Week 4:
1. Bernard Gui's Manual for Inquisitors

Introduction

Bernard Gui was a Dominican friar who served the Inquisition for almost 25 years. He studied logic and theology at Montpellier, and then served as prior at several Dominican convents. In 1307 Pope Clement V made him an Inquisitor, headquartered in the diocese of Toulouse, in southern France. He remained in that role until he was made bishop of Tuy and then Lodève, where he died in 1331.

Among Gui’s many writings are two dealing with the Inquisition. One is a collection of the sentences he issued over a period of seventeen years in eighteen "sermons" or autos-da-fe. Gui sentenced 930 individuals. Bernard Gui also summed up his experience as an inquisitor for his fellows in a work titled Practica inquisitionis heretice pravitatis [the conduct of the inquisition of heretical depravity], it was composed toward the end of his career and probably was finished in 1323-1324. There are five parts. The fifth and most important part is a review of the beliefs of those heretics whom Gui considered important in his day: Cathars, Waldenses, "pseudo-Apostles," Beguins, Jews, and sorcerers or invokers of demons. Gui included this description in order to aid Inquisitors, since it could be very difficult to detect heretics. The descriptions are based to a considerable extent on earlier works, to which Gui made additions out of his own experience. This selection from the manual describes two groups, the Cathars (whom he terms Manichaeans) and a group of radical Franciscans, whom he terms Beguines.

General Advice and Remarks.

This is the procedure when anyone is to be heard or examined, whether he has come in person of his own free will, has been cited, or has been summoned as suspect, noted, defamed, or accused of the crime of heresy, of showing favor or hospitality to heretics, or of anything else which falls within the cognizance of the Inquisition of heretical depravity or has any connection with it. In the first place, after he has been quietly and unostentatiously summoned and warned by the inquisitor or the inquisitor's deputy, have him swear upon the Holy Gospels of God to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth in regard to the matter of heresy and whatever touches thereupon or is connected in any way with the office of the Inquisition. He is to do this both in respect of himself as a principal and also as a witness in the case of other persons, living or dead. Once the oath has been taken and registered, let the witness be urgently exhorted to tell the truth, of his own accord, in the matter of heresy, so far as he knows, has known, or has heard of it. If, however, he requests time or opportunity for deliberation in order to give a more carefully considered response, that may be granted him if it seems expedient to the inquisitor, especially if he seems to be seeking it in good faith, not guilefully. Otherwise, he is required to answer about himself without delay. Thereupon, the date of the hearing may be entered by a notary, that "In such a year, on such date, one N., from such town or village, such diocese, who came of his own free will, or was cited or summoned, was formally placed in
judgment before the religious person N.-inquisitor of heretical depravity, deputed by the Apostolic See to the kingdom of France-having taken oath upon the Holy Gospels of God to speak the whole truth and nothing but the truth about the fact or the crime of heresy and everything pertaining thereto, both in respect of himself as a principal and also as a witness in the case of other persons, living or dead, has said and confessed," etc. It should be noted further that if anyone should argue openly and obviously against the faith, adducing the arguments and the authorities upon which heretics are wont to rely, such a person may easily be proved guilty of heresy by loyal, learned sons of the Church, for one is presumed to be a heretic from the very fact of striving to defend error. But because modern heretics endeavor and seek covertly to disguise their errors rather than openly to confess them, even men versed in the Scriptures cannot prove their guilt, because they manage to escape by verbal trickery and carefully contrived subtleties. The result of this is that men of learning are rather thrown into confusion by them, and those heretics, glorying therein, are further encouraged by observing how they thus elude learned men, slipping cleverly out of their hands by the sly cunning and tortuous ambiguity of their replies. For it is exceedingly difficult to catch heretics when they themselves do not frankly avow error but conceal it, or when sure and sufficient evidence against them is not at hand. Under such circumstances, serious problems beset the investigator from every side. For, on the one hand, his conscience torments him if an individual is punished who has neither confessed nor been proved guilty; on the other, it causes even more anguish to the mind of the inquisitor, familiar through much experience with the falsity, cunning, and malice of such persons, if by their wily astuteness they escape punishment, to the detriment of the faith, since thereby they are strengthened, multiplied, and rendered more crafty. Another consideration, too, is that the faithful laity see occasion for scandal in the fact that the proceedings of the Inquisition, once started against someone, are abandoned, as it were, in confusion, and they are to some extent weakened in the faith by observing that learned men are thus mocked by low and uncouth persons. For they believe that we have at our command in support of the faith arguments so clear and obvious that no one may oppose us in these matters without our knowing at once how to overcome him, in such wise that even laymen may clearly perceive just what these reasons are. Hence, in such a situation, it is not expedient to dispute in matters of the faith against such astute heretics in the presence of laymen. Furthermore, a point worthy of attention is that just as no one medicine is for all diseases, but rather different and specific medicines exist for particular diseases, so neither is the same method of questioning, investigation, and examination to be employed for all heretics of the various sects, but for each, whether there be one or many, a particular and suitable method ought to be utilized. So the inquisitor, like a prudent physician of souls, will proceed cautiously in regard to the persons whom he questions or concerning whom he makes inquiry. He will weigh their quality, condition, standing, health, and local circumstances, and will act with caution on the matters upon which there is to be inquiry and examination. He should not impose or force all the following interrogatories upon everyone without distinction and in
the same order; nor, in the case of some, should he be satisfied with these questions and only these. But with the bridle of discretion let him so harness the wiles of heretical persons that, with the help of God and the skill of a midwife, he may draw the writhing serpent from the sink and abyss of errors. In these matters, no single and infallible pattern can be set, for, if that were done, the children of darkness might anticipate too far in advance the sole customary method and might too easily avoid or guard against it as a trap. Therefore, the wise inquisitor should be careful to set his course by the replies of the witnesses, the sworn statements of accusers, the counsel of men taught by experience, the shrewdness of his own natural intelligence, and the following questions or interrogatories, as God shall direct. We shall append in order in the following pages material of use in giving some sort of idea as to how examinations may be conducted against five sects—the Manichaeans; the Waldenses, or Poor of Lyons; the pseudo-Apostles; those who are called in the vernacular Beguins; Jews who have been converted to the faith of Christ and have returned to the vomit of Judaism—and also against sorcerers, diviners, and invokers of demons, whose noxious influence is exceedingly harmful to the purity of the faith. A general outline of the error of each sect will be given first, followed by an outline of the plan and method of conducting the examination, as will appear on the following pages.

