Lelaidier I 274 for her uncle's 'acte coupable' (1205) would place her reconciliation 'vers 1211' (cf. Vicaire, *Histoire* I 251), which is not very plausible.

⁶⁶ Her name is sometimes given as 'P.Covinens', but this is a misreading of the manuscript, 'p.' being part of the date ('anno et die *predictis*').

Poncius and Willelmus Auterii of Villepinte

On 28 February 1246 two brothers both reported that their father, Ramundus Auterii, had been reconciled by Dominic.

Poncius Auterii, who was still living at Villepinte, said that 'R(amu)ndus Auterii pater ipsius testis et R(amu)nda mater ipsius testis fuerunt heretici, et postmodum conuersi et reconciliati, ita tamen quod dictus pater ipsius testis fuit reconciliatus per beatum Dominicum apud Prulianum et super hoc habuit litteras testimoniales ab eodem, et sunt .xxxv. anni, et dicta mater ipsius testis fuit reconciliata per abbatem de Villalonga, et sunt .xxx. anni et amplius. Tamen dicta Ramunda mater ipsius testis rediit postea ad uomitum et fuit facta iterum heretica' (f.179^v).

W. Auterii, now living at Castelnaudary, gave a similar account: 'Dixit quod Ramundus Auterii et Ramunda uxor eius, pater et mater ipsius testis, fuerunt heretici, et postea fuerunt ad fidem catholicam conuersi et reconciliati per beatum Dominicum et per abbatem de Villalonga, .xxx. anni sunt et amplius, et super hoc habuerunt litteras reconciliationis; tamen dicta Ramunda mater ipsius testis rediit ad uomitum postea et fecit se hereticam et fuit combusta' (f.251^r).

Neither brother was revealing all that could be told about the family's involvement in Catharism,⁶⁷ but there does not appear to be any reason to question what they say about their parents' reconciliation, except that greater credence can probably be given to the more precise statement made by Pons. Raymond senior, we may take it, was reconciled by Dominic at Prouille in about 1211.

⁶⁷ Poncius, with one or other of his brothers, appears to have had his mother living with him in Villepinte after her relapse: on 5 July 1245 Ramundus Iohannis testified that 'quando erat puer uidit Ramundam Auteira in domo Guill(el)mi Auteri et Poncii fratrum, ubi stabat ipse testis, et dicebatur quod erat heretica' (f.177^r), and on 23 February 1246 Ramundus Sabbaterii said that 'uidit R(amu)ndam auiam ipsius testis et socias suas hereticas apud Villam pictam in domo Ramundi Auterii et Poncii Auterii fratrum et uidit ibi cum eis dictos Ramundum et Poncium et W(illel)l(m)um et Bernardum filios dicte Ramunde heretice ... et sunt .xx. anni' (f.179^v). Bernard revealed an even darker secret about Raymond junior when he made his confession on 5 Dec. 1245: 'Ramundus Auterii frater ipsius testis fuit hereticus per tres annos, et postea conuersus fuit et mortuus fuit in fide ecclesie Romane, et ipse testis uidit eum pluries dum erat hereticus, sed numquam ado(rauit) eum, et sunt .xvi. anni uel circa' (f.179^r).

Poncius Martelli of Bram

In June 1246⁶⁸ Poncius Marcelli, or Martelli,⁶⁹ of Bram (f.189^v) said that 'dum ipse testis esset puer, stetit apud Fanumious cum Will(elm)ò de Podio Siurano et Guill(elm)o de Podio Siurano hereticis⁷⁰ per duos annos et pluries ado(rauit) eos tociens quod non recordatur, et postea exiuit inde et stetit cum sancto Dominico bene per .xii. annos et amplius, et postea non uidit hereticos nisi captos, et sunt .xl. anni uel circa'.

'Stetit cum hereticis' clearly means that Pons lived with the heretics, and 'stetit cum sancto Dominico' must be taken in the same sense.⁷¹ If he abandoned the heretics 'about forty years ago', i.e. c.1206, 'quite twelve years and more' brings us with little exaggeration to Dominic's departure from the Midi in December 1217. However, Pons cannot literally have passed this whole period with Dominic since Dominic was not continuously in any one place,⁷² and 'stetit cum' can hardly mean 'travelled with'.

⁶⁸ The date is incompletely given as 'ii iunii', which might be anything from 'ii kal.' (31 May) to 'ii yd.' (12 June).

⁶⁹ The manuscript habitually confuses c and t, and appears to use 'Marcelli', 'Martelli' and 'Martel' indifferently.

⁷⁰ On 27 May 1246 Bernardus Gasc of Fanjeaux recalled seeing 'Dominicum de Podiosiura et W.mum fratrem dicti Dominici et Petrum de Podiosiura' in the house of the perfectus Petrus Belhome about 40 years ago (f.159^v); these brothers are perhaps the same as Pons's rather unconvincing 'Willelmus' and 'Guillelmus' of Pexiora.

⁷¹ *Stare* is frequently equivalent to *morari* (cf. English 'stay', as used in Scotland). There are some good examples in the original depositions on Dominic's Bologna miracles edited from the lost Osma manuscript in *Acta Sanctorum*, Aug. I, Antwerp 1733, 558-559: 'Quaedam puella, nomine Thomasina, filia Thomasini scriptoris, qui stat Bononiae juxta curiam sancti Ambrosii', 'Quaedam domina, nomine Gilla, uxor domini Marscoti, qui stat in strata Castellionis', 'Quaedam mulier, Gilla nomine, uxor Hugonis, qui fuit Bononiae sed nunc stat Imolae'. Cf. also C.Douais, *Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'Inquisition dans le Languedoc*, Paris 1900, II 134, 'Guillelmus Mitonis quondam de Alsona nunc stans apud S.Martinum Carcassonensis diocesis'.

⁷² For example, his presence at Prouille is periodically attested (MOPH XXV nos. 29, 34, 46), but he evidently also frequented the area along the river Ariège (ACL §15-17; MOPH I 69-70), and he passed one Lent in the home of some ladies with heretical leanings (Ferr. §22); he was in Carcassonne for a time as the bishop's vicar in *spiritualibus* (Const. §55), and from 1215 onwards he was based in Toulouse, either in the Seilhan house or at Saint-Romain (Jordan, *Lib.* §38, 44); presumably before this he was for a time 'in domo domini Fulconis episcopi Tholosani' (MOPH XXII 18). In 1215 he went to Rome with Bishop Fulk (*Lib.* §40-42, MOPH XXV no. 65), and he returned there in 1216 to seek confirmation of his order (*Lib.* §45, MOPH XXV nos. 77-81).

'Stetit cum Dominico' must signify that in some sense Pons lived in Dominic's house, and the only home Dominic could have offered him was Prouille;⁷³ it is suggestive in this connection that in April 1223 a Poncius Martellus was one of the people who attested on oath that a certain Navarrus miles had given Prouille his share in a property at Las Crosas (Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 45-46 no. 293).⁷⁴ His later residence at Bram, only a few miles away, is obviously consonant with his having been 'adopted' by Prouille as a boy.⁷⁵

In as much as he was Dominic's protégé it is not surprising that Pons chose to say that he lived with Dominic, not simply that he lived at Prouille, and he may have hoped to make a good impression on Dominican inquisitors by emphasizing his connection with 'Saint Dominic';⁷⁶ but we must be wary of inferring too much from his words. In 1214/1215-1217, except perhaps for a few months at the end of 1217 after the dispersal of the brethren,⁷⁷ Dominic was based in Toulouse, not Prouille, and before that he was probably based in Carcassonne for a year or more (cf. below, VIII 2); it was not relevant to Pons's deposition to give a detailed account of his 'living with Saint Dominic', and if he saw no reason to mention that

⁷³ Until 1215 there was no alternative, and it is most unlikely that Pons lived with the brethren in Toulouse in 1215-1217 while their own community was beginning to take shape. Balme also seems to have believed that he lived at Prouille: 'Nous n'avons pu contrôler l'exactitude de son affirmation. Il n'est question de lui dans aucun des actes passés à Prouille, que nous possédons, depuis 1206 jusqu'à 1217, peut-être parce qu'il était encore trop jeune pour être cité comme témoin' (Balme-Lelaidier I 184).

⁷⁴ Nothing else seems to be known about this transaction; Las Crosas is probably the place of that name in the territory of Fanjeaux, where Prouille had already been given a property in 1211 (Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 74 no. 325).

⁷⁵ He had perhaps even been asked to act as a kind of agent for Prouille at Bram, whose church belonged to the nuns (MOPH XXV no. 11; Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 112 no. 353). He seems to have moved to Bram by about 1226, since he mentions an heretical household being there 'about twenty years ago'; he also recalled seeing two heretics captured there 'about five years ago', and said he had heard that a local lady was a receiver of heretics, which her own deposition (f.189^v) shows to be true.

⁷⁶ There is no reason to attribute *sancto* to the copyist of Toulouse 609, since elsewhere in the same manuscript Dominic is called *frater* five times, *beatus* five times, and *sanctus* only once. This suggests that the original records of the depositions respected the language used by different people.

⁷⁷ According to Salanhac, the dispersal took place from Prouille in mid August 1217 (MOPH XXII 15), and the date accords well with Jordan's precise information about when the first Dominicans arrived in Paris (*Lib.* §52); after that the only documentary evidence of Dominic's whereabouts shows that he was at Castelnaudary on 11 Sept. (MOPH XXV no. 83).

Dominic was not literally living with him for some three, probably four, years towards the end of the period, we have no right to infer from what he says that Dominic was not also absent for some three years in 1208-1211.

Poncius Iaule of Castelnaudary

Poncius Iaule testified on 8 July 1246 (f.252^r) that 'ipse fuit hereticus per tres annos, et tunc stabant publice apud Saxiacum, et sunt .l. anni, et postea fuit confessus fratri Dominico a quo habuit litteras quas amisit'.

There were probably heretics operating publicly in Saissac considerably later than 'fifty years ago'; it seems to have been one of the places whose inhabitants fled in 1209, and it was in the crusaders' hands before the end of the year.⁷⁸ Assuming that our Poncius Iaule is the same as the one whose wife, Rixendis, made her deposition on 27 June 1246, he was in Castelnaudary by 1220 and had apparently not entirely broken off his contacts with Saissac heretics.⁷⁹

There is no indication when or where he made his confession to Dominic; his words are compatible with a date before the end of 1207 or after the middle of 1211, so they shed no light on where Dominic was in the intervening period.

Marquesa, formerly of Fanjeaux

BNF Doat 23 contributes one more piece to our dossier, the lengthy deposition of Marquesa, formerly of Fanjeaux, on 26 Aug. 1243 (ff.94^r-99^v). She testified (f.96) that 'Ermengardis mater ipsius testis recessit cum Turcha haeretica a castro Fanoioiuis et iuit apud Auellanent et ibi haeticauit se et assumpsit habitum haeticorum; et tunc ipsa testis hoc audito cucurrit illuc ad matrem suam et reduxit eam secum apud Fanumioiuis, et deseruit ibi dictam sectam

⁷⁸ Cernai §136; *Chanson* 41.23; cf. Griffe, *Le Languedoc Cathare au temps de la Croisade*, Paris 1973, 17.

⁷⁹ Rixendis testified (f.251^r) that, during the siege of Castelnaudary 'about twenty-five years ago' (presumably Amaury de Montfort's siege of 1220-1221), Willemus Seguier, 'dominus de Saxiaco', brought two heretics to her house (possibly the famous Guilabert de Castres and Raymund Agulher), though she did not at first realize they were heretics (cf. Griffe, *Le Languedoc cathare au temps de la croisade* 193-194).

et fuit ibi reconciliata per fratrem Dominicum. Interrogata dixit quod ipsa non adoravit tunc matrem suam nec alios haereticos; de tempore quod sunt triginta duo anni'.

Ermengard had presumably sought refuge at Lavelanet when Fanjeaux was abandoned in 1209; there is no reason why she should not have been brought back to Fanjeaux and reconciled by Dominic 'thirty-two years ago' in 1211.

All told, then, these inquisition records offer us some convincing dates and some unconvincing dates, but they tell us nothing whatsoever about what Dominic was doing, or where he was, between the end of 1207 and the middle of 1211.

4. *Dominic's alleged apostolate in Toulouse in 1210*

In the first edition of his *Histoire*, Vicaire devoted an appendix to the 'apostolat de saint Dominique à Toulouse en 1210' (*Histoire* I 377-379).⁸⁰

He begins with a group of three testimonies from the Languedoc canonization process (ACL §15-17), which are meant to indicate 'un ministère prolongé du saint' in Toulouse. Some preliminary observations on ACL are necessary before we consider them.⁸¹

Three Italian clerics were responsible for the main enquiry into Dominic's sanctity, but, to supplement their own investigation, they wrote to three Toulouse ecclesiastics on 19 Aug. 1233 bidding them examine 'testes ydoneos, qui uobis per aliquem fratrem illius ordinis fuerint presentati' (MOPH XVI 169-170). Presumably after consultation with the Toulouse Dominicans, the

⁸⁰ Although he did not retain this appendix in the revised edition, he cited it to justify his assertion that 'durant l'année 1210 et la moitié de 1211 se place un long ministère à Toulouse et dans les environs' (*Histoire*² I 301; see also I 262).

⁸¹ The fullest surviving witness to ACL as it existed independently of the combined (and edited) Bologna and Languedoc processes is Modena, Bibl. Estense Campori App. 59 ff.139^r-144^r (cf. AFP 66 [1996] 60-62); an incomplete text is also found in Vat. lat. 10152 ff.182^v-186^r. The tradition of the combined processes is twofold: that of Bologna is represented by Venice, Bibl. Marciana IX 61 ff.41^r-44^r, and Borselli's abridgement (Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1999 ff.26^v-28^v; AGOP XIV 53 ff.135^v-137^v); Bernard Gui's text was edited in QE I 56-58 from his lost Carcassonne manuscript, and copied from the lost Prouille manuscript into Cambefort's compilation (Prouille MS of Cambefort ff.88^r-90^r), and there is a Spanish translation of it in the manuscript of S.Domingo el Real, Madrid, ff.73^v-78^r.

actual enquiry was entrusted to the prior of Prouille and another Dominican, and to the prior and cellarer of the canons of Saint-Antonin, Pamiers; it was the report compiled by these four men which was sent to Bologna by the ecclesiastics who had appointed them (ACL §2).

ACL falls clearly into two sections corresponding to the two pairs of investigators, one centred on Pamiers (ACL §3-17), the other on the Lauragais (ACL §18-26).⁸² Each part begins with a substantial testimony in which a long list of qualities is attributed to Dominic (ACL §3, 18); the following testimonies, whatever else they made add, generally involve endorsement of these *capitula*.⁸³ Apart from this, however, the two teams chose different tactics: the canons of Pamiers interviewed individual witnesses, but the Dominicans rounded people up en masse to subscribe to the *capitula*, though individuals could add to them if they wished.

Let us now look at the testimonies adduced by Vicaire:⁸⁴

(15) Guilielma uxor Helye Martini, testis iurata, dixit quod ipsa nebat pro cilicio quod ad induendum preparabatur ipsi. ... Ducentis uicibus et plus secum comedit, sed numquam uidit eum quartam partem frusti piscis in uno prandio comedere uel ultra duo uitella ouorum nec bibere ultra unum ciphum uini limphatum pro tribus partibus aque, nec etiam uidit eum comedere ultra unam lenam panis. Vidit etiam quod, cum grauissimo dolore sepius affligeretur, circumstantes eum in lecto ponebant et ipse statim in terram se prostrabat, quia non consueuerat in lecto iacere.

⁸² The fact that the two sections correspond to the two teams deputed to conduct the enquiry, and that it was their report which was sent in by the people who had deputed them, shows that ACL as we have it is structurally intact, although only résumés of some parts of the text have survived (notably those which listed the witnesses in various places who assented en bloc to a number of statements about Dominic). There is not the slightest reason to suspect that we have lost whole sections of ACL.

⁸³ The *capitula* can be seen as an early instance of the use of *articuli interrogatorii* in a canonization process; cf. A. Vauchez, *La sainteté en occident aux derniers siècles du moyen âge*, Rome 1981, 57-58. The pronounced similarity between ACL §3 and §18 suggests that a preliminary set of *capitula* was drawn up in Toulouse (pace Vicaire, *Saint Dominique de Caleruega*, Paris 1955, 197, it cannot be attributed to Philip of Vercelli, whose rôle was simply to present Dominican witnesses to the papal investigators in Bologna [ACB §1]); it is clear that the primary witness interviewed by each pair of investigators was free to elaborate on the *capitula*, and it was probably his deposition which was then put to other witnesses.

⁸⁴ I take the text essentially from the Modena manuscript, without noting variants which do not affect the sense and are irrelevant to our discussion.

(16) Tolosana Rogueza, testis iurata, dixit quod credit omnia capitula esse uera, et eum credit uirginem. Et dixit quod ipsa nebat cilicium de pilis pardorum et yrcorum ad usum ipsius.

(17) Beceda monacha sancte Crucis iurata, dixit quod ... congregauit caudas boum ad cilicium faciendum ad opus ipsius et domini Fulconis episcopi Tholosani. Et non audiuit ab eo umquam uanum uerbum, licet multum fuerit ei familiaris. Et cum ipsa sepe fecisset ei lectum, non iacebat in lecto, immo mane inueniebat ita paratum sicut dimiserat quando strauerat, et hoc etiam faciebat quando erat infirmus, immo sepe inueniebat ipsum dormientem in solo disco-opertum et, cum eum cooperuisset, quando redibat inueniebat eum orantem uel stantem uel prostratum. Magnam enim curam habebat circa eum. Dixit etiam quod, cum ipse comedisset ultra ducentas uices in domo in qua ipsa habitabat, ad plus comedebat duo oua, licet plura cibaria pararentur ei. De omnibus autem supradictis est publica et celebris fama per episcopatum Tholosanum totum et Conseranensem et undecumque ipse transitum fecit, si tamen moram aliquam ibi contraxit, inter religiosos, clericos et laycos, uiros et mulieres, qui eum cognouerunt.

Vicaire admits that these three witnesses belong to the Pamiers part of the enquiry, 'mais où étaient-elles quand elles ont connu Dominique?' In MOPH XVI the witness of ACL §16 is called 'Tholosana Nogueza',⁸⁵ which Vicaire translates as 'Noguière de Toulouse'; from this he argues that 'Noguière était autrefois à Toulouse, dont elle est originaire', with the consequent possibility that it was there that she knew Dominic. But 'Tolosana Rogueza' is her name, it does not mean 'Rogueza of Toulouse' (for which the normal Latin would in any case be 'Rogueza Tolosana'). Not surprisingly, *Tolosanus* and *Tolosana* are names found chiefly in Toulouse,⁸⁶ and we may concede that Tolosana Rogueza's family probably was 'originaire de Toulouse'; but families have been known to move, and the names are not confined to Toulouse.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ *Nogueza* comes from the Bologna version of the text; the Modena and Vatican manuscripts have *Rogueza*, and Bernard Gui read *Neguesa*.

⁸⁶ E.g. Devic-Vaissete VIII 394-395; MOPH XXIV 34; J.H.Mundy, *Society and Government at Toulouse in the age of the Cathars*, Toronto 1997, 458 (Tolosana), 371, 396, 397, 401, 404, 412 (Tolosanus).

⁸⁷ As early as the eleventh century there was a 'Guillelm Tolosa' at Berre, not far from Marseille (M.Guérard, ed., *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de saint-Victor de Marseille* II, Paris 1857, 162); in 1184, according to the résumé in Devic-Vaissete VIII 1836, Arnaud Brus and his sister Toulousaine, ceded to the abbot of Grandselve their rights at Bassolenca in the territory of Lassela, probably Lassale near Montech (cf. CdF 21

Vicaire then uses the relationship between Tolosana's testimony and those of Guilielma and Beceda to extend his already dubious inference to them: 'l'apparement des trois dépositions nous amène donc à penser que les deux autres s'y trouvaient également'. He finds confirmation of their presence in Toulouse in the fact that Beceda 'porte témoignage sur l'opinion qu'on avait de St Dominique, non seulement dans le diocèse de Couserans, où se trouve son monastère, mais aussi dans celui de Toulouse', and that she and Guilielma between them 'l'ont hébergé plus de 400 fois'. 'Quelle localité', he asks, 'pouvait exiger un ministère aussi durable, sinon la seule très grande ville du pays, Toulouse?'

In reality the only relationship between Tolosana's testimony and the other two is that each of these witnesses said that she helped make a hairshirt for Dominic; and it hardly follows from the fact that a woman called Tolosana sewed him a hairshirt that two other women who performed a similar service must have lived in the same place, and that the place must have been Toulouse. What is more, Tolosana and Beceda specify different materials for his hairshirt, suggestive of different environments (neither of them urban): if Beceda collected 'caudas boum', she must have been living in a place where cattle were pastured; Tolosana's 'pili pardorum et yrcorum', by contrast, imply that she was near a terrain where wild animals were to be found.⁸⁸

Beceda obviously could not literally vouch for Dominic's reputation throughout the length and breadth of the dioceses of Toulouse and Couserans, let alone 'undecumque ipse transitum fecit'. The area around Pamiers was in the diocese of Toulouse⁸⁹

[1986] 115), a few miles south of Montauban; c.1224 we hear of a 'Tolsanus' of Lavaur described as a Waldensian, though he may have been a Poor Catholic (testimony of Arnaldus de Corbariu on 10 March 1243, Doat 22 f.71; cf. Y.Dossat, CdF 2 [1967] 216), and the widow of 'Tolosanus de Larrocha' was living at Villeneuve-la-Comtal at least when she was interviewed by the inquisitors on 5 July 1246 (Toulouse 609 f.184'). In J.Duvernoy, ed., *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier*, Toulouse 1965, III 329, we find a 'Tholosanus Gilberti de Tholosa'; it was evidently not considered superfluous to specify that he was 'de Tholosa'.

⁸⁸ There were no panthers in the Midi; as Prof. Posnan suggested to me, *pardus* must be taken loosely to mean some other kind of large cat, such as a lynx. In conjunction with *pardi*, *yrci* probably means wild goats. On wild life in the area, cf. another Pamiers deposition: 'Cum iret cum eo et aliis per nemora, remanebat [sc. Dominicus] ultimus, et cum requireretur sepius inueniebatur flexis genibus non obstante timore luporum rapidorum qui multos inuadebant' (ACL §10).

⁸⁹ Pamiers did not become a separate diocese until 1295 (HC I 94).

but quite close to that of Couserans; if she was living there when Dominic was in the region, her decision to become a nun at Sainte-Croix, just across the diocesan boundary, is easy to understand, and she would have been well placed to acquire information about Dominic's standing in both dioceses.

There is a real relationship between her testimony and that of Guilielma; it is so close, in fact, that we may well believe that they looked after Dominic together, and that the 'domus in qua ipsa [Beceda] habitabat' was Guilielma's house — the two women even appear to have collaborated in making Dominic's hairshirt, Beceda collecting the material and Guilielma doing the sewing. If they were living in the same house, then the occasions on which they each gave him hospitality add up to 'more than two hundred times' (and that cannot be taken as a precise figure, it means 'a lot of times'),⁹⁰ not 'plus de 400 fois'. Furthermore, there is nothing to indicate that they were not spread over a number of years, and Dominic could have had well over 1000 opportunities to enjoy their hospitality even if he was not in the region between the beginning of 1208 and June 1211 and even if (except when he went to Rome) he never slept or took a meal elsewhere in 1213-1217 while he was the bishop's vicar in Carcassonne or working in Toulouse.⁹¹

We may therefore conclude from their testimonies that Dominic frequented the place where Guilielma and Beceda lived, but not that he conducted a long concentrated mission there. The question to which Vicaire believed Toulouse to be the only possible answer, 'Quelle localit e pouvait exiger un minist ere aussi durable?', does not even arise.

⁹⁰ Guilelma and Beceda are more likely to have used large numbers in the exaggerated way characteristic of most literature in this period than to have been affected by 'the arithmetical mentality' (cf. A.Murray, *Reason and society in the Middle Ages*, Oxford 1978, 174-180).

⁹¹ If Diego and Dominic hurried home after their initial engagement in the Languedoc mission (as reported in Cernai §20-24) but returned in time to spend 15 days of July in Languedoc (Diego's last documented presence in Spain in the summer of 1206 is on 3 July: Gonz alez, doc. 790), and if Dominic remained there until the end of 1207, he would have had 533 days in the region in 1206-1207. If we leave the whole of 1208-1210 out of account (in case Dominic was at Osma) and suppose that he did not return to Languedoc until 20 June 1211 (the first date on which his presence there is attested), if we discount Lent 1212 (he was staying with some heretically inclined ladies) and 1213-1217 except for three months after the dispersal of the brethren (to cover the maximum possible period for Dominic's work in Carcassonne and Toulouse), that still leaves 581 days (July-Dec. 1211, Jan. 1212, April-Dec. 1212, Sept.-Nov. 1217).

Having lodged Guilielma, Tolosana and Beceda in Toulouse to his own satisfaction, Vicaire goes on: 'Or nous savons que Dominique fut également hébergé à Toulouse par l'évêque Foulques lui-même ... Cela prolonge encore la durée de ce ministère'. The evidence for this comes from Salanhac, who mentions meeting a Cistercian from Grandselve called Aimery of Solignac the day before the first celebration of the newly canonized Dominic's feast day, 'quem quia antiquus socius et fidelis amicus beati Dominici fuerat in domo domini Fulconis episcopi Tholosani, instanter rogavi quod ad festum ueniret in crastino celebrandum'.⁹² We might perhaps, at a pinch, take 'in domo domini Fulconis' to mean 'in Fulk's household', but it is more naturally understood to refer to the bishop's house in Toulouse; this time, then, there is real evidence of Dominic staying in Toulouse, at least for long enough to make friends with Aimery.

Vicaire's next step is to pin down the time when Dominic lodged with his lady-friends and with Bishop Fulk. He rules out 'le ministère de Dominique à Toulouse à partir de 1215' on the grounds that 'le saint logeait alors parmi ses frères' at the Seilhan house. However, there must have been some delay between Dominic's arrival in Toulouse and Peter Seilhan's gift; where was Dominic living before he acquired the Seilhan house? The bishop's residence is as likely a place as any; he and Aimery may well have been there together for a time in the latter part of 1214.⁹³ If Aimery had been in Fulk's entourage more or less from the time when Fulk became bishop of Toulouse,⁹⁴ he and Dominic could have met in the bishop's house long before 1214: granted the close co-operation between Fulk and Diego (cf. Puylaurens VIII 46), it is quite possible that Diego and Dominic spent some time as Fulk's guests in the latter part of 1206 to plan their strategy.

Toulouse was a no-go area for the clergy between the end of May 1211 (Cernai §234) and the city's reconciliation in April 1214,

⁹² MOPH XXII 18, though the punctuation there (after *fuerat* instead of *episcopi Tholosani*) is wrong; I have taken the text and punctuation from Gui's own manuscript, Toulouse 490 f.9^r.

⁹³ Below, in VIII 2, I indicate some reasons for believing that Dominic was working in Toulouse well before the end of 1214.

⁹⁴ His presence at Fulk's side is attested in June 1211 and April 1221 in undoubtedly authentic deeds (MOPH XXV nos. 12, 153), and he is also mentioned in the false deed which Koudelka printed as MOPH XXV App. II 1B, which, for reasons which I shall explain elsewhere, I believe to be based on two genuine deeds from the end of 1206 and the beginning of 1208; it may be presumed that Aimery's name was taken from one of these.

and before that it was under interdict from Sept. 1209 to March 1210 (Cernai §138, 162). Since 'l'apostolat du saint avant la Croisade (été 1209) s'était principalement porté sur la région de Fanjeaux et de Carcassonne ... on en conclura que l'apostolat principal de Dominique à Toulouse ... se plaça entre mars 1210 et mai 1211'.

Vicaire's evidence for Dominic's apostolate 'en Lauragais et dans le Carcassès' before the crusade is indicated in *Histoire*¹ I 297 (retained in *Histoire*² I 301). Apart from some inquisition records (which prove nothing about 1208-1209, as we have seen), Vicaire bases himself on Dominic's reported answer to the question 'cur non libentius Tolose in Tolosanaque diocesi quam Carcassone in eiusque diocesi moraretur': 'Quia in Tolosana inquit diocesi multos qui me honorant inuenio, apud Carcassonam uero omnes econtrario me impugnant' (Const. §62). Vicaire says that this must refer to a time before the crusade: 'après le 15.VIII.1209 la population de Carcassonne a été radicalement renouvelée et les hérétiques ne sont évidemment pas revenus'.

We obviously cannot be sure how accurately the conversation was remembered and conveyed to Constantine or how faithfully he reproduced it; but there can be little doubt that it was sent in by the province of Provence in conjunction with other Carcassonne material which better fitted the description of what the brethren had been asked to supply, namely *miracula* (MOPH III 33.16-18). This implies that it belongs with the real Carcassonne 'miracles' reported in Const. §55-56: one Lent, while Dominic was living there as vicar of the absent bishop, Guy des Vaux-de-Cernai, he prophesied the king of Aragón's death, and, after fasting on bread and water and never going to bed throughout the whole of that Lent, 'fortiorem se esse dicebat, pulcriorque et pinguior apparebat'. The Lent in question is certainly that of 1213 (cf. below. VIII 2), but, understood in what seems to me to be the most natural way,⁹⁵ the question which

⁹⁵ I take *morari* to mean 'live, dwell' (as in successive editions of the BAC *Santo Domingo*) rather than 'linger' (as in Vicaire, *Saint Dominique de Caleruega* 52); the dictionaries suggest that this was its predominant sense in medieval Latin, and it is chiefly in this sense that it passed into Romance languages (*morar* in Spanish and Portuguese, *morer* in Old French; *demorar* in Occitan, *demeurer* in French, *dimorare* in Italian). In oratio recta the question could be either 'Why wouldn't you prefer to live in Toulouse and its diocese ...?' or 'Why do you not prefer living in Toulouse ...?'. On the second interpretation, it could have been asked anywhere, but it would imply that Dominic already had some experience of living in Toulouse (which would damage Vicaire's theory, in that, on his own hypothesis, it would mean that Dominic

elicited Dominic's comments on the relative merits of Toulouse and Carcassonne implies that he was living at Carcassonne but could have been living at Toulouse, which suggests that the conversation should be dated after the reconciliation of Toulouse in April 1214;⁹⁶ and this date is not as implausible as Vicaire would have us believe.

Even if it is literally true that the whole population left Carcassonne when the city was surrendered to the crusaders on 15 August 1209 (Cernai §98; *Chanson* laisse 33), it is difficult to believe that it was repopulated from scratch, and we may consider it probable that at least the less prominent of its original inhabitants drifted back when calm returned; Count Raymond of Toulouse certainly had friends in the region in 1211, if not in the city itself (*Chanson* 61.15). And it is likely that Bishop Guy des Vaux-de-Cernai was not well accepted there.

The previous bishop, Bernard-Raymond de Roquefort, was a well-connected local man, but, though he may have been a loyal catholic himself, he belonged to what M. Roquebert called 'une famille cathare par excellence' (CdF 20 [1985] 223, 237, 241), and the crusade put him in an impossible position. At Termes, whose surrender he was called on to negotiate in 1210, his mother was among the besieged heretics and his brother was one of the people defending the place against the crusaders (Cernai §185). In November 1209 this same brother had viciously assaulted a party of Cistercians just outside Carcassonne; Simon de Montfort had the bodies of two who were killed brought into the city and given honorable burial (Cernai §130-131).

Guy originally came to the region in 1207 as part of the Cistercian preaching campaign against heresy (Cernai §51), but when Abbot Arnaud called him back there towards the end of 1209 his mission was to the crusaders, as we learn from Innocent III's endorsement of Arnaud's orders (PL 216:157). We do not know exactly how he came to be bishop of Carcassonne, but on 15 April 1211 Innocent ordered his legate to accept Bernard-Raymond's resignation and to instruct the canons to elect someone suitable 'cum

had lived in Toulouse before 1209), and it is thus unclear why Dominic replied simply in terms of the *diocese* of Toulouse. The question has more point if Dominic was living in Carcassonne when it was asked, in which case the obvious implication is 'Wouldn't you rather be living in Toulouse?'

⁹⁶ This corroborates Vicaire's belief that Dominic continued to act as the bishop's vicar in Carcassonne until Bishop Guy returned in about May 1214 (Cernai §508) (cf. *Histoire* I 333).

tuo consilio' within eight days; should they fail to do so, he was to appoint someone himself 'appellatione remota' (PL 216:409-410). Guy was not in the region; he came 'from France' after his election to Carcassonne, arriving in Albi in time to celebrate Easter 1212 there with Simon de Montfort (Cernai §299). The editors of his nephew's *Hystoria* provide a useful résumé of his activities in the ensuing years (Cernai III viii-ix, xii-xiii) from which it can be seen that, having returned to the Midi, he resumed his place among the crusaders; his primary allegiance was evidently to them rather than to his diocese.⁹⁷

It is hard not to detect the hand of Simon de Montfort in Bernard-Raymond's removal and the substitution of Simon's old friend Guy,⁹⁸ and it is more than likely that Guy was resented as a puppet of the occupying forces; he was certainly in conflict with his predecessor and with his chapter in 1217 (Devic-Vaissète V 1465 no. XXXIX). As M.Zerner-Chardovine comments, it looks as if he failed to win the support of his canons.⁹⁹

It is by no means certain, then, that Dominic, as vicar of a foreign bishop¹⁰⁰ seen as an agent of the crusaders, would have been popular in Carcassonne in 1213-1214.¹⁰¹

If the conversation is reported accurately, Dominic's distinction between Carcassonne, where 'omnes me impugnant', and the *dio-*

⁹⁷ On his absorption in the crusade from 1208 onwards, cf. Vicaire, *Histoire* I 310.

⁹⁸ As a child Simon apparently regarded Guy as his mentor, and the two men were close friends (Cernai §299). Before their common involvement in the Albigensian crusade they had both taken part in the fourth crusade. We have an eye-witness account from Guy's nephew of how the two of them stood out against the proposed attack on Zara; when Guy read out the pope's letter forbidding the attack, the Venetians wanted to kill him, and Simon came to his rescue (Cernai §106). Simon and Guy joined forces again to oppose the plan to take the crusade to Constantinople instead of going straight to the Holy Land (see D.E.Queller, *The fourth crusade*, Philadelphia 1977, 71).

⁹⁹ 'L'abbé Gui des Vaux-de-Cernay prédicateur de croisade', CdF 21 (1986) 199: 'Gui tentait sans y réussir de s'attacher un chapitre resté très réticent'.

¹⁰⁰ Y.Dossat, 'Patriotisme méridional du clergé au XIII^e siècle', CdF 7 (1972) 419-452, cites some spectacular evidence of the degree to which the French were 'foreigners' in the Midi and resented as such, even by loyal Catholics — even by Abbot Arnaud after he became archbishop of Narbonne (art. cit. 421-424). The linguistic division is dramatically revealed by the inability of John XXII, a native of Cahors, to understand a confidential letter written in French by the king of France (art. cit. 420).

¹⁰¹ It is suggestive that no witnesses seem to have been questioned at Carcassonne during the Languedoc canonization process; was this because Dominic was not fondly remembered there?

cese of Toulouse, where 'multos qui me honorant inuenio', implies that he had not yet spent any significant amount of time in the city of Toulouse.

Vicaire goes on to say that his dating of Dominic's major apostolate in Toulouse 'concorde précisément avec ce que l'on sait du ministère intense de Foulques auprès des ses ouailles durant l'année 1210' (we shall return to this 'ministère intense' shortly); and if he was working in Toulouse in the period leading up to the exodus of the clergy, or Fulk's own departure from the city on 2 April (Cernai §221-222), 'on s'explique ainsi comment le 15 mai 1211, Dominique se trouvait à Lavaur aux côtés de Foulques' and 'pourquoi on ne trouve aucun signe de la présence et de l'activité du saint à Prouille en 1210 et dans la première partie de 1211'.