[Chapter I: Manichaeans of the Present Time]


The sect and heresy of the Manichaeans and the supporters of its aberration declare and confess that there are two gods and two lords, to wit, a beneficent God and an evil one. They assert that the creation of everything visible and corporeal was wrought, not by God the Heavenly Father, whom they term the beneficent God, but by the devil, or Satan, the wicked God—for him they call the evil god, the god of this age, and the prince of this world. Thus, they postulate two creators, namely, God and the devil; and two creations, that is, one invisible and incorporeal, the other visible and corporeal. Also, they pretend that there are two churches: The beneficent one, they say, is their sect, which they declare to be the Church of Jesus Christ. But the other they call the evil church; this they hold to be the Roman Church, which they shamelessly refer to as the mother of fornication, the great Babylon, the harlot and cathedral of the devil, and the synagogue of Satan. They despise and distort all its offices, its orders, its ordinations, and its statutes. They call all who hold its faith heretics and sinners, and they declare as dogma that no one can be saved in the faith of the Roman Church. Also, all the sacraments of the Roman Church of our Lord Jesus Christ—the Eucharist or sacrament of the altar, baptism which makes use of actual water, confirmation, ordination, extreme unction, penance, and marriage of man and woman—each and everyone they declare empty and vain. And, like monkeys, they devise in imitation certain others which seem almost like them. In place of baptism by water, they concoct another baptism, a spiritual one, which they call the consolamentum of the Holy Spirit, whenever they admit anyone, in health or in sickness, into their sect and order by the imposition of hands, in accordance
with their abominable rite. In place of the consecrated bread of the Eucharist, the body of Christ, they concoct a certain bread which they call "blessed bread" or "bread of holy prayer." This they hold in their hands at the beginning of their meal; and, following their ritual, they bless, break, and distribute it to those present and to their believers. As for the sacrament of penance, they say that true penance consists in entering and remaining faithful to their sect and order. They sought for, and searched out, it appears that they utter all the foregoing in duplicity and falsehood, in accordance with their ideas as set forth and explained above, in order thus to deceive simple persons and even highly educated men if they happen to be inexperienced. They teach and expound to their believers all the errors mentioned above and, once they have been discovered and cannot hide, they openly defend, affirm, and profess them before inquisitors.