The implication that we do have evidence of Dominic's activity at Prouille in 1208-1209 is explained in *Histoire*¹ I 284 (retained in *Histoire*² I 289-290). After admitting the lack of documentary evidence between August 1207 and mid 1211, Vicaire quotes Jordan's statement about Dominic's continued presence in the Midi, which, he says, 'plusieurs documents confirment et éclairent', and first of all 'un document vivant: la permanence et le développement de la maison de Prouille', as revealed by MOPH XXV no. 9, the deed of 19 March 1209 in which William Claret (without Dominic) was given possession of St Martin's, Limoux, for the nuns. Vicaire evidently saw no need to question the accuracy of Jordan's statement, but even so MOPH XXV no. 9 can only serve as evidence of Dominic's activity on the tacit premiss that Prouille would not have survived without him, which is a gratuitous insult to the competence and loyalty of people like William Claret (whose ongoing care for Prouille is attested by MOPH XXV no. 9), Bishop Fulk and, not least, the nuns themselves.

The 'evidence' for Dominic being 'aux côtés de Foulques' at Lavaur on 15 May 1211 is two documents which do not mention him: MOPH XXV no. 10, a gift made by Simon de Montfort to the *domine et fratres* of Prouille, and no. 11, Fulk's gift of a life-interest in the church of Bram to the individual 'domine conuerse' of Prouille. It is, of course, possible that these gifts were prompted by Dominic, but the contrast between MOPH XXV no. 11 and subsequent Prouille deeds raises a far more important question than why Dominic was at Fulk's side at Lavaur (if indeed he was at Fulk's side).

Two new features appear simultaneously in Prouille deeds from Dec. 1211 onwards. The first is that Prouille begins to be referred to as *monasterium* or *abatia*, and between Sept. and Dec. 1212 it is referred to as *abatia nouiter constructa* (MOPH XXV nos. 13, 27-29, 33-34, 36-37, 39). If we may believe Fulk's later claim to have built the monastery ('quod a nobis edificatum fuit et constructum') (Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 77-78 no. 333), it was thanks to him that this development took place; yet in May 1211 he was still treating the Prouille community as a collection of individual 'convert ladies', not as an institution to which a permanent donation could be made. Something must have occurred between May and December, and the other new feature which appears in Prouille deeds at the same time suggests what it was: in May 1211 Fulk's gift was made directly to the *domine conuerse*, but in the deeds already cited from Dec. 1211 onwards Dominic is named as the primary agent in transactions concerning the monastery. It looks as if Fulk turned Prouille into a proper monastery only when he could put Dominic in charge of it.

This gives added significance to MOPH XXV no. 9. On 17 April 1207 William Claret acted with Dominic in accepting the gift of St Martin's, Limoux (MOPH XXV no. 5), but on 19 March 1209 he acted alone in taking possession of it for the nuns (MOPH XXV no. 9). This does not of itself prove that Dominic had left the Midi, but *if* Dominic was not there it would explain, not only why William acted alone in 1209, not only why there is no trace of Dominic's presence at Prouille in 1210-1211, but also why Fulk waited until the latter part of 1211 to start treating Prouille as a durable institution and why it was then that he facilitated its transformation into a proper monastery with proper buildings.

Dominic may or may not have been at Lavaur with Fulk and Simon de Montfort in May 1211, he was certainly with them (and with the papal legates) at the siege of Toulouse on 20 June (MOPH XXV no. 12); but we do not need to invoke a supposed apostolate in Toulouse in the months preceding the bishop's exodus on 2 April to account for this. If Dominic had only just returned to the region — quite possibly thanks to an urgent request from Fulk to the new bishop of Osma — he would obviously have taken the earliest opportunity to present himself to Fulk and to the legates.

Presumably to keep Dominic occupied in Toulouse until the last possible moment before the clergy's departure — Fulk left the city on Holy Saturday (Cernai §222) — Vicaire suggests a connec-

tion between the ladies of ACL and Ferrandus's story of Dominic spending Lent ('celui de 1211') with some heretically inclined noblewomen and converting them by a display of extreme austerity (including a request to make him a hairshirt) (Ferr. §22).

It may well be correct to identify the ACL witnesses, or at least Guilielma and Beceda, with Ferrandus's 'quedam nobiles'; but Vicaire's location of the latter 'du côté de Toulouse' is tendentious, and his assertion that the Lent in question is 'celui de 1211' depends entirely on his theory that Dominic was staying with them in connection with his work in Toulouse, a later date being therefore excluded since the bishop ordered the clergy to leave Toulouse soon after Easter (Cernai §234).

Ferrandus actually situates his noblewomen 'in partibus Tolosanis', which is how he identified the whole domain of the anti-heretical mission (§18);¹⁰² and a story preserved in the Dominican province of Provence refers to the river Ariège — in the territory of the Pamiers part of ACL — as being 'in partibus Tholosanis' (cf. MOPH I 69).¹⁰³ If Guilielma and Beceda were Ferrandus's 'quedam nobiles', there is nothing to stop us believing that they were already living in the vicinity of Pamiers, and that Dominic's ascetic prowess was paraded for their benefit during the Lent of 1212, for example.¹⁰⁴

Vicaire has one more card up his sleeve: 'Sans doute est-ce à cette époque' that Dominic 'acquies à la vie religieuse soeur Blanche et son mari, Toulousains fortunés'. Blanche features in the list of nuns on 15 May 1211 (MOPH XXV no. 11) but not among the 'first nuns' of Prouille; 'ses biens servirent à construire en pierres de taille la moitié du grand dortoir; elle fut envoyée à Saint-Sixte en 1221'.

It is true that there is no Blanche in the list of the 'first nuns', and that a *Blanca* is listed in MOPH XXV no. 11,¹⁰⁵ but she is not

¹⁰² Cf. the title which the manuscripts of the official version of Ferr. attach to §13 (confirmed by Humbert's adaptation of it as the title of §13 of his own *legenda*), 'Qualiter in partibus Tolosanis remansit et predicauit'.

¹⁰³ The story is included in Gerald de Frachet's original edition of the *Vitas fratrum*. On the different versions of the *Vitas fratrum* see my 'Évolution des *vitas fratrum*', CDF 36 (2001) 415-418.

¹⁰⁴ Lent ran from 7 Feb. to 24 March 1212. The earliest documentary proof of Dominic's presence at any particular place in 1212 is MOPH XXV no. 29, which shows that he was at Prouille on 7 May; a Prouille document of 14 Feb. mentions him, but does not show that he was present there (MOPH XXV no. 27).

¹⁰⁵ We must deal elsewhere with the famous list of the 'first nuns', the most primitive version of which is that published in J. de Rechac, *La vie du glorieux patri-*

said to be from Toulouse. The connection with Toulouse is made on the authority of Percin, Échard and Balme, but Échard simply cites Percin (QE I 83), Balme quotes Cambefort and Percin (Balme-Lelaidier II 455), and the 'Prouille manuscript' to which Percin refers (*Monumenta* I 22 §56) is undoubtedly Cambefort;¹⁰⁶ so it all comes back to Cambefort, who actually distinguishes between the Blanche of 1211 (included among the 'filles aynees' of Prouille) and the one sent to San Sisto who belongs in the 'second ranc, les fondatrices de diuers couuans qui sont sorties dudit monastere' (Prouille MS ff.21^v-22^v). Of the latter he says:

Seur Blanque suiuant les antiens documans du monastere de Prouille estoit de la ville de Tholose femme mariee, laquelle d'un commun acord avec son mari se separarent, son mari se fit religieux. Quelques annees apres la fondation, St Dominique la tira de Prouille et la fit conduire a Rome avec quelques religieuses ... Ceste seur Blanque donna de grands biens, fit bastir la moitie du grand dortoir de Prouille de bonne pierre de taille.

Thanks to Bernard Gui we are well informed about the development of Prouille's buildings in the thirteenth century. He repeatedly draws attention to parts of the monastery being built *in stone*, from which we may infer that the original buildings were made of wood; and the stone dormitory for the nuns was completed in 1315 (MOPH XXIV 24-28), so it is extremely unlikely that it was financed by a nun who was in the community by 1211. We may accept that 'les antiens documans du monastere' call the benefactress Blanche, but, assuming she really was a nun, she can more plausibly be identified with the 'Blanca de Tholosa' who is attested at Prouille in 1328 and 1336 (Guiraud, *Cartulaire* I 279 no. 230, II 183 no. 441) than with the 'Blanca' of 1211.

In any case, Vicaire's argument depends on the unwarranted and unjust assumption that no one but Dominic could acquire recruits for Prouille.

Vicaire's case for Dominic's intense apostolate in Toulouse in 1210 collapses at every point; and the very structure of ACL is against it.

arche S. Dominique, Paris 1647, 197-198. We must also deal elsewhere with the considerable textual problems in which MOPH XXV no. 11 is embroiled; they do not affect our present concerns.

¹⁰⁶ I shall go into the question of Percin's manuscript sources elsewhere.

As we have seen, the Languedoc enquiry was entrusted to three Toulouse ecclesiastics with instructions to take the advice of some Dominican. They evidently believed, presumably on the advice of the Toulouse Dominicans, that the two areas most closely connected with Dominic's time in the Midi were the Lauragais and the Ariège valley. No enquiry was made in Toulouse itself,¹⁰⁷ not even among the Dominicans, though we may surmise that the province had been told to send someone to give evidence in Bologna — this could be why there is a deposition from John of Navarre in ACB;¹⁰⁸ it might therefore have been considered unnecessary to seek further evidence from the local Dominicans, which would explain why ACL contains no depositions from such obvious potential witnesses as Peter Seilhan¹⁰⁹ and Stephen of Metz.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ Apart from 'Acta de Tholosa' no witness in ACL is identified as being from Toulouse, and she comes in a short list of women who 'concordant in supradictis capitulis' immediately after the Montréal witnesses (more precisely, it seems, the *male* Montréal witnesses) who, to the number of 64, 'concordantes in predictis capitulis iurati dixerunt quod nunquam tam sanctum et tam honestum hominem in carne uiderunt' (they are poorly represented in MOPH XVI by ACL §22). The list of women also includes 'Blayda de Fenoleto' and 'Guiralda de Monte Regali', and there is nothing to suggest that they were not at Montréal too. It is in any case most unlikely the prior of Prouille and his socius went all the way to Toulouse simply to get one woman to agree to the *capitula*, or that Acta was the only person in Toulouse who could be found to speak up for Dominic's sanctity.

¹⁰⁸ Salanhac heard John telling the story of how he behaved when Dominic sent him to Paris (MOPH XXII 155), which suggests that he returned to the province of Provence after studying in Paris. He gave his evidence on 10 Aug. 1233 (cf. AFP 66 [1996] 185), but he was presumably not in Bologna on 24 May, since he says nothing about Dominic's translation; it looks as if he went there specifically to testify. He had had wide, if not very long, experience of Dominic, which could be a reason for him to be chosen to represent the Provence Dominicans: he joined the Toulouse *predicatio* in Aug. 1215 (ACB §25); he went to Paris in Aug. 1217, but evidently did not stay there long since at the beginning of 1218 Dominic sent him from Rome to Bologna (Jordan, *Lib.* §55), where he was able to learn about Dominic's early years from former associates of his in Osma (ACB §29); later in 1218 he accompanied Dominic to Spain (ACB §27), but he was back in Paris by August (ACB §26; *Lib.* §53), where he would have met Dominic again in 1219 (*Lib.* §59).

¹⁰⁹ It is not clear from MOPH XXIV 59 and Guillaume Pelhisson, *Chronique*, ed. J. Duvernoy, Paris 1994, 44-46, whether Peter was still in Limoges at the time of the Languedoc enquiry or whether he had already arrived in Toulouse, but, considering the rôle he played in the creation of the order (*Lib.* §38; *Gui, Cat. mag., Dom.* §7) and his devotion to the memory of 'dominus Dominicus' (MOPH XXIV 59), his testimony should have been worth collecting; like John of Navarre, he probably accompanied Dominic to Spain in 1218, from where he was sent to Paris in view of a foundation in Limoges (AFP 65 [1995] 99, 122-126).

¹¹⁰ Stephen of Metz was probably in the Toulouse community in 1233 (Pelhisson, ed. cit. 46); we do not know when he first met Dominic, but he was his

There may not have been anyone in the Dominican community with personal memories of the *predicatio* reaching back before 1213, but it is hard to believe that the Toulouse brethren would have been unable to suggest any witnesses for the investigators to interview in Toulouse itself if Dominic had ever engaged in an intense mission there, as suggested by Vicaire.

We may conclude that Dominic's apostolic activities were focused largely on the Lauragais and the Ariège valley, and that in Toulouse itself, apart from some formal ecclesiastical business (illustrated by MOPH XXV no. 61), he was chiefly concerned with the establishment and shaping of his own community of preachers and with the monastery of nuns which had been entrusted to his care (MOPH XXV nos. 64 and 80).

5. *The great preaching campaign of 1210*

The evidence which Vicaire cites for Fulk's 'ministère intense auprès de ses ouailles' in 1210 is *Chanson* laisse 46; he developed the theme elsewhere (*Histoire*² I 301-303): taking occasion of a period of relative calm, 'Foulques se consacrait activement à la réforme de ses ouailles. Fidèle au programme d'évangélisation rappelé par le pape, il ne se contentait pas d'attaquer l'hérésie; il s'en prenait aux vices, spécialement à l'usure'. In a footnote he mentions that, according to the *Chanson*, the legate, Arnaud Amaury, abbot of Cîteaux 'y collaborait'. 'Dans ce travail apostolique', he goes on, 'plusieurs documents unissent le nom de Dominique à celui de l'évêque ... Cette liaison de Dominique et l'évêque à Toulouse n'avait rien de fortuit. Il fallait au prédicateur une position canonique expresse ... Pour prêcher à Toulouse, il lui fallait la mission de l'évêque. En le prenant pour collaborateur, Foulques réalisait la volonté formelle du pape et du concile d'Avignon'.

Vicaire rather jumbles together the contents of two papal letters and a legatine decree issued at the council of Avignon in September 1209 to create 'la volonté du pape et du concile', but he does not seriously misrepresent their combined effect.

socius in Carcassonne in 1213-1214 (Const. §55-56). Another potential witness was the new Dominican bishop of Toulouse, Raymond du Fauga, who had apparently travelled with Dominic (MOPH XXII 59); he may well be the 'R.' of MOPH XXV no. 91 who seems to have turned up in Rome in 1218 and, when Dominic set off for Spain, presumably accompanied him at least as far as Narbonne (AFP 65 [1995] 122-127).

On 10 March 1208 Innocent III addressed a letter to the bishops of Languedoc in which he urged them to foster the 'word of peace and faith' sown by Peter of Castelnau with the 'irrigation' of their own preaching, 'sperantes quod de morte huius fecundissimi grani multus sit fructus in Christi Ecclesia proventurus' (PL 215:1356); but he says nothing about the bishops preaching vicariously through other people.

On 28 March 1208 Innocent wrote to his legates in the region. On the whole he simply repeats the commission he had given them on 31 May 1204 (MOPH XXV no. 3): their task is still the same, to 'extirpate heresy' by converting heretics and using coercive measures against the recalcitrant; as before, they must urge the king and his barons to fulfil the responsibilities which belong to the secular arm (though they are now warned not to deflect support away from the crusade to the Holy Land). The pope drops what he had said in 1204 about involving Cistercian preachers in the mission; instead there is a new clause at the end of his letter: 'Cum autem propter necessitates urgentes aliquando esse insimul non possitis, viros idoneos de quocumque ordine vel religione ad predicationis officium exercendum vobis assumere procuretis, quorum quilibet, ubi simul omnes nequiveritis interesse, in hiis que ad honorem et profectum ecclesie Dei pertinent, exercent vices suas'.¹¹¹ This authorizes the legates, but not the bishops, to make use of auxiliary preachers.

The first decree of the council of Avignon complains about the negligence of prelates which has resulted in the pullulation of 'diversae ac damnatissimae haereses' in the region; because of this, the legate Milo says, 'praesentis comprobatione concilii duximus statuendum, ut in sua dioecesi quilibet episcopus frequentius et diligentius solito fidem praedicet orthodoxam et, cum expedierit, per alias honestas et discretas personas faciat praedicari;¹¹² in eo tamen et diligens et cautus praedicator existat, ut adulteria, fornicationes, periuria, usuras, odia, aggressiones, et cetera mortalia vitia adeo verbo detestetur et opere, quod exinde honestas, pax, patientia et iustitia et ceterae inserantur virtutes'. The next two decrees institute measures against heresy and usury (Mansi XXII 785-786).

¹¹¹ A. Teulet, *Layettes du trésor des chartes* I, Paris 1863, I 317-319.

¹¹² In interpreting this as saying that bishops 'doivent constituer sous leur autorité une équipe de prédicateurs qui ne seront que cela', Vicaire goes far beyond the plain meaning of the text (*Dominique et ses Prêcheurs* 204).

No doubt Fulk, as a conscientious bishop, did his best to carry out the instructions of the pope and the council; but the 'plusieurs documents' which are supposed to connect Dominic with Fulk 'dans ce travail apostolique' do not amount to much.

Vicaire appeals first to inquisition records showing that 'Foulques imposait des pénitences canoniques à des gens que le saint avait d'abord réconciliés' (*Histoire* I 302). In concreto, however, only two women, Na Segura and Ramunda Gasc, said that they had been reconciled by Dominic and given penitential crosses by a bishop of Toulouse (whom neither identifies more precisely); and these are presented as separate facts with no necessary connection between them. Two of their companions in heresy, Ramunda Germana and Ermengarz Aycharda also received penitential crosses, the former explicitly from Fulk's successor, Raymond, 'about ten years ago' (Toulouse 609 ff.20^r, 22^v). Dossat claimed that 'l'évêque de Toulouse Foulques fait une application fréquente de cette pénitence', but the evidence he cites from Toulouse 609 only furnishes one certain instance, and much of it actually refers to penances imposed by Raymond, not Fulk.¹¹³

Bishop Raymond was undoubtedly at Le Mas in pursuit of heretics in the mid 1230s: on 27 May 1245 'Poncius del Mas uel de Lobeira' confessed that he had unwittingly harboured a woman heretic, whom the bishop of Toulouse caught in his house and reconciled 'about twelve years ago' (f.1^v). There is a good chance that it was he, not Fulk, who gave Segura and Ramunda their penitential crosses. Even if Fulk was the bishop who penanced them after they had been reconciled, Vicaire himself admits that 'un certain temps peut avoir séparé les deux actes'; at most, then, only a rather

¹¹³ Dossat, *Crises de l'inquisition* 112. Of the people listed, only Rixendis of Fanjeaux says that 'fuerunt impositae sibi cruces per dominum Fulconem episcopum' (f.168^r). 'P.W.' of Labécède took his heretical mother to Toulouse where she was converted and received an unspecified penance from the bishop (i.e. Fulk) 'about 35 years ago' (f.118^v). Stephanus Sclaris of Lagarde received an unspecified penance from Fulk 'about 40 years ago' and, apparently on a separate occasion, he received crosses from an unidentified bishop of Toulouse (f.70^v). Ramunda Gasc 'habuit cruces ab episcopo Tholosano' (f.22^v), but she does not identify the bishop. 'Guarezia (not 'Gauzia') of Le Mas received her crosses from the bishop of Toulouse 'about ten years ago' (f.21^r) (i.e. c.1235, when Raymond was bishop), Audiardis Ebrarda of Villeneuve-la-Comtal received crosses 'a domino R. episcopo Tholosano' about ten years ago (f.184^r), Dulcia received crosses 'a domino R. episcopo Tholosano' (f.184^r), and Bernarda Vesiana had crosses imposed 'per dominum R. episcopum Tholosanum' (f.184^v).

tenuous link would be implied between Fulk and Dominic. In any case, as we have seen, the inexact dates suggested by these depositions would, if taken literally, refer to a time before Dominic even arrived in the Midi; they are certainly not evidence of collaboration between him and Fulk in 1210.

The only other 'document' cited by Vicaire is Beceda's testimony that she collected material 'ad cilicium faciendum ad opus ipsius et domini Fulconis episcopi Tholosani' (ACL §17). She would have had no occasion to mention Fulk in the context of Dominic's canonization process unless there was some association between them in her mind; it is quite possible that she was thinking of an occasion, perhaps several occasions, on which they visited her together while engaged in a common mission. But our question is not whether Dominic and Fulk ever worked together, but whether they were doing so in 1210; and on that point Beceda cannot help us. Vicaire's attempt to refer her testimony specifically to 1210 and to Toulouse does not succeed; for all we know, then, she may have contributed to the making of hairshirts for Dominic and Fulk as early as 1206 or as late as 1217.

Vicaire's reasons for involving Dominic in Fulk's preaching activities in 1210 and early 1211 may not be very good, but at least he gives them, and he indicates the source from which we learn about these activities, the *Chanson de la Croisade Albigeoise*, with a passing acknowledgement that the 'collaborator' actually mentioned by the *Chanson* is the papal legate, Abbot Arnaud. In his wake, however, the supposed cooperation between Dominic and Fulk in these months took on a life of its own.

In the date-chart appended to Patrice Cabau's article on Fulk in CdF 21 (1986) 151-179, the bishop's 'prédications contre le prêt et l'usure avec le légat Arnaud Amauri' are attributed to the winter of 1209-1210; as a separate item, under 1210-1211, he 'prêche à Toulouse, secondé par Dominique' (art. cit. 174).

Mireille Mousnier went further: citing no evidence except the first edition of Vicaire's *Histoire* I 297,¹¹⁴ she conjured up a preaching campaign involving not just Fulk and Dominic but Uncle Tom Cobby and all: 'nous savons', she says, that Aimery of Solignac 'a participé à la prédication à Toulouse au cours de l'année 1210-1211,

¹¹⁴ This is less developed than the corresponding passage in *Histoire*² I 301-303.

aux côtés de Guy des Vaux-de-Cernay, de Foulques, de l'abbé de Villelongue ... et de Dominique' (CdF 21 [1986] 120);¹¹⁵ this was recently repeated by Beverly Mayne Kienzle.¹¹⁶

All this apostolic activity is no doubt most impressive, but it is a far cry from what the *Chanson* actually says, and, apart from Vicair's attempt to document Dominic's association with Fulk, a few lines from the *Chanson* are the only source on which the whole edifice is built — a few lines whose meaning is not even certain. I quote *laisse* 46.1-7:

L'evesque de Tholosa, Folquets cel de Maselha,
 Que degus de bontat ab el no s'aparelha,
 E l'abas de Cistel l'us ab l'autre cosselha.
 Tot jorn van prezican la gent co no-s revelha;
 Del prest e del renou l'un e l'autre-s querelha.
 Per trastot Agenes lor tenc aital roelha
 Si qu'en cavalguet l'abas tro a Santa Bazelha.

The Belles Lettres editor, admitting that *roelha* is a hapax, conjectured that it was derived from *roda* (wheel) and referred to a preaching tour. Janet Shirley followed suit and translated lines 6-7 as 'They travelled all over the Agenais, even riding as far as St Bazeille'.¹¹⁷ However, my Occitan advisers have informed me that

¹¹⁵ The list of participants was probably taken from a note in which, to amplify his statement that Dominic's socius was 'souvent un cistercien', Vicair says, 'Qu'on se rappelle également son apostolat avec Guy des Vaux-de-Cernai, Foulques, l'abbé de Villelongue, Aimery de Grandselve, tous quatre cisterciens' (*Histoire*¹ I 140); he does not relate their alleged 'apostolate with Dominic' to any particular year. Fulk undoubtedly did collaborate with Dominic (cf. Pelhisson 34; Puylaurens VIII 46, X 54; MOPH XXII 9). Guy was one of the twelve abbots who took part in the Cistercian mission in 1207 (Cernai §51), so for a time he and Dominic were simultaneously engaged in the same task, though if they had actually worked together we should have expected Guy's nephew to say more about Dominic (whom he only mentions once, in Cernai §54, and he connects him with Diego, not Guy); on Vicair's own account, from 1208 onwards Guy was entirely taken up with the crusade (*Histoire*¹ I 303-304). Aimery was Dominic's friend (MOPH XXII 18), but there is no evidence that they ever undertook any apostolic work together. Vicair's claim that the abbot of Villelongue was part of the Cistercian mission and that he 'travailla avec Dominique à diverses conversions' (*Histoire*¹ I 223) seems to rest entirely on the testimony of Willelmus Auterii (quoted above) that in about 1216 the abbot reconciled a heretic whose husband had been separately reconciled by Dominic some five years earlier, which does not establish any connection between the abbot and Dominic in 1207 or 1210 or at any other time.

¹¹⁶ *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania, 1145-1229*, York 2001, 164.

¹¹⁷ *The song of the Cathar wars*, Aldershot 1996, 32. The subject of *cavalguet* is *l'abas*, so, even if *roelha* does mean 'tournée (de prédication)', it is only Arnaud whose moves are described.

this interpretation of *roelha* is very doubtful; they suggest that the word is more plausibly connected with Old French *roeille* which, because of the significance of rolling one's eyes, can mean 'anger' (cf. *Roman de la Rose* 3734, where it is combined with 'ire').

I propose the following translation:

The bishop of Toulouse, Folquet of Marseille, with whose goodness no one can compare, and the abbot of Cîteaux take counsel of each other. Every day they go and preach to the people, who do not come to their senses. The one and the other complain about lending and usury. The abbot maintained just such anger against them throughout the Agenais, so much so that he went all the way to Sainte-Bazaille.

There is no mention of Dominic or of anyone other than Fulk and Arnaud; these two are clearly presented as engaging in a concerted preaching campaign against usury, but that is all. There is nothing in the text to imply that they continued for any length of time, and, if the rest of the *laisse* is to be believed, they failed to make any impression on the populace.

The text furnishes no precise indication when this campaign occurred, but it is clear enough where it fits into the story.

On 6 Sept. 1209 the council of Avignon called for the bishops to do more preaching, and ordered measures to combat usury; it also excommunicated the people of Toulouse and, provisionally, Count Raymund of Toulouse (Cernai §138).¹¹⁸ Some time after this, the legate Milo and the bishop of Riez wrote to the pope informing him of what had been done, and putting the pope on his guard against Raymund who, they had reliably been informed, was intending to go to the Holy See (PL 216:126-128).

On 11 Nov. 1209 Innocent III wrote to the bishops of the region (PL 216:158-160) expressing his delight at Simon de Montfort's appointment to take charge of the lands which the crusaders had occupied. To further the good work thus begun, he urged each bishop to preach insistently to his subjects and exhort them to apply themselves and their goods to extirpating the remains of heresy (with the offer of a plenary indulgence to them if they did). Since those who fight 'pro fraterna defensione' ought to be shielded 'a

¹¹⁸ On this council, cf. O.Pontal, *Les conciles de la France capétienne jusqu'en 1215*, Paris 1995, 384-387.

fraternis iniuriis', the pope also said that the creditors of such fighters must be told, on pain of ecclesiastical censure, to release them from any obligation they might have contracted to pay interest (*usurae*) on their debts.

Chanson 41 mentions the capture of the French baron, Bouchard de Marly, at Cabaret, which happened in Nov. 1209 (Cernai §123). *Laisse* 42 reports Simon de Montfort's reaction and the deterioration of his position 'throughout that winter' until the following Lent; it also states that the count and consuls of Toulouse went to Rome.

Chanson 43 describes the pope's reception of Count Raymund and claims, incorrectly, that he absolved the count from all his sins. Raymund probably reached Rome around the middle of January 1210.¹¹⁹

Chanson 44 takes Count Raymund from Rome to Paris and then back to Toulouse, after which, at an unidentified abbey, he is said to have had such a friendly meeting with Simon de Montfort and Arnaud that one would have thought all conflict between them was at an end, and the last thing anyone would have expected was that Arnaud would go to Toulouse. To the astonishment of its inhabitants, however, Arnaud did go to Toulouse (*laisse* 45), and the count ceded the Château Narbonnais to him and to the bishop. The king of Aragón also had a meeting with Arnaud, though nothing came of it; this meeting seems to have taken place towards the end of April or in May.¹²⁰ Arnaud's entry into Toulouse can probably be dated to some time in March, assuming it had something to do with the city's reconciliation (that of the count came later).¹²¹

¹¹⁹ Cf. Pontal, *Conciles* 385; Griffe, *Le Languedoc cathare au temps de la croisade* 46. Innocent refers to Raymund's visit in several letters written towards the end of the month (PL 216:171-176, 183), including one to the bishop of Riez and Master Thedisius in which he bade them convoke a council to judge Raymund's case (PL 216:173).

¹²⁰ The editors of Cernai (I 153-154) suggest that the king visited the region in March-April 1210, but the Belles Lettres editor of the *Chanson* makes a good case for preferring the period between mid April and mid June (I 110-111), which also accords with the dating implied by Cernai §145, 149-150.

¹²¹ The rather vague chronology of *Chanson* 44 can be clarified with the help of the more precise narrative which the consuls and citizens addressed to the king of Aragón in 1211 (Devic-Vaissete VIII 614-616). After their excommunication at Avignon in Sept. 1209 they sent envoys to the pope who, 'post multos labores et diversa pericula redeuntes', showed the abbot of Cîteaux the letter which the pope had given them, in which he instructed the bishop of Riez, the abbot of Cîteaux and

Chanson 47, immediately after the account of the preaching campaign against usury in *laisse* 46, describes the state of constant hostility in Toulouse between the confraternities of the city and the Bourg, an hostility allegedly fostered by the bishop, the abbot of Cîteaux and the clergy to make the people of Toulouse destroy each other.¹²²

At the beginning of *Chanson* 48, 'in summer, when winter declines and mild weather and warmth return', we find Simon de Montfort getting ready to besiege Minerve. The siege seems to have started some time in June 1210.¹²³

Laisse 47 describes an ongoing situation which could have overlapped with the events of *laisse* 46, but otherwise the chronological sequence is clear and suggests that Fulk and Arnaud's

Master Thedisius to proceed without delay to Toulouse and, if the city was really prepared to make amends, grant it absolution. The letter, dated 19 Jan. 1210, is quoted in extenso. The abbot insisted on acting alone in the matter, 'contra tenorem rescripti'; considering this an act of oppression, the citizens made a new appeal to the pope, but 'procedente tempore' they were persuaded by the abbot and Bishop Fulk and others to withdraw it and allow the abbot to proceed on his own; to help fight heresy and support the church, they promised to pay £1000. The abbot professed himself satisfied and, in his presence and that of Fulk and other 'religiosi viri' of the diocese, the bishop of Uzès pronounced a solemn blessing on the citizens. However, the city found itself unable immediately to pay more than £500 and the consuls were excommunicated again. 'Perpessi aliquamdiu tam impudentem hanc iniuriam', at the request of the legates and their own bishop they swore to abide by their will and that of the pope in matters pertaining to the church, and they agreed to hand over hostages to the bishop. So from mid Lent (i.e. 28 March) some of their best men were held hostage at Pamiers (they were conditionally released on 9 Aug.). All this having been done, they were reconciled.

¹²² Puylaurens similarly describes how Fulk established a confraternity in Toulouse, with the legate's help, to facilitate his attack on heresy and usury, and to provide a way in which the citizens of Toulouse could obtain 'ista que extraneis concedebatur indulgentia'; as a result 'facta fuit magna inter cives et burgenses divisio, ita quod in Burgo adversus istam fecerunt aliam confratram ... fiebantque cum armis et vexillis frequenter et equis armatis prelia inter partes' (XV 64-66). Puylaurens places this chapter after the surrender of Carcassonne (on 15 Aug. 1209, cf. Cernai §98) and the crusaders' efforts 'ipso tempore et hyeme sequente usque ad principium estatis' to subdue the places in the vicinity which held out against them (XIV 62), and before the settlement arranged between Simon de Montfort and the king of Aragón on 27 Jan. 1211 (cf. Cernai §211) (Puylaurens XVI 66).

¹²³ According to Cernai, the siege was undertaken at the prompting of the citizens of Narbonne who proposed it to Simon de Montfort 'anno ab incarnatione domini .m.cc.x. circa festum beati Iohannis baptiste' (§151), i.e. about 24 June 1210; Minerve was taken 'circa festum beate Marie Magdalene' (§166), i.e. about 22 July, after a siege of about seven weeks (§158). These dates are obviously not quite consistent.

preaching campaign against usury should be dated to April/May 1210.¹²⁴

So what remains of Fulk's 'ministère intense auprès de ses ouailles' in 1210 with Dominic at his side, not to mention the larger cast mustered by Mousnier? Not much, I fear. All that we actually know from more or less contemporary sources is that:

- 1) in the spring of 1210 Fulk preached against usury in concert with Arnaud;
- 2) he and Arnaud also created a rather bellicose confraternity in Toulouse to combat heresy and usury;
- 3) on at least one occasion between 1206 and 1217 Beceda helped get hairshirts made for Dominic and Fulk;
- 4) at an unspecified time an unnamed bishop of Toulouse, who might well be Raymond rather than Fulk, imposed penitential crosses on two women at Le Mas who had (once) been reconciled by Dominic (probably in 1206/1207).

6. *The baptism of Simon de Montfort's daughter*

It has come to be an accepted fact that Dominic baptized Simon de Montfort's newborn daughter, Petronilla, in 1211, perhaps as early as February;¹²⁵ there is, however, no direct evidence that it is true. All that is actually attested is that by September 1211 a daughter (unnamed) had been born to Simon and his wife, Alix, in the Midi, that Simon wanted Dominic to baptize a daughter of his (unnamed) who subsequently became prioress of Saint-Antoine in Paris, and that he had a daughter called Petronilla who was entrusted to the nuns of Saint-Antoine as a child.

¹²⁴ I do not know why the Belles Lettres editor, without explanation, dates it to 'hiver 1210'; this is obviously the source of Cabau's '1209-1210 hiver'.

¹²⁵ According to Balme-Lelaidier I 239 Petronilla was born in February and Simon wanted Dominic to baptize her. In their note on Cernai §258 the editors say that the daughter referred to there, born in 1211, can be identified with Petronilla. H.C.Scheeben says that Dominic baptized Petronilla in May 1211 (*Der heilige Dominikus*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1927, 63, with note 95). W.A.Hinnebusch, *History of the Dominican Order* I, Staten Island 1965, 31, is less precise, but agrees that Petronilla was born in 1211 and baptized by Dominic. Even more vaguely L.Galmés, in the 1987 BAC *Santo Domingo*, 54, says that Dominic baptized a daughter of Simon in 1211. In *Histoire*¹ I 298 Vicairé dated Petronilla's baptism itself to February 1211, but in the revised edition he more cautiously dated her birth to February and her baptism to some time before 15 May (*Histoire*² I 294, 305).

We learn about the daughter who was born in the Midi from Cernai §258: when Simon de Montfort was being besieged at Castelnaudary in September 1211, his wife, Alix, was at Lavaur, 'filia autem quam in terra illa genuerant nutriebatur apud Montem Regalem'. No evidence is given for the assertion in Balme-Lelaidier that this daughter was born in February 1211, but we know enough about the moves of Simon and his countess to get some idea of the possibilities.

If the girl was conceived before her father left to join his fellow crusaders at Lyons towards the end of June 1209,¹²⁶ she could have been born as early as March 1210, though this would mean that Alix made the journey South in the final stages of her pregnancy.

Alix first arrived in the Midi 'circa initium quadragesime' in 1210 (Cernai §141); Ash Wednesday fell on 3 March. After her arrival it seems that Simon left her at Carcassonne for a time, then sent for her to join him at Pennautier after the capture of Minerve (*Chanson* 50) towards the end of July (Cernai §166). She then accompanied him to the siege of Termes (Cernai §181), which was captured on 22 November (Cernai §192). Simon then turned further South and West and mopped up Coustaussa and Puivert (Cernai §192), after which he headed North to recapture Castres and Lombers; by Christmas he had regained control of most of the Albigois (Cernai §193). We have no information about the countess's moves after the capture of Termes.

In January 1211 Simon had to go to Narbonne for a meeting (Cernai §195) which later adjourned to Montpellier (Cernai §211-212); he then returned home to Carcassonne (Cernai §213-214). In the latter half of March he set off again towards the North, where he accepted the capitulation of Cabaret and then besieged Lavaur (Cernai §214-215), which was captured on 3 May (Cernai §226) after a siege of over a month (*Chanson* 67.4). Since Alix was at Lavaur in May (MOPH XXV no. 10) and September (Cernai §258), we may take it that she accompanied her husband from Carcassonne in March, but stayed behind at Lavaur when he moved on, which he must have done well before the end of May.¹²⁷

Cernai does not tell us when the baby was born, only that she was being nursed at Montréal in September 1211. If the child was conceived soon after the countess's arrival in the Midi, she could

¹²⁶ Cernai §82; the month is confirmed by Robert of Auxerre, MGH SS XXVI 273.

¹²⁷ Cf. Cernai §231-237, with the editors' note 2 on §237.

have been born in December 1210, assuming a normal pregnancy. Montréal would have been on Simon's way North to Castres, so he might have left his wife to give birth there in December, or, if he left her at Carcassonne, the baby might have been entrusted to a wetnurse at Montréal. This is one possibility.

Otherwise, always assuming a normal pregnancy, the baby could have been born in or after April 1211, in which case we must assume that Alix remained at Lavaur either to have the baby or to recover from childbirth. Simon's son Amaury was also there in May (MOPH XXV no. 10), but by September he was ill at Fanjeaux (Cernai §258), so he and his party could have taken the baby to a nurse at Montréal.

From Cernai §266 we learn that the baby's godfather was William Cat: one of the people with Simon at the siege of Castelnaudary was 'miles quidam Carcassonensis de Monte Regali, Willelmus cognomine Catus, cui nobilis comes terram dederat ipsumque militem fecerat, quem etiam in tanta familiaritate habebat quod filiam ipsius comitis dictus Willelmus levaverat de sacro fonte; comes siquidem et comitissa et omnes nostri de ipso supra omnes indigenas confidebant adeo quod comes proprium suum primogenitum ipsi tradiderit aliquando ad custodiendum'. Since he changed sides in the course of the siege and went over to the enemy,¹²⁸ he cannot have acted as godfather thereafter. If we make the reasonable assumptions that Alix had not left Lavaur since May, and that William Cat was in Simon's entourage from April until September, the *terminus ante quem* for the child's baptism is Simon's departure from Lavaur in May 1211.

The editors of Cernai and the Belles Lettres editor of the *Chanson*, in their respective notes, identify this William Cat with the Guilhelms Catz who features in *Chanson* 54.9 as a leader of the raiding party which left Cabaret by night, with Pierre-Roger of Cabaret, Raimond Mir 'and all their relatives', to attack the engines of war collected outside Carcassonne in readiness for Simon's siege of Termes. He was presumably one of the people who had fled from the Carcassonne region in 1209 and sought refuge with Pierre-Roger at Cabaret (cf. Cernai §214).¹²⁹ If he is indeed the same as the god-

¹²⁸ His treachery is also reported by Puylaurens, as is the fact that he was linked to Simon by *compaternitas* (XVII 74).

¹²⁹ Like Pierre-Roger, some members of the Cat family were definitely implicated in heresy: cf. É.Griffe, *Le Languedoc cathare de 1190 à 1210* 174; id., *Le Languedoc cathare et l'inquisition*, Paris 1980, 113-114; Duvernoy's note on Puylaurens XVIII 75.

father of Simon's daughter, he must have made his submission to Simon later in 1210 or more probably, as the editor of the *Chanson* suggests, in 1211 when Cabaret itself was surrendered, shortly before the siege of Lavaur (cf. Cernai §214, *Chanson* 64-66).

It is, however, unlikely that someone who was leading an attack on Simon in the summer of 1210 had become the Montforts' favourite native (*indigena*) and trusted friend only a year later; what is more, the William of the *Chanson* was evidently the head of his family contingent, worthy to be named with the lord of Cabaret, whereas Cernai's William was made a knight (*miles*) by Simon and must have been a relatively junior member of the family. All considered, we may accept that the two Williams were related to each other, but we should not treat them as identical; Cernai's William probably broke ranks with his family and became the invader's protégé when Simon swept into the region. We may agree with Griffe, then, that he joined Simon in 1209 (*Le Languedoc cathare et l'inquisition* 113), in which case his rôle as godfather sheds no light on the question when Simon's daughter was born or baptized.

The evidence that Simon wanted Dominic to baptize one of his daughters comes in a long section of Humbert's *cronica ordinis* devoted to the Montforts and their links with Dominic and the Dominicans (cf. MOPH I 322): Simon and Dominic became so *familiares* 'quod uoluit comes quod ipse beatus Dominicus benedictionem faceret in nuptiis uxoris filii sui ... et filiam quandam suam baptizaret, que usque hodie uiuens et priorissa apud sanctum Antonium Parisius religiosissima et magne sanctitatis habetur'. Humbert goes on to describe the foundation of the monastery of Montargis by another of Simon's daughters, Amicie, in which he himself must have been involved as provincial of France (cf. Creytens, AFP 17 [1947] 56).

All that we learn from this is that, at the time of writing (1260), a daughter of Simon's was prioress of the Cistercian nuns of Saint-Antoine in Paris, and that it had been Simon's wish that she should be baptized by Dominic. Humbert tells us neither the name of the daughter nor the date of her baptism; it may or may not be significant that the baptism is mentioned after Amaury's wedding which took place in June 1214 (Cernai §511).

These two pieces of information, derived from Cernai and Humbert's *cronica*, were combined by Malvenda, who noted the birth of Simon's daughter in 1211 and added, 'Hanc autem a

S.Dominico baptizatam dicemus anno 1213' (*Annales* 99).¹³⁰ In his wake, Rechac declared boldly that it was in 1211 that Dominic 'bat-tisa la fille de Simon Comte Mont-fort, laquelle fut depuis grande Religieuse & Superieure du Monastere de saint Antoine' (*Vie de S.Dominique* 187). Souèges took the further step of identifying this daughter with the one who was engaged to the infante of Aragón in 1211,¹³¹ and in this he was followed by Badetti (Mamachi, *Annales* 281). Touron and Pollidori went even further and, despite the evidence of Humbert's *cronica*, named the girl as Amicie, though they misrepresented her name as 'Anicia'.¹³²

The modern story, identifying her as Petronilla, was launched in Balme-Lelaidier I 239; the name was taken from a document in which Simon's widow, Alix, entrusted her daughter Petronilla to the Cistercian nuns of Saint-Antoine, with the stipulation that she could, if she wanted, become a nun there when she reached the age of twelve.¹³³ It has since been generally taken for granted that the prioress of the *cronica* can be identified with Petronilla, and Petronilla is certainly the only daughter of Simon who is known to have had any connection with Saint-Antoine.¹³⁴

¹³⁰ This means, not that the baptism occurred in 1213, but that Malvenda will deal with it under the year 1213. It is actually under 1214 that he quotes Dietrich of Apolda (§55) and Humbert's *cronica* on the wedding of Simon's son and the baptism of his daughter (*Annales* 114-115).

¹³¹ T.Souèges, *Année Dominicaine* Aoust I, Amiens 1693, 206.

¹³² A.Touron, *La vie de saint Dominique*, Paris 1739, 172; F.M.Pollidori, *Vita di S. Domenico*, Rome 1777, 33.

¹³³ The document is now Paris. Centre historique des archives nationales S 4373 no. 18 (from which I quote it); it was edited (not quite accurately) in A.Rhein, *La seigneurie de Montfort en Iveline depuis son origine jusqu'à son union au duché de Bretagne*, Versailles 1910, 322. In her article on Alix, Monique Zerner makes great play of rather scant evidence to suggest a close link between the Montforts, Saint-Antoine, and Saint-Antoine's founder, Foulques of Neuilly ('L'épouse de Simon de Montfort et la croisade albigeoise', in *Femmes: Mariages - Lignages. XII^e - XIV^e siècles. Mélanges offerts à Georges Duby*, Brussels 1992, esp. 466-468); she overlooks an anecdote reported by Stephen of Bourbon which provides evidence of a connection between Alix and Saint-Antoine in about 1220 (A.Lecoy de la Marche, ed., *Anecdotes historiques ... tirés du recueil inédit d'Étienne de Bourbon*, Paris 1877, §288).

¹³⁴ The only difficulty in the way of this identification is a sentence in Aubri of Trois-Fontaines: under the year 1237, having noted an attempt to get Simon de Montfort junior married to the countess of Flanders and his actual marriage to the sister of King Henry III, he adds, 'Soror eiusdem Symonis vocabatur Petronilla' (MGH SS XXIII 940-941). It is not clear why he mentions Petronilla at all, but, granted that he does, it is odd that he says nothing about her being a nun of Saint-Antoine, since he was himself a Cistercian.

However, the identification of Petronilla with the girl mentioned by Cernai raises chronological difficulties. On 19 Feb. '1221' Alix entrusted Petronilla to the nuns of Saint-Antoine in the following terms:

Nouerint uniuersi presentes litteras inspecturi quod nos A. domina Montisfortis uolumus et disponimus quod filia nostra Petronilla nutriatur in domo Sancti Antonii Parisien(s) quoadusque duodecimum etatis annum compleuerit, et pro uictu illius recipiat eadem domus singulis annis decem libras parisiensium in terra nostra de Monteforti. Postquam autem dicta Petronilla duodecimum etatis annum compleuerit, si uoluerit fieri monialis in eadem domo, concedimus et gratum habemus. Et uolumus atque disponimus quatinus dicte domui Sancti Antonii assignentur in puram et perpetuam elemosinam uiginti libre parisien(sium) percipiende singulis annis in terra nostra de Monteforti. Quod ut ratum habeatur sigilli nostri munimine roboramus. Actum anno Domini .m°.cc°.° vicesimo primo, vndecimo kal. marcii.

Rhein interpreted the date as meaning 19 Feb. 1222, which is what we should expect since the *stylus paschatis* was generally used in Paris. Assuming this to be correct, Petronilla would already have been actually or nearly eleven years old if she was born between Dec. 1210 and May 1211; this scarcely leaves room for an *annual* payment (*singulis annis*) of ten Parisian pounds for her upkeep until her twelfth birthday.

Zerner saw the difficulty: taking it as a known fact that Petronilla was born 'dans la première moitié de l'année 1211', she proposed that the date should be interpreted as meaning 1221 modern style (art. cit. 466) precisely to make sense of *singulis annis*. However, it is *not* a known fact that Petronilla was born in 1211, it is merely a conjecture; rather than reinterpreting the date, we should question whether it was Petronilla who was born in 1211.

Of the known daughters of Simon, the one who can most easily be connected with Cernai's story is actually Amicie, the future countess of Joigny, assuming her to be the 'A.' who was betrothed to the king of Aragón's son on 27 Jan. 1211 (Cernai §211, with the editors' note). If she was born in Dec., perhaps even March, 1210, she would have been admirably suited to a fiancé who was, at the time, just under three years old (Puylaurens XI 56, with the editor's note); but we have no reason to suppose that she was baptized by Dominic.¹³⁵

¹³⁵ If she had been, Humbert would probably have known about it, in which case he would certainly have mentioned it in his *cronica*.

Petronilla may be the prioress of Saint-Antoine who had been baptized by Dominic; if so, she could have been born any time before Dominic's departure from Languedoc at the end of 1217, and we can accept the implication of Humbert's *cronica* that her baptism occurred later than her brother's wedding in 1214. She sheds no light whatsoever on Dominic's moves in 1211.

7. *Dominic's rejected bishoprics*

One final clue remains to be considered: the bishoprics which Dominic refused to accept in the South of France.

Our richest source of information on the subject is the testimony of John of Navarre (ACB §28), but unfortunately the textual problems are more complicated than I realized in 1996 (cf. AFP 66 [1996] 64-66).

According to the whole manuscript tradition of the combined canonization processes, John testified that Dominic refused 'two or three' bishoprics (ACB §28) before he himself entered the order, i.e. before 28 August 1215 (ACB §25):¹³⁶

Bis uel ter electus fuit in episcopum et ipse semper renuit, uolens potius cum fratribus suis in paupertate uiuere quam aliquem episcopatum habere. Interrogatus quomodo scit hoc respondit quia non solum de hoc communis fama erat tunc temporis inter fratres, sed etiam apud omnes alios, laicos et clericos. Interrogatus ad quos episcopatus fuit electus respondit ad Biterensem et Conuenarum. Interrogatus quando hoc fuit respondit antequam intraret ordinem predicatorum.

However, the two witnesses who give us access to the original text of ACB before it was edited into the combined processes, Dietrich of Apolda and J.A.Flaminius,¹³⁷ persistently say that he was elected three times (*ter*), not 'two or three times'.

¹³⁶ We should not rely too much on what John says about Dominic's refusal of three bishoprics being the common talk of the brethren and everybody else; as we shall see, ACL shows that quite a lot of people knew about his refusal of *one* bishopric, but John alone mentions three. In much the same way John presents Dominic's conversations with different people about his plan to disperse the brethren as if they all happened at once, and he gives the impression that he knew what Dominic said to all of them (ACB §26), neither of which can be literally true (cf. AFP 69 [1999] 15-16).

¹³⁷ Cf. AFP 66 (1996) 59-62. From what Flaminius says about the layout of the manuscript he was using (*Vitae patrum inclyti ordinis Praedicatorum*, Bologna

Dietrich includes 'Pater noster, contemptor mundi, electus in episcopum ter renuit' in his curt résumé of John's testimony, without naming any sees (Dietrich §307).¹³⁸ Elsewhere he gives a fuller quotation: 'Contigit ergo ut a collegiis trium cathedralium ecclesiarum episcopalis dignitas eidem offerretur, ipse uero malens humiliari cum mitibus paupertatem Christi preposuit sedibus et regnis, ideoque et Byterensis et Conuararensis et Cozeranensis ecclesiarum infulas recusauit, nec cathedras acceptauit' (§49); but most manuscripts do not have *et Cozeranensis*, and it looks as if Dietrich began with a text which only named Béziers and Comminges, and then edited Couserans into it from Constantine §62, which is unmistakably the source of Diet. §221 where Couserans alone is mentioned.¹³⁹ In §49 Dietrich was not aiming at concision; if he could at first only name two sees, he would have had no reason to state categorically that Dominic was elected by *three* cathedral chapters if his source gave him the option of saying 'two or three'.

In his humanist 'translation' of ACB, Flaminus makes John say 'Ter quarundam Ciuitatum delectus est episcopus', but he omits the names of these *ciuitates* (f.72^v);¹⁴⁰ the omission would be intelligible

1529, f.69^v), it was almost certainly the original manuscript in which the notary recorded the witnesses' depositions day by day; it had presumably been left with the Dominicans in Bologna when the complete process was assembled and sent to the pope.

¹³⁸ *Ter* was erased in the Bollandists' manuscript, Brussels, Bibl. Roy. 7825 f.25^r, so it is missing in the text published in *Acta Sanctorum*.

¹³⁹ The manuscript tradition of Dietrich's *Libellus* is extraordinarily complicated and we cannot go into it in detail here. *Et Cozeranensis* is found in two Leipzig manuscripts (Leipzig 846 and 833) which represent a distinct edition which there is no reason not to attribute to Dietrich himself. The material on which it was based is found in a less orderly arrangement in several manuscripts, including the one used by the Bollandists (Brussels 7825), but these do not contain *et Cozeranensis*, and it was on the basis of them that Dietrich produced his own later editions, so *et Cozeranensis* does not appear in them either. This suggests that *et Cozeranensis* was not in Dietrich's primitive text, which implies that it did not come from the primary source he was using at this point (ACB §25). *Et Conseranensis* or *et Coseranensis* re-appears in a group of three manuscripts characterized by interpolations made in the South of France (Toulouse 485, Madrid Bibl. Complut. 147, Salamanca 65), quite possibly derived from Bernard Gui's annotations (cf. MOPH XXVII 45-46); Gui knew about Dominic's refusal to become bishop of Couserans independently of Dietrich (MOPH XXII 118; cf. MOPH XXVII 54), so *et Conseranensis* should probably be regarded as an interpolation in these manuscripts. *Et Siceranensis*, avowedly inserted into the Bollandist text from a manuscript other than Brussels 7825, is found only in Paris, BNF Res. D.1740.

¹⁴⁰ Elsewhere, in connection with Dominic's reputation, Flaminus says 'Hac impulsa sunt fama trium cathedralium ecclesiarum Collegia, ut illum sibi Episcopum

if there was a discrepancy in the text between the number of times Dominic was said to have been elected and the number of sees actually mentioned.

All told, it seems to me probable that the original text of John's deposition said that Dominic 'ter electus fuit in episcopum', and that *bis uel ter* was substituted in the combined edition because only two sees were named, Béziers and Comminges.

Dominic's election at Couserans evidently caused some excitement in Toulouse. Abbot Pons of Boulbonne, former archdeacon of Toulouse, expatiates on it at length (ACL §3):¹⁴¹

Dominus P. abbas Bolbonensis ordinis Cisterciensis iuratus dixit quod ipse erat archidiaconus Tholosanus et in eadem ciuitate audiuit a domino Fulcone bone memorie, tunc Tholosano episcopo, et ab ipso beato Dominico et etiam a multis aliis quod archiepiscopus Auxitanus presentauit predicto beato Dominico episcopatum Coseranensem, qui ad eius curam pertinebat, et ipse noluit recipere. Ad cuius instantiam opposuit excusationem de nouella plantatione predicatorum et sanc-timonialium de Pruliano, que ad ipsum spectabant. Et credit quod electio eius esset canonica et concors.

What Pons says about clerical gossip in Toulouse and the *nouella plantatio predicatorum* shows that Dominic's refusal of Couserans occurred after the clergy had returned to the city and after the establishment of his preaching institute there, i.e. towards the end of 1214 at the earliest. This means that he must have been elected to succeed the papal legate, Bishop Navarre, whose date of death is unknown but he is last heard of as one of the episcopal advisers to Simon de Montfort at Pamiers in November 1212 (Devic-Vaissete VIII 626).¹⁴²

deligerent', again without naming names (f.9^v); but this was ultimately inspired by Diet. §49: there was a paraphrase of Diet. §49 (without the names of any sees) in the 1494 Venice Dominican breviary f.335^v, and this was quoted in Taegio's *Chronicae ampliores* (Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1894 f.9^v, AGOP XIV 51 ff.3^v-4^r), which may well have been Flaminius's immediate source (cf. *Mediaeval Studies* 47 [1985] 64).

¹⁴¹ It was also mentioned by B.Clareti of Boulbonne, who said that 'audiuit eum electum fuisse episcopum Coseranensem' (ACL §5), and by the abbot of St Paul's Narbonne ('dixit quod respuit episcopatum Coseranensem nec uoluit preesse illi ecclesie, licet in pastorem et prelatum esset electus', ACL §18).

¹⁴² His successor is first attested shortly before Christmas 1216 (*Gallia Christiana* I 1130 and 'Documenta' 185-186).

The metropolitan who offered Couserans to Dominic can scarcely be other than Garsias, formerly bishop of Comminges, a supporter of Simon de Montfort, whom he and Bishop Navarre invited to extend his control into Gascony in 1212 (Cernai §358). The previous archbishop was accused of nearly every crime in the book, and Innocent urged him to resign on 15 April 1211 (PL 216:408-409), but he apparently took no notice even after he was excommunicated by the papal legates; the pope took a stronger line on 21 May 1213 when he bade the archbishop of Bordeaux, the bishop of Agen and the abbot of Clairac give him one last chance to clear himself, with the proviso that, if he failed to do so, they were to depose him and see to the appointment of a suitable successor (PL 216:789-790). The archbishop who took part in the council of Montpellier in January 1215 (Cernai §543) was presumably the suitable successor, Garsias.

All this suggests that Dominic's election to Couserans occurred between mid 1214 and mid 1215.

If it was the talk of the town in Toulouse, it is difficult to believe that John of Navarre, who joined Dominic's *predicatio* towards the end of August 1215, did not hear of it. If, as I have argued, he testified in 1233 that Dominic was elected to three bishoprics, he obviously had heard of it, and had presumably forgotten, or had perhaps never grasped, exactly where Dominic was elected on this occasion.¹⁴³

Constantine reports a 'bon mot' in connection with Dominic's refusal to accept his election at Couserans: 'Proinde electus aliquando in Cozeranensem episcopum omnino renuit, contestans se prius terram deserere quam electioni alicui de se facte aliquatenus consentiret, illius nimirum imitatus exemplum qui, cum eum ut regem facerent turbe conquirerent, in montem fugiens manifeste quam sit prelationis officium appetendum ostendit' (§62).

¹⁴³ In as much as John was one of Jordan's main sources of information when he was compiling the initial nucleus of the *Libellus* in Paris in 1218/1219 (AFP 68 [1998] 21, 23, 28, 61-63), his inability to say precisely what had happened may explain why Jordan says that Dominic was held in such esteem that 'ab archiepiscopis et episcopis aliisque prelatibus illarum partium multo dignus haberetur honore' (*Lib.* §36) without mentioning his election to any bishoprics; cf. his reason for excluding most of what he had heard about Dominic's miracles: 'plura quidem audiuiimus; sed ob diuersitatem narrantium scripto mandata non sunt, ne forte dum res gesta ordine describeretur incerto incertum generaret legentibus intellectum' (*Lib.* §99). It is quite possible that John himself only learned of Dominic's refusal of two other bishoprics too late to say anything about them to Jordan.

The source of the 'bon mot' is ACL §25, among the items which some female witnesses at Montréal added to the standard *capitula*:

R. et Zensana¹⁴⁴ dixerunt quod audierunt a beato Dominico¹⁴⁵ quod ante fugeret de nocte cum baculo suo quam acciperet episcopatum uel aliam dignitatem.

Among the male witnesses at Montréal, Mark the deacon testified that Dominic 'episcopatum respuit' (ACL §22).

Dominic's response here is different from and scarcely compatible with the reply he is said to have made to the archbishop of Auch: the reason he gave for not becoming a bishop in 1214/1215 would also have been a reason for not running away by night. The connection made by Constantine, or his informants, between Dominic's 'bon mot' and the Couserans election is plainly wrong.

The election to which the Montréal witnesses allude must have occurred earlier, when Dominic did not yet have responsibilities which tied him to the region, and it could well be the one mentioned by one of the Prouille witnesses (ACL §21):¹⁴⁶

Frater R. Corda dixit idem quod suprapositus, audiuit autem de uirginitate ipsius a domino Fulcone Tholosano episcopo, a fratre B. Amamino, a fratre I. de Calaroga, et etiam quod respuit episcopatum Biterrensem, et quod uidit quendam liberatum a demone per beatum Dominicum.

Béziers was the scene of one of Diego's earliest encounters with the heretics in 1206 (Cernai §24), so Dominic could have been viewed with favour in any of the numerous elections which took place there during his time in Languedoc; however, there is no sign that any outside candidates were considered in 1208/1209 or

¹⁴⁴ The name appears in the manuscripts as *Çensana*, *Censana*, *Zonzamias*, *Zonzana*, *Zonzanna*, or *Zozannas*.

¹⁴⁵ The manuscripts of the combined processes have *ab eo*.

¹⁴⁶ The syntax is not entirely clear: *et etiam quod* could be construed with *audiuit*, in which case Dominic's refusal of the bishopric of Béziers would be something which frater R. had heard about, though in that case it is unclear from whom he had heard it; it is much more likely, though, that *quod respuit* should be construed directly with *dixit*, as *quod uidit* must be, in which case the rejected bishopric is something frater R. knew about for himself. The Borselli paraphrase drops *de uirginitate ipsius*, which makes the syntax unambiguous, but probably gives the wrong sense: 'Dixit quod audiuit a domino Fulcone episcopo Tholosano et a fratre Dorotheo Aniano, a fratre Iuliano de Calaroga, quod respuit episcopatum Biterrensem'.

1211/1212 when Renaud de Montpeyroux and Pierre d'Aigrefueille were elected, both of them local canons (*Gallia Christiana* VI 326-331), and if Dominic won either of the two elections held in the first half of 1215¹⁴⁷ this would surely have been talked about in Toulouse, in which case it would be strange that Abbot Pons, who was archdeacon of Toulouse at the time, knew only of Dominic's election to Couserans (ACL §3).

The occasion on which the electors in Béziers are most likely to have chosen Dominic was in Dec. 1212, when the election was held under the eye of the crusaders and their own metropolitan; and Dominic would have been free to 'run away by night'.¹⁴⁸

In November 1212 Simon de Montfort summoned a meeting of lay and ecclesiastical dignitaries at Pamiers to draft a set of regulations for the lands he had conquered (Cernai §362-364); among those present was Bishop Guy of Carcassonne (Devic-Vaissete VIII 626). Whether Dominic was there or not, he seems to have been on Simon's mind, since, before leaving Pamiers, Simon made a gift to Prouille (1 Dec., MOPH XXV no. 38). From Pamiers, Simon and his party went to Carcassonne; on the way, one of his old colleagues from the fourth crusade, Enguerrand of Boves, who had joined him in the Midi, also made a gift to Prouille (5 Dec., MOPH XXV no. 39).¹⁴⁹ From Carcassonne, Simon went on to Béziers to confer with Arnaud, archbishop of Narbonne, 'super hiis que spectabant ad negotium Ihesu Christi'; since Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernai was present, we may presume that his uncle, the bishop of Carcassonne, was also there (Cernai §366). By the time he departed for 'France' after the council held at Lavaur in January 1213,¹⁵⁰ Bishop Guy had appointed Dominic his vicar *in spiritibus* (Const. §55).

¹⁴⁷ M.H. Laurent says that Raimond le Noir died on 20 Aug. 1215 (DHGE VIII 1356), but this must be a lapsus calami for 20 April (cf. the evidence cited in *Gallia Christiana* VI 331).

¹⁴⁸ Dominic's only title on 20 June 1211 was 'predicator' (MOPH XXV no. 11); it is not absolutely clear how or when he became 'predicationis humilis minister', as he styled himself in 1214/1215 (MOPH XXV no. 61), but the title is at any rate unlikely to have had any official significance before 1214 (cf. below, VIII 2). He was responsible for Prouille by 1212, as we have seen, but only on behalf of the bishop, who could surely find someone to replace him; in 1215, by contrast, he was almost certainly responsible for Prouille as part of the *nouella plantatio predicatorum*.

¹⁴⁹ Enguerrand was one of the leaders of the fourth crusade who supported Simon in opposing its diversion to Constantinople; cf. Queller, *The fourth crusade* 63; J. Godfrey, *The unholy crusade*, Oxford 1980, 85.

¹⁵⁰ He was in Paris by 3 March (Cernai §418).

It was while Simon, Archbishop Arnaud and Bishop Guy were at Béziers that the canons elected one of the most enthusiastic clerical participants in the crusade, William, archdeacon of Paris.¹⁵¹ If, as it seems reasonable to suppose, they were trying to find a bishop who would be acceptable to the new régime, Dominic would be as suitable as Archdeacon William. When William refused, was Dominic their next choice (or vice versa)?

Even if Dominic did not talk about it, news of his election would surely have reached Carcassonne before long, thanks to Bishop Guy and Simon de Montfort; it would not be surprising if Dominic's friends in Montréal were soon quizzing him about it. No 'frater R. Corda' is known, but *Corda* is only preserved in one manuscript¹⁵² and it should perhaps be emended to *Garda*, since there was a Raimundus Garda at Prouille in 1223 and in 1235 (Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 45 no. 293, 79 nos. 335-336), and he is probably identical with the Raimundus Garda who witnessed a gift to Prouille in 1212 or 1209 before he became a religious (cf. *infra* 111), in which case he could easily have heard of Dominic's election to Béziers if it occurred in Dec. 1212.

It was probably in Dec. 1212, then, that Dominic was elected to the see of Béziers and declared that he would rather run away by night than accept.¹⁵³

If it is correct to attach Dominic's 'bon mot' to the Béziers election, then we have good information that he was in the region at the time, as he was when he was elected to Couserans. We know nothing about the Comminges election, which is mentioned solely by John of Navarre, except that Dominic refused to accept it, which he could have done wherever he was.

There was obviously a vacancy at Comminges when Garsias was translated to Auch; but if Dominic was elected to succeed him it would have been up to Garsias to confirm the election. If Comminges and Couserans both elected Dominic at much the same time

¹⁵¹ Cernai §366; on William, cf. §175.

¹⁵² The Modena manuscript contains a fuller text of ACL than any other, but it is not good at names.

¹⁵³ Malvenda similarly suggested that Dominic was elected at Béziers in 1212 (*Annales* 104), and some authors followed suit: e.g. Percin, *Monumenta conv. Tolosani* I 10; *Gallia Christiana* VI 329; A.Villemagne, *DHGE* VIII 1041. Badetti complained that no evidence had been adduced to support this theory (*Mamachi, Annales* 294); I hope I have at least made a plausible case.

and Garsias decided in favour of Couserans, then Dominic would have had no chance to reject both sees; if Garsias offered him Comminges and Couserans one after the other, why was it only remembered that he offered him Couserans? If John's testimony is accurate, it is more likely that Dominic was elected at Comminges in 1206/1207 or in 1209/1210.¹⁵⁴

Shortly after he became pope, Innocent III wrote to the archbishop of Auch bidding him take firm measures against heresy, 'quoniam pestis huiusmodi erroris, sicut ex tua et plurium assertione cognovimus, in partibus Vasconie ac circumpositis terris fortius invalescit' (*Register Innocenz' III* I 119); but Auch was not included among the provinces in which the legates were told to act against heresy in 1204 (though they were given faculties to operate in neighbouring dioceses too) (*ibid.* VII 125, MOPH XXV no. 3), and Gascony does not seem to have been much affected by Catharism or Waldensianism.¹⁵⁵ We may therefore wonder how Dominic came to be as well known in the diocese of Couserans as his 'canonica et concors' election and the testimony of Beceda imply (ACL §3, 17), and the diocese of Comminges was even further removed from the field of his apostolic labours.

One way in which Dominic could have become known to the clergy of Comminges was if he broke the journey there between Languedoc and Osma — Saint-Bertrand de Comminges was on a recognized pilgrim route to Compostela (CdF 15 [1980] 99-101). Dominic could have passed through Saint-Bertrand when he accompanied Diego on his two embassies to the North (Jordan, *Lib.* §14-16), and he probably returned to Spain with Diego after their first participation in the mission against heresy in 1206, in which case they could have stayed at Saint-Bertrand on their way to Spain and on their way back to Languedoc later in the year;¹⁵⁶ and, of course, if he went back to Osma when he heard of Diego's death in 1208, that would have given him an occasion to stay there without being overshadowed by his bishop.

¹⁵⁴ Bishop Speragus is attested in 1205 and in April 1206, and Bishop Adhémar in 1207 and 1209; the see was vacant in May and June 1210, and Garsias is attested as 'electus' later in the same year (*Gallia Christiana* I 1097; HC I 207; DHGE XIII 396).

¹⁵⁵ M.Lambert, *The Cathars*, Oxford 1998, 71; K.V.Selge, *Die ersten Waldenser*, Berlin 1967, map at the end of vol. I. Evidently Innocent III did not at first know 'la zone exacte d'extension' of heresy in the Midi (G.Paloc, in CdF 38 [2003] 363).

¹⁵⁶ Diego was back in Castile by 29 April and returned to the Midi some time after 3 July 1206 (González, docs. 783, 790).

Whatever we make of it, Dominic's election at Comminges sheds little light on our immediate question, since we can only guess how he came to be considered a potential bishop there, and we have no information about where he was when he was elected.

Conclusions

Having looked at all the evidence which might have corroborated Jordan's assertion that Dominic remained in Languedoc from 1208 until 1215, we may draw the following conclusions:

- 1) Since Jordan's comparable statement about the continuity of Diego's time in Languedoc is demonstrably false, what he says about Dominic's time there cannot be treated as reliable on its own.
- 2) In spite of attempts to show otherwise, there is no evidence which proves that Dominic was in Languedoc between the beginning of 1208 and June 1211.
- 3) Such evidence as there is about Prouille during this period makes most sense on the assumption that, after Diego's death, Dominic was not available to take charge there until the latter part of 1211.
- 4) There is some reason to believe that Dominic was living at Osma for a while after Menendo became bishop there.
- 5) The period for which there is no evidence of Dominic's presence in Languedoc coincides fairly exactly with the period during which there was no confirmed bishop in Osma who could authorize him to work outside the diocese.
- 6) There is therefore a strong presumption that Dominic returned to Osma when he heard of Diego's death and that he was sent back to Languedoc, or given permission to go back there, around the middle of 1211.

VIII: SOME POINTS OF CHRONOLOGY, 1206-1215

1. *Diego's involvement in Languedoc*

All the major sources on events in Languedoc in the early years of the thirteenth century report the bishop of Osma's involvement in the campaign against heresy, but none of them gives us anything like a complete picture. From the thirteenth century onwards historians tried to impose some sort of pattern on the inadequate information which was available to them.¹ In 1938 and 1953 Vicaire took valuable steps towards establishing a chronology on the basis of a sober evaluation of the major sources,² and in 1978 Gallén greatly increased the stock of reliable dates by bringing into the discussion the acts of Castilian royal councils which furnish a number of precise indications when Diego was present in the kingdom (Gallén, 'Les voyages ...'); but, if we are to make sense of the disparate material at our disposal, we must pay more attention than has usually been given to the actual stories related by our narrative sources and to the nature and limits of the information on which their authors could draw.

Diego attended royal councils on 25 Sept., 25 Oct., 7 Nov. and 30 Nov. 1207 (González docs. 810-815); there was no bishop of Osma in attendance between 31 Jan. and 29 May 1208, and on 23 Sept. Diego's successor was there as 'electus' of Osma. This gives credence to Diego's reported epitaph according to which he died on 30 Dec. 1207 (cf. Vicaire, AFP 23 [1953] 344). He must, then, have left Languedoc, never to return, in time to be at S.Esteban on 25 Sept.

The most intensive phase of the campaign against heresy began with the arrival of twelve Cistercian abbots with some of their monks. One of them was Guy (Cernai §51), uncle of the

¹ Cf. below, Appendix II.

² P.Mandonnet - M.H.Vicaire, *Saint Dominique*, Paris 1938, esp. I 83-88; M.H.Vicaire, 'Saint Dominique en 1207', AFP 23 (1953) 335-345.

chronicler Pierre des Vaux-de-Cernai (Cernai §300) who may therefore be presumed to have had good information on the subject. Pierre does not provide a precise date for their arrival, but he says that it occurred after the debate at Montréal, while 'our preachers' were still in the neighbourhood (§47); he reports the debate itself in §26, and it was evidently a major one since 'convenērunt omnes heresiarche' to debate against Diego and the legate Raoul,³ and the legate Peter of Castelnau came to Montréal specially for it.

According to Guillaume de Puylaurens (IX 50-52) the debate at Montréal in 1207 was the most important of the whole campaign;⁴ two papal legates, Peter of Castelnau and Raoul, were there, but the bishop of Osma played a leading part on the Catholic side, opposed by a number of prominent Cathars such as Guilabert of Castres.⁵ Puylaurens used the *stylus incarnationis*, so his date should mean that the debate took place after 25 March.⁶

Robert of Auxerre, whose chronicle runs up to 1211, the year of his death (MGH SS XXVI 219-221), had limited information about the Languedoc mission against heresy, but he seems to have obtained it, directly or indirectly, from a participant in the abbots' campaign. Under the year 1207 he notes the spread of heresy, espe-

³ 'Adversus viros sepius memoratos', in the context, can only refer to them: according to Cernai's narrative, Diego and Raoul and Peter of Castelnau set off from Montpellier to preach and debate with heretics, but Peter was advised to leave them for his own safety and did not rejoin them until they all met at Montréal (§20-24, 26).

⁴ 'Inter plurimas disputationes quas in diversis locis habuere cum hereticis, una fuit sollemnior ...'. This does not just mean, as Duvernoy translates it, 'l'une des plus solennelles', it means 'there was one which was particularly *sollemnis*', i.e. it was the most important of them all.

⁵ Puylaurens's story of these years is dominated by Fulk, whom he evidently knew well (cf. VII 44 'ut ipsum sepe dicentem audivi') and who is explicitly cited as a source of information on another episode involving Diego (VIII 48); it is more than likely that he had heard Fulk speak about the Montréal debate, but he also sought information from Bernard of Villeneuve who was one of the judges at it. His report, though far from contemporary, may be considered reliable.