Thenceforth, what is needful is to exhort them to conversion and, in every possible way, to show them their error, using the services of specially trained and diligent men. Inquisitors, in normal practice, detain such perfected heretics for a rather long time for a number of reasons, first, in order more frequently to urge them to conversion, for their conversion is especially helpful. The conversion of Manichaeans is usually genuine and seldom feigned; when they are converted, they tell everything, reveal the truth, and betray their confederates, whence results a great harvest. Also, as long as such perfected heretics are held, their believers and accomplices more readily confess and expose themselves and others, fearing to be betrayed by the heretics if the latter are converted. However, after their conversion has been repeatedly urged and invited, if the heretics are unwilling to return to the faith and seem to be obdurate, sentence is pronounced against them and they are abandoned to the secular arm and tribunal.

[2] Concerning the Way of Life and the Practices of These Manichaeans.—It is expedient, also, to touch on some facts in regard to the way of life, the customs, and the behavior of these heretics, since thereby they are more easily recognized and apprehended. In the first place, it should be known that under no circumstances do they take an oath. Also, they observe annually three forty-day fasts, namely, from the feast of St. Brice [November 13] until Christmas, from Shrove Sunday until Easter, and from the feast of Pentecost until the feasts of the apostles Peter and Paul [June 29]. The first and last week of each period they call "strict," for then they fast on bread and water, whereas, during the other weeks, they fast on bread and water for three days only. All the rest of the year they fast on bread and water three days each week, unless they are traveling or are ill. Also, they never eat meats or even touch them, or cheese, eggs, or anything which is born of the flesh by generation or coition. Also, under no circumstances will they kill any animal or any winged creature, for they say and believe that there are in brute animals and even in birds those spirits which leave the bodies of men (if they have not been received into their sect and order through the imposition of hands according to their custom), and that these spirits pass from one body to another. Also, they touch no woman. Also, at the
beginning of the month, when they are gathered together with their believers or
by themselves, they bless a loaf or a piece of bread. Holding it in their hands,
with a towel or some white cloth hanging from their necks, they say the Lord's
Prayer and break the bread into small pieces. This bread they call "bread of holy
prayer," and "broken bread"; their believers call it "blessed bread" or
"consecrated bread" (panem signatum). They partake of it as communion at the
beginning of a meal; they give and distribute it to their believers. Also, they teach
their believers to show them reverence in a ceremony which they call the
melioramentum, although we call it adoration. The believer bends the knees and,
with hands clasped, bows low before the heretics over some bench or down to
the ground. He bows three times, each time saying as he rises, "Bless us," and
finally concluding, "GoodChristians, give us God's blessing and yours. Pray the
Lord for us that God may keep us from an evil death and bring us to a good end
or into the hands of faithful Christians." The heretic replies: "From God and from
us you have it (that is, the benediction); and may God bless you and save your
soul from an evil death, and bring you to a good end." By "evil death," the
heretics mean dying in the faith of the Roman Church, while by "a good end" and
by "the hands of faithful Christians," they mean being received at the end of one's
life into their own sect and order, according to their practice; this they hold to be a
good end. How ever, they say that the reverence described above is made not
to themselves but to the Holy Spirit, who, they say, is in them and by Whom they
have been received into the sect and order which they claim is their: Also, they
teach their believers to make with them a pact, which the call "the agreement","to
the effect that the believers desire to be taken into the heretics' sect and order at
the end of their life. Once that pact is sealed, the heretics may accept them
during an illness even though they should have lost the power of speech or their
memories should have failed.