⁶ The first time Puylaurens has occasion to give a date (II 28) he explicitly says 'ab anno dominice incarnationis'. He reports that Fulk entered Toulouse to take up his bishopric on the feast of St Agatha '1205' which was also sexagesima (VII 44); this can only refer to 5 Feb. 1206. I do not know why Vicaire (*Histoire* I 217) and J.Gallén ('Les voyages ...' 81-82) claim that he 'suit le style de Pâques', which would mean that 1207 did not begin until 22 April.

cially in and around the territory of the Count of Toulouse (MGH SS XXVI 271). He goes on:

Quocirca de consilio domini pape Cisterciensis abbas aliique abbates circiter 13 delegantur eiusdem ordinis viri probabiles, omnes et sapientia et facundia preinstructi, parati ad satisfactionem omni poscenti rationem de fide, et pro fide etiam animas ponere non verentes. Egressi igitur de Cistercio mense marcio numero circiter 30 per Ararim labuntur in Rodanum modicis expensis, equitaturis nullis, ut per omnia viros evangelicos se probarent. Ingressi denique quo tendebant, bini vel terni ab invicem divisi, partes illas perambulant, et hostes fidei sane doctrine spiculis appetentes ...

'Mense marcio' could mean any time in March;⁷ granted the length of the journey and the fact that they were travelling 'equitaturis nullis', we may infer that the Cistercians reached their destination some time in April. Their systematic deployment is confirmed by Cernai §47.

We know from MOPH XXV no. 5 that Dominic was at Carcassonne on 17 April 1207 and that the archbishop of Narbonne was in the house of the bishop of Carcassonne at the time; if, as I believe (cf. Appendix I), there is a genuine document underlying MOPH XXV App. II 2, Dominic was at Fanjeaux on 27 April, and so was Bishop Fulk.

Montréal is near the point of convergence between the archdiocese of Narbonne and the dioceses of Carcassonne and Toulouse. The debate there was obviously a well-planned affair, and Cernai's narrative implies that it was also the rendez-vous agreed with the Cistercians, which suggests that the debate was meant to lead straight into the Cistercians' mission; it cannot be a coincidence that,

⁷ Scheeben asserted that 'Robert datiert nach dem Osterstil'; since Easter fell on 22 April in 1207, this should mean that the Cistercians set off in March 1208, but Scheeben considered it more likely that Robert was mistaken about the month (AFP 9 [1939] 252-253). Vicaire accepted Scheeben's premiss, but suggested that Robert was dealing with events which essentially occurred after 22 April 1207 and did not bother to specify that his reference to March actually meant, on his reckoning, March 1206 (AFP 23 [1953] 338 n.22). In fact, Robert's year began at Christmas or on 1 Jan. For example, he dates the third Lateran council 'anno domini 1179 post medium quadragesimae' (MGH SS XXVI 241); mid Lent fell on 11 March 1179, and the three full sessions of the council were held on 5, 14 and 19 March (R.Foreville, *Latran I, II, III et Latran IV*, Paris 1965, 136; J.Alberigo et al., *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta*, Bologna 1973, 205-206), all of which would have been in '1178' if Robert had been using the *stylus paschatis* or the *stylus incarnationis*. We may take it, then, that his understanding of 'March 1207' was no different from ours.

at just the time suggested for their arrival by Robert of Auxerre, we have evidence that the bishops of the region were all in the vicinity. It would certainly have made sense for the Cistercians to plan their campaign in consultation with them.

All told, we have good reason to believe that the Montréal debate (which lasted two weeks according to Cernai §26) straddled the end of March and the beginning of April, and that the Cistercian team arrived shortly afterwards, probably so that the mission could begin in earnest immediately after Easter (22 April). This means that Diego fitted it in between royal councils on 16 March and 3 May (he missed one on 29 April) (González docs. 799-801).

Robert describes the Cistercians as setting off 'modicis expensis, equitaturis nullis, ut per omnia viros evangelicos se probarent'; according to Cernai §47 this was 'secundum quod audierant de episcopo Oxomense', which must refer to the advice Diego is said to have given the legates when they met by chance at Montpellier while he was returning from Rome to Osma (Cernai §20-21); Diego's rôle in determining this strategy is also pointed out by Jordan, *Lib.* §19-20.⁸ If the Cistercian party assembled at Cîteaux before travelling to Languedoc, as Robert indicates, it is reasonable to believe, as Cernai §21 implies, that the expedition was planned at the previous general chapter in mid September 1206.

Robert says that the Cistercians went to Languedoc 'de consilio domini pape',⁹ which might seem to leave no room for Diego's initiative in the matter. But Innocent had already written to the abbot of Cîteaux towards the end of Jan. 1204 asking 'ut si quos in ordine suo ad predicationis officium idoneos esse cognoverit' he should send them to help the two Cistercian legates who were already working in the region, Peter of Castelnaud and Raoul, as soon as they

⁸ Jordan's information was certainly garbled, in that he turns Diego's initial encounter with the legates into a local council involving a legate, the local bishops, and the twelve Cistercian abbots; the 'council' would be an understandable misconception if, as I have suggested, the abbots planned their strategy at a meeting with the local bishops under the presidency of Arnaud as legate and abbot of Cîteaux.

⁹ Jordan similarly refers to the twelve abbots whom Innocent 'contra hereticos Albigenes ad predicandam fidem direxerat' (*Lib.* §19), and *Vitas fratrum* I reports, on the authority of an old monk of Bonnevaux, a vision concerning the Order of Preachers which occurred 'tempore quo duodecim abbates ordinis nostri a domino papa missi fuerunt contra Tolosanos hereticos' (or, in the vulgate version, 'contra Albigenes hereticos') (cf. MOPH I 8).

were asked for,¹⁰ and he alluded to this in his letter of 31 May 1204 when he made the abbot himself a legate with the other two (*Reg. Inn. III VII 124, MOPH XXV no. 3*); it cannot be by accident that both Robert and Cernai echo this letter:

Innocent III	Robert	Cernai §47
<p>Gaudemus ... quod in ordine vestro multi reperiuntur habentes zelum Dei secundum scientiam, potentes in opere et sermone ac parati de ea que in nobis est fide et spe omni poscenti reddere rationem, in quibus etiam eam vigere credimus caritatem ut animas suas pro fratribus suis ponant.</p>	<p>De consilio domini pape Cisterciensis abbas aliique abbates circiter 13 delegantur eiusdem ordinis viri probabiles, omnes et sapientia et facundia preinstructi, parati ad satisfactionem omni poscenti rationem de fide, et pro fide etiam animas ponere non verentes.</p>	<p>Supervenit vir venerabilis abbas Cistercii Arnaldus a partibus Francie abbates .xii. habens secum qui, totius viri religionis, viri perfecte scientie ... advenerunt, parati de ea que in ipsis erat fide et spe omni disputanti reddere rationem.</p>

Our sources are not contradictory: Diego influenced the timing and manner of the Cistercians' participation in the Languedoc mission, but it was the pope who first called for it, and Arnaud evidently made sure that they were all aware of this.

Robert had little information about Diego, except that

Affuit et cum eis quidam episcopus Oximensis (*sic*) civitatis Hispanie, vir mitissimus ac disertus, qui et ipse lucrandis animabus invigilans et circumquaque perambulans, de relictibus suis cibariorum emerat copiam et per loca plurima posuerat et predicatoribus verbi Dei largiter exponebat (MGH SS XXVI 271).

The tense of *emerat* and *posuerat* indicates that Diego had laid down provisions for the preachers before their arrival. He attended a royal council in Castile on 16 March 1207 (González doc. 799), and he played a significant part in the debate at Montréal, after which, according to Cernai §47, he remained in the neighbourhood preaching; it is doubtful, then, whether he could have made all the arrangements for his staging-posts 'per plurima loca' during this one visit to Languedoc.

¹⁰ O.Hageneder – J.C.Moore – A.Sommerlechner, *Die Register Innocenz' III VI*, Vienna 1995, 407.

Judging by González docs. 792-799, Diego was in Castile between 3 Feb. and 16 March, but the last previous attestation of his presence there is on 3 July 1206 (doc. 790); he could have had ample opportunity between July 1206 and Jan. 1207 to make his preparations for the Cistercians' arrival, and it was surely also during this period that he established his monastery at Prouille (Jordan, *Lib.* §27). It certainly existed by 17 April 1207, when Archbishop Bérenger of Narbonne made a gift 'priorissae et monialibus nouiter conuersis monitis et exemplis fratris Dominici Oxomensis sociorumque eius' (MOPH XXV no. 5), and I believe we can retrieve a genuine document from '1206' (i.e. before 25 March 1207) in which Fulk made the church of Prouille over to Diego, at Dominic's request, 'pro mulieribus conuersis per predicatores ad predicandum contra hereticos et ad repellendam heresim pestiferam delegatos, tam presentibus quam futuris ibidem religiose uiuentibus'.¹¹

If we are to believe Cernai, it was also in this period that Diego first encountered the legates at Montpellier. He begins his account of 'the preachers' with a formal date: 'Anno uerbi incarnati .M.CC.VI. Oxomensis episcopus, Diegus nomine, uir magnus et magnifice extollendus, ad curiam Romanam accessit, summo desiderio desiderans episcopatum suum resignare quo posset liberius ad paganos causa predicandi Christi euangelium se transferre'. The pope, however, ordered him back to his diocese and it was while he was returning there that, at Montpellier, he found 'uenerabilem uirum Arnaldum, abbatem Cisterciensem, et fratrem Petrum de Castro Novo et fratrem Radulphum, monachos Cistercienses, apostolice sedis legatos, iniuncte sibi legationi pre tedio renuntiare uolentes'. He reinvigorated their commitment to their task by suggesting a new strategy and volunteering to put it into practice himself. He then set off with Peter and Raoul, 'abbas autem Cisterciensis Cistercium perrexit, tum quia in proximo erat celebrandum Cisterciense capitulum generale, tum quia post celebratum capitulum quosdam de abbatibus sui ordinis uolebat secum adducere qui eum in exequendo iniuncto sibi predicationis officio adiuuarent' (§20-21).

¹¹ The text is found in one manuscript (Avignon 1437 f.5^v), and it was edited, apparently from a different manuscript, in *Gallia Christiana* XIII ii 247. The edition in MOPH XXV App. II 1 gives a misleading impression by merging it with another false deed. I shall, Deo uolente, present a full account of the matter elsewhere.

Cernai used the *stylus incarnationis*,¹² so, on this account, Diego arrived at the papal curia on or after 25 March 1206, and his meeting with the legates occurred shortly before the Cistercian general chapter which was due to begin in mid September.

The difficulty with this is that, according to Jordan, whose evidence on this point must be taken seriously (cf. AFP 68 [1998] 60-63), Diego went to Rome to ask permission to become a missionary, instead of returning to Spain, at the conclusion of a journey undertaken for the king of Castile (*Lib.* §16-17). The king had probably sent him to Denmark,¹³ but wherever it was it involved an arduous journey.¹⁴ He could scarcely have completed this whole itinerary between 3 July, when we know he attended a royal council at Vitoria (González, doc. 790), and September. As Gallén indicated, there is a far more plausible gap for this journey between 23 Oct. 1205 and 29 April 1206 (González, docs. 780-783).

Cernai's information does not seem to have been rich in dates, and he had to piece Diego's story together from disparate fragments.¹⁵ His uncle, Abbot Guy, could have told him what happened

¹² He regularly dates things 'ab incarnatione Domini' (e.g. §82, 151), and, for example, the new crusaders who arrived 'circa mediam quadragesimam' in '1210' (§213) undoubtedly arrived in mid March 1211 (in which the fourth Sunday of Lent fell on 13 March).

¹³ Jordan tells us that Diego and Dominic went 'ad marchias'; Gerald de Frachet says more precisely that their engagement in the Languedoc preaching campaign occurred 'post reditum de marchia Dacie' (cf. MOPH I 321). Koudelka took 'marchia Dacie' to mean Denmark's territories in northern Germany (AFP 43 [1973] 9), but there is apparently no evidence that they were ever so designated (cf. P.B.Halvorsen, *Dominikus*, Oslo 2002, 47-48), and Gerald's phrase could well be a compromise between Jordan's 'authoritative' text and independent information that Diego was returning from *Dacia*. The ultimate source of the story must be what Dominic told his recruits about the origins of the *predicatio*, and Gerald could have received, from veterans like Matthew of France (prior of Paris when Gerald joined the order in 1225) or Peter Seilhan (who did not die until c.1257) (MOPH XXIV 59-60), a more accurate report of it than Jordan did — 'ad marchias' could perhaps echo a reference to 'Danimarca' which Jordan's informant had failed to grasp properly.

¹⁴ After breaking their journey at Toulouse, 'recedentes inde et ad locum destinatum ubi puella erat multorum tandem laborum dispendio uenientes' they arranged the desired marriage for the king's son. The king then sent Diego back to fetch the girl, 'qui laboriosum iter rursus aggrediens, cum ad marchias peruenisset, puellam interim defunctam inuenit' (*Lib.* §15-16).

¹⁵ While he was travelling in Languedoc with his uncle, in 1212-1213 and 1214-1218 (ed. cit. III vii-ix), the one person who could have given him a fuller picture of Diego's part in the drama was Dominic, but unfortunately the only information he obtained from Dominic is the location of a miracle which he does not integrate into the story (§54). For us it is evidence that Dominic participated in the Montréal

at the Cistercian general chapter in 1206, at which Arnaud presumably explained Diego's proposal and announced his own plans, and about events which occurred from the abbots' arrival at Montréal onwards; for the earlier part of the story it looks as if his main source was the associates of Peter of Castelnau from whom he heard about Peter's repeated asseveration that the mission could never succeed until 'one of us preachers' dies for the faith (Cernai §360): Peter's perspective appears to have coloured Cernai's understanding of the legates' meeting in Montpellier — according to §20 they were 'iniuncte sibi legationi pre tedio renuntiare volentes', but Peter is the only legate who had actually tried to resign from the mission (*Register Innocenz' III VII* 370-371); and Peter is the only preacher whose movements are tracked at all systematically (§20-24, 26-27).

Peter was present at Montpellier with the other two legates, and he set off with Diego and Raoul and was with them at Servian (where they debated with the heretics 'per octo dies') and at Béziers (where they preached and debated 'per dies .XV.'), but he was then advised to depart for his own safety and 'recessit ... tempore aliquanto' (§20-24); at that point Cernai appears to lose track of Diego and Raoul. The next episode which he reports is an eight-day sojourn at Carcassonne, but, judging by the accompanying miracle which happened 'tempore illo prope Carcassonam', it does not belong here, since the miracle was witnessed by Abbot Guy (§24-25) who did not arrive in the region until after the Montréal debate (§51).¹⁶ On the plea that it would take too long to describe how 'predicadores nostri circuibant per castella', Cernai then passes directly to the Montréal debate, for which Peter returned (§26); after the debate Peter 'iuit in Provinciam et laboravit ut pacem componeret inter nobiles Provincie' (§27).

debate, but Cernai apparently did not even make that connection; he obviously did not benefit from Dominic's knowledge in constructing his general narrative concerning 'the preachers'.

¹⁶ The miracle happened on the Nativity of John the Baptist (24 June), so it does not fit into Cernai's story at this point: if the Montpellier meeting occurred shortly before the Cistercian general chapter, as Cernai believed, the preachers must have spent their fortnight at Béziers in October. If the Cistercian party arrived in April 1207, there is no reason why Guy should not have witnessed a miracle near Carcassonne on 24 June 1207 in connection with an eight-day debate there. Furthermore, Diego attended royal councils on 3, 7, 19 and 30 June 1206, but in 1207 his presence in Castile is not attested between 2 June and 25 Sept. (González, docs. 784-787, 806, 810), so he too could have been at Carcassonne in late June 1207.

If it is correct, as it surely must be, to place the journey which eventually brought Diego to Montpellier in the long gap which follows his appearance at a royal council on 23 Oct. 1205, and if, as Cernai §21 and *Lib.* §20-22 indicate, Diego sent his party back to Osma and proceeded thereafter on foot 'uno comite contentus' (Cernai §21), then, to accommodate the debates at Servian and Béziers and get Diego back to Castile in time for the royal council at Berlanga on 29 April (González, doc. 783), we cannot date the Montpellier meeting later than the beginning of March 1206, and if Diego and Raoul continued their campaign beyond Béziers, we might have to date it as early as January.¹⁷ In any case, Cernai seriously underestimated the interval between the encounter at Montpellier and the Montréal debate, as well as the 'aliquantum tempus' during which Peter was apart from Diego and Raoul; and the impression he gives that Diego and Raoul spent the whole intervening period travelling round preaching and debating is certainly false.¹⁸

¹⁷ William of Tudela, author of the first part of the *Chanson de la croisade albigeoise*, which he began in 1210 (laisse 9.24), was primarily interested in the crusade, and the hero of the first part of his tale is the 'very holy man ... whom God loved so much', Abbot Arnaud of Cîteaux (3.9, 4.1-2). All he says about Diego is that he and 'the other legates' held a *cort* with the Cathars ('cels de Bolgaria') at Carcassonne in the presence of the king of Aragón (2.17-20). This must refer to the debate which the king held in February 1204 (we have no more precise date than this) to determine whether the Waldensians and Cathars were heretics. There is a gap between Diego's attendances at royal councils on 14 Oct. 1203 and 26 Feb. 1204 (he missed one on 4 Nov.) (González, docs. 753, 755, 758), to which Gallén plausibly ascribes his first royal embassy. If the *cort* was held early enough in Feb., Diego could have been at it, especially if, as I suggested in AFP 68 (1998) 60, it was on his return from the first embassy that he made a detour to Cîteaux; but he is not mentioned in the king's report and he was never a papal legate, so Tudela was probably misinformed about his presence. If we identify the 1204 *cort* with Cernai's eight-day debate at Carcassonne (Cernai §24), the rest of the story will not work: it cannot have been on this occasion that Diego met all three legates, since Arnaud was not yet a legate, and it is unlikely that he could have completed his journey in the time available if he engaged in debates at Servian and Béziers on the way (and returned home on foot).

¹⁸ Diego attended royal councils in Castile between 29 April and 3 July 1206 and between 3 Feb. and 16 March 1207 (González docs. 783-799); and on 17 June 1206 and on 28 Jan. 1207 Raoul, Peter of Castelnau and the bishop of Pamplona were required to investigate King Peter of Aragón's marriage to Mary of Montpellier (PL 215:908-909, 1080-1081), which they evidently did (PL 216:750), presumably in the early months of 1207. At the same time 'the legates' were evidently engaged in persuading King Peter and other noblemen in the vicinity to swear 'pacis foedera', while Count Raymond of Toulouse was persecuting the church in the province of Arles and was excommunicated by 'the legates'; all this is mentioned by Innocent III in a letter to Raymond on 29 May 1207 (PL 215:1166-1168). Peter must have

It looks as if Cernai arranged this part of his story around a single fixed point, the 1206 Cistercian general chapter at which Abbot Arnaud took steps to implement Diego's proposal: Diego's meeting with the legates must have preceded the chapter, and the arrival of the Cistercian abbots must have followed it. We must take Cernai's information seriously, then, but not his chronology.

Puylaurens gives us a completely different perspective on the events of these years, reflecting his familiarity with Bishop Fulk. He ignores Diego's relationship with the legates and highlights his collaboration with Fulk. Having been elected bishop of Toulouse, Fulk entered 'his church' on 5 Feb. 1206 and found it poor and riddled with heresy, 'sic forte Dominus ordinabat ... ut episcopus pauper prodiret expeditus ad expugnandam hereticam pravitatem'. 'In ipsis quoque diebus', Puylaurens goes on, 'dominus Deus ... duos de Hispania ad hoc opus produxit electos pugiles, dominum Didacum episcopum Oxomensem et religiosum virum sanctum postea declaratum socium eius Dominicum; duo ergo isti episcopi mittentes manus ad fortia, aggregatis sibi abbatibus ordinis Cisterciensis et aliis bonis viris, superstitionem hereticorum ... ceperunt aggredi' (VII-VIII 44-46).

Whereas Cernai the Cistercian fits Diego into an essentially Cistercian narrative, Puylaurens places the Cistercians among other 'boni viri' who took part in a campaign led by Fulk and Diego. Neither seems to have had any very clear idea of the chronology of these years, and Puylaurens was apparently as unaware of the gap between Feb. 1206 and the arrival of the abbots as Cernai was of the gap between the Montpellier encounter and the Montréal debate; but each of them knew things which the other did not, and their reports can be treated as complementary.

There is a significant discrepancy between Cernai's account of the immediate aftermath of the Montpellier encounter and Puylaurens's statement that 'one of the first debates' with heretics took place at Verfeil (VIII 46), a debate on which he had detailed information. It is extremely unlikely that Diego went as far North as

interrupted his work in the area to attend the Montréal debate (Cernai §27), and the pope's letter refers to 'legates' in the plural, so the same must be true of Raoul (Arnaud was bringing his preachers from Cîteaux and putting them to work, and no other legate has yet appeared on the scene — the bishop of Pamplona was not concerned with anything except the king's marriage, nor, as the letter to Queen Mary makes clear, was he a papal legate, PL 216:750).

Verfeil between his meeting with the legates and his return to Osma, and it was probably in the course of the same tour that he debated with heretics at Lavaur (Jordan, *Lib.* §23), to the North-East of Verfeil; since Puylaurens says nothing about Diego coming from Rome (if anything, he implies that he and Dominic came from Spain) or about the meeting at Montpellier, we may infer with some confidence that he and Cernai had information about different 'beginnings'. If the beginning which linked Diego to the legates occurred in January/March 1206 (after which he returned to Osma), may we not locate the second beginning, which linked him with Fulk, in the period between his attendances at royal councils on 3 July 1206 and 3 Feb. 1207 (González, docs. 790, 792)? Especially if Diego returned to Languedoc soon after 3 July 1206, this would be early enough to justify the impression given by Puylaurens that the two bishops got together soon after Fulk's accession to the see of Toulouse; and, of course, the more time Diego spent in Languedoc, the more convincing Dominic's memory becomes of him being there for 'about two years' (assuming Dominic's memory to be the ultimate source of the statement in *Lib.* §28).

Cernai tells us little about the unfolding of the Cistercian mission except that the abbots were assigned their own territories, *termini proprii*, 'per quos discurrendo predicationi insisterent disputationibusque insudarent' (§47). With no indication of any passage of time, he then announces that the Bishop of Osma wanted to return to his diocese; on the way, he held a debate with Waldensians at Pamiers, on which Cernai had detailed information (§48). Diego then completed his journey and died within a few days of reaching his diocese (§49), having been preceded in death by Raoul, who died at the Cistercian abbey of Franquevaux (§50). With these *luminaria* gone, Abbot Guy 'prior inter predicatores constitutus est et magister, abbas siquidem Cisterciensis ad alias partes se transtulit, quibusdam magnis negotiis tunc temporis occupatus'; the preachers continued their work, but 'post multum temporis, cum parum aut nichil predicando sive disputando proficere potuissent, ad partes Gallie sunt reversi' (§51).

Apart from a few isolated incidents (§52-54), this closes the story of 'the preachers': 'His de predicatoribus verbi Dei breviter prelibatis, ad martyrium ... fratris ... Petris de Castro novo ... veniamus' (§55). After quoting Innocent III's letter on Peter's 'martyrdom' to the local magnates (§56-65) Cernai returns to his narrative (§66): 'Videntes igitur prelati Narbonensis provincie et alii quos

tangebatur negotium pacis et fidei decessisse beatos viros Oxomensem episcopum et fratrem P. de Castro Novo et fratrem Radulfum, qui fuerant predicationis in terra prenotata principes et magistri, animadvertentes etiam quod eadem predicatio iam peregerit ex parte maxima cursum suum nec multum profecerit ... ad pedes summi pontificis iudicant transmittendum' (§67).

Cernai seems to have imagined that Arnaud went directly from Montpellier to Cîteaux for the impending general chapter, and that, as he intended, he brought some of his fellow abbots to work in the Languedoc mission more or less immediately 'post celebratum capitulum' (cf. §21). Since Cernai's next fixed point appears to have been Innocent III's letter on the murder of Peter of Castelnau, dated 10 March 1208 (§65), and he evidently associated Peter's death with the end of the preaching campaign and the local hierarchy's consequent appeal to the Holy See, this left 'multum temporis' before the Cistercians returned frustrated 'ad partes Gallie' (§51).

At some unspecified time within this 'multum temporis' Diego decided to visit his diocese and, in the outcome, he died there; at this point Cernai's chronology becomes superficially incoherent as well as vague: he reports Abbot Guy's appointment as 'prior inter predicatores et magister' after the deaths of Diego and Raoul (§51), but it was their loss (with no mention of Guy), in conjunction with the fact that the preaching had almost run its course, which prompted the local hierarchy to appeal to the pope after the murder of Peter of Castelnau.

The essential key is the mention of the preaching having run its course: this shows that there was a fixed limit to the Cistercian campaign, and that this limit had almost been reached when Peter was murdered on 14 Jan. 1208.¹⁹ In the light of this we can interpret both Cernai's story and Robert of Auxerre's statement that the party which set off from Cîteaux in March 1207 worked in Languedoc (with little success) 'for three months' (MGH SS XXVI 271).

Robert's information came ultimately from someone involved in the campaign, so his 'three months' must be taken seriously.²⁰ It is, in any case, unlikely that twelve abbots could commit themselves, or that the general chapter would commit them, to an open-ended

¹⁹ For the date, see the editors' note to Cernai §55.

²⁰ According to the editors' note on Cernai §51, the period indicated by Robert is 'beaucoup trop court' and 'désigne vraisemblablement des retours isolés'; but they failed to notice the misleading narrative logic which forced Cernai to allow the preachers 'multum temporis'.

mission; a three-month campaign, from the latter part of April to the latter part of July, would give them time to return to their monasteries and get ready for the general chapter in September.

Cernai connects Guy's appointment as 'prior inter predicatores' with 'quedam magna negotia' which kept Arnaud busy elsewhere. He does not identify these 'magna negotia', but on 21 Aug. 1207 Innocent wrote to Arnaud and Peter of Castelnaud bidding them go to Marseilles to sort out a messy dispute over the lordship of the city (PL 215:1206-1207); they presumably had to attend to this as soon as the general chapter was over. Cernai is equally uninformative about how his uncle was 'prior inter predicatores constitutus', but we may reasonably surmise that he was appointed by Arnaud or by the general chapter to lead a second three-month campaign in Languedoc; if it was scheduled to begin in the latter part of October, it would have nearly run its course at the time of Peter's murder, exactly as Cernai says (§67), and Guy's mandate as 'prior et magister' would obviously expire with it.²¹ The two people who might have kept the preaching going independently of the Cistercian mission were Raoul and Diego, and they were both dead; no wonder the local prelates thought it was time to ask for a new initiative from the pope.

Diego was intending to return to the region (§49), so it was his death, not his departure, which was the final blow to the preaching campaign, and Cernai was wrong to believe that he died within a few days of returning to his diocese; but he attended a royal council on 25 Sept. 1207 (González, doc. 810), so he would have been gone by the time Guy began to operate as 'prior inter predicatores', even if he was not yet dead as Cernai §51 implies, and Raoul had apparently died early in July.²²

On this hypothesis, both Robert and Cernai had their main facts right. There was a three-month campaign which began with a party of Cistercians leaving Cîteaux in March 1207. Guy was appointed 'prior inter predicatores' after the disappearance of Raoul and Diego. There was a second Cistercian campaign with Guy at

²¹ Later in 1208 Guy was back in 'France', urging Simon de Montfort to take up arms against the heretics (Cernai §103, with the editors' notes).

²² If he is the other legate involved in the events mentioned by the pope on 29 May (PL 215:1166-1168), he, like Peter of Castelnaud (Cernai §27), must have gone 'in Provinciam' soon after the Montréal debate. The fact that he died at Franquevaux, near Saint-Gilles, suggests that he was still there when he was taken ill; his *depositio* was commemorated on 9 July (editors' note on Cernai §50).

its head, but it was due to finish round about the time when Peter of Castelnau was murdered. Since Guy had no mandate to continue, the 'predicationis principes et magistri' whose loss mattered then were Raoul and Diego.

It only remains to ask when Diego left Languedoc for the last time. Unlike Cernai, we know that he cannot have lingered for long after the Montréal debate since, though he missed a royal council on 29 April, he attended one at S.Esteban, in his own diocese, on 3 May (González, docs. 800-801); however, there is a gap between 2 June and 25 Sept. (docs. 806, 810) during which he could have returned to Languedoc. As we have seen, the latter part of June 1207 is the only possible date for the debate at Carcassonne to which Cernai alludes in §24 if it is related to the miracle which he describes in §25; in any case, if Diego's final departure occurred soon after the Montréal debate, the memories which reached Cernai and Jordan were seriously inaccurate in suggesting that he died soon after his arrival in Osma (Cernai §49, *Lib.* §30).

According to Cernai, Diego took part in an important debate at Pamiers on his way home (§48); Jordan also mentions this debate (*Lib.* §23), and Puylaurens gives an elaborate account of it (VIII 48-50), but neither of them indicates where it fits into the story. Cernai's placing of it at the end of Diego's time in Languedoc could be arbitrary, since he seems to have arranged what he knew about Diego into a single passage through the territory, from Montpellier to Béziers, from there to Carcassonne and Montréal, and finally to Pamiers; nevertheless, the details which he provides suggest that he was drawing on good information.

What Cernai says about Diego's intentions at the time of his final departure — intentions which remained unfulfilled because of his death — chimes well enough with what Jordan knew about them. Jordan's account probably conflates several different occasions,²³ but

²³ Diego's fear that he might be accused of neglecting his own church (on the meaning of *domestica ecclesia*, see AFP 68 [1998] 49-50) is more convincing as an explanation of why he did not remain very long in Languedoc in the early months of 1206 than as a reason for him to return to Osma in the spring or summer of 1207, when he had not been away for any length of time; and MOPH XXV no. 5 shows that he had given Dominic and William Claret some kind of responsibility for Prouille by 17 April 1207 and that Dominic was at the head of the party of preachers whose converts had become nuns there, which would suggest that Diego put them in charge during his sojourn in Languedoc between 3 July 1206 and 3 Feb. 1207 (González, docs. 790, 792) rather than when he went back to Osma for the last time as implied by *Lib.* §29.

he mentions two purposes which Diego was certainly prevented from realizing: the provision of funds to complete the monastery at Prouille, and the establishment of a stable anti-heretical preaching mission with its own manpower (*Lib.* §28). According to Cernai, Diego's aim in going to Osma was 'ut et domui sue disponeret et predicatoribus verbi Dei in Narbonensi provincia de suis proveniunt necessaria provideret' (§48), and he set off 'firmum habens propositum redeundi quam citius posset ad peragendum negotium fidei in provincia Narbonensi' (§49). If he needed to 'make arrangements for, provide for, his household', he was presumably expecting to be away for a considerable time, as he undoubtedly would have been if he really hoped to 'see the business through to the end' when he came back to the province of Narbonne ('ad *peragendum negotium fidei*') — an ambition which is obviously consonant with what Jordan says about his plan for a sustainable mission against heresy.

It is not surprising that a report of Diego's intentions (albeit a slightly confused one) reached Jordan: they were an integral part of the pre-history of the order, so Dominic would have talked about them, and Dominic would surely have known what was on Diego's mind when he set off for Osma never to return. It is less clear how Cernai knew about them, but a plausible source suggests itself if they were genuinely part of the same story as what he tells us about Pamiers (§48):

Dum recederet tendens in Hispaniam, venit apud Apamias in territorio Tolosano et convenerunt ad eum Fulco Tolosanus et Navarrus Cosoranensis episcopus et plurimi abbates. Habita ibi disputatione cum Valdensibus ...

The debate at Pamiers was a formal one with a designated judge, and it was held in the palace of the Count of Foix, who entertained the Waldensian and Catholic teams on alternate days; according to Puylaurens (VIII 48), not only was a group of Waldensians, led by Durandus of Osca, converted, but 'fuerunt et alii heretici convicti', apparently Cathars. This sounds like a major planned event; but, if we may trust Cernai, Fulk and Navarre and 'plurimi abbates' did not just come to the debate, they came to meet Diego ('convenerunt *ad eum*'). As at Montréal, there appears to be a high-level assembly of ecclesiastics in conjunction with the debate, but this time the leading figure is Diego, not Arnaud.

Cernai does not identify the 'plurimi abbates', but he says nothing to connect them with the Cistercians brought to the region by Arnaud, and he would surely have mentioned it if he or his uncle Guy had been there; it is quite possible, then, that they were local abbots. Fulk's participation needs no explanation, since heresy was a serious problem in his diocese, but Navarre's presence is most easily understood if he was there as papal legate, in which capacity he is first attested in Innocent III's letter of 29 May 1207 (PL 215:1161). If the meeting took place in August or September 1207, its purpose is not hard to divine: the Cistercian campaign was winding down and even if it was renewed after the general chapter it would only be for another limited period; Cernai was probably right to give the impression that the legate most closely associated with the idea of a longer-term campaign was Raoul,²⁴ but Raoul was dead, so hopes for a continuation of it beyond the Cistercian mission were focused on Diego. In such a context, Diego's intentions were of considerable importance. Whoever told Cernai about the meeting — Fulk, maybe, who is cited as his informant on other matters (§160, 232) — could also have told him about Diego's plans.

That the continuation of the *predicatio* was of concern to the local hierarchy is confirmed in a general way by Puylaurens: at the time of their recourse to the Holy See for a new initiative, 'ne cepta predicatio remaneret' ('come to a standstill') 'de ordinandis perpetuis predicatoribus contra hereticos est provisum, Domino inspirante, et hac de causa sub beato episcopo domino Fulcone ordo predicatorum principaliter est exorsus' (X 54). Puylaurens has compressed developments which occurred over a period of years into a single sentence, but, in the light of what we learn from Cernai and Jordan, we can see what he means.

In 1207 it was Diego who actually planned to do something 'de ordinandis perpetuis predicatoribus' (Jordan, *Lib.* §28); that is why, as Cernai §67 implies, it was his death, combined with the ending of the Cistercian mission and the murder of Peter of Castelnau, which made the situation so dire. With the benefit of hindsight, Puylaurens could point to the creation of the Order of Preachers as the solution to the problem, but the local prelates reviewing the situation in January 1208 could not have foreseen this.

²⁴ He was also the only legate who had been authorized to recruit preachers for the mission (MOPH XXV no. 4; I hope to devote another article specifically to the interpretation of this papal letter).

There is no independent confirmation that the Pamiers debate took place at the end of Diego's time in Languedoc, but we can at least make excellent sense of Cernai's narrative, with all its details, if Fulk, Navarre (as legate) and a number of local abbots gathered at Pamiers not just for the debate, but also, and perhaps primarily, for a meeting with Diego to discuss the post-Cistercian phase of the preaching campaign of which Diego was to be the mainstay when he had made the necessary arrangements in Osma.²⁵

We can, it seems, formulate an approximate chronology which does justice to Diego's known dates and to both the genuine information and the perceptible ignorance displayed in our main narrative sources (see below, VIII 4).

2. *Dominic and the 'predicatio', 1213-1215*

According to Constantine's *legenda* (§55-56), Dominic passed one Lent in Carcassonne as the bishop's vicar *in spiritualibus* while the bishop himself was 'in Francia'; one day, under pressure from a persistent Cistercian laybrother, he foretold the impending death of the king of Aragón, a prophecy which was fulfilled 'sequenti anno'. The king was killed at the battle of Muret on 12 Sept. 1213 (Cernai §448, 453, 457, 463); Ash Wednesday fell on 27 Feb., so, reckoning by the *stylus incarnationis*, several weeks of Lent belonged to the previous year. Constantine's story, then, indicates that Dominic was living in Carcassonne from 27 Feb. to 14 April (Easter Sunday) 1213.

This tallies with what Cernai tells us about his uncle's moves. Bishop Guy went to 'France' after the council of Lavaur in January

²⁵ A date in Aug./Sept. 1207 is also compatible with what can be inferred about the movements of Durandus of Osca after his conversion at Pamiers. On 18 Dec. 1208 he was in Rome with some of his companions to receive from the pope a formal declaration of their conversion and approval of their chosen way of life (PL 215:1514); judging by the spread of papal letters (including some whose existence is implied by those whose texts are known), the 'ceteri fratres' to which Innocent alludes were not just in Languedoc, but also in the province of Tarragona and in northern Italy (PL 215:1510-1513; 216:29-30, 73-74, 274-275). This must mean that, after his own conversion, Durandus toured these places persuading other Waldensians to accept reconciliation with the church and join him in establishing the Poor Catholics. Since we do not know how long this took him, we cannot use him to prove that the Pamiers debate was held in Aug./Sept. 1207; but it would surely have been possible for him to accomplish his tour between Sept. 1207 and Dec. 1208.