[3] Concerning the Method of Heretication or the Reception of the Sick into This
Sect or Order.-
The following is the method of admitting persons to their sect or order during an
illness or near the end of life of the suppliant. The heretic asks the individual who
is to be received, if [the invalid] can speak, if he or she wishes to become a good
Christian man or woman and wishes to receive holy baptism. Upon receiving an
affirmative answer, accompanied by the request, "Bless us," the heretic, with his
hand over the head of the sick person (but not touching her if it be a woman) and
holding the Book, repeats the Gospel, "In the beginning was the Word," as far as
"the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." At the conclusion of the
reading, the invalid repeats the Lord's Prayer, if he can; if not, one of those
present says it for him. Thereafter, the sick man, if able, bows his head over
clasped hands and says three times, "Bless us," while all the others present
adore the heretic in the fashion described above. On the spot, or in a place apart,
the heretic makes many prostrations, obeisances, and genuflections to the
ground, repeating the Lord's Prayer several times while bowing and rising.

[4] Concerning Their Method of Religious Instruction.-It would take long to treat in
detail of the methods by which these Manichaean heretics preach and propound
their doctrines to their believers, but it is well to present some of them briefly
here. In the first place, they usually say of themselves that they are good
Christians who do not swear or lie or speak evil of anyone; that they kill neither
man nor beast nor anything which has the breath of life; and that they hold the
faith of the Lord Jesus Christ and His Gospel, as Christ and the apostles taught
it. They say that they occupy the place of the apostles and that it is because of
the foregoing facts that the members of the Roman Church, to wit, the prelates,
the secular and regular clergy, and especially the inquisitors of heretics,
persecute them and call them heretics, just as the Pharisees persecuted Christ
and His apostles, although they are really good men and good Christians. Also,
they discuss with laymen at every opportunity the wicked life of clerics and
prelates of the Roman Church. They give examples and speak at length about
their pride, avarice, uncleanliness of life, and whatever other evils they know. In this connection, they cite the texts of the Gospels and the Epistles,
as they interpret and understand them, against the state of prelates, clergy, and
members of religious orders, whom they refer to as Pharisees and false
prophets, those who "say, and do not." One by one, they tear down and
disparage all the sacraments of the Church, especially the sacrament of the
Eucharist, saying that the body of Christ is not therein, for were it large as the
greatest mountain, Christians would already have eaten all of it. Also, they say,
the Host comes from straw and passes through the tails of stallions and mares
(referring to the flour's being passed through the sieve); also, that it goes into the
latrine of the stomach and is ejected through the basest part of the body, which
could not happen, they insist, if God were present. Also, in the matter of baptism,
[they say] that the water is a material substance and corruptible, and therefore is
part of the work and creation of the evil God and cannot hallow the soul, but the
clergy sell that water out of avarice, just as they sell land for the burial of the
dead and oil for the sick when they anoint them, and just as they make a profit
from the confession of sins to the priests. Also, they claim that confessions made
to priests of the Roman Church are of no value, for, inasmuch as the priests are
sinners, they cannot bind and loose and, being themselves unclean, they cannot
cleanse another person. Also, they say that the Cross of Christ deserves no
adoration or veneration because, according to them, no one adores or venerates
the gallows on which his father or some relative or friend has been hanged. Also,
they say that those who adore the Cross should, with equal right, adore all thorns
and alliances, for just as in Christ's passion the Cross was for His body, so were
the thorns for His head and the soldier's lance for His side. Many other offensive
teachings do they set forth on the subject of the sacraments of the Church. Also,
they read the Gospels and the Epistles in the vernacular, interpreting and
expounding them in their own favor and against the existing establishments of
the Roman Church. It would take too long to deal with these points individually
here, but one may read them at greater length in their books, which they have
filled and defiled with that material, and may hear them fully in the confessions of
their believers after conversion.
[5] The Following Are Suggested Questions to Be Put to Believers of the Sect of the Manichaeans.-In the first place, let the one under examination be asked whether he has anywhere seen or known a heretic or heretics, knowing or believing them to be such or to have that name or reputation; where he saw them; how often; with whom; and when. Also, [ask] whether he had any familiar association with them; when; how; and who was responsible for it; also, whether he received any heretical person or persons in his home; who they were; who brought them there; how long they stayed; who visited them there and escorted them thence; and where they went; also, whether he heard their preaching; and what they said and taught; also, whether he adored them or saw them adored by others, or saw reverences made to them in the heretical fashion; and about the practice of adoration; also, whether he ate of their blessed bread; and about the method of blessing the said bread; also, whether he made a pact or covenant with them to the effect that he wished to be received into their sect and order at the point of death. Also, [ask] whether he saluted them or saw them saluted by others in the heretical fashion, which is to place a hand upon each of the heretic's cheeks, bending one's head, and turning it toward each cheek, and saying thrice, "Your blessing," a mode of salutation which the believers who are to become perfected observe upon the arrival or departure of heretics. Also, [ask] whether he was present at a heretication of any person and about the method of heretication; the names of the heretic or heretics; the persons there present; the place in the house where the invalid lay; the time and hour; whether the hereticated person bequeathed anything to the heretics-what, how much, and who paid the legacy; whether adoration was performed there to the said heretic; whether the hereticated person died of that illness and where he was buried; and who brought there and escorted thence the heretic or heretics; also, whether he believed that the hereticated person could be saved in the faith of the heretics. Also, [ask] what he heard said or taught by the heretics against the faith and sacraments of the Roman Church; what he heard them saying about the sacrament of the Eucharist; about baptism, matrimony, confession of sins to priests, adoration or veneration of the Holy Cross; and similarly for other errors enumerated above; also, whether he believed that heretics were good men and truthful; that they had and kept a good faith, a good sect, and good doctrine; that the heretics themselves and their believers could be saved in their faith and sect; also how long he has shared in or persisted in the said belief; also, when he first began to accept this belief; also, whether he still believes it; also, when and why he abandoned it. Also, [ask] whether he has ever on any other occasion been summoned or cited before any inquisitor; when and why; whether on any other occasion he has confessed in the matter of heresy; whether he has abjured heresy before any inquisitor; whether he was restored to the communion of the Church or absolved; also, whether since that time he has in any way been involved in the matter of heresy; which heresy; and in what way, as listed above; also, whether he knows any person or persons who are believers in or sympathizers with the activity of heretics, or are their harborers; also, whether he has ever accompanied a heretic or heretics from place to place or has had their books in his possession; also, whether his relatives were believers or were
sympathizers with the activities of heretics or had been penanced for complicity in heresy. This is the general line of questioning for the sect under consideration, from which special questions often may be developed through the diligence and alertness of the inquisitor.

... Chapter IV: Concerning the Sect of the Beguines

[1] The sect of Beguins, who call themselves the Poor Brethren and who say that they keep and profess the third rule of St. Francis, appeared in recent times in the provinces of Provence and Narbonne, and in certain parts of the province of Toulouse, which has from early times been included in the province of Narbonne. They began to be recognized and exposed in their erroneous opinions in the year of our Lord 1315, or a little before or after that time, although many persons earlier had commonly thought them to be suspect. Thereafter, year by year, in the provinces of Narbonne and Toulouse and in Catalonia, many were seized, held, and their errors unmasked. Many of both sexes were found to be heretics, were so adjudged, and were burned, from the year of our Lord 1317 onward, particularly in Narbonne, in Bezières, in the diocese of Agde, in Lovede, around Lunel in the diocese of Maguelonne, in Carcassonne, and in Toulouse, where three foreigners were involved.

[2] Concerning the Errors or Erroneous Opinions of the Beguins of Recent Times: Their Origin.-Now Beguins (for by this name are commonly called those who refer to themselves as the Poor Brethren of Penitence of the third order of St. Francis and who wear a garb of coarse brown or greyish brown woolen cloth, with or without a cape) of both sexes in recent times were discovered in the year of our Lord 1317, and year by year thereafter, in various places in the province of Narbonne and in some parts of the province of Toulouse, and they confessed before the court to having and clinging to many errors and wrong opinions. They set themselves up against the Roman Church and the Apostolic See, against the primacy of that see, and against the apostolic power of the lord pope and of the prelates of the Roman Church. By lawful inquisition and through the depositions and confessions of a number of them, recorded before the court, as well as through declarations by many of them, in and for which they have chosen to die by burning rather than to recant as is canonically required, the source of their errors and pernicious opinions has been discovered. They have culled these, at least in part, from the books and pamphlets of Brother Peter John Olivi, who was born at Serignan, near Bezières-that is to say, from his commentary on the Apocalypse, which they have both in Latin and in vernacular translation, and also from some treatises which I the Beguins say and believe that he wrote: one dealing with poverty, another with mendicancy, and a third with dispensations. [They took them] also from certain other writings they attribute to him, all of which they have in vernacular translations. They read, believe in and treat these as veritable Scriptures. They say and believe that this Brother John received his knowledge by revelation from God, especially his commentary on the Apocalypse.