1213 with Fulk of Toulouse 'ut promoverent negotium fidei contra hereticos' (Cernai §40, 368, 418). Guy 'discurrebat per Franciam et negotium fidei ... omnimodis in quantum poterat promovebat' (§439). On about 6 April 1214 he set off to return to Languedoc, having spent 'the whole of the previous year' labouring 'in partibus Gallicanis' to muster support for the Albigensian crusade; leaving Nevers on 13 April, he and his nephew probably reached Carcassonne early in May, 'ibique fecimus paucos dies' (§508). Simon de Montfort then sent him North with the newly arrived crusaders to the area around Rodez and Cahors 'ut terras ... hostium Christi penitus devastarent'; Simon meanwhile went to Valence to arrange the marriage of his eldest son, Amaury, to the daughter of the dauphin of Vienne. The wedding was celebrated at Carcassonne not long afterwards (early in June, it seems); by this time the bishop and his army 'iam diu a Carcassona exierant' and were in the diocese of Cahors (§510-512).

Const. §55-56 only refers to Dominic spending one Lent at Carcassonne, but if he was acting as the bishop's vicar it is not unreasonable to infer that he continued in that capacity until the bishop's return.²⁶ Guy himself was not notably resident in his diocese even when he was in the region, so we should not be too confident that Dominic stayed put at Carcassonne until May 1214; but, if I have rightly interpreted his explanation of why he would not prefer to be living in Toulouse (Const. §62), he must have been more or less resident in Carcassonne at some point after the reconciliation of Toulouse in April 1214, and we know from Humbert's *cronica ordinis* that Simon de Montfort chose him to bless Amaury's marriage to the dauphin's daughter (cf. MOPH I 322), which implies that he was in Carcassonne in June, after the bishop had departed again.

The evidence is obviously consistent with the belief that Dominic was based in Carcassonne, as the bishop's vicar, from Jan. 1213, when Guy set off for 'France',²⁷ until May 1214, when Guy returned, and that, at Simon de Montfort's request, he stayed on to celebrate Amaury's wedding in early June; I am not aware of anything to contradict this theory.

²⁶ Vicaire seems to have taken this for granted (*Histoire* I 333).

²⁷ Unless Dominic was at the council of Lavaur himself, he had presumably been asked to serve as Guy's vicar before the council's preliminaries began on 14 Jan (Cernai §368).

Jordan seems to have been well-informed about the benefactions which provided the preaching operation with funds both before and after its establishment in Peter Seilhan's house in Toulouse (*Lib.* §37, 39); inter alia, he tells us, 'habebat ipse frater Dominicus ecclesiam Fani Iouis et quedam alia, de quibus omnibus sibi et suis poterat necessaria prouidere' (*Lib.* §37).²⁸

It is in this context that we must interpret MOPH XXV no. 58, the deed of 25 May 1214 in which Fulk, at Fanjeaux, 'uoluntate et assensu fratris Dominici capellani de Fanoioiuis',²⁹ granted Prouille some tithes which the monastery would otherwise have had to pay to the church of Fanjeaux. This is the only dated reference to Dominic as *capellanus* of Fanjeaux, but it would have been wrong for the bishop to alienate part of the parish's income at Dominic's request unless he had made some long-term arrangement; since it is unlikely that he wanted Dominic to be tied down at Fanjeaux, the arrangement was presumably that Dominic would see to it that the parish was manned, not that he would take up residence there himself. Jordan was undoubtedly right that Dominic was given the benefice as a source of revenue 'sibi et suis', and the arrangement probably continued until 17 April 1221 when the church of Fanjeaux was given to the order in perpetuity (MOPH XXV no. 153).³⁰

We need not jib at Jordan's reference to Dominic's 'sui'. He had a socius with him in Carcassonne in 1213-1214, Stephen of Metz (Const. §55), later attested as a Dominican in Toulouse (Pelhissou 46). During the Lent in which his display of austerity converted his hostesses he had a socius with him (Ferr. §22), and we may surmise that knowledge of the episode reached Ferrandus because this same socius had become a Dominican and talked about it in Spain; if it is accepted that Dominic was not in Languedoc between 1208 and

²⁸ *Necessaria prouidere* is the reading of the Osma manuscript and I see no reason to doubt that it represents Jordan's original text; when the *Libellus* was revised by the order to serve as an official life of Dominic, 'sustentationem accipere, que uero de eisdem redditibus sibi possent subtrahere impartiebantur sororibus monasterii de Pruliano' was substituted.

²⁹ For *capellanus* as a designation of the parish priest, the holder of the benefice, cf. J. Avril, *CdF* 25 (1990) 24.

³⁰ The order renounced all revenues at the general chapter of 1220 (Jordan, *Lib.* §87); Dominic evidently took the occasion of Fulk's visit to Rome to implement this decision with regard to the revenues the brethren had been receiving in Toulouse: on behalf of the order, Dominic renounced its share in the diocese's tithes in return for the outright gift of the church of Fanjeaux, in which he presumably hoped that a Dominican community would be established.

1211, the Lent in question was almost certainly that of 1212.³¹ Dominic was not the only canon of Osma who ended up in the Order of Preachers, and at least one of his fellow-canons is said to have been with him in Languedoc before the establishment of the Toulouse équipe;³² as likely a time as any for them to have joined him in the Languedoc mission is when he returned to it himself in 1211.

We should not use MOPH XXV no. 58 as evidence of where Dominic was living in May 1214,³³ but Fulk's provision of a source of income for Dominic 'et suis' is at least a hint that the *predicatio* was taking shape again, that Dominic was no longer simply 'predicator', as on 20 June 1211 (MOPH XXV no. 12), he was, or was on the way to becoming, 'predicationis minister' (MOPH XXV no. 61).

A further step is implied by Simon de Montfort's gift of Casseneuil to Dominic 'et suis sequacibus quicumque ei in officio inchoate salutis assisterent' (Jordan, *Lib.* §37). That the gift was

³¹ It is very unlikely that in 1206, between the Montpellier meeting and Diego's return to Castile, Dominic was able to devote Lent (15 Feb. - 2 April) to a household of Catharizing women. The Montréal debate must have taken place during Lent 1207 (7 March - 22 April). Even if Dominic returned to Languedoc early enough in 1211, he would surely not have begun by spending the whole of Lent working on one household. In 1213 he was at Carcassonne for Lent, and he was probably still there in 1214. In Lent 1215 (4 March - 19 April) he was surely getting his preaching équipe established in Toulouse (cf. MOPH XXV no. 62), and in Lent 1216 (23 Feb. - 10 April) we may presume that he was busy discussing Innocent's advice with his brethren and, in due course, working to realize their decision to adopt the Rule of St Augustine, a decision which must have been taken before Fulk arranged for them to be given the church of Saint-Romain (it was as a formal religious community that they needed a church), and Saint-Romain was made over to them in July (MOPH XXV no. 73). Lent 1217 (8 Feb. - 26 March) is out of the question, since Dominic was still in Rome on 7 Feb. 1217 (MOPH XXV no. 81). By the beginning of 1218 he was in Rome again (*Lib.* §55), and in Lent 1219 he was probably still in Spain (*Lib.* §59; AFP 65 [1995] 90-95). This leaves only one other Lent which he could have passed in Languedoc, that of 1212.

³² The 'canonici fratris Dominici' from whom John of Navarre learned about Dominic's time in Palençja (ACB §29) must have been canons of Osma who became Dominicans, probably Miguel de Ucero and the other Dominic, whom John met in Bologna in 1218 (AFP 65 [1995] 78-79). Jordan had to modify (or confuse) his original statement that St Dominic was on his own in Languedoc after Diego's death to accommodate the information, received presumably when the other Dominic arrived in Paris c.1219, that the two Dominics were together in Languedoc before the establishment of the Toulouse community (*Lib.* §31; cf. AFP 68 [1998] 32); we may take it that this development was based on good information.

³³ Strictly speaking, it does not even show that Dominic was at Fanjeaux on 25 May 1214, since Fulk could have been implementing an agreement which he had already made with Dominic elsewhere.

made to the *predicatio* as an institution, not just to Dominic, is shown by the fact that, when Honorius III issued *Religiosam vitam* for the brethren of Saint-Romain on 22 Dec. 1216, he included Casseneuve among its properties (MOPH XXV no. 77.54-55).

Jordan knew that Casseneuve was given to Dominic and his 'followers', and that, by contrast, the benefice of Fanjeaux was held by him personally ('habebat ipse ...'); he was also correct to place Dominic's possession of the church of Fanjeaux before his community in Toulouse was founded, whereas Fulk's gift of tithes was made to this community (this is confirmed by MOPH XXV no. 63) (*Lib.* §37, 39). He seems to have had precise and accurate information, so we can probably rely on his placing of Simon's benefaction in the period before the establishment of the Toulouse community; Casseneuve was taken by the crusaders on 18 Aug. 1214 (Cernai §527), and it could have been given to Dominic and his 'followers' during the council of Montpellier in Jan. 1215, at which Simon assisted from a nearby *castrum* (Cernai §543-544).³⁴

We should certainly not play down the significance of the self-oblation of Peter Seilhan and Thomas, and of Peter's gift of his houses in Toulouse, to Dominic (Jordan, *Lib.* §38) — Jordan probably had good information that this was a crucial turning-point in the development which led to the founding of the Order of Preachers; but there must have been some reason why Peter and Thomas 'obtulerunt se fratri Dominico', and there can surely be no doubt that they wanted to place themselves at his disposal precisely as head of the *predicatio*, in which case their act presupposes the existence of a mission under Dominic's leadership to which they wished to commit themselves.³⁵ What was new, thanks to them, was that for the first time the *predicatio* had a home of its own and men of its own,³⁶ two preconditions for its becoming a durable institution such as Diego had dreamed of.

³⁴ Simon's generosity took a new turn in 1214. He and his barons had previously made several donations to Prouille (MOPH XXV nos. 10, 30-32, 38, 50-52, 59-60), but on 4 June he gave Verfeil to the diocese of Toulouse (Devic-Vaissete VIII 653; Puylaurens XXVIII 102); his gift of Casseneuve to Dominic's preachers shows a similar concern for ecclesiastical institutions.

³⁵ Because he gave the proto-Dominicans their home, Peter Seilhan used to joke that the order had not received him, he had received it (Gui, *Cat. mag., Dom.* §7); one should not press a joke too hard, but he could not have received the 'order' unless, in some sense, it already existed.

³⁶ Until then Dominic's associates in the mission were not bound to him by any kind of obedience (*Lib.* §31).

One precise date is furnished by the deed in which the Seilhan brothers divided their inheritance:³⁷ on 25 April 1215 Dominic received Peter's share 'pro eodem Petro Seilano et pro se et pro omnibus suis successoribus et habitatoribus domus quam idem dominus Dominicus constituerat'. This implies that Peter had already 'given himself (and his goods) to Dominic', otherwise why was Dominic receiving his share of the property on his behalf? It is also clear that Dominic had already established some kind of *domus* (household, community), presumably in Peter's property.

The houses which were to go to Peter were made over 'Petro Seilano et domino Dominico et habitatoribus dicte domus presentibus et futuris et eorum ordinio' ('their posterity'). The whole transaction was done 'consilio et uoluntate domini fratris Dominici predicti et fratris Willelmi Raimundi³⁸ qui pro se et omnibus eorum successoribus et habitatoribus dicte domus pro presentibus et futuris totum hoc laudauerunt'. This shows that Dominic's 'household' was meant to be a permanent institution.

The nature of this 'household' is revealed by the deed³⁹ in which Bishop Fulk announces that he has appointed as preachers in his diocese 'fratrem Dominicum et socios eius qui in paupertate euangelica pedites religiose proposuerunt incedere et ueritatis euangelice uerbum predicare'; since it is right that those who preach the gospel should live by the gospel, he assigns part of the diocesan tithes 'in perpetuum predictis predicatoribus et aliis quos zelus domini et amor salutis animarum eodem modo ad idem predicationis officium accinxerit'. It is clear that Fulk, like the Seilhan brothers, saw Dominic's preachers as a permanent institution.

Fulk's deed is dated 'anno uerbi incarnati M^o.cc^o.xv^o. regnante Phyl. rege Francorum et comite Montis fortis principatum Tolose tenente et eodem F. Tolosano episcopo'. The description of Simon de Montfort as 'principatum Tolose tenens' exactly fits his situation

³⁷ MOPH XXV no. 62; for a facsimile of the original, see Balme-Lelaidier I between pp.500-501.

³⁸ Frater Willelmus Raimundus was clearly a member of Dominic's *domus* and, presumably, some sort of official there. It is doubtful whether he can be identified, as Vicaire suggests (*Histoire* I 359), with the Dominican of the same name who was an inquisitor in the 1240s; he is certainly most unlikely to be identical with the Guillermus Raymundi Burdegalensis who was prior of Bordeaux in the early 1250s, prior of Narbonne 1256-1258, then inquisitor of Toulouse, then prior of Narbonne again in 1261 until his death in the same year (MOPH XXIV 84, 252).

³⁹ MOPH XXV no. 63. The original has apparently been lost, but there is a facsimile in Balme-Lelaidier I between pp.516-517.

between May and December 1215, when he was caretaker of the county of Toulouse, but not yet its count;⁴⁰ it is likely, then, that the ecclesiastical status of Dominic's *équipe* in the diocese was formalized soon after the legal basis for its possession of Peter Seilhan's property was secure.

If, by 25 April, things had developed as far as the Seilhan deed implies, Jordan was certainly wrong to say that Peter made his self-oblation and gave Dominic his houses 'ingruente tempore quo ad Lateranense concilium Romam adire ceperunt episcopi' (*Lib.* §38). If this is to be intelligible at all, 'episcopi' must be taken to mean bishops in the vicinity of Toulouse,⁴¹ and they had no occasion to leave for Rome nearly as early as May — the date set for their arrival was 1 Nov. (Foreville, *Latran I-IV* 258). According to Jordan, Dominic accompanied Fulk to Rome (*Lib.* §40), and he seems to have been there at the beginning of October;⁴² but, if John of

⁴⁰ The council of Montpellier on 8 Jan. 1215 elected Simon 'in totius terre illius principem et monarcham', but, since the legate did not have power to confirm this, a letter was sent to the pope begging 'ut nobilem comitem Montis Fortis quem unanimiter elegerant concederet eis in terre dominum et monarcham' (Cernai §546-547). On 2 April the pope wrote to Simon entrusting all the lands of the Count of Toulouse to his care 'usque ad tempus concilii generalis' (Cernai §556, 559); the envoys bearing this letter, and others addressed to the legate and local prelates, arrived while Prince Louis was at Saint-Gilles in April/May — on 20 April he went from Lyons to Vienne, where Simon de Montfort joined him, from there he went to Valence, and from Valence to Saint-Gilles (Cernai §551-553); from Saint-Gilles he went to Montpellier and Béziers, where he received a delegation from Narbonne, whose citizens were ordered to pull down its walls 'within three weeks', which they did in May (Cernai §560-562, with the editors' note on §562). The prince then moved on to Carcassonne and while he was there the legate held an assembly at which he formally entrusted 'totam terram' to Simon de Montfort 'usque ad concilium generale', as the pope had ordered (Cernai §563); no precise date is given, but the prince was still at Carcassonne on 22 May (Cernai §564, with the editors' note), and before he left there Simon sent his brother Guy to take possession of Toulouse in his name (Cernai §565). The legate, the prince and Simon himself arrived in Toulouse in June (Cernai §566, with the editors' note). On 30 Nov. the decree formally granting Simon the county of Toulouse was read before the Lateran council, and it was promulgated on 14 Dec. (Cernai §572, with the editors' note).

⁴¹ Taken at its face value, what Jordan says is meaningless: bishops from Scandinavia had to start their journey long before bishops from France, and it would take bishops from Spain longer to get to Rome than bishops from Tuscany; there was no single 'tempus quo Romam adire ceperunt episcopi' if *episcopi* is taken generally.

⁴² A bull which he received, taking Prouille under papal protection, is dated 8 Oct. 1215 (MOPH XXV no. 65) — the original is lost, but all witnesses agree on the date. It is possible that their testimonies all lead us back directly or indirectly to the lost Prouille bullarium rather than to the original: Carquet (AGOP XIV lib. K p.759)

Navarre's memory may be trusted, Dominic was still in Toulouse on 28 Aug. (ACB §25).

Chronological consistency can easily be restored if the bishops were setting off, not, as Jordan thought, for the Lateran council, but for the local council of Montpellier, which began on 8 Jan. (Cernai §543). This would suggest that Peter and Thomas 'obtulerunt se' at the beginning of January.⁴³

Jordan describes Peter and Thomas as 'probi uiri et ydonei de Tholosa' (*Lib.* §38), and the Seilhans were an established Toulouse family by this time.⁴⁴ There can surely be no doubt that they gave themselves to Dominic in Toulouse; and they would scarcely have committed themselves to him like this without first getting to know him and his work. It follows that Dominic must have been operating in Toulouse before the end of 1214.

Unfortunately the only surviving document which illustrates Dominic's public ministry in this period is undated: it is an official letter in which 'frater Dominicus Oxomensis canonicus predicationis humilis minister' declares that he has provisionally authorized Raimundus Guillermus to keep an avowed former 'clothed heretic' living like anyone else in his house in Toulouse 'quousque super hoc nobis uel sibi expressius mandatum faciat dominus cardinalis, et quod hoc sibi non cedat, uidelicet Raimundo Guillermo, in infamiam seu dampnum' (MOPH XXV no. 61). We know nothing else about this particular case, but Raimundus Guillermus was presumably worried that he might be open to a charge of harbouring a heretic,⁴⁵

and Cambefort (Prouille MS f.56') explicitly refer to the bullarium; the claim that the text in BOP I 1 comes from 'exemplar authenticum cuius autographum asservatur in Monasterio Pruliano' cannot now be verified; Rechac gives no indication of his source, but the bullarium cannot be excluded (*Vie de S. Dominique* 236); Percin, *Monumenta* I 15 §25, refers to 'bulla Mss. Prullii', but his track-record makes this unreliable; Échard, QE I 12, explicitly cites Percin. Even so, if the date is wrong, it is probably too early, not too late.

⁴³ Bernard Gui was probably correct to say that Peter and Thomas made their self-oblation in '1214' (i.e. before 25 March 1215) (MOPH XXVII 96).

⁴⁴ Cf. Mundy, *Society and government* 341-345.

⁴⁵ The pope instructed his legate to reconcile the people of Toulouse and take them under papal protection provided they undertook to remain 'in fide catholica et ecclesiastica pace'; should they prefer to 'persist in their error' the pope threatened a new crusade against them and 'quoslibet alios receptatores aut defensores eorum qui plus ipsis haereticis sunt nocivi' (PL 216:959-960). When Toulouse was reconciled to the church, the consuls, on behalf of all the inhabitants of the city and the Bourg, swore, inter alia, not to be or to support *receptatores hereticorum* (Devic-Vaissete VIII 648).

or at least of shielding an ex-heretic from the consequences of his former misbelief.⁴⁶

The original of Dominic's letter does not survive, but we have a description of the seal, which contained the words 'sigillum Christi et predicationis'. It is clear that Dominic, as 'predicationis minister', had faculties from 'the cardinal' to make temporary decisions about people in Toulouse who were in any way implicated in heresy. 'The cardinal' can only be Peter of Benevento, who was papal legate in the region in 1214-1215 (Cernai §503).

Koudelka dates the letter to the beginning of 1215 on the grounds that Fulk returned to Toulouse then 'una cum clero suo necnon fratre Dominico' (MOPH XXV p.52). It is true that the legate sent Fulk to Toulouse to take possession of the Château Narbonnais after the council of Montpellier in Jan. 1215 (Cernai §549), but there is no reason to suppose that this was the first time he and his clergy returned to the city after its reconciliation. The consuls, in the name of the whole population, made their submission to the legate on 25 April 1214 (Devic-Vaissete VIII 647-651), and it is natural to assume, with Vicaire (*Histoire* I 331), that the clergy then returned to Toulouse.⁴⁷

Vicaire also dated Dominic's letter to 1215, and, on the strength of that, he maintained that, though Dominic *could* have moved to Toulouse during the second half of 1214, he did not in fact do so; but his argument is different from Koudelka's (*Histoire* I 333): the letter shows that Dominic was operating on a mandate from the bishop and the legate; 'or c'est en janvier 1215 seulement, au concile de Montpellier, qu'il a pu les atteindre'. In a note, Vicaire explains that the legate, after a brief stay in Languedoc in April 1214, went to Aragón and did not return until the council of

⁴⁶ Under one of the statutes promulgated by Simon de Montfort at Pamiers in Nov. 1212 for the lands under his control, 'Nullus hereticus vestitus et reconciliatus habeat licentiam remanendi in villa in qua conversabatur in illa perversa protectione' (Devic-Vaissete VIII 628). In the period which followed the reconciliation of Toulouse it remained to be seen whether a similar law would be introduced there.

⁴⁷ Balme implied that Fulk did not return to Toulouse before mid February when he took possession of the Château (Balme-Lelaidier I 486); this may be the inspiration of Vicaire's comment in *Histoire*¹ I 378 that it was in February that 'l'évêque put rentrer dans sa ville' (though even the first edition contained the statement that the clergy returned immediately after the city's reconciliation: *Histoire*¹ I 325). This may be the source of Griffe's unexplained statement that Fulk 'put rentrer dans sa demeure épiscopale' in 1215 (Griffe, *Languedoc cathare au temps de la Croisade* 153). For evidence that Fulk actually returned to Toulouse by July 1214, see N.M.Schulman, *Where troubadours were bishops*, New York 2001, 136, 155.

Montpellier. 'Dominique n'a évidemment pas reçu de mission spéciale en IV.1214; un mois plus tard, il est toujours *capellanus* (curé) à Fanjeaux'.

As we have seen, Dominic was not curé at Fanjeaux in any sense which would have prevented him from taking on a 'mission spéciale'; so why should he not have received his commission from the legate in April? Raimundus Guillermus had no reason to wait until 1215 to start worrying about his situation, and Dominic's reference to future instructions could perfectly well refer to the cardinal's expected return from Aragón;⁴⁸ there is no objection in principle to dating Dominic's letter any time after 25 April 1214 (or, if he remained in Carcassonne until early June, any time after that).

In January 1214 the pope was optimistic that the Albigensian crusade had essentially accomplished its purpose, 'haereticis ex maxima parte destructis et ab illis partibus effugatis, virisque catholicis in locum succedentibus eorumdem', though new dissensions were already threatening the *pacis foedera* which had brought an end to previous hostilities; he was therefore, as he explained to the local prelates, sending a legate 'qui auctoritate ac vice nostra pacis foedera iam pridem inita corroboret et confirmet, et ut vir potens in opere et sermone novellam plantationem irrigans in fide foveat et consolidet orthodoxa' (PL 216:955-956).⁴⁹

There was a particular need for orthodoxy to be consolidated in Toulouse. When the city was reconciled, a distinctive clause was added to the formula of submission, requiring the consuls to promise obedience to the Holy See and to the legate particularly 'super negotiis fidei orthodoxe et super expurganda civitate Tholosana et suburbio ab omnia spurcicia hereticorum et credentium eorumdem, et super dispositionibus vestris ad corroborandam et confovendam catholice fidei puritatem' (Devic-Vaissete VIII 649).

The legate reconciled Toulouse 'habito diligenti consilio' (Cernai §507), and it would be surprising if this did not include consultation with the bishop of Toulouse; whether or not Dominic was involved, Fulk would surely have appreciated that the situation in Toulouse cried out for the kind of apostolate which Dominic and his

⁴⁸ Having completed his business in Languedoc, Peter spent a long time in Aragón 'pro gravibus negotiis', and then returned to convene a council at Montpellier in January (Cernai §542).

⁴⁹ As Puylaurens put it (XXIII 88), the legate was sent 'finem pacis labori bellico cum Dei auxilio positurus', in other words, to bring the labour of war to its desired conclusion, peace.

colleagues had made their own. Although the evidence is meagre and circumstantial, it makes a good deal of sense to suppose that, in April 1214, Fulk discussed with the cardinal the possibility of re-establishing the *predicatio* as an official institution, headed by Dominic⁵⁰ and equipped with faculties from the legate, and the desirability of putting it to work in Toulouse as soon as possible.

If this is what happened, it would provide a context for the measures taken by Fulk and Simon de Montfort in the ensuing months to fund Dominic's *predicatio*; it would also suggest an explanation of Jordan's 'dating' of Peter Seilhan and Thomas's self-oblation.

'Ingruente tempore quo ad Lateranense concilium Romam adire ceperunt episcopi' is not just inaccurate, it is a very peculiar way of indicating when something happened, so peculiar that Jordan would scarcely have used it unless it was part of the information which he had received (and misunderstood). If, as a result of Fulk's discussions with the legate, the *predicatio* had been reconstituted as an institution, its acquisition of property and manpower of its own, thanks to Peter and Thomas, would represent a significant new development; it might well have been remembered that they 'obtulerunt se fratri Dominico' just when the bishops were setting off for Montpellier — when the time for their departure was pressing on them (*ingruente tempore*) — if a development so fraught with new possibilities occurred just in the nick of time for it to be discussed with the legate at the council.

All told, we have strong reasons for believing that Dominic was working in Toulouse well before the end of 1214, and that Peter and Thomas 'obtulerunt se' at the beginning of 1215. We still cannot say when Dominic first moved to Toulouse, but he could have spent most of his time there from the second week of June onwards.

MOPH XXV no. 61 shows that the *predicatio* of which Dominic styled himself 'minister' was operating, at least to some extent, on the authority of the legate. The developments which took place in 1215 were in many ways the belated realization of Diego's idea of a durable mission against heresy with its own long-term preachers,

⁵⁰ Dominic may well have been the de facto leader of a team of preachers since his return to Languedoc in 1211, and it is quite possible that he was thought of as their 'magister', as Const. §55 suggests he was called in Lent 1213; but it is doubtful whether this was a fully official position until it was made official by Peter of Benevento.

but there were still difficulties to be overcome: in as much as the *predicatio* received its authority from the legate it could not be permanent, since its commission would lapse with the legate's own powers; it could be given permanence by the bishop, but only as a diocesan institution, and the problems which the *predicatio* was meant to address were not confined to the diocese of Toulouse.

This surely enables us to see exactly why Fulk and Dominic wanted the pope to 'confirm' the institute they had created (Jordan, *Lib.* §40). It is extremely unlikely that Fulk had acted without securing the legate's agreement to the arrangements he was proposing to make; but the legate could no more endorse them in perpetuity than he could make Simon de Montfort the permanent ruler of Toulouse. The transformation of a mission resting on legatine authority into a permanent diocesan institution needed the pope's validation; and we may presume that Fulk and Dominic also raised the question how, on this basis, the remaining territory of the legatine *predicatio* was to be covered.

In 1995 I argued that the pope's suggestion to turn the *predicatio* into a religious order was designed to facilitate its eventual expansion throughout the church (AFP 65 [1995] 30-35). We may now add that the issue of expansion was probably raised by Fulk and Dominic (perhaps also by Peter of Benevento, who had no doubt briefed the pope on developments in Languedoc), though the pope took it up on a far larger scale than they had anticipated.

For a partial chronology of Dominic's activities from 1211-1215, see below, VIII 4.

3. *Jordan of Saxony*

We can now attempt to see what lies behind the somewhat confused narrative which Jordan put together on the basis of the — probably already rather garbled — information he received in Paris c.1218 from people like John of Navarre.

Diego's 'two years' in Languedoc (*Lib.* §28) reflect fairly precisely the period in which *Dominic* was there as Diego's companion or vicar — very precisely, in fact, if their encounter with the legates occurred in January 1206. It would not be surprising if this is what Dominic remembered in connection with Diego's participation in the anti-heretical mission, and it is understandable if he saw no reason to mention that, within this period, neither of them was actu-

ally there for three or four months in 1206 and that thereafter Diego came and went several times.

The 'council' at which Jordan imagined Diego giving his advice is a misguided amalgam of recognizable ingredients (*Lib.* §19-20):

Eo tempore dominus Innocentius papa duodecim abbates ordinis Cisterciensis cum uno legato contra hereticos Albigenses ad predicandam fidem direxerat, qui celebrato cum archiepiscopis et episcopis aliisque illius terre prelati concilio deliberabant quisnam aptior esset modus ad id pro quo missi fuerant fructuosius exequendum. Interim, dum sic consiliarentur ad inuicem, accidit prememoratum
 * Oxomensem episcopum per Montem Pesulanum iter agere, ubi concilium agebatur. ...

Innocent *had* sent the twelve abbots in the sense that it was on the authority of earlier letters of his, to which Arnaud evidently drew attention, that the Cistercian mission was launched. The abbots *did* implement a suggestion made by Diego, though it was made to the legates on a previous occasion, not directly to them. There *was* a meeting of local prelates, under the leadership of one legate (Arnaud), at the start of the abbots' mission, though it was not held at Montpellier and it was not then that Diego advised them how to conduct themselves. The meeting at Montpellier was an earlier one at which Diego only encountered the legates (all three of them), and it was there that he proposed his new strategy.

As Jordan tells the story, the assembled abbots asked Diego what they should do, and he, saying 'Quod me uideritis facere faciatis', 'uocauit suos eosque Oxomam cum equitaturis et suppellecti et diuerso quem secum adduxerat apparatu remisit, paucis clericis in sua societate retentis, dixitque suum propositum in eo esse ut in illa terra moram faceret causa fidei propagande, detinuit etiam secum predictum Dominicum suppriorem' (*Lib.* §20-21). His advice and example persuaded the abbots to do likewise: 'Remittentes singuli ad loca sua que secum adduxerant ... habentes predictum episcopum super se maiorem et quasi caput totius negotii pedites sine expensis in uoluntaria paupertate fidem annuntiare ceperunt' (§22).

We know from Robert of Auxerre that the abbots set off from Cîteaux with minimal baggage; Jordan's idea that they sent back 'ad loca sua que secum adduxerant' was an inevitable consequence of the erroneous belief that they were already in Languedoc when Diego first offered his advice.

According to Cernai §21, Diego set off from Montpellier 'uno comite contentus', which contradicts Jordan's 'paucis clericis in sua

societate retentis'; the discrepancy is easily explained if Dominic was Diego's only companion for the remainder of the journey back to Osma, but the bishop returned to Languedoc later in 1206 with several more of his canons (which would help to explain the conversion of the first nuns of Prouille 'monitis et exemplis fratris Dominici Oxomensis *sociorumque eius*', MOPH XXV no. 5).

Cernai §21 presents the legates as reluctant to embark on a strategy as novel as that proposed by Diego, but 'si quis favorabilis auctoritatis eos sub hac forma vellet precedere, ipsum libentissime sequerentur'; Diego himself gave the necessary lead. This must be what underlies the story in *Lib.* §22 that Diego announced his intention to remain in the region and that the abbots took him as 'maiolem et quasi caput totius negotii'.⁵¹

Thanks to this misunderstanding of the scope of Diego's authority, *Lib.* §29 gives the misleading impression that, when Diego placed Dominic in charge of 'those who remained', this referred to the whole preaching campaign, whereas, as we know from Cernai §51, Abbot Guy became the 'prior et magister' of the Cistercian mission; Dominic was only left in charge of Diego's team.

I have already suggested that Diego's 'final' departure from Languedoc, as recounted by Jordan (*Lib.* §28-29), fuses elements from several different departures, and the interval between his arrival in Osma and his death ('post paucos dies') is obviously an underestimate. Dominic probably did not know exactly when Diego reached Osma; if his story was that Diego died 'shortly afterwards', this could easily evolve, when the tale was repeated, into the more dramatic 'post paucos dies'.

When news of Diego's death arrived, 'hii qui in partibus Tholosanis remanserant singuli ad propria redierunt' (*Lib.* §31). Muddles in the story so far meant that Jordan could not distinguish between the Cistercians, who were due to go home anyway, and Diego's team which dispersed precisely because of his death. But, in the light of their different information, Jordan and Cernai

⁵¹ Dominic's account of what happened thereafter may well have played down the developments which resulted in the creation of a *predicatio* of which Diego really was the head, since that would have required him to talk about himself, as *de facto* superior of this *predicatio*, more than he wanted to. There is, of course, no reason why Diego should not have said that he intended 'moram facere' in the sense of 'make a delay' in completing his return to Spain; and it is likely that he was 'maior et caput' of the small party which put his advice into practice immediately after the Montpellier encounter.

reached the same conclusion: Diego's death (combined with that of Raoul and the murder of Peter of Castelnau) meant the end of the organized preaching campaign.

As I have pointed out elsewhere, Jordan had good information on Diego, but his stories about Dominic's activities between 1206 and 1215 seem to be based on exaggerated rumours; as I argued, this must reflect what Dominic told his recruits in Toulouse about the origins of the *predicatio* and the order which grew out of it: Dominic talked about Diego, he did not talk about himself (AFP 68 [1998] 60-63).

We can quite possibly recognize Dominic's narrative in the essential framework which is still discernible in *Lib.* §19-43: the two most significant turning-points, after Diego's departure, were the self-oblation of Peter Seilhan and Thomas (§38) and the advice which Innocent III gave when Dominic went to Rome with Fulk for the Lateran council (§40-41). Jordan wrongly made these two events almost synchronous, so he rounds off the preconconciliar phase of the story at the end of §37 by saying, 'Igitur a tempore obitus episcopi Oxomensis usque ad Lateranense concilium anni fluxerunt fere decem, quo tempore quasi solus permansit ibidem'.

'Almost ten years' before the council actually takes us back to Diego's encounter with the legates at Montpellier (Jan./March 1206 - Nov. 1215), not to Diego's death.⁵² I see no reason why these 'almost ten years' should not have been part of Dominic's history of the order as he related it in 1216, but, if so, Jordan (or his informant) was wrong to place them after Diego's 'two years', since they really included the 'two years'.

This misconception generated another, though Jordan himself had to modify it. If the other preachers all went home when news of Diego's death arrived (*Lib.* §31), and if Peter Seilhan and Thomas were the first people to 'give themselves' to Dominic (§38) and they did so just before the Lateran council, the conclusion followed that 'frater Dominicus solus ibidem ... permansit' (§31) for the next 'almost ten years' (§37).

However, two further bits of information showed that even after Diego's departure Dominic was not really *solus*.

Thanks, probably, to the other Dominic's arrival in Paris, Jordan learned that he was with his homonym in Languedoc before

⁵² This was pointed out by Malvenda, *Annales* 71.

1215, and he also came to realize that William Claret (mentioned in *Lib.* §29) was not one of the preachers who went home after Diego's death. So, although Jordan asserts that Dominic 'solus ibidem ... permansit', he contradicts himself by adding, 'quem licet interdum aliqui sequerentur non tamen ei quasi per obedientiam tenebantur; ex hiis autem suis sequacibus erant memoratus Guilielmus Clareti et frater Dominicus quidam Yspanus, qui postmodum in Yspania prior extitit de Manino' (*Lib.* §31; cf. AFP 68 [1998] 32).⁵³ This implies a more accurate understanding of the significance of Peter Seilhan and Thomas's self-oblation: they were not Dominic's first companions, but they were his first subjects.

Secondly, as we have seen, Jordan had good information about the funding of the *predicatio* before as well as after the establishment of the Toulouse community. Fulk could not have given Dominic the church of Fanjeaux for the support of 'him and his' if he had no 'his', nor could Simon have given Casseneuil to him and his *sequaces* if he had no *sequaces*; so Dominic must have been only 'quasi solus' for the 'almost ten years' before the Lateran council (*Lib.* §37).

Jordan's awareness that there was a significant period of 'almost ten years' may well derive ultimately from Dominic, but it was wrongly combined with other information to yield the belief that it ran from Diego's death up to the Lateran council and that, during these ten years, Dominic 'solus ibidem ... permansit'.