...
Furthermore, one should observe and note that among these Beguins some are found who know, uphold and believe in many or all of the errors described below; they have become steeped and hardened in them. There are others who are able to discuss only a few of them and yet are sometimes found to be more stubborn in their convictions and beliefs than their equally misguided fellows. Then, there is a third sort, who have heard or remembered only a little and who yield to right reason and sane counsel. Some there are, to be sure, who obstinately persist and will not retract, who elect rather to die than to abjure, for by so doing they claim to defend evangelical truth, the life of Christ, and evangelical and apostolic poverty. Yet one also finds some among them reluctant to be involved in errors or wrong opinions and who are on their guard against them.

[3] The Following Deals with Their Manner and Way of Life.-The Beguins live in villages and small towns, where some of them live together in little dwellings which, in the phraseology they affect, they call "houses of poverty." Both the occupants and those who dwell in their own private homes quite frequently gather together in these houses with associates and friends- of the Beguins on feast days and Sundays. There they read or listen to the reading in the vernacular from the above-mentioned pamphlets or tracts, out of which they imbibe poison, although certain other things are also read there-the commandments, the articles of faith, legends of the saints, and a summa on vices and virtues. Thus the school of the devil, with its appearance of good, seems, in monkey fashion, to imitate the school of Christ in some ways. But in Holy Church the commandments of God and the articles of faith must be preached and expounded publicly, and not secretly, by rectors and pastors of the Church-not by simple laymen, but by doctors and preachers of the word of God. It should also be noted that there are some among them who beg publicly from door to door, for they claim to have embraced evangelical poverty. There are others who do not beg publicly but do perform some manual labor, thus earning money and leading a life of poverty. Furthermore, some of the more simple among them, of both sexes, do not clearly grasp the articles and errors described below but are in a state of ignorance. Yet among them are those who generally have a firm conviction of the injustice and unwarranted character of the condemnations of Beguins which have occurred since the year of our Lord 1318 by judgment of prelates and inquisitors of heretical depravity in several localities in the province of Narbonne (namely, in Narbonne, Capestang, and Beziers, in the vicinity of Lodeve, in the diocese of Agde, and around Lunel in the diocese of Maguelonne), in Marseilles, and in Catalonia. They revere as just and good those persons who were condemned as heretics.

[4] Outward Signs by Which They May Also Be Recognized.-It should also be noted that, in keeping with the remark of Augustine in his Contra Faustum, Book XIX: "Men cannot be held together in any bond of religon, whether true or false, unless they are bound by some common performance of visible signs or sacraments," these Beguins have certain patterns of overt
behavior, in speech and other actions, by which one may distinguish them from other people. Their method of address or of returning a salutation is this: As they approach or enter a house, or meet on a journey or on the street, they say, "Blessed be Jesus Christ," or "Blessed be the name of Jesus Christ." Also, at prayer, in church or elsewhere, they sit bending over, head covered, usually turning their face toward an opposite wall or some such spot, or toward the ground; rarely are they seen to kneel with lapsed hands like other men. Also, at the midday meal, after the food been blessed, those who know it repeat the Gloria in excelsis deo in their knees, while the others listen. At the evening meal, also, those who know it recite the Salve regina.