Diego made one final contribution to the story by prophesying the Albigensian crusade, and Dominic could not have included the prophecy in his history without mentioning the crusade itself (cf. *Lib.* §32-33). This would naturally raise the question what Dominic

⁵³ In most versions of the text there is a double inconsistency: Dominic was alone; there were some people who followed him *pro tempore*, but they were not bound to him by obedience; among these *sequaces* were William Claret and Dominic of Spain who was later prior 'de Manino' in Spain. At least in the case of Dominic of Spain, Jordan evidently knew that he was not a temporary *sequax*. The Osma manuscript lacks *pro tempore*, so the words may not belong to Jordan's text, in which case they must have been added when the *Libellus* was edited, presumably at a general chapter, for official use in the order (MOPH XXVII 38-39, AFP 68 [1998] 11-13). I am no longer persuaded that Ferrandus had access to an independent tradition on this point (cf. AFP 68 [1998] 32 n. 58), since he could have written what he wrote entirely on the basis of *Lib.* §31, especially if his text lacked *pro tempore*.

himself did during it; the answer, whether supplied by him or, more probably, by someone else, was that he carried on preaching. This is presumably the basis for 'frater Dominicus solus ibidem in *predicationis iugitate permansit*' in *Lib.* §31, but it gave rise to a further muddle.

After Diego's death 'cepit crux aduersus Albigenses in Francia predicari' (*Lib.* §32), and 'eo tempore quo ibi crucesignati fuerunt mansit frater Dominicus ibidem usque ad obitum comitis Montis Fortis uerbi diuini sedulus predicator' (*Lib.* §34).

Jordan's statement is untrue: Simon was killed on 25 June 1218 (Cernai §607-612), and Dominic left Languedoc in December 1217 (AFP 65 [1995] 62-63); nor is it likely that Jordan was misled on this point by any of his informants in Paris: when Dominic sent some of his brethren to Spain and others to Paris in August 1217 (*Lib.* §46-49, 51-52; MOPH XXII 15), it looks as if he told each party to send someone to report back to him in Rome early the next year (cf. AFP 65 [1995] 120-121); they should have known that he left Languedoc before Simon's death (which the Parisian brethren could hardly have escaped hearing about, since news of it must have reached Paris quickly enough). What is more, Jordan himself knew that Dominic was in Rome near the beginning of 1218 (*Lib.* §55); whatever he understood by 'the beginning of the year', it preceded Simon's death.

It is possible that Jordan inadvertently contradicted himself by misusing information given him by Peter Seilhan or John of Navarre that their own sustained association with Dominic came to an end at the time of Simon's death;⁵⁴ it is more likely, though, that 'usque ad obitum comitis Montis Fortis' was not part of Jordan's original text.

Without it, *Lib.* §34 simply asserts that Dominic went on preaching while the crusaders were in Languedoc, which Jordan may have considered misleading when he revised his text in 1221 or, more probably, in 1233, since Dominic was plainly not in Languedoc during the later stages of the crusade, not even during

⁵⁴ John was sent to Paris in Aug. 1217 (*Lib.* §51), but he was with Dominic in Rome in time to be sent to Bologna early in 1218 (*Lib.* §55; cf. AFP 65 [1995] 55-57, 62-69). Peter Seilhan probably remained in Toulouse, and, once the siege had begun, it is unlikely that Dominic would have been able to visit him there; but he seems to have joined Dominic in Rome in April 1218 (AFP 65 [1995] 122-125). Peter and John both accompanied Dominic to Spain, but were sent to Paris when news reached him of Simon's death (*ibid.* 60-61, 97-99, 125-126).

Prince Louis's short-lived expedition in 1219, let alone in the period between the royal crusade of 1226 and the final settlement agreed at Meaux in 1229, all of which could be included in 'tempus quo ibi crucesignati fuerunt'. If Jordan had forgotten exactly when Simon de Montfort died, he might have been misled by *Lib.* §46 into thinking that his death occurred soon after the dispersal of the brethren (which Jordan could date approximately by the time when the two parties sent to Paris arrived there, *Lib.* §52); since Dominic must have left Languedoc himself at much the same time if he was in Rome by early 1218 (*Lib.* §55), it might have seemed appropriate to clarify §34 by inserting 'usque ad obitum comitis Montis Fortis'.

The real information underlying §34, then, is that Dominic carried on preaching while crusaders were in the land ('eo tempore quo ibi crucesignati fuerunt', not 'toto tempore').⁵⁵

Jordan's chronology is based on intervals, not dates, and, properly understood, these intervals are both significant and accurate. The essential starting point was the encounter at Montpellier early in 1206: this was when, thanks to Diego's intervention, the mission in Languedoc adopted the strategy which was to be the fundamental inspiration of Dominic's *predicatio*. 'Two years' covers the period in which Diego was the leading light of the campaign, as remembered by Dominic; 'almost ten years' covers the period between Montpellier and the advice given by Innocent III which resulted in Diego's ideals becoming permanently embodied in a religious order.⁵⁶

Dominic's history must have laid stress on the Montpellier encounter. If he told his recruits that Diego died (or more precisely, news of his death arrived) 'two years later', and that Innocent gave his advice 'nearly ten years later', but in between came

⁵⁵ Assuming Jordan's information on this point to have come from the Dominicans in Paris, it must be based on what they had learned before they left Toulouse, and at that time, as they could hardly have failed to be aware, there were still crusaders in the land; they obviously could not have said anything about 'the whole time' that crusaders were there. They could have heard people talking about what happened 'the whole time since the crusaders arrived', but that is not what Jordan says.

⁵⁶ Are the figures accurate enough to warrant the conclusion that the period in which Diego was in charge did span a full two years? If so, his encounter with the legates must be dated to Jan. 1206.

the crusade which Diego had foretold, it is easy to see how the two intervals could have been misunderstood: Dominic's point of reference in both cases was Montpellier, but the second interval could have been taken to refer to the period after Diego's 'two years'.

The period of 'almost ten years' from 1206-1215 is significant whether or not Dominic was continuously involved in the Languedoc mission; a period of ten years *after Diego's death* would be much less obviously relevant unless it referred to a time when Dominic was active independently of Diego. The misunderstanding of the second interval would thus create a presumption that, when Diego died, Dominic carried on the work which he had begun (alone, since the other preachers all went home); and there would have been nothing in Dominic's narrative to contradict this impression if he did not talk about his own activities or his own comings and goings.

An attentive reading of Jordan's text in the light of other evidence shows that his narrative is inaccurate on several points because good ingredients were incorrectly synthesized. His statement that 'a tempore obitus episcopi Oxomensis usque ad Lateranense concilium anni fluxerunt fere decem, quo tempore quasi solus permansit ibidem' (*Lib.* §37) is undoubtedly flawed in this way. Our analysis has certainly not shown that he *must* have been wrong to believe that Dominic was present in Languedoc continuously from 1206 until 1215, but it has given us scant reason to believe that he was right. The underlying good information is that almost ten years elapsed between Dominic's first involvement in the anti-heretical mission and his visit to the pope on the occasion of the Lateran council. This was a significant period because it was in these years that what was to become the Order of Preachers took shape, and as such it must have featured in Dominic's history of the *predicatio*; the exact demarcation of Dominic's presences and absences were not part of that history.

4. *Chronological résumé*

1205

After 23 Oct. Diego and Dominic set off on the second embassy for the king of Castile.

1206

- Jan.⁵⁷ They met the papal legates at Montpellier and, in the company of Peter of Castelnau and Raoul, initiated a new phase in the campaign against heresy with debates at Servian and Béziers and perhaps others thereafter of which we know nothing. Diego, and probably Dominic, then continued their journey to Osma.⁵⁸
- 29 April - 3 July Diego's presence is attested in Castile.
After 3 July Diego and Dominic returned to Languedoc. Diego campaigned against heresy with Bishop Fulk in the northern part of the diocese of Toulouse (including debates at Verfeil and Lavaur); and he made at least preliminary arrangements for staging-posts to be equipped with provisions for the (Cistercian) preachers. Before the end of '1206' (i.e. before 25 March 1207) he established a monastic community at Prouille for women 'converted by Dominic and his companions'.⁵⁹

1207

- 3 Feb. - 16 March Diego's presence is attested in Castile (but Dominic probably remained in Languedoc).
Late March A big formal debate with Cathars was staged at Montréal, in which Diego and Dominic actively participated.

⁵⁷ This assumes that the two years which Jordan allocated to Diego's stay in Languedoc can be taken as a precise, if misunderstood, figure; otherwise the Montpellier meeting could be dated to February or early March.

⁵⁸ If Diego retained only one companion (Cernai §21), presumably Dominic (cf. Jordan, *Lib.* §21), it must be probable that the two of them completed the rest of the journey to Osma together, and that while they were there Dominic resigned as subprior of the chapter (cf. *Lib.* §21) as a prelude to their next visit to Languedoc. On Dominic's 'adoption' of the title *frater*, cf. AFP 69 (1999) 34-37.

⁵⁹ This implies that, for at least part of the time, Dominic operated separately from Diego; this could refer to a time after Diego's return to Spain, but it makes it unsafe to assume that Dominic accompanied him on all his travels in the region or that he assisted at all the debates in which Diego took part.

April	Abbot Arnaud arrived with a party of Cistercian preachers who were deployed throughout the territory in consultation with the local bishops. They campaigned systematically for three months.
3 May - 2 June	Diego's presence is attested in Castile (but Dominic probably remained in Languedoc).
After 2 June	Diego returned to Languedoc. He may have taken part in a debate at Carcassonne in late June.
Early July	Raoul died at Franquevaux.
Aug./Sept.	Diego conducted a debate with Waldensians (and Cathars?) at Pamiers, ⁶⁰ and held a meeting with local ecclesiastics and the new papal

⁶⁰ There is no evidence that Dominic was also present. Vicaire argued that he was (Cdf 2 [1967] 165-167) on the grounds that he is called Diego's *socius* (Cernai §54, Puylaurens VIII 46), that *socius* is a 'terme technique' referring to the 'loi du *socius*' which was an integral part of the *forma apostolica* which Diego persuaded the legates to adopt at Montpellier (Cernai §21; according to Mark 6.7, Christ sent his apostles out *binos*, in pairs), and that, since the legates and the Cistercians were engaged elsewhere, Diego must have gone to Pamiers with 'son *socius* propre, saint Dominique'. So far as I know, *socius* first became a technical term in Dominican usage, and if the Dominican 'loi du *socius*' was inspired by Diego's advice to the legates in 1206 it is surprising that neither Cernai nor Jordan alludes to it in connection with the Montpellier meeting or the Cistercian mission — they both indicate that Diego followed his own advice by getting rid of most of his entourage (Cernai §21, *Lib.* §20), not that he imitated the apostles by keeping a *socius*, and that the preachers went on foot (Cernai §47, *Lib.* §22) — a particularly 'apostolic' trait, according to Bernard, *Vita Mal.* VIII 17. Even if travelling with a *socius* was already ideologically significant, neither Cernai nor Puylaurens justifies the belief that Dominic was Diego's '*socius* propre' — in neither of them does *socius* have to be interpreted as 'the companion of Diego' rather than as 'someone in Diego's entourage' (he is highlighted by Puylaurens because, by the time of writing, he was an important figure in his own right); there were other members of the team who could have accompanied Diego to Pamiers. Vicaire added a sentimental argument that Dominic would have accompanied him since they were about to part for the first time after ten years of 'vie commune quotidienne', but this could only be maintained while it was still believed that Diego was continuously present in Languedoc between the Montpellier meeting and his final return to Spain; by the time he revised his *Histoire* Vicaire knew this to be incorrect, but his statement that Dominic was losing his bishop's company for the first time in ten years passed unchanged from *Histoire*¹ I 273 to *Histoire*² I 279. He also suggested that it was at Pamiers that Dominic became friends with Arnaud de Crampagna who was the judge at the debate (Puylaurens VIII 48); but Arnaud's meagre deposition in ACL §7 shows that he had personal knowledge of Dominic, not when he first met him. It must therefore remain an open question whether Dominic participated in the Pamiers debate.

- legate, Navarre, to discuss the continuation of the preaching after the end of the Cistercian mission, a continuation in which he was expected to play a leading rôle. In preparation for this, he returned to Osma.
- 14 Sept. Cistercian general chapter, at which Guy of Vaux-de-Cernai was appointed to lead a second three-month preaching campaign in Languedoc.
- 25 Sept. Diego's presence in his diocese is attested.
- 30 Nov. Diego's last attendance at a royal council.
- 30 Dec. Diego died.

1208

- Jan. Peter of Castelnaud was murdered on 14 Jan. Peter's murder does not feature in Jordan's narrative and may therefore not have been part of the story which was transmitted to him, so it is likely that Dominic had already received the news of Diego's death and returned to Osma. Seeing that the Cistercian mission had nearly run its course, and the planned continuation of the preaching campaign had been frustrated by the deaths of Raoul and Diego, the prelates of Languedoc appealed to the pope for a new initiative.

1211⁶¹

- 20 June Outside Toulouse. Dominic witnessed the bishop of Cahors' homage to Simon de Montfort (MOPH XXV no. 12). This is his first documented re-appearance in Languedoc.
- Dec. Dominic is attested as being in charge of Prouille, and there is the first indication that Prouille is becoming a 'monastery' ('abbey') (MOPH XXV no. 13).

⁶¹ It should be borne in mind that Prouille documents are only evidence of Dominic's presence there if he is directly addressed ('tibi Dominico') or if he contributes something to the document in his own name ('ego Dominicus').

1212

- 7 Feb. - 25 March Dominic lodged with some heretically inclined ladies throughout Lent and converted them by his ascetic prowess.
- 7 May Dominic was at Prouille (MOPH XXV no. 29).
- Sept. Dominic was at Prouille on one Monday (MOPH XXV no. 34).
- Dec. Dominic was elected bishop of Béziers (he refused to accept).

1213

- Jan. Dominic based himself in Carcassonne, where he was the bishop's vicar *in spiritualibus*. He probably remained based there until June 1214.
- 22 April Dominic was at Prouille (MOPH XXV no. 46).

1214

- April The legate, Cardinal Peter of Benevento, gave Dominic an official position as head of the *predicatio* and faculties to deal with issues concerned with heresy, or at least he empowered Fulk to give him such a position.
- 25 May Dominic is attested as holding the benefice of Fanjeaux (as a source of income for 'him and his'), and he was perhaps there with Fulk (MOPH XXV no. 58).
- Early June Carcassonne. Dominic blessed the marriage of Amaury de Montfort to the daughter of the dauphin of Vienne.
- June(?)/Dec. Dominic worked in Toulouse, probably taking up residence in the bishop's house. As 'predicationis minister' he gave an official letter to Raimundus Guillermus (MOPH XXV no. 61).

Some time between mid 1214 and mid 1215 Dominic was elected bishop of Couserans (he refused to accept).

1215

- Early Jan. Toulouse. Peter Seilhan and Thomas 'obtulerunt se,' and Peter gave his houses, to Dominic.

-
- 8 Jan. The council of Montpellier began. This was probably when Simon de Montfort gave Casseneuil to Dominic and his 'followers' (his fellow-preachers), unless he had found some way to do so earlier (the town was captured on 18 Aug. 1214).
- 25 April Toulouse. The Seilhan brothers formally divided their inheritance; Dominic received Peter's share.
- May (?) Toulouse. Fulk officially appointed Dominic and his companions preachers in the diocese and established them as a permanent diocesan institution.
- 28 Aug. Toulouse. Dominic received John of Navarre into 'the order' (ACB §25).
- 8 Oct. Rome. Dominic received a bull from Innocent III taking Prouille under papal protection.
- Oct./Dec. Innocent III advised Dominic that he and his brethren should form a religious community.

APPENDIX I

A gift at Fenouillet

In the course of his article on St Dominic, Échard quotes several 'diplomata' or 'instrumenta' concerning Prouille;¹ in some cases there is no known printed source from which he could have taken the text, so he had presumably received material from Prouille. One such case is the dossier printed in QE I 10-11 comprising a deed dated Thursday 9 Feb. '1211' (i.e., as Échard points out, 1212) in which Usalguerius and his brother 'Rannes' gave everything they had in the territory of Fenouillet to the nuns of Prouille (= MOPH XXV no. 26), and one dated 28 March 1213 (= MOPH XXV Appendix II 2) in which Simon de Montfort allegedly confirmed this gift, though it includes the text of a deed dated 27 April 1212 in which the two brothers gave the nuns their estate (*villa*) in Fenouillet.

The first deed is also known from Rechac, *Vie de saint Dominique* 202, but there it is dated Thursday 9 Feb. '1208'.

From Rechac the text passed to Cambefort, Prouille MS f.45, and from him to Percin, *Monumenta* I 7 §32;² the text in Mamachi, *Annales* App. 39-40 no. 23, was expressly taken from QE. Subsequent editors cite no source which does not derive ultimately either from Échard or from Rechac, so they are our primary witnesses; however, as can be seen from my apparatus criticus, a number of emendations and errors pass unannounced from one edition to another.

The purpose of my edition here is to present the evidence; I do not claim to have solved all the textual problems involved.

¹ As the asterisk at the beginning shows, it was Échard who composed the whole article on Dominic with which QE begins.

² I hope one day to publish a study of the relationship between Rechac, Cambefort and Percin. The 'cahier' in Archives dép. de l'Aude H 461 containing Cambefort's notes on Rechac's book lacks a folio where his transcription of MOPH XXV no. 26 should be, but he copied texts from Rechac before he started using Prouille manuscripts and he rarely retranscribed them when he came across them in these manuscripts; there is little room for doubt that his text of MOPH XXV no. 26 was taken entirely from Rechac. Percin's references to manuscripts are extremely unreliable, but he certainly used Cambefort; his text of MOPH XXV no. 26 has the same lacuna as that of Rechac-Cambefort, and, though he omits the date, his placing of the deed shows that his source dated it '1208'.

- B Balme-Lelaidier I 277-278
 C Cambefort, Prouille MS f.45^{rv}
 E QE I 10
 G Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 119 no. 365
 K Koudelka, MOPH XXV 26-27 no. 26
 L Laurent, MOPH XV 35-36 no. 21
 M Mamachi, *Annales*, App. 39-40 no. 23
 P Percin, *Monumenta* I 7
 R Rechac, *Vie de S. Dominique* 202

Notum sit omnibus haec audientibus quod ego Usalguerius de Feno-
 leto et ego Raines frater eius et simul ambo bono animo ac spontanea uolun-
 tate et sine omni dolo per nos et per omnes successores nostros damus
 et concedimus et tradimus sine omni nostro nostrorumque retentu domino
 Deo et B. Mariae de Pruliano et omnibus monialibus ibidem nunc et in per- 5
 petuum commorantibus et ibi Deo et S. Mariae seruiantibus et semper per-
 manentibus, pro redemptione animarum nostrarum et parentum nostrorum,
 totum quidquid habemus uel habere debemus in territorio de Fenoletto et
 in terminis eius in terris cultis et incultis, pratis, pascuis, aquis, nemoribus
 et hominibus, et omnia quae aliquo iure nobis contingunt uel contingere 10
 possunt in praedicto territorio, ut habeant et teneant et semper possideant
 ad omnem suam uoluntatem faciendam dictum territorium, quod situm est
 in Narbonensi dioecesi in terra Redesii et concluditur inter territorium de
 Fontazellis et territorium de Onelio, et nos erimus inde semper boni
 guirentes bona fide. Testes huius rei sunt Pontius capellanus, Raimundus 15
 Garda, magister Paganus, Isarnus Bola, Petrus Boer. Facta est charta ista
 .v. idus febr. feria quinta anno ab incarnatione Christi 1208 regnante
 Philippo rege Francorum. Arnaldus Sancii de Lauriaco notarius.

1 haec audientibus] hoc audientibus *BG*, *om.* *P* Fenoletto *EMBGLK*] Fenouil-
 leto *C*, Fenoiletto *R*, Fenoiletto *P* 2 Raines *BGLK*] Rannes *EM*, Razes *C*, Razes
R, Baseus *P* frater eius] eius frater *P* ac] et *P* 4 et¹ *om.* *P* sine ... domino
om. *P* 6-7 et ibi ... permanentibus *om.* *RCP* 8 quidquid] quod *P* uel habere
 debemus *om.* *P* Fenoletto] Fenouiletto *C*, Fenoiletto *R*, Fenoiletto *P*, Fenoiletto
E 9 in terris] et in terris *P* et incultis, pratis *om.* *P* aquis *om.* *P* 10 aliquo]
 alio *BGL* uel] et *RC* 12 suam uoluntatem faciendam] uoluntatem suam *P*,
 suam uoluntatem semper faciendam *RC* 12-18 dictum ... notarius *om.* *P* 13
 Redesii *PMBGLK*] Radesii *C*, Radelii *R*, Tedesii *E* et] sic *EM* 14 Fontazellis]
 Fontarzellis *RC* Onelio] Ouelio *RC* 15 guirentes *BGLK*] gerentes *RCEM* huius
 rei sunt] sunt huius rei *RC* Pontius] socius *RC* 16 Bola] Boto *RC*, Bota *EM*
 Boer *BGLK*] Boet *RCEM* 17 ab incarnatione Christi *om.* *RC* 1208 *RC* et *idem*
innuit *P*] *MCCXI* *EMBGLK* 18 Sancii] Sancis *RC* Lauriaco] Lauraco *BG*
 notarius *RCPEM*] scripsit *BGLK*

The most significant discrepancy between Échard's text and that of
 Rechac is the date. Échard's date has the merit of being coherent: 9 Feb.
 did fall on a Thursday in '1211' (i.e. 1212), whereas in 1209 it fell on a Mon-
 day (and in 1208 on a Saturday). However, Échard was aware of the need

to check the correspondence between calendar dates and days of the week (cf. QE I 20 note), so he might have emended the text he had received to make the date coherent (and, within the required limits, 1212 is the only year in which 9 Feb. fell on a Thursday).³ However, Arnaldus Sancii wrote a similarly incoherent date in an undisputedly genuine deed whose original survives (MOPH XXV no. 33),⁴ so Rechac's reading cannot be dismissed as impossible and it accordingly has a certain claim on us as the *lectio difficilior*.

Usalguerius and Raines are known to have been involved with Prouille in 1212; this is shown by several documents in which one or both appear as witnesses (MOPH XXV nos. 27-29).⁵ They apparently also made a gift to Prouille in 1211 (MOPH XXV no. 25). This might seem to support Échard's date for our deed. On the other hand, though, there are features of the text which favour the earlier date.

From 14 Feb. 1212 onwards there is a large number of documents written by Arnaldus Sancii, and they invariably end with 'Arnaldus Sancii de Lauriaco scripsit' or a more elaborate version of the same thing, always including 'scripsit' and never including 'notarius'; yet the end of our deed (until it was corrupted by editors) is 'Arnaldus Sancii de Lauriaco notarius'. From Dec. 1211 until 1214 all other donations made to Prouille in deeds written by Arnaldus (and in nearly all the rest) were made 'domino Dominico ... et cunctis fratribus et sororibus',⁶ not just to the nuns; to find a parallel for a gift just made to the nuns we must go back to 1207-1209 (MOPH XXV nos. 5 and 9). In documents from between Dec. 1211 and May 1213, especially those written by Arnaldus Sancii, Prouille is almost always referred to as 'monastery' or 'abbey', but this is not so in MOPH XXV no. 26.

On the available evidence, the case for accepting the date given by Rechac, even if it requires correction, is at least as strong as the case in favour of Échard's date (which is itself possibly the result of emendation).

The second deed was until fairly recently known in its entirety only from Échard. Laurent noted the existence of a parchment manuscript in

³ This would not be the only possible emendation. For example, the day of the week might have been misread (it could already have been mistranscribed in some compilation which was the ultimate source of both Rechac and Échard); if we take 'feria .v.' to be a corruption of 'feria .ii.', we arrive at another coherent date, Monday 9 Feb. '1208' (i.e. 1209).

⁴ The date in the original is clearly 'xvii. kal. octob., feria .v., anno ab incarnatione Christi m.cc.xii.', but, as Koudelka points out, 15 Sept. 1212 fell on Saturday, not Thursday.

⁵ Nos. 28-29 reveal the correct form of Raines's name, which Balme restored in MOPH XXV no. 26.

⁶ On 24 Oct. 1215 the only change in his formula is that 'priori eiusdem loci' takes the place of 'domino Dominico' (MOPH XXV no. 66).

the Vatican archives (Fondo Domenicani 1), but he evidently made no use of it; the text was first edited from it by Koudelka in AFP 28 (1958) 105-106. It seems to have been at Prouille in the fourteenth century (Koudelka, art. cit. 102), and Bernard Gui may have seen it, or something like it, when he spent a day there in 1307 (cf. R.J.Loenertz, AFP 24 [1954] 6-8).⁷

Bremond quotes part of this deed in a note (BOP I 1); he does not mention Échard (who is cited in another note on the same page as the source of a different Prouille document), and his comment 'asservatur Prulii' suggests that his knowledge of the deed did not come entirely from Échard, but it remains doubtful whether his quotation can really count as independent evidence. At any rate, for the bulk of the document the two primary witnesses are the Vatican parchment and QE.⁸

I here re-edit the text from ASV Fondo Domenicani 1, leaving abbreviated proper names unexpanded, and drawing attention to odd forms with exclamation marks to show that they are not due to printer's error; in the apparatus I note the variants found in successive editions before that of Koudelka.

B = Balme-Lalaidier I 299-300, 371-372

E = QE I 10-11

G = Guiraud, *Cartulaire* I 53-54 no. 77, II 120 no. 366

L = MOPH XV nos. 24 & 41

M = Mamachi, App. 40-41 no. 25

X = BOP I 1 note

Pateat uniuersis quod nos Symon dei gratia comes Lic., dominus Montis fortis, dux Narbonen., comes Thol'en. (!), uicecomes Bitern. (!), uidimus cartam sigillo uenerabilis patris nostri F. Tholosani episcopi pendente munitam nobis per fratrem Dominicum dilectum nostrum priorem monasterii monialium beate Marie de Pruliano presentatam in hac forma:

5

Nouerint uniuersi quod nos Valguerius (!) et Raines de Foneleto (!) fratres damus bono animo et spontanea uoluntate concedimus in redemptione animarum nostrarum priorisse et monialibus nouiter conuersis moni-

⁷ In a note which he presumably added to his account of Prouille after his visit there Gui says he had found Dominic called 'prior of Prouille' in 1207 in an 'ancient deed' (*instrumentum*) in the monastery's possession (MOPH XXIV 7, 23); the deed presently under consideration, if genuine, actually attests Dominic's priorship of Prouille in 1213, but to an inattentive reader — and Gui spent only a single day at Prouille — it might give the impression that the section in which Dominic is called prior belongs in the deed dated 1207, and there is no other known document to which Gui could be alluding (cf. Koudelka, art. cit. 101, 103).

⁸ As Koudelka pointed out in AFP 28 (1958) 103-105, references by Balme and Laurent to BNF fr. 8671 do not lead to anything relevant, and AGOP XIV lib. Y f.15 is expressly copied from QE; so the whole printed tradition before Koudelka derives ultimately from Échard's unidentified source at Prouille.

10 tis et exemplis fratris Dominici Exosmensis (!) sociorumque eius habitan-
 tibis nunc et in perpetuum in castro Fani Iouis et in ecclesia beate Marie
 de Pruliano Thol'en. (!) dyocesis uillam nostram de Fonoletto (!) Narbon.
 dyocesis in Redesio intus et extra cum terris cultis et incultis, agris, pas-
 cuis, nemoribus et omnibus iuribus et pertinentiis suis iure perpetuo inte-
 15 gre possidendam, et dictas priorissam et moniales et per ipsas et nomine
 earum fratrem Dominicum et fratrem G. Clareti cum traditione presentis
 carte in possessionem dicte uille mictimus corporalem. Actum est hoc anno
 incarnationis domini .m.cc.vii .v. kal. maii in castro Fani Iouis in presentia
 uenerabilis patris nostri F. Tholosani episcopi et fratris Dominici et fratris
 G. Clareti et fratris B. de Fuxo ordinis predicatorum et domini B. de Duro
 20 forti et domini P. R.i de Tonecxs et domini Ysarni de Pruliano et Arnaldi
 Sancii qui hanc cartam scripsit precibus supradictorum. Et nos F. dei per-
 missione Tholosanus episcopus precibus predictorum Valguerii (!) et
 Raines presentem cartam in testimonio supradicte pie donationis sigilli nos-
 tri munimine fecimus roborari.

25 Nos autem, uidentes conferentium deuotionem et dicti monasterii
 piam plantationem considerantes, dictam donationem in redemptione ani-
 marum nostri et parentum nostrorum, sicut superius in presenti pagina ple-
 nius continetur, libere confirmamus et dictam uillam cum omnibus iuribus
 et pertinentiis suis dictis monialibus iure perpetuo integre concedimus pos-
 30 sidendam. In cuius robore firmitatis presentem cartam sigilli nostri
 munimine duximus confirmandam. Actum est hoc Carcassone in domo do-
 mini episcopi anno domini .m.cc.xiii. .v. kal. aprilis.

1 Lic.] Licestriae E, Leicestriae XMBGL 2 dux Narbon. om. X Thol'en.]
 Tholosanus EXMBGL Bitern.] Biterensis EXMBGL 3 F.] Fulconis EXMBGL 5
 presentatam (+EXML) om. B, inter parentheses restituit G 6-31 nouerint ...
 confirmandam om. X 6 Valguerius] Usalguerius EMBGL Foneleto] Foneleto
 EMBGL 7 redemptione] redemptionem EMBGL 9 Exosmensis] Oxomensis
 EMBGL eius (+EM) om. BGL 11 Thol'en.] Tolosanae EMBGL Foneleto] Fone-
 leto EMBGL 12 Redesio (+MBGL)] Tedesio E 15 G.] Guillelmum EMBGL 17
 domini om. EMBGL mcccvii] mcccxi EMBGL 18 F.] Fulconis EMBGL 18-19
 et fratris Dominici ... ordinis predicatorum om. EMBGL 20 P. R.i de Tonecxs]
 P. Rii de Tonecx] EM, P. de Tonnenx BGL Ysarni (+M)] Isarnii E, Isarni BGL
 22 Valguerii] Usalguerii EMBGL 23 Raines (+EM)] Rainis BGL testimonio]
 testimonium EMBGL 25 conferentium] concessionem EMBGL monasterii]
 magistri EMBGL 26 plantationem] praesentationem EMBGL redemptione]
 redemptionem EMBGL 31 est hoc om. X domini om. X

Once again, the main textual problem concerns a date: was the brothers' original deed written in 1207 (as in the Vatican manuscript) or in 1212 (as in QE)? The reference to 'priorisse et monialibus nouiter conuersis monitis et exemplis fratris Dominici ... habitantibus nunc et in perpetuum in castro Fani Iouis et in ecclesia beate Marie de Pruliano' strongly supports 1207. *Nouiter* had already been dropped from the formula by 19 March 1209 (MOPH XXV no. 9.20), and by May 1211 there was no more mention of any of the nuns living at Fanjeaux (MOPH XXV nos. 10-11).

It is easy enough to misread 'vii' as 'xii', so Échard's text at this point could be due to someone's accidental mistranscription of 'vii', or Échard himself may have emended the dates in both the Fenouillet deeds to give greater plausibility to the contention that Simon was confirming the gift made in Feb. 1212 (though it still remains unexplained why he actually quotes a deed of April 1212).

Some of Échard's readings are obviously wrong (such as *concessionem* and *magistri* in 25, *praesentationem* in 26), some look like grammatical corrections (*redemptionem* in 7 and 26, *testimonium* in 23); some are manifestly superior to those of the Vatican manuscript, but it would not have been difficult for Échard or for someone at Prouille to make the necessary emendations, so there is no guarantee that the QE text comes from an independent original. In any case, implausible readings such as *Thol'en.* in 2 and 11, *Exosmensis* in 9, the wrong name for the principal donor in 6 and 22, and the incorrect Latin form of Fenouillet in 6 and 11, make it difficult to accept the Vatican parchment as a genuine original. What is more, the text claims that the confirmation of the gift was itself 'confirmed' by being sealed, but, as Koudelka pointed out (art. cit. 102), the Vatican parchment was never sealed.

Koudelka also drew attention to features of the text which show that neither the confirmation nor the deed it quotes can be authentic (ibid. 106-109). The confirmation, for instance, is dated 1213, but Simon gives himself titles (duke of Narbonne and count of Toulouse) which he was not granted until 1215; and his titles are listed in the wrong order (the highest-ranking, duke of Narbonne, should come first).⁹ In the 1207 deed Dominic and William Claret are listed as witnesses, though they were parties to the transaction; and they and another witness are described as 'ordinis predicatorum', nine years before the Order of Preachers came into being.¹⁰

It is clear that the Vatican parchment is not a genuine original and that the deed which it contains is a fake, though someone went to the

⁹ We may also notice that it seems to be contrary to Simon's practice in the Midi to attach 'dei gratia' to his inherited title, Earl of Leicester; he normally attached it or some equivalent to his acquired titles, presumably because he believed that his acquisition of them was a special divine favour (he had, after all, obtained them in God's service). Of the 23 deeds edited in Devic-Vaissete VIII and MOPH XXV, one from 1209 has no 'dei gratia' formula (Devic-Vaissete VIII 571), and four begin with something like 'dei prouidentia dux Narbone' (Devic-Vaissete VIII 688, 694, 704; MOPH XXV no. 84) — 'dei prouidentia' coming at the beginning because it was attached to an acquired title which outranked all the rest. Of the remaining 18 deeds, most (including all those edited from originals) begin with one or more of Simon's inherited titles and then attach 'dei gratia' or 'dei prouidentia' or some such phrase to 'viscount of Béziers etc.' (Devic-Vaissete VIII 579, 587-588, 599, 604, 621, 626, 653, 660, 667, 680; MOPH XXV nos. 10, 31, 32, 38, 50, 52); there are only two exceptions where 'divina miseratione' or 'dei miseratione' is attached to 'comes Leicestrie' (Devic-Vaissete VIII 637, 658-659).

¹⁰ We may presume that the omission of the three witnesses 'ordinis predicatorum' in Échard's text was deliberate, whether the excision was made by him or by someone at Prouille.

trouble of producing something designed to look like an authentic deed. Koudelka (art. cit. 109-110) plausibly suggested that the key to the forger's purpose lies in the list of witnesses to the 1207 deed, which includes 'B. de Duro Forti' and 'P. Ri. de Tonecxs'; at the beginning of the century both families were deeply implicated in heresy, but later on there were men and women from both of them in the Dominican order who might have wished to 'rehabilitate their ancestors' in this way.¹¹

However, some of Koudelka's criticisms are unfair. He objects to the confirmation giving Dominic the title 'prior of Prouille' 'qu'aucun texte authentique ne lui donne'; but Koudelka himself identified Dominic as the prior of Prouille alluded to in two documents from 1215 (MOPH XXV pp.59-60). Dominic was certainly referred to as 'prior of San Sisto' at a time when the brethren had already moved to Santa Sabina (MOPH XXV no. 152); there is no reason in principle why he should not have been referred to as 'prior of Prouille' in 1213.

Koudelka complained that the deed quoted in the confirmation purports to be a gift made by the brothers from Fenouillet in 1207, yet five years later 'the same brothers, before the same notary, give the same property to the same monastery, in slightly different terms, without breathing a word of their earlier gift, as if it had never taken place'. But when Isarn of Aragón, on the instructions of the archbishop of Narbonne, handed over St Martin's, Limoux, to the nuns on 19 March 1209, he did so without any explicit reference to the archbishop's earlier deed giving the same property to the same nuns in the same terms on 17 April 1207 (MOPH XXV nos. 5 and 9).

¹¹ Galharda de Duroforti was a nun at Prouille by 1234 (Guiraud, *Cartulaire II* 112 no. 353), and Comtor de Thonenchis was prioress on 28 Oct. 1269 when a number of people, including Guillaume de Durfort, made a gift to the monastery (ibid. II 81-82 no. 342); she is also attested as prioress on 1 June 1278 and, apparently, on 14 Sept. 1296 (ibid. II 196-197 no. 454, I 267 no. 215). Wm. de Tonnencs was prior of Orthez in 1256-1257 (MOPH XXIV 117), assigned to be lector at Cahors in 1265 (C. Douais, *Acta capitulorum provincialium*, Toulouse 1894, 107), subsequently prior of Marseille, Agen, Bordeaux and Perpignan, and, at the wish of the pope, he was appointed the first prior of Saint-Maximin, though he never took up the post; he died in extreme old age in 1299 (MOPH XXIV 85, 113, 257, 275-276). Sicard de Durfort was part of the founding community sent to Pamiers in 1270 (Douais, *Acta* 152). Vicaire claims that Isarn of Prouille (otherwise first mentioned in connection with the monastery on 21 June 1221, MOPH XXV no. 176) was also implicated in heresy (*Histoire I* 247-248), but this does not seem to be true — his brother, Guillelmus Petri (cf. Guiraud, *Cartulaire II* 51 no. 297), had the reputation of being 'vir catholicus et fidelis et bonus' (Devic-Vaissete VII ii 354). Vicaire evidently identified Isarn with the 'W. Isarnus de Prolano' who is alleged in Balme-Lelaidier I 169 to have been seen taking part in an heretical gathering at Fanjeaux in 1204; but this identification is hazardous and in any case the inquisition record cited by Balme (Devic-Vaissete VIII 1150) mentions 'Willelmus de Proliano', not 'W. Isarnus'. W. Isarnus witnessed a gift to Prouille in 1207 (MOPH XXV no. 6.33).

In fact, if we accept the earlier dating of MOPH XXV no. 26, there is a remarkable parallelism between the two benefactions, both of which concern properties in the county of Razès in the archdiocese of Narbonne: on 17 April 1207 the archbishop of Narbonne made his gift to Prouille, and the same gift was repeated in his name on 19 March 1209, presumably because the first donation had failed to take effect; on 27 April 1207, the Fenouillet brothers made their gift, which they repeated on 9 Feb. 1209, presumably because their first donation too had failed to take effect. The archbishop's gift continued to be disputed for decades, and it was his original deed of 1207, not that of 1209, which was regularly adduced by Prouille and quoted in successive 'confirmations' of the gift;¹² the original deed of 1207 is similarly quoted in Simon's confirmation of the Fenouillet brothers' gift. Presumably because the archbishop's gift continued to be disputed, it is not listed among the properties of Prouille confirmed by Innocent III in 1215 (MOPH XXV no. 65) or by Honorius III in 1218 (MOPH XXV no. 90); nor is the Fenouillet property listed in either bull.

According to Koudelka, 'le faussaire ... commet une grosse gaffe, en oubliant que Simon atteste et confirme la donation faite par un autre, car il lui fait dire qu'il la confirme "in redemptionem animarum nostri et parentum nostrorum", comme s'il était le donateur, ajoutant un "ut superius continetur", auquel rien ne répond dans la charte'. However, in a deed whose authenticity Koudelka did not dispute (though no original survives), Simon confirmed a gift made by Hugh of Lacy in very similar terms: 'Ego Simon dominus Montis Fortis dei gratia uice comes Biterrensis et Carcassonensis, assensu et uoluntate A. uxoris meae et A. primogeniti mei, ad honorem dei et Beatae Mariae, et in remissionem peccatorum nostrorum, dono et concedo et confirmo quicquid dominus Hugo de Lasco dominus Lauriacensis et Castri Noui dedit domino Dominico Oxomensis canonico et fratribus et dominabus de Prolano ...' (MOPH XXV no. 50). And 'sicut superius in presenti pagina plenius continetur' refers to the 1207 deed included in the confirmation, exactly as Cardinal Romanus in 1229, having quoted Bérenger's original donation (MOPH XXV no. 5), says 'Nos uero piam praedictam donationem autoritate quae fungimur confirmamus sicut superius in praesenti pagina plenius continetur ...' (BNF Doat 98 f.32').

With reference to the 1207 deed, Koudelka objected that Arnaldus Sancii, who is said to have written it, 'had his own formulary' which is familiar to us from the many documents he is known to have written for Prouille, but the 1207 deed, instead of using Arnaldus's formulae, borrows different ones from MOPH XXV nos. 5 and 9. However, the charge of infi-

¹² The 1264 vidimus of the whole dossier (BNF Doat 98 ff.27'-46'') naturally contains a copy of MOPH XXV no. 9, but only one; by contrast it contains five copies of no. 5 since it was adduced by Prouille in 1222, 1223, 1229 and 1231 and was therefore quoted again in the archbishop of Narbonne's résumé of the affair in 1252.

delity to his own formulary applies also to MOPH XXV no. 26, in which, as we have seen, Arnaldus uniquely calls himself 'notarius' and omits 'scripsit', and his description of the beneficiaries is out of line with other documents from 1212-1213. Unless we are to believe that the whole dossier on Fenouillet is inauthentic, we must accept that Arnaldus could vary his formulae. I have suggested that the language of the '1212' deed supports the alternative date offered by Rechac, 1209; is it not possible that in 1207 Arnaldus had not yet developed his own formulary?

As for the 'borrowings' from Bérenger's deed (MOPH XXV no. 5), there is nothing inherently suspect in the fact that Arnaldus used the same way of identifying the gift's recipients; the phrase had no doubt been suggested to Bérenger, and it could well have been suggested to Arnaldus. And, if there was a genuine donation on 27 April 1207, it would not be surprising if Bérenger's deed of ten days earlier was used as a model in other ways too, especially if Arnaldus was still new to the job.

As it stands, the 1213 deed is undoubtedly inauthentic; but if it is a complete fake it must have been created by a very peculiar forger.

Having decided, for whatever reason, to use the Fenouillet brothers' gift to accommodate his fiction, he did not base his fake document on the genuine deed which was at his disposal (MOPH XXV no. 26), he embarked on the far more ambitious scheme of inventing not just one new deed, but two; yet he knew so little about such things that he did not even realize that parties to a transaction could not also serve as witnesses to it, and that a document which claims to be sealed ought to be sealed (or at least look as if a seal had once been attached).

He was so devoid of historical sense that he provided his 1207 deed with witnesses belonging to the still non-existent Order of Preachers, and in his 1213 deed he gave Simon titles which he did not yet have (and made a dog's dinner of the titles while he was at it); yet he had enough historical knowledge and sensitivity to choose a description of the Prouille community which was appropriate to 1207, to appreciate that Simon was the right person to confirm a gift of property in the county of Razès,¹³ to give a significant rôle to the bishop of Toulouse at a time in 1207 when he could plausibly be supposed to be in the neighbourhood, and, most remarkably of all, to claim that his deed of confirmation was drawn up in the bishop of Carcassonne's house in Lent 1213, precisely when Dominic was living there as the bishop's vicar¹⁴ — this was a stroke of genius, if it is really a complete invention.

¹³ As viscount of Béziers and Carcassonne, Simon was also lord of Razès (e.g. MOPH XXV no. 10; Devic-Vaissete VIII 604, 626); cf. Griffe, *Languedoc cathare au temps de la croisade* 14.

¹⁴ After the king of Aragón rallied to the side of the count of Toulouse and more or less declared war on Simon de Montfort in Jan.-Feb. 1213 (Cernai §413-416,

I cannot believe in this forger who displays such a fine sensitivity to historical detail and yet so crassly over-egged his pudding by adding Dominic and William Claret to the witnesses of his 1207 deed and throwing all the titles he could think of into Simon's confirmation of it. Is it not much more likely that the convincing detail comes from a genuine deed and that it is only the silly mistakes which were contributed by the forger?¹⁵

Koudelka's verdict was that the 1213 document was 'nullius fidei' (MOPH XXV p.183), but, as I have tried to show, it is not nearly as flawed as he made out; if we remove its obvious absurdities, we are left with a perfectly plausible deed from 1207 and a perfectly plausible confirmation of it in 1213. If, in spite of Simon's confirmation, the nuns never succeeded in gaining possession of the property which the Fenouillet brothers wished them to have, no harm would be done by suppressing the original deeds and replacing them with a fake in which the compromised families of some Dominican men and women could be endowed with a proper Catholic past.

Chanson laisses 130-132), nothing much appears to have happened in the crusade until after the knighting of Simon's son, Amaury, at Castelnaudary on 24 June (Cernai §425), so there seems to be no reason why Simon should not have been at Carcassonne on 28 March 1213 — his presence there is attested some time in May when he confirmed another gift made to Prouille (MOPH XXV no. 50). Koudelka objected that Simon's deeds are usually dated according to the *stylus paschatis*, so 28 March '1213' should mean 28 March 1214, which was Good Friday, an unlikely day for Simon and Dominic to be doing business; but if the date was invented by our forger he has forestalled this criticism: a deed drawn up in the bishop's house might well be dated in the manner which was usual there, according to the *stylus incarnationis*, in which case the date means 28 March 1213, which was Thursday in the 4th week of Lent.

¹⁵ The inclusion of 'frater B. de Fluxo ordinis predicatorum' among the witnesses to the 1207 deed could be another case of 'family rehabilitation': Raymond-Roger, count of Foix, was a notorious supporter of heretics — Cernai calls him 'that worst of traitors, that most cruel persecutor of the church' (§48); but his grandson, Raymond, was a Dominican and, when he died in 1258 after being prior of Toulouse for sixteen years (MOPH XXIV 50-51), the family evidently wanted the relationship to be remembered (cf. Vicaire, CdF 9 [1974] 227). There was also a Dominican Stephanus de Fluxo who died in 1272/1273 (Douais, *Acta cap. prov.* 181), and on 22 Oct. 1308 there was a Berengaria de Fluxo at Prouille (Guiraud, *Cartulaire* II 224 no. 484). It is equally likely, though, that the witnesses to the genuine deed included 'frater B. de Fluxo predicator' (cf. Dominic's title in MOPH XXV no. 12) and that 'predicator' was turned into 'ordinis predicatorum' when Dominic and William Claret were inserted.

APPENDIX II

The Nachleben of Jordan's chronology

A survey of some of its main landmarks reveals how persistently the historiographical tradition after Jordan was dominated by his chronology of Diego and Dominic's participation in the Languedoc mission.

Jordan provides no dates for the period before 1215, merely intervals: Diego spent two years, then Dominic spent nearly ten years, in Languedoc. Later legends follow the same pattern (Ferr. §17, 25; Const. §16, 20; Humb. §20, 28), as do Jean de Mailly¹ and Dietrich of Apolda (§32, 45). Bartholomew of Trent did not even retain Jordan's intervals,² and James of Varagine only kept the ten years allotted to Dominic.³

Probably the first attempt to attach precise dates to the story occurs in a revision of Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum historiale*.⁴ It is based on good information that 'Cisterciensis ordinis abbates et alii quidam a domino papa mittuntur ad Prouinciam ad haeresim extirpandam' in 1207; since, in all versions of the legenda of Dominic, it was Diego's meeting with these abbots which led to his involvement in the anti-heretical campaign, Vincent attaches the same date to this meeting. As a result, his account of the consequences of Diego's advice leads immediately into a brief mention of Peter of Castelnau's murder.⁵ Vincent then backtracks to deal with Dominic's earlier life, including Diego's embassy and Dominic's conversion of their host in Toulouse, for which he provides no date. Vincent correctly dates the arrival of the crusaders to 1209, and, under the same year, notes that Diego returned to Osma and

¹ M.D.Chapotin, *Les Dominicains d'Auxerre*, Paris 1892, 319-320 (I have checked most of the manuscripts).

² *Liber epilogorum*, ed. E.Paoli, Florence 2001, 210.

³ *Legenda Aurea*, ed. G.P.Maggioni, Florence 1998, 720, 722.

⁴ In the earliest version he simply took over the text of Ferrandus (cf. J.B.Voorbij, in S.Lusignan – M.Paulmier-Foucart, edd., *Lector et compiler, Vincent de Beauvais*, Grâne 1997, 162).

⁵ 'Coeperunt singuli evangelicam paupertatem amplecti, pedites discurrere ac strenue fidem Christi uerbo et opere praedicare, habentes super se quasi totius negotii ducem episcopum Oxomensem. Quod videntes ac invidentes haeretici coeperunt ex adverso opportunius praedicare. Petrus itaque de Castronovo domini papae legatus a comite Tolosano ... occiditur.' *Coeperrunt ... praedicare* is taken almost verbatim from Ferr. §14.

died 'exacto in fidei praedicatione biennio'. The *biennium* is obviously responsible for Diego's death being dated to 1209, but the result fits the way the story is told in Ferr. §18-19, which implies that the crusade was launched at more or less the time when Diego died; it does not, however, make much sense of the statement, which Vincent repeats from the *legenda*, that Dominic remained in Languedoc for a further ten years between Diego's death and the Lateran council (*Speculum historiale*, Douai 1624, 1217-1221).

Gerald de Frachet built his chronology around a different date. He had presumably found a report somewhere of the legates' mission in 1204 (which is accurate, in so far as that was when Arnaud became a legate), and, taking Jordan's intervals at their face value, he needed to date Diego's first arrival on the scene twelve years before the Lateran council, i.e. in 1203. By reinterpreting 1204 as the date of the Cistercian abbots' mission, he could more or less make sense of all his data: if 1203 was when Diego was sent on his embassy by the king and when Dominic converted their host in Toulouse, they could have met the abbots (in line with Jordan, *Lib.* §19 etc.) in 1204; the only problem was that this did not leave enough time both for Diego to be involved in the mission for two years after his meeting with the abbots and for Dominic to have ten years between Diego's death and the Lateran council.

Gerald included in his universal chronicle the statement that 'Anno domini m.cc.iiii. duodecim abbates cisterciensis (*sic*) cum uno legato a papa contra hereticos mittuntur, ut plenius in uita beati Dominici legitur' (BAV Reg. lat. 598 f.90^v), and he began his *cronica ordinis*, which was originally intended as a supplement to the universal chronicle,⁶ with a résumé of the whole period under the heading '1203' (cf. MOPH I 321):

Anno domini m.cc.iiii. beatus Dominicus ... cum Oxomensi episcopo Tholosam ueniens ipsa die hospitem suum hereticum conuertit, ubi cum dicto episcopo post reditum de marchia Dacie per biennium predicationi uacauit. Post reditum autem dicti episcopi in Hyspaniam per decem annos in Narbonensi prouincia permansit confundens hereticos et confirmandos catholicos ...

The next date mentioned is 1215, when Dominic accompanied Fulk to the Lateran council.

There can be little doubt that 1204 was the only real date which Gerald could find for the preceding period, and that 1203 was an inference from Jordan's intervals; and his failure to subdivide the period between 1203 and 1215 into Diego's *biennium* and Dominic's *decennium* was surely deliberate.

⁶ The earliest version of it is found in two manuscripts of the *chronicon universale*, BAV Reg. lat. 598 and Angers 668 (605).

Humbert was less cautious in the *cronica ordinis* he composed to replace Gerald's *cronica* in the *Vitas fratrum*: treating Dominic's *decennium* as an absolute datum, he made Diego return to his diocese in 1205; to accommodate all the events which he lumped together under the heading '1203' he reduced Diego's *biennium* to 'about two years' (cf. MOPH I 321-322):

Anno domini M^oCC^oIII^o. Beatus Dominicus cum Oxomensis episcopo Dydaco Tolosam uenit, ubi ipsa die cooperante deo hospitem suum hereticum ad ueram fidem reduxit; deinde, peracta legatione regis semel et iterum et curia uisitata ab ipso episcopo, remansit cum eodem quasi per biennium in predicationis officio in partibus Tolosanis.

Anno domini M^oCC^oV^o. Post reditum Dydaci episcopi ad suam dyocesim beatus Dominicus remanens quasi solus ... per decem annos per diuersa loca prouincie Narbonensis et precipue circa Carcasonam et Fanum Iouis impugnano hereticos catholicam fidem extulit et, animarum saluti datus, totus officio predicationis uacauit ...

To understand the subsequent influence of Humbert's *cronica*, it must be borne in mind that its dates served as headings and, as such, they were liable to be omitted by copyists who thought it was the rubricator's business to put them in; judging by the manuscripts I have looked at, the first two were particularly vulnerable.⁷

The original version of Rodrigo of Cerrato's life of Dominic contains the usual statements that Diego returned to Osma 'post biennium' and died, and that Dominic remained 'in partibus Tolosanis annis fere decem quasi solus'.⁸ In the third edition, however,⁹ without otherwise changing the text, Rodrigo added a date to Diego's mission 'ad marchias':

Igitur cum tempus esset ut beati uiri uirtus prodiret in publicum, cum dictus Didacus iret ad marchias rogatu Alfonsi regis Castelle, regis uidelicet eiusdem filio cuiusdam puelle nobilis conciliaturus connubia, secum duxit seruum dei Dominicum anno domini m.cc.iii.

⁷ Wien, Dominikanerkonvent 25/25 omits the date-headings throughout; 1203 is omitted by Firenze, BN conv. soppr. J.VII.10; Soest, Stadtbibliothek 16 omits 1203 and 1205; 1205 is also omitted by Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1555 and 1743.

⁸ Rodrigo does not explicitly identify the outer limits of the 'nearly ten years', but his language here is taken from Const. §20 who does specify that they ran from Diego's death up to Lateran IV.

⁹ The oldest edition is found in BL add. 30057, the second in Madrid, Bibl. Univ. 146, the third in a manuscript in Segovia, Cathedral. The text was edited from the Segovia manuscript in Mamachi, Appendix 312-334, and in V.D.Carro, *Domingo de Guzmán*, Madrid 1973, 775-801 (see §6, 10-11).

There can be no doubt that the source of the date is Gerald's *cronica ordinis*, since the third edition also contains another insertion which is taken more or less verbatim from Gerald:¹⁰

Gerald

... Ubi [*sc. Tholose*] cum dicto episcopo, post reditum de marchia Dacie, per biennium predicationi uacauit. Post reditum autem dicti episcopi in Hyspaniam per decem annos in Narbonensi prouincia permansit confundens hereticos et confirmans catholicos, uerbis et exemplis annuncians dominum Ihesum Christum.

Rodrigo

Mansit autem in partibus Tolosanis cum episcopo Exomensis post reditum de marchia Dacie per biennium uacans predicationi. Post reditum uero dicti episcopi in Hyspaniam remansit in Narbonensi prouincia predicando annis fere decem quasi solus uirtute domini confortatus.

It was presumably this insertion which prompted Rodrigo to substitute *triennium* for *biennium* in his earlier statement that 'sepeditus episcopus post biennium reuersus est Oxomam et ex hac luce subtractus': if he spent two years 'uacans predicationi' after coming back 'de marchia Dacie', his embassy 'ad marchias' must have occurred before then, so the interval between the embassy and his return to Spain must have been more than a *biennium*.

Galvano similarly adopted the date 1203 from Gerald's *cronica*, or from a manuscript of Humbert's *cronica* which omitted 'anno domini m.cc.v',¹¹ though otherwise he tells the usual story (distorted in Galvano's customary manner). After reporting how the king of Castile sent Dominic and Diego 'uersus marchias', Galvano says that 'in illa legatione beatus Dominicus apud Tholosam quendam suum hospitem hereticum ad fidem conuertit anno domini m.cc.iii, anno etatis sue xxx';¹² later on, he says that Diego 'post duos annos beatum Dominicum suum uicarium et caput omnium cruce signatorum (*sic*) ordinauit; qui rediens ad ecclesiam suam Oxomensem ... uitam finiuit. ... Et beatus Dominicus quasi solus ... per .x. annos predicauit ...'.¹³

Meanwhile Vincent of Beauvais had been brought into play by Martin of Troppau, who wrote in the Imperatores part of his chronicle that 'anno domini 1207 ab Innocentio papa cum legato 12 abbates Cisterciensis

¹⁰ Everything from 'cum episcopo' to 'predicando' in Rodrigo's text is peculiar to the Segovia manuscript.

¹¹ One or other of these chronicles is found in most manuscripts of the *Vitas fratrum*, which was certainly one of Galvano's sources.

¹² The manuscript tradition unequivocally supports 'anno etatis sue xxx', though it is obviously incompatible with Galvano's statement that Dominic was born in 1170 (MOPH II 1), itself based on a misunderstanding of Dietrich §11.

¹³ Ravenna, Bibl. Classense 347 f.1; the text is slightly better than the one printed by Reichert from a different manuscript in MOPH II 2-3.

ordinis in terram Albigensium ad predicandam fidem hereticis mittuntur, quibus de Hispania Dydacus Oxomensis episcopus, habens secum fratrem Dominicum in comitatu, pro hereticis convertendis adiungitur' (MGH SS XXII 471). In the Pontifices section, however, he declared enigmatically that 'Ordinem fratrum Predicatorum incepit sanctus Dominicus in Tolosanis partibus, ubi contra hereticos verbo et exemplo predicabat, anno domini 1198, pontificatus domni Innocentii anno 6' (ibid. 438). '1198' probably derives from a note to the effect that the Dominican and Franciscan orders both began in the reign of Innocent III who became pope in 1198; if so, it is 'pontificatus anno 6' which is significant, and it should mean 1203. This aligns Martin with Gerald de Frachet.¹⁴

Ptolemy of Lucca's *Annales*, presumably on the authority of a manuscript of Humbert's *cronica* which dated Diego's embassy to 1202 rather than 1203,¹⁵ place the embassy and Dominic's first arrival in Toulouse in 1202; Diego's *biennium* thus came to an end in 1204, under which year Ptolemy says that 'dimisso beato Dominico, cum quo steterat in partibus Tolosanis ad predicandum contra hereticos per biennium, rediit in Yspaniam'. He also adopted Martin's statement about the mission of the Cistercian abbots in 1207, but his own narrative required him to drop Martin's mention of Diego and say only that Dominic joined the abbots then; all told, then, Dominic 'mansit in partibus Tholosanis a MCCII usque ad XV continue predicando contra hereticos'.¹⁶ The story is coherent, but scarcely consistent with the legends on which it was ultimately based.

When he returned to the subject in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* Ptolemy adopted a slightly different chronology, apparently under the influence of a different manuscript of Humbert's *cronica*. The first arrival of Dominic and Diego in Toulouse is now dated to 1203 (XXI 5, RIS¹ XI 1121); Diego's return to Spain is still dated 1204,¹⁷ but by implication this must mean the end of 1204, since thereafter Dominic spent eleven years 'in partibus Tholosanis et Albigensibus' up to the confirmation of his order, i.e., as Ptolemy explains, 'ab anno domini MCCV usque ad MCCXVI' (XXI 10, RIS¹ XI 1124). Although Ptolemy does not explicitly mention the traditional intervals, this allows Diego to be 'quasi per biennium ... in partibus Tolosanis', which is all that Humbert's *cronica* requires, and it gives Dominic his *decennium* up to Lateran IV. As before, the mission of the Cistercian abbots comes too late for Diego to be

¹⁴ There is a clear hint in *Vitas fratrum* V that Gerald regarded 1203 as the year in which the order began (cf. MOPH XXVII 62 note 6).

¹⁵ I know of two Italian manuscripts of Humbert which give the date as 1202: Roma, Bibl. Vallicelliana F 28, and BAV, Chigi F.IV.86.

¹⁶ *Annales*, ed. B.Schmeidler, MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum, nova series VIII, Berlin 1955, 94-96.

¹⁷ The date is given simply as 'eodem anno', but the last year mentioned before this is 1204.

involved in it, though, for some reason, it is now dated to 1208 (XXI 11, RIS¹ XI 1124).¹⁸

Nicholas Trevet's narrative, though not his chronology, is based on Humbert. In his *Annales*, under the year 1204, he paraphrases Humbert's account of Diego's embassy, Dominic's conversion of their Toulouse host, Diego's visit to the Roman curia and his encounter with the twelve abbots (Humb. §10-13); he then switches to Humbert's *cronica* for a brief account of what ensued:

Humbert	Trevet
(<i>Dominicus</i>) remansit cum eodem (<i>Didaco</i>) quasi per biennium in predicationis officio in partibus Tolosanis.	Habens secum Dominicum, biennio fere cum eisdem (<i>sc. duodecim abbatibus</i>) predicationis officio insistens remansit in partibus Tholosanis.

He dates the Montréal debate and the foundation of Prouille to 1205, and under the year 1206 he says that Diego, 'expleto in praedicatione contra haereticos biennio', returned to Osma and died, 'solus autem frater Dominicus ... per decennium fere in continuatione praedicationis indefessa permansit'.¹⁹ The likeliest explanation for his chronology is that his manuscript of Humbert's *cronica* lacked the earliest dates and he took 1204 from Gerald's *chronicon universale*; on that basis, Diego's *biennium* would end in 1206.

Vincent seems to come into play again in Antoninus.²⁰ Though Antoninus leaves this part of Dominic's life dateless in *Historiae* III 23.4, in his account of Innocent III he apparently merges Vincent's story with material taken from other sources on Peter of Castelnau's murder and the calling of the Albigensian crusade to produce his own thoroughly confused version of what happened (*Historiae* III 19.1.3). The chapter begins with the date '1206' and passes to Albigensian affairs with an introductory 'eo tempore': 'at that time' the crusade began to be preached, 'et primo Petrus monachus de Castro nouo missus fuit legatus a papa'; he was killed. The pope then sent Gualo to France as his legate, 'missi quoque sunt ab Innocentio cum ipso legato abbates .xii. ordinis Cisterciensis ... qui crucem contra Albigenes predicarent'. While they were discussing their mission, 'superuenit ex Hispania Didacus Oxomensis episcopus ... qui in socium secum duxerat beatum Dominicum'.

All the chronologies considered so far depend essentially on Jordan or on dates inferred from Jordan. However, early in the fourteenth century Bernard Gui was able to add a new ingredient to the mixture: thanks to

¹⁸ In between, Ptolemy reports that Gualo was sent as legate to preach the crusade in 1208, so he probably assumed him to be the legate associated with the Cistercian preachers.

¹⁹ *Annales*, ed. T.Hog, London 1845, 175-179.

²⁰ Vincent is cited as Antoninus's source for the miracle of fire at Fanjeaux (*Hist.* III 19.1.4). I use the Lyons 1543 edition of the *Historiae*.

information received from Osma, he apparently had precise dates for Diego's episcopate, and he knew that Diego died in 1207 (*Cat. mag., Dom.* §4).

Gui realized that harmonization was not always possible, but he did his best not to discard anything contained in 'authentic' sources such as, in this case, approved lives of Dominic;²¹ he found an ingenious way of combining Jordan's chronology, as interpreted by Gerald, with his own information about Diego. If Diego died in 1207, the beginning of his involvement in the Languedoc mission had to be dated to 1205; Gui accordingly re-interpreted the decision to return to Spain which Gerald and Humbert had implicitly or explicitly dated to 1205 as referring to the end of his visit to the papal curia, not to the end of his time in Languedoc (for which another decision to return to Spain was postulated) (*Cat. mag., Dom.* §4):

Anno domini m.cc.v., in fine scilicet quarti istius anni, deliberavit prefatus episcopus cum sancto Dominico redire in Hispaniam. Transeuntes autem per Montem Pessulanum inuenerunt ibi quendam apostolice sedis legatum cum XII abbatibus ...

The comment that Diego took this decision 'at the end of his fourth year' implies that Gui knew, not just the year in which Diego became a bishop, but at least approximately the time of year. The previous bishop, Martin, died on 27 July 1201,²² and Diego is first attested as bishop at a royal council on 11 Dec. (González doc. 711); the end of his fourth year must therefore have fallen in the latter part of 1205. It must, then, have been in the latter part of 1207 that, 'post biennium', Diego returned to Spain and died soon afterwards (*Cat. mag., Dom.* §4); this tallies with what seems to be his correct date of death, 30 Dec. 1207.

This redating of Diego's involvement in the Languedoc mission enabled Gui to retain 1203 as the year in which Dominic converted the Toulouse host, but he had to keep it separate from the *biennium*: he could thus allow Diego a whole year after the Toulouse episode in which to go about the king's business ('per annum in dicto negotio regis Castelle moram contrahens'), and this still left ample time for him to visit the pope (*Cat. mag., Dom.* §3).

Thanks to his one extra bit of information, Gui could produce a far better arrangement of the beginning of the story than any of his predecessors; however, it put paid to Dominic's *decennium*, though Gui did his best not to contradict his authentic sources too blatantly (*Cat. mag., Dom.* §6):

Post obitum prefati domini Dydaci mansit beatus Dominicus quasi per X annos in prouincia Narbonensi ... uidelicet usque ad tempus Lateranensis concilii.

'Quasi per X annos' is, in the circumstances, a polite way of saying 'about eight years'.

²¹ On Gui's historical method, cf. MOPH XXVII 180-195.

²² Loperráez, *Descripción histórica* I 187; T.Portillo Capilla, *Instituciones del obispado de Osma*, Soria 1985, 85.

Gui was not able to rest on his laurels for very long. One of the sources he used in his *Flores chronicorum* was Cernai, and, though he stuck loyally to Jordan's story of his encounter with twelve abbots and one legate, he redated it to 1206 in line with Cernai §20; this apparently made him uncertain about Diego's embassy and Dominic's conversion of the Toulouse host: although he initially said that these occurred 'quasi biennio antea ... sub anno m.cc.iii', he changed the date in some manuscripts to 'm.cc.iiii' (MOPH XXVII 109-110).²³

Gui's Dominican compilation was more influential than the *Flores chronicorum* on later Dominican historiography. It is undoubtedly the source of Borselli's chronology:²⁴

Gui, *Cat. mag., Dom.* §3

Anno siquidem domini prefato M°CC°III° beatus Dominicus cum felicitis memorie Dydaco suo episcopo Oxomensis in marchias siue in Daciam proficiscens exigente matrimoniali negotio ab Alphonso rege Castelle sibi commissio ...

Borselli f.1^v

Anno domini 1203 ... beatus Dominicus cum felicitis memorie Didaco suo episcopo in marchias siue in Daciam proficiscens exigente matrimoniali negotio ab Alphonso rege Castelle sibi commissio ...

This was the occasion for Dominic's conversion of their host in Toulouse.

Under 1205 Gui (*Cat. mag., Dom.* §4) says that, on their way back to Spain, Diego and Dominic ran into the legate and the twelve abbots who were holding a council about the campaign against heresy (in which Gui included the preaching of a crusade). Less subtly and less grammatically, Borselli says under 1205 (f.2^r): 'Contra Albigenses legatus pape cum XII abbatibus Cystersiensis ordinis missus, beatus Dominicus cum Didaco Exomensis episcopo processit dans eis consilium ...'.

Still in clear dependence on Gui, Borselli goes on to report Diego's death in 1207, after which

Gui §6

mansit beatus Dominicus quasi per X annos in prouincia Narbonensi, maxime in partibus Tholosanis et Carcassesii et Albigesii, in quibus pestis heretica amplius seuiebat, confundens hereticos ...

Borselli f.2^r

predicauit beatus Dominicus cum sotiis suis in prouintia Nabornensi (*sic*) et in partibus Tholosanis et Carcassesii et Albigensium, in quibus pestis heretica seuiebat per decem annos.

²³ Of the manuscripts I used in MOPH XXVII, at least one, BNF n.a.l. 1171, was emended by Gui himself.

²⁴ Borselli's chronicle of the Masters General is contained in Bologna, Bibl. Univ. lat. 1999.

Borselli is explicitly the source of Taegio's statement in his *Chronicae ampliores* that in 1203 Diego went on the king's business 'ad marchias siue in Daciam'; on their way, Dominic converted their host in Toulouse. Borselli is also cited for their encounter with the Montpellier 'council', though Taegio says that the twelve abbots were sent on their mission by the pope 'anno domini 1204 circa finem anni', with the implication that it was at the beginning of 1205 that they held their council at which Diego and Dominic appeared. Taegio quotes Humbert, in the guise of 'frater Iustinus', on Diego's departure and death (Humb. §20-21), thus restoring to its traditional place the bishop's intention to return to his diocese; but he inserts a date which he presumably took from Borselli, 'anno domini 1207'.²⁵

Although he had access to the Bologna manuscript of Gui, to Borselli and, probably, to Taegio's *Chronicae ampliores*, Flaminius retained only one date: it was in 1203 that Diego was sent on the king's embassy, taking Dominic with him (*Vitae Patrum* f.4').

Sebastian of Olmeda similarly seems only to have had one date, 1203, which probably came directly or indirectly from Galvano since it includes a reference to Dominic's age: the year in which he and Diego first arrived in Toulouse was 'annus a Christo Domino tertius post MCC quo et Dominicus agebat virum perfectum implebatque mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi'. The twelve Cistercian abbots are brought on stage immediately and Dominic and Diego are said to have met them 'opportune'. Unusually, there is no trace of Diego's *biennium*; instead Sebastian says that he returned to his church 'post non multos dies', though Dominic remained 'in partibus Tholosanis fere per decennium usque ad generale videlicet ecclesiae concilium'.²⁶

Hernando de Castillo seems not to have known Gui's compilation, and 1203 was apparently the only date he inherited, probably from Flaminius who is one of his acknowledged sources; connecting it with a royal council at Palencia (González doc. 737 or 738), he specified that Diego received his instructions from the king 'por el mes de Abril'.²⁷ However, he was able to reintroduce 1207 as the year of Diego's death, on the authority of an inscription in the cathedral at Osma.²⁸

²⁵ Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 1894 ff.3, 4^v; AGOP XIV 51 ff.1^v, 2^r.

²⁶ *Chronica ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. M. Canal Gómez, Rome 1936, 10.

²⁷ It is possible that he picked a council at Palencia because he noticed that, after the meeting on 28 April, Diego missed two councils on 11 and 13 May; but the interval would only have permitted him to go on quite a short journey, since he attended a council at Atienza on 19 May (González docs. 740-742). It is extremely unlikely that Castillo had any actual evidence that Diego received his marching orders at a council meeting in Palencia.

²⁸ H. de Castillo, *Primera parte de la historia general de Sancto Domingo I*, Madrid 1584, ff.14^v, 18^v; his sources are listed in the prologue.

Thanks to Sorbin's French translation of the *Hystoria Albigensis*, Malvenda was able to reintroduce Cernai into the picture.²⁹ Stressing Cernai's proximity to the events he was reporting, he insisted, on Cernai's authority, that Diego and Dominic met the legates, and only the legates, at Montpellier in 1206 — the twelve abbots arrived later, in 1207, as can be inferred from Cernai's narrative, and the date is confirmed by Vincent of Beauvais and Martin of Troppau. On the grounds that Diego spent a year on the king's business (the ultimate source of this being Gui, though Malvenda does not cite him at this point), he argued that Diego must therefore have set off on the king's embassy in 1205 and that Dominican sources dating it to 1202, 1203 or 1204 must be wrong (*Annales* 48, 57, 68).³⁰

Thanks to the inscription quoted by Castillo, Malvenda could confirm Gui's statement that Diego died in 1207, and he conjectured that he died 'in fine anni' (*Annales* 70); combined with the surmise that he began his preaching in 1206 'anno ineunte' (ibid. 69), this safeguards his *bien-nium* in the region, which was presumably the motive for the twin conjectures.

Malvenda was obviously right to take Cernai seriously, but he found few followers, especially among Dominican historians, though T.Soueges accepted that Diego met the legates (and only the legates) in 1206, and, on the grounds that it is 'certain' that he spent 'environ deux ans' preaching against heresy, he insisted that he must have died towards the end of 1207, notwithstanding the Cistercian menology which placed his death on 6 Feb.³¹

Bzovius adopted much of what Malvenda placed under the year 1207, and his dependence on Malvenda is not in doubt.³² He quotes a large section from Cernai on the iniquities of the count of Toulouse, but his text is Malvenda's retroversion of Sorbin's translation:³³

²⁹ On this translation, see Cernai, ed. cit. III lxxxiii-xc. Malvenda quotes Cernai in his own Latin retroversion from Sorbin's French.

³⁰ On p.48 he says that his manuscript of Humbert's *parvum ordinis chronicum* dates it to 1202 (as I have mentioned, I know two manuscripts which have this reading), but that Gui dates it to 1203. It is unlikely that Malvenda knew Trevet's *Annales*, but he could have found Diego's embassy dated to 1204 in the so-called *Praeclara Francorum facinora* (f.1^v in the edition of c.1520), which was essentially an edition of Gui's *Flores chronicorum*.

³¹ *L'Année Dominicaine, Aoust I*, Amiens 1693, 163-164, 185. C.Henríquez placed Diego's death under 'octavo idus februarii' (6 Feb.), without giving any reason for his choice of date (*Menologium Cistertiense*, Antwerp 1630, 45).

³² Bzovius only started work after Malvenda had abandoned his *Annales*, but he evidently had access to his manuscript; cf. AFP 65 (1995) 150-151.

³³ A.Bzovius, *Annalium Ecclesiasticarum tomus XIII*, 1207 V (I quote from the Antwerp 1617 edition). Malvenda's 'ut facile percipi potuit' comes from a misunderstanding of Sorbin's 'dont s'est peu apperceuoir' — he failed to see that 'peu' is the past participle of *pouvoir*, not the equivalent of *paucum*.

Cernai §28

Quia ergo oportunitas se ingressit, hic de incredulitate ipsius comitis aliquid breviter explicemus. Primo dicendum quod quasi a primis cunabulis semper hereticos dilexit et fovit et eos in terra sua habens quibuscumque modis potuit honoravit. Usque hodie etiam, sicut asseritur, ubicumque pergit hereticos sub communi habitu secum ducit ut, si ipsum mori contigerit, inter manus eorum moriatur. ...

Malvenda

Et quia opportuna, inquit, se offert occasio, breviter nonnulla de incredulitate eiusdem Comitis explicemus. Primum sciendum quod ab ineunte aetate ille fuit amator haereticorum et eos in Terris suis recepit, atque omnibus modis honoravit, ut facile percipi potuit, etiam usque ad illum diem quo, ut affirmant, eos conducebat iuxta se in habitu communi et vulgari ut non agnoscerentur, in eum finem quod, si ipsum mori contingeret, ad minus inter eorum manus moreretur. ...

Sorbin (1569) f.9

Pour ce donques que la commodité s'est offerte, expliquons brievement ici quelque chose de l'incredulité dudit comte. Premièrement, faut dire, que dès son ieune aage, il a esté amateur desd. Heretiques et les ayant entretenuz en sa terre, les a honnorez par tous moyens, dont s'est peu appercevoir: voire iusques à ce iour, que comme lon afferme, il les amene quant à soy en habit commun et vulgaire, pour n'estre cogneuz: afin que s'il luy conuient mourir, qu'au moins il meure entre leurs mains ...

Bzovius

Quia opportuna se offert occasio, breviter nonnulla de improbitate eiusdem Comitis Petrum monachum Senarii referentem audiemus. Primum sciendum quod ab ineunte aetate ille fuit amator haereticorum et eos in terris suis recepit, atque omnibus modis honoravit, ut facile percipi potuit, etiam usque ad illum diem quo, ut affirmant, eos conducebat iuxta se in habitu communi et vulgari ut non agnoscerentur, in eum finem quod, si ipsum mori contingeret, ad minus inter eorum manus moreretur. ...

Still following Cernai, Malvenda then relates the arrival of the Cistercian abbots and indicates the evidence that this happened in 1207, by which time Diego and Dominic had already been engaged in the mission for some time; after dealing with the Pamiers debate, he passes to Diego's death and the evidence for its date. Bzovius goes into less detail, but his continuing dependence on Malvenda is clear:

Haec et alia Petrus monachus de Raymundo Tolosano, quem ut Innocentius Pontifex ab errore revocaret, praeter alios viros insignes quos ad praedican- dum fidem Catholicam destinavit, duodecim quoque Abbates Ordinis Cisterciensis et unâ cum eis Divum Dominicum Guzmanum ire iussit ... In ea praedicatione Didacus Uxamensis Episcopus, non postremas partes cum tulisset, in Ecclesiam suam redux satis defunctus est, post mortem multis miraculis clarus.

Castillo

Esta enterrado en la yglesia del Burgo de Osma, en la capilla que llaman del Crucifixo, al lado del Euangelio, junto al Altar de la dicha capilla, con vna letra que dize, *Hic iacet Didacus Azebes Episcopus Oxomensis, Obiit era 1245 ...* que es el año del Señor de mil y dozien-
tos y siete.

Malvenda

Sepultus siquidem iacet sanctus Episcopus in Ecclesia suburbii Oxomensis, in Capella quae Crucifixi dicitur, prope altare ad Cornu Euangelii, cum hac inscriptione, *Hic iacet Didacus Azebes, Episcopus Oxomensis. Obiit Aerae M.CC.XLV.* At cum Aerae ratio triginta octo annos, ut est perspicuum, addat ad annos Christi nati, constat Didacum hoc anno 1207 defunctum.

Bzovius

Sepultus est sanctus Episcopus in Ecclesia suburbii Uxamensis, in capella quae dicitur Crucifixi, propter altare ad cornu Euangelii, cum hac inscriptione: *Hic iacet Didacus Azebes episcopus Uxamensis, obiit aera MCCXLV.* Cumque aerae ratio triginta octo annos addat ad annos Christi nati, constat Didacum hoc anno 1207 defunctum esse.

Bzovius goes on immediately: 'Didacum Uxamensem secutus est, sed per gradum martyrii, frater Petrus de Castro Nouo'.

All this sits uncomfortably with what Bzovius has said earlier, on the authority of Antoninus, about Innocent sending twelve Cistercian abbots to preach the crusade in response to Peter of Castelnau's murder, and Diego, 'una secum ducens Diuum Dominicum Guzmanum', coming upon them when they were planning what to do; Bzovius departs from Antoninus only in dating this to 1204 rather than in or after 1206 (1204 XXII-XXIII). He failed to construct a coherent story out of his various sources.

Rechac wandered off into realms of fantasy on the alleged authority of an 'ancien manuscrit du Conuent de Saint Iaques en la ville de Pauie' (no such convent ever existed). From this manuscript, which is as unconvincing as it is mysterious, he knew exactly when and where Diego was sent on his embassy (April 1203, to 'la Marche, qui est un país entre le Berry et le Lymosin'), who Prince Fernando's bride was to be ('Mademoiselle N. de Luzignan, fille du Comte de la Marche, Hugues le Brun, et seur de Hugues de Luzignan, Vicomte de Thouars'), and why Diego spent a whole year on the king's business (he had to make two journeys to France). 1203+1 = 1204, so it was in 1204 (not 1206 'comme disent quelques-uns') that Diego went to Rome (*Vie de saint Dominique* 104-108). Leaving Rome, he reached Cîteaux in about October 1204, from where he went to Montpellier to meet the papal legates, and he started his preaching campaign at the beginning of 1205 with Peter of Castelnau and Raoul (*ibid.* 183). The pope had not let him resign his see entirely, but he had authorized him to spend two years in the Languedoc mission; so, when the Cistercian preachers arrived at the beginning of 1207, this was the cue for him to return to his diocese, where he died the same year, soon after his arrival (*ibid.* 122-123). Whatever we make of the Pavia manuscript, the essential

ingredients of this tale are familiar, and it is clear that Rechac's chronology derives ultimately from the older Dominican tradition, though he took some details from Cernai and Malvenda, not least the distinction between the legates whom Diego met at Montpellier and the later mission of the twelve abbots.

Échard used Gui to arrive at much the same chronology as Malvenda: he misquotes him as saying that Diego left Rome 'anno domini MCCV in fine istius anni', which, since Gui used the *stylus vetus*, means the early months of 1206 *stylo novo*. On the basis of this understanding of Gui, Échard argued that Diego set off for 'the marches' towards the end of 1203, spent a year on the king's business, then six months on his Roman journey, bringing us to about the middle of 1205; he and Diego would then have reached Montpellier towards the end of 1205 (*stylus vetus*). The Cistercian menology could be disarmed in the same way: we know that the year in which Diego died was 1207, 'quem tamen intelligas stylo veteri, novo MCCVIII Febr. VI'. If Diego died on 6 Feb. 1208, 'sic qui anno MCCVI circa februarium Montempessulanum advenerat biennium fere in Occitania cum haereticis viriliter decertavit' (QE I 4-5, 8).

Échard admitted that Cernai only mentions Diego meeting three legates at Montpellier, but he judged Malvenda wrong to infer that no one else was there. Citing 'veteres omnes nostri scriptores' (Jordan, Constantine, Humbert, Dietrich, Trevet, Gui), he maintained it was 'certo certius' that the twelve abbots were also there, though many of them probably went with Arnaud when he had to 'leave the mission' to celebrate the general chapter. On this basis, Cernai's account of Arnaud arriving later with a party of abbots could be understood as referring to their *return* to the mission, datable to 1207 on the authority of Guillaume de Nangis³⁴ and Vincent of Beauvais (QE I 5-7).

Cuypers agreed that the Cistercian abbots were already involved in the mission before Diego met them at Montpellier, but he made mincemeat of Échard's chronology, which he accused him of dreaming up out of nothing.³⁵ Having pointed out Échard's misquotation of Gui, he proceeded to misinterpret Gui for himself, as well as proposing a gratuitous emendation:

Anno domini m.cc.v (*suspicio pro MCCV legendum esse MCCIV, propter antecedentia et sequentia*) in fine QUARTI istius anni deliberavit episcopus cum sancto Dominico redire in Hispaniam. Transeuntes autem per Montempessulanum &c. *Quid autem ibi facit vox illa quarti, nisi referatur ad annum praecedentem; aut in numerum immediate verba illa antecedentem error irrepsisse dicatur?*

³⁴ H.Géraud, ed., *Chronique latine de Guillaume de Nangis I*, Paris 1843, 127-128; Guillaume's text comes verbatim from Robert of Auxerre except that where Robert says 'egressi de Cistercio mense marcio' Guillaume changes *marcio* to *maio* (though this is presumably just a textual accident).

³⁵ *Acta Sanctorum, Aug. I*, Antwerp 1733, 399-400, 395-397.

In other words, he failed to see that Gui was referring to the fourth year of Diego's episcopate and took him to mean that Diego decided to return to Spain in 1205 i.e. at the end of 1204 (a less than convincing interpretation, as he evidently and rightly felt).

He then complained that Échard did not do justice to Diego's *biennium* in the Languedoc mission — the *continuum biennium*, as Gui calls it (*Cat. mag., Dom.* §4). Échard's 'biennium fere' covers the time between Diego's arrival on the scene and his death, but the period in question is the time he spent engaged in the mission; and it was not just 'biennium fere': Jordan, Constantine, Vincent of Beauvais and Dietrich of Apolda, as well as Gui, all refer to Diego preaching for a full two years.³⁶

Cuypers was on stronger ground in his refutation of Échard's theory about Diego's date of death. The year, he points out, is attested by the monument quoted by Castillo and Malvenda, which gives it according to the Spanish era in which there is no distinction between *stylus vetus* and *stylus novus*; therefore 6 Feb. 'aera MCCXLV' can only mean 6 Feb. 1207, not 6 Feb. 1208. The argument is valid, even if the date is wrong.

Taking Diego's date of death and his full *biennium* of preaching as his primary data, Cuypers proposed his own 'systema chronologicum': Diego first set off for 'the marches' around the middle of 1203; having spent a year on the king's business, he went to Rome and then to Montpellier, where he arrived 'in fine quarti istius anni', i.e. at the end of 1204 (*stylus novus* — 'nam antiquus ille stylus, quem Echardus tam studiose ubique distinguit, non videtur in hac re locum habere, nec semper apud scriptores usitatus esse'); this allows for a full two years' involvement in the Languedoc mission before Diego went home to die in Feb. 1207.

Following the chronology implied by Cernai, J. Vaissete dated Diego's meeting with the legates 'vers le mois de Juillet 1206', shortly before the Cistercian general chapter.³⁷ On the authority of Robert of Auxerre and Guillaume de Nangis he dated the arrival of the Cistercian abbots to 1207; Cernai shows that it occurred just after the Montréal debate, and it was followed by the debate at Pamiers, after which Diego returned to Spain 'et mourut dans son diocèse au commencement de l'année suivante', in Feb. 1208 (Vaissete accepted Échard's interpretation of the date). This does not allow Diego a full *biennium* in the region, but Trevet, taken to be a major

³⁶ Though Cuypers took the *biennium* as sacrosanct, he made no attempt to explain or take seriously Dominic's 'anni fere decem' after Diego's death, which rests on exactly the same authority and is equally well 'supported' in subsequent literature (indeed, on pp.402-403 he summarily dismisses the *decem annos* mentioned in Humbert's *cronica*).

³⁷ On the authority of Trevet and the *Praeclara Francorum facinora* he dated Diego's first royal embassy to 1204 rather than 1203, but he pointed out that the *stylus vetus* would treat the beginning of 1204 as part of 1203.

source, merely says that Diego preached in the region *biennio fere* and for this to be satisfied 'il suffit qu'il y ait été une partie de l'an 1206 et une autre partie de la suivante'.³⁸

Notwithstanding Cuypers's criticisms and the evidence adduced by Vaissete, A. Touron essentially followed Échard. On the authority of Humbert's *cronica* and Gui he dated Diego's embassy to 1203, though, like Vaissete, he suggested that this did not necessarily contradict the alternative date, 1204, found in Trevet and the *Praeclara Francorum facinora*: 'Sans doute que ceux-ci commençoient l'année au premier de Janvier, et les autres à Paques'. On the authority of 'Bartholomew' of Lucca and Gui, Touron dated the meeting with the abbots at Montpellier 'vers la fin de l'année 1205'³⁹ — he solved the question of whom Diego met by identifying the abbots with the legates: at Montpellier Diego and Dominic 'trouverent plusieurs Abbés de Cîteaux, Légats du Pape, qui travailloient depuis quelque tems à la réduction des Albigeois et à l'extirpation de l'Hérésie'. 'C'est du commencement de l'année 1206 qu'on doit compter les dix années que saint Dominique employa à combattre les Albigeois, jusqu'au tems du quatrième Concile de Latran'.

On Cernai's authority, Touron made the Pamiers conference Diego's last public appearance in Languedoc, and he took it for granted that the Cistercian party was there too; on this assumption, 'il est aisé de fixer l'époque de cette conférence au mois de Juillet 1207, puisque les Religieux de Cîteaux, qui s'y trouverent présens, ne demeurèrent que trois mois dans leur Mission, qu'ils avoient commencée dans le mois de Mai, selon la chronique de Guillaume de Nangis'.⁴⁰ Without giving a precise date, Touron makes Diego's death more or less contemporary with that of Peter of Castelnau on 15 Jan. 1208.⁴¹

³⁸ *Histoire générale de Languedoc* III, Paris 1737, 143, 148, 558-559.

³⁹ Touron refers to *Hist. Eccl.* XXI 10, where Ptolemy (not Bartholomew) of Lucca actually says that Diego returned to Spain in 1204, leaving Dominic to combat heresy 'in partibus Tholosanis', and 'Martène t.6, *Collect. amplissi.*' (i.e. Martène-Durand VI 398 = Gui, *Cat. mag., Dom.* §4), which Touron interpreted in the manner of Échard to mean that Diego met the legates towards the end of 1205, though he did not follow Échard in taking this to signify a date early in 1206.

⁴⁰ Touron took issue with Vaissete for acknowledging the evidence of Guillaume de Nangis but still maintaining that it was only towards the end of 1207 that Diego returned to Spain; 'mais cet Auteur avoit besoin de faire entendre que Diego ne s'étoit retiré que sur la fin de 1207 pour accorder en quelque sorte ce que disent communément les anciens Historiens que ce Prélat demeura près de deux ans dans la Mission (*biennio fere*) avec ce qu'il voudroit lui-même nous persuader que Diego et S. Dominique n'étoient arrivés à Montpellier ... que vers le mois de Juillet 1206'. Touron himself, though he accepted Rechac's claim that Innocent had given Diego permission to spend two years in Languedoc, seems content to send him home after *biennium fere*.

⁴¹ *La vie de saint Dominique*, Paris 1739, 31-33, 36, 38, 70-72, 77-78.

The eighteenth-century Dominican Annalists believed in being meticulous; Cristianopoulo, to whom the period which concerns us was entrusted, discussed Diego's chronology in considerable detail.

With regard to the embassy to Denmark, he cites Humbert's *cronica* as his first authority for the date 1203, rightly dismissing '1202' as due to textual error. In support, he cites Gerald's *cronica* (though he did not recognize it as such), Rodrigo, Galvano, Borselli (whom he could not name),⁴² Sebastian of Olmeda and Bernard Gui 'quem ego permagni aestimo'. The only divergent voices are those of Trevet and the *Praeclara Francorum facinora*, which date the embassy to 1204; Touron's explanation of the discrepancy is noted as plausible, but Cristianopoulo himself suggests a slightly different one: Gui etc. mean that Diego set off at the end of 1203, whereas the date in Trevet and the *Praeclara facinora* refers to the year during which he was travelling. That Gui believed he set off at the end of 1203 is clear: according to him, Diego spent a year about the king's business, then went to see the pope, and planned to return to Spain in March 1205 (Mamachi, *Annales* 129-130).

Cristianopoulo then discussed when Diego and Dominic arrived at Montpellier. His main authority is Gui, understood, or rather misunderstood, in the way suggested by Cuypers: the correct text, as Cristianopoulo rightly insisted, is 'anno domini m.cc.v, in fine scilicet quarti istius anni, deliberavit prefatus episcopus cum sancto Dominico redire in Hyspaniam'; the date, we are told, means 'exeunte anno MCCIV, ineunte vero jam MCCV'.⁴³ Since Gui's year began on 25 March, this must refer to the end of March. So, if Diego was planning to leave Rome at the end of March 1205, he must have arrived there about the beginning of March; the journey from Denmark should have taken about three months, so he left there in Nov. or Dec. 1204; he had devoted one year to the king's business, so he must have left Spain on the first embassy in Nov. or Dec. 1203 (*Annales* 135-138).⁴⁴

Cristianopoulo's narrative follows Cernai in saying that it was the three legates whom Diego met at Montpellier. In a long note he mounted a strong argument against Échard's theory that the Cistercian abbots came twice, once before the Montpellier meeting (at which they could therefore be present) and again in 1207, but he was clearly unnerved by the consistent Dominican tradition that Diego met twelve abbots at Montpellier;

⁴² *Hieronimi* is missing in the copy of Taegio which was made for the Annalists, leaving 'ex cronica fratris [space] Bononiensis' (AGOP XIV 51 f.1'); hence Cristianopoulo's 'Bononiensis chronographus'.

⁴³ Unlike Cuypers, Cristianopoulo presents this exegesis without any hint of embarrassment.

⁴⁴ Against Échard, Cristianopoulo says that Diego would not have needed six months to get from Denmark to Rome; against Échard and Cuypers he insists that Gui's date refers to Diego's intention to leave Rome, not his arrival at Montpellier.

he concludes rather limply 'non ausim veteres illos auctores tanta gravitate, tanto numero, tantaque inter se consensione, adeo confidenter ut factum est a Malvenda reprehendere', leaving it to the reader to make his own mind up (*Annales* 145-148). It is a pity that his courage failed him and that he did not see that 'tanta consensio' was due to Dominican writers simply repeating what Jordan had said, so that their 'tantus numerus' was irrelevant.

Returning to the issue of chronology, he argued that, if Diego left Rome at the end of March or in April 1205 and then went to Cîteaux, he must have reached Montpellier soon after that; which accords with the 'summa nostrorum consensio' that he spent two years in the province of Narbonne and died in 1207. Cristianopoulo dismissed Cernai's statement that he only reached Rome in 1206 on the grounds that people who had known Dominic (like Jordan) or his companions (as Constantine had) possessed greater authority, and that it was more likely that a single writer made a mistake of one year than that so many people could be wrong about Diego's *biennium* (*Annales* 149-151).

On Puylaurens's authority, Cristianopoulo dated the Montréal debate to 1207, this being confirmed by Cernai's statement that soon afterwards Arnaud arrived with his party of abbots, who left Cîteaux in March 1207 according to Robert of Auxerre (or in May according to Guillaume de Nangis who, as Cristianopoulo pointed out, basically copied Robert). Diego then set off for Spain, debating with Waldensians at Pamiers on the way (*Annales* 169-173).

The year of Diego's death is known from the inscription quoted by Castillo, era 1245, i.e. 1207 (with no possibility of appeal to any *stylus vetus* to turn it into 1208). 6 Feb., the date given by the Cistercian menology allegedly on the authority of 'an ancient Osma legendary', cannot be right, since Diego was at the Montréal debate which Puylaurens dates to 1207, i.e., since he calculated *veteri ratione*, late March or April 1207, and this tallies with the indication that the abbots who arrived soon afterwards set off in March (or May) 1207. Everyone agrees that Diego spent a *biennium* in the Languedoc mission; since he arrived at Montpellier in April or May 1205, he must have left in April or May 1207 and died not long afterwards. 'Haec omnia', according to Cristianopoulo, 'veterum gravissimorumque testium auctoritate constant'; a legendary of unknown date or authorship carries no weight against such testimony. As a final argument, Cristianopoulo, adapting Touron, points out that the abbots who set off in March (or May) spent only three months in the Languedoc mission and they departed after news arrived of Diego's death (Cristianopoulo presumably took this from Jordan); so Diego must have died some time in the summer of 1207 (*Annales* 182-185).

It is remarkable to what extent this whole historiographical tradition relied on Jordan and on inferences drawn from Jordan, and how readily it sacrificed other evidence to safeguard his narrative and especially Diego's

biennium (sometimes not even allowed to become a *quasi biennium*), in spite of periodic attempts to give more weight to Cernai.

Cristianopoulo's chronology was accepted for some time,⁴⁵ but towards the end of the nineteenth century even the few points on which real clarity had been achieved began to be re-observed.

Balme dated most of the story earlier than Cristianopoulo; in particular, he moved the Montréal debate and the arrival of the Cistercian abbots back to 1206, without attempting to show how this could be squared with the evidence adduced by Cristianopoulo, and he asserted that Diego set off for Spain, via Pamiers, in the 'first days' of 1207.⁴⁶

In 1905, A.Luchaire, whose interest was focused on Innocent III, not Dominican history, accidentally introduced a new piece into the discussion (= MOPH XXV no. 4): on 19 Nov. 1206 Innocent wrote to his legate, Raoul, prescribing 'des mesures spéciales'. 'Ici se place une coïncidence curieuse': just four months earlier, Diego and Dominic had given similar advice to the papal legates at Montpellier;⁴⁷ since it is unlikely that a travelling bishop would be able to convince papal legates to change their strategy unless he was carrying instructions from the pope, Luchaire concluded that the letter of Nov. 1206 was the pope's follow-up to Diego's meeting with the legates.⁴⁸

J.Guiraud's chronology is vague, but it seems to be based mainly on Balme.⁴⁹ When he returned to the fray after the publication of Luchaire's

⁴⁵ E.g. F.M.Pollidori, *Vita di S.Domenico*, Rome 1777, 11, 15-16, 27-28; G.B.Melloni, *Vita di S.Domenico*, Naples 1791, 10, 11-12, 18; H.D.Lacordaire, *Vie de S.Dominique*, Paris 1841, 43-44, 46-47, 68-70; A.T.Drane, *Life of St Dominic*, London 1857, 7-8, 10-13, 20-21. In her later work, *The History of St Dominic*, London 1891, 21-22, Drane paid more attention to Cernai and dated Diego's visit to Cîteaux to spring '1205' i.e. 1206, and the meeting with the legates to summer 1206, on the grounds that he and they were at Montréal on 24 June that year (presumably a confused reference to Cernai §25, which refers to a debate at Carcassonne and a miracle which happened there on 24 June).

⁴⁶ He also dated Diego's first departure from Spain to summer 1203 'at the latest', and had him reach Rome towards the end of 1204 so that Dominic could witness King Peter of Aragón's coronation and his oath to combat heresy, this apparently being the only reason for wanting them to reach Rome so soon since Balme allowed them to remain at Cîteaux for Easter 1205 (10 April) before meeting the legates (Balme-Lelaidier I 57, 64-66, 103-107, 125).

⁴⁷ Luchaire, unaware of any controversy surrounding the date, clearly assumed that Cernai's chronology, as interpreted by Vaissete (Devic-Vaissete VI 245), was correct and that the Montpellier meeting occurred in July 1206.

⁴⁸ *Innocent III, La croisade des Albigeois*, Paris 1905, 89-91.

⁴⁹ In *Saint Dominique*, Paris 1901 (the book was first published in 1899), 13, 15, 26, 28, Guiraud says that Diego set off on his first embassy in 1203, reached Rome towards the end of 1204, left Cîteaux 'dans les premiers mois de 1205', met the legates soon afterwards, returned to Spain and died in 1207; in the statement on p.18 that he spent less than two years in the mission because he died in 1206,

book, without bothering to argue with Luchaire's implied dating of Diego's meeting with the legates (which he 'knew' to be wrong), he refused to accept the postulated connection between the instructions Innocent supposedly gave Diego for his legates and the letter of Nov. 1206; by his reckoning, though the letter shows that Innocent was in agreement with Diego's strategy, Diego had already formulated it in the previous year (*Cartulaire* I cccx-cccxi).

This and some other papal letters to which Luchaire had drawn attention inspired Mandonnet to develop an even less defensible hypothesis.⁵⁰

Like Balme, Mandonnet supposed Diego to have left Spain on his first royal embassy in 1203, and to have reached Rome towards the end of 1204; but he brought forward the Montpellier meeting to Dec. 1204 or Jan. 1205, apparently so that he could integrate Diego into Innocent III's plans for the Languedoc mission. Diego asked to be allowed to go and evangelize Cumans, but the pope assigned him a different task, the evangelization of the Languedoc heretics, and, the following January (1205), he wrote in the same vein to his discouraged legate, Peter of Castelnaud, urging him not to abandon his preaching; 'sous la direction de l'évêque d'Osma et avec la collaboration de son jeune sous-prieur, le projet présentait des chances de succès'. After leaving Rome, Diego went to Cîteaux 'pour persuader aux cisterciens de fournir la collaboration dont le pape avait fait pressentir la demande dans ses lettres du 29 janvier et du 31 mai précédents' (*Saint Dominique* 31, 33-34).

Mandonnet apparently dated the Montréal debate and the arrival of the Cistercian abbots to March '1205' (*Saint Dominique* 36), perhaps a misprint for 1206.⁵¹ The Cistercians returned home after three months and their departure, together with the foundation of Prouille, persuaded Diego that it was time to go back to Spain to fetch 'des secours matériels et spirituels' (*ibid.* 37-38). In his absence the mission came to a halt, since his own party did not dare continue preaching without him and the legates had no authority in the matter; Raoul therefore informed the pope of the situation, obtaining in return the letter of Nov. 1206, which, according to Mandonnet, was written 'en confirmation directe de la mission de saint Dominique et de ses compagnons après le départ de l'évêque d'Osma' (*ibid.* 38-40). Having sent Diego back to Spain in the middle of 1206, Mandonnet revived the discredited date, Feb. 1207, for his death (*ibid.* 40).

'1206' is presumably a misprint, but by implication he must have returned to Spain early in 1207. In *Cartulaire de Notre-Dame de Prouille*, Paris 1907, I cccvi, cccxiii, cccxvi, cccxviii, the chronology is the same, except that Guiraud now dates the Montréal debate to 'les premiers jours' of 1206, and that at Pamiers to 'l'année suivante' (1207), after which Diego returned to Spain and died 'l'année suivante', which presumably refers to the same 'année suivante', i.e. 1207 rather than 1208.

⁵⁰ According to Vicaire, who was presumably privy to his thinking, Mandonnet was also impressed by the evidence of Gerald's *cronica ordinis*, which he took to be an independent source (Mandonnet-Vicaire I 83-84).

⁵¹ It is printed as 1206 in Mandonnet-Vicaire I 41.

Scheeben also accepted 6 Feb. 1207 as the date of Diego's death, but for the rest he based his chronology on Cernai and, as a result, allotted far less than a *biennium* to Diego's time in Languedoc. We need not go into his eccentric interpretation of the reasons for Diego's journey, but it is worth noting the influence of his passionate belief in the radical originality of Dominic's conception of the Order of Preachers and his determination to shield it from the slightest hint of indebtedness to Innocent III.

According to Scheeben, Diego started his journey in 1206, reaching Toulouse 'in den ersten Tagen des Frühlings 1206', and Rome 'etwa gegen Ende Juni'. Scheeben utterly dismisses the suggestion that the pope used Diego to send instructions to his legates about a new method to be adopted in their campaign against heresy — such a theory leads to the 'weitere These, die den Predigerorden aus der Initiative des Papstes Innocenz III hervorgehen läßt'. Diego's meeting with the legates at Montpellier occurred not long before the Cistercian general chapter, so 'es war Hochsommer' when they embarked on their preaching campaign. The tactic which he suggested was first proposed at Montpellier, 'und zwar ohne erkennbaren Einfluß Innocenz' III'; Luchaire misunderstood the 'Kausalzusammenhänge' between Innocent's letter of Nov. 1206 and the subsequent foundation of the Dominican order: 'Im Sommer 1206, in Montpellier, ist die Idee des Predigerordens konzipiert worden, also vor dem briefe Innozenz' III'; Innocent's letter 'enthält eine Approbation der Idee Diegos ... Dominikus entwickelt diese Idee unabhängig von Rom'.

Taking as primary evidence the supposed acts of the Montréal debate (whose credentials had already been called into question by Cristianopoulo in Mamachi, *Annales* 170), with the help of some ingenious 'textual criticism', Scheeben dated the Montréal *débate* to October, which meant that the Cistercian party must have left Cîteaux in October 1206 immediately after the General Chapter, rather than in March or May 1207. Soon after Christmas 1206 Diego set off to pay a visit to his diocese, taking in a debate at Pamiers on the way; he reached Osma in late January 1207 and died on 6 Feb.⁵²

In his annotated re-edition of Mandonnet (Mandonnet-Vicaire I 83-88, 141-150), and in his article in AFP 23 (1953) 335-345, Vicaire brought the discussion back to earth.

He rightly questioned the independent value of the dates in Gerald's *cronica*, which in any case Mandonnet grossly misread if his theory is correctly reported by Vicaire.⁵³ He also insisted on the compelling evidence

⁵² H.C.Scheeben, *Der heilige Dominikus*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1927, 12, 26-27, 36-37, 43, 49, 51-54, 431 notes 46 and 57.

⁵³ Gerald's independence was supposed to be shown by the fact that his reference to Dominic remaining 'per decem annos in Narbonensi prouincia' after Diego's departure is different from Jordan's 'almost ten years' between Diego's departure and the Lateran council; it allegedly means that Dominic remained in the province of

dating the Montréal debate and the arrival of the Cistercian abbots to March/April 1207, and on the worthlessness of the supposed acts of the debate; this of itself shows that 6 Feb. 1207 cannot be correct as Diego's date of death, and Vicaire argued strongly in favour of 30 Dec. 1207.

The main weakness of Vicaire's discussion is that he tried to discredit Jordan's evidence on the grounds that he was writing long after the event (which is dubious) and that he was dependent on Cernai (which is unlikely); he gave proportionately greater credit to Cernai, with little attempt to study either of their texts in its own right or to discover the sources and nature of their information, and he glossed over the fact that Cernai does not simply 'fixe à 1206 l'arrivée en Languedoc de Dominique et de son évêque', he 'fixes their arrival' *in Rome* in 1206, i.e. after 2 April 1206 if, as Vicaire originally maintained, he treated Easter as the beginning of the year.

Vicaire noted correctly that Cernai implies that the Montpellier meeting took place not too long before the Cistercian general chapter. In 1938 he opted for the end of May 1206 (Mandonnet-Vicaire I 86), more vaguely for May/Aug. 1206 in 1953 (AFP 32 [1953] 338, 345 — 'mi-août' is a misprint for 'mai-août'), and for June 1206 in 1957 (*Histoire* I 173).⁵⁴

In 1978 Gallén ('Les voyages ...') brought into play the evidence of Diego's attendance at royal councils in Castile, which fully confirms his death on 30 Dec. 1207 and reveals two significant gaps in his attested presence in Castile which can accommodate his two trips to Denmark, but it also requires a re-appraisal of the dating and continuity of his involvement in the Languedoc mission. As Gallén pointed out, one fact to emerge is that Diego and Dominic 'n'ont pas pu rencontrer l'abbé Arnaud Amaury et les autres légats à Montpellier en juin 1206, comme le suppose Vicaire'; if the meeting occurred when they were on their way back from Rome, 'le début du printemps 1206 est la seule date possible' ('Les voyages ...' 81).

Gallén gives the impression that this tallies with Cernai's dating of the Montpellier to 1206, i.e. after 25 March 1206 (*ibid.* 81, 84); however, the chronology he established on the basis of secure dates is in fact not compatible with Cernai's statement that Diego arrived *in Rome* in 1206, or with the implication of his narrative that the Montpellier meeting took place shortly before the Cistercian chapter in September.

In the revised edition of his life of Dominic, Vicaire duly changed the date of the meeting from June to March (*Histoire*² I 183), and he ventured

Narbonne until his departure in 1217 — 'après 1216 dit la chronique'. But Gerald's *cronica* says nothing about Dominic leaving the region except in connection with his visit to Rome in 1215; in 1216 he is said to have sent brethren 'de Tholosa ... in Hyspaniam, Franciam et Lombardiam', but Gerald is silent about Dominic's own moves, and the first hint that he is no longer in the region is that in 1219 'de Roma missi sunt fratres Bononiam a beato Dominico, quos ipse post modicum subsequitur'.

⁵⁴ By now he accepted that Cernai used the *stylus incarnationis*: 'Cernai ... place en 1206 la rencontre de Montpellier, soit après le 25.III (style de l'Incarnation)'.

to suggest the first half of the month, on the grounds that Cernai's date 'porte sur l'ensemble des événements'; but he too failed to remark that what Cernai actually says (that Diego arrived *in Rome* in 1206) is at odds with the new chronology. Nor did he make much attempt to deal with Cernai's statement that Arnaud left the Montpellier meeting for the impending general chapter: in *Histoire*¹ I 192 he said that Arnaud 's'apprêtait à présider le chapitre général de l'ordre ... il allait donc se séparer de ses compagnons'; in *Histoire*² I 201 he changed this to 'Arnaud Amalric, l'organisateur, avait à s'occuper des affaires de son ordre et à préparer le chapitre général ... il allait donc se séparer de ses compagnons'. This is a re-interpretation of Vicaire's own story, not an interpretation of Cernai.

Vicaire's older chronology was widely accepted, and the revised version established by him and Gallén has had little success in ousting it.⁵⁵

⁵⁵ One form or another of Vicaire's older chronology is found, for example, in BAC *Santo Domingo*, Madrid 1947, 113; W.A.Hinnebusch, *History of the Dominican Order* I, Staten Island 1966, 21; K.V.Selge, *Die ersten Waldenser* I, Berlin 1967, 194; C.Thouzellier, *Catharisme et Valdésisme en Languedoc*, Louvain-Paris 1969, 194; É.Griffe, *Le Languedoc cathare de 1190 à 1210*, Paris 1971, 249; V.D.Carro, *Domingo de Guzmán*, Madrid 1973, 316; A.D'Amato, *L'Ordine dei Frati Predicatori*, Rome 1983, 14; V.J.Koudelka, *Dominikus*, Olten 1983, 15; K.Thomell, *Dominikus*, Uppsala 1983, 32; M.Joulin, *Petite vie de saint Dominique*, Paris 1989, 40; B.M.Ashley, *The Dominicans*, Collegeville 1990, 5; A.D'Amato, *Domenico di Guzman*, Bologna 1992, 32; M.Lohrum, *Dominikus*, Leipzig 1992, 23; M.Costen, *The Cathars and the Albigensian crusade*, Manchester 1997, 112; A.Villacorte Baños, *El Castellano Domingo de Guzmán*, Salamanca 1998, 96; P.Tourault, *Saint Dominique face au cathares*, Perrin 1999, 80. His new chronology is found, for instance, in BAC *Santo Domingo*, Madrid 1987, 53; P.Lippini, *San Domenico visto dai suoi contemporanei*, Bologna 1998, 87; R.Spiazzi, *San Domenico di Guzman*, Bologna 1999, 560; P.Épinoux, in J.Berlioz, ed., *Le pays cathare*, Paris 2000, 104; Halvorsen, *Dominikus* 81. No doubt I shall be similarly haunted by the support I gave in earlier works to the Gallén-Vicaire chronology (*Early Dominicans*, New York 1982, 12; *Saint Dominic*, Strasbourg 1995, 9).