[5] The Following Deals with the Erroneous, Schismatic, Presumptous, or False Beliefs of the Said Beguins and Their Followers.—In the first place, those who are commonly called Beguins (although they themselves say they are the Poor Brethren of Penitence of the third order of St. Francis) say and affirm that they believe and maintain that Lord Jesus Christ, while He was man, and His apostles also, owned nothing personally or even in common, for they were the perfect poor is world. They say that this is perfect evangelical poverty, which is to own nothing personally or in common. Also, they say that to own in common detracts from the perfection of evangelical poverty; "that the apostles could not have owned anything personally or in common without sin or without diminishing their perfection. Also, they deem it heretical to believe and assert anything contrary to the teaching. They say that the rule of St. Francis is the very life of Jesus, just as Christ observed it in this world and which He handed on to the apostles, charging them to observe it. Also, that which St. Francis transmitted to the brethren of his order in his rule, relative to evangelical poverty, requires that those who profess this rule may own nothing personally or in common beyond "poor usage" (usus pauper), that is necessary to life, while always tasting the destitution of poverty and having nothing superfluous. Also, they say that the Blessed Francis was, after Christ and His mother (and, some add, after the apostles), the chief and foremost observer of the evangelical life and rule, and its restorer in that sixth era of the Church in which they say we now are. Also, they hold that this said rule of St. Francis is the Gospel of Christ or is one and the same with the Gospel of Christ. Also, they say that those who impugn or in any respect contradict the rule of St. Francis, which they call the Gospel, impugn and contradict the Gospel of Christ and in consequence err and become heretics if they persist in their error. Also, just as they say that since neither the pope nor any other can change anything in the Gospel of Christ, neither add to nor take from it, so no one can change anything in the aforesaid rule of St. Francis, neither add to nor subtract from it as far as concerns the vows and evangelical counsels or precepts contained therein. Also, and in consequence, they say that the pope cannot annul the evangelical rule of St. Francis, or change it, or remove from amongst the other orders the order of St. Francis which they call the evangelical order. They also make the same claim in every respect regarding the third order of St. Francis and his third rule. Also, they say that no pope, nor even a general council, can annul or decree anything contrary to anyone of the acts which have
been confirmed, decreed, or prescribed by a previous pope or a preceding general council. Hence, they commonly maintain that the two rules of St. Francis mentioned above (some of them even include any of the other rules, confirmed by Roman pontiffs), cannot be annulled by any succeeding pope or even by a general council. Also, they say that if the pope should alter any part of the rule of St. Francis, should add or suppress anything, above all in respect of the vow of poverty, or if he should annul the said rule, he would thereby be acting against the Gospel of Christ. They contend that no Friar Minor or any other person would be obliged to obey him in such an event, no matter how often he should command it, not even under pain of excommunication for disobedience, because such excommunication would be unjust and would bind no one. Also, they claim that the pope cannot grant dispensation to anyone from vows made under the rule of St. Francis, to wit, those of chastity, poverty, and obedience. Also, that he cannot give dispensation to any one from a vow of poverty made to God, even should that vow have been simple and not solemn (not acknowledged by the Church) because a person who has taken a vow of poverty is irrevocably bound to it. An individual receiving such a dispensation would fall from a greater and higher degree of virtue and perfection to a lesser and lower one; and the power of the pope, in their opinion, serves only constructive, not destructive ends. Also, they say that the pope cannot issue a constitution or a decretal granting a dispensation or giving to Friars Minor the right to keep grain and wine in common granaries or cellars for use or necessary provision at a future time, because this would be contrary to the evangelical rule of St. Francis and, in consequence, to the Gospel of Christ. Also, they say that our Lord Pope John XXII acted against the Gospel of Christ when he issued a certain constitution beginning Quorundam, wherein he grants Friars Minor permission or dispensation to gather grain and wine in granaries and cellars for future use, at the discretion of the prelates of their order. And they say that by this he fell into heresy, and that, so long as he persists in this, he has lost the power to bind or loose, as well as other pontifical powers; prelates installed by him since he issued the said constitution have no ecclesiastical jurisdiction or power. They say, also, that all prelates and others who agreed or who knowingly shall agree with the lord pope in the issuance of the said constitution have for this reason become heretics, if stubbornly they persist therein, and they have lost all ecclesiastical power or jurisdiction. Also, they say that the Friars Minor who were responsible for the issuance of the said constitution, or those who consent to it and accept it and take advantage of it, have become heretics by so doing. Also, they say that the pope cannot, under God, permit any Friar Minor, even by papal license, to transfer to another religious brotherhood or order in which the Friar Minor himself as well as the other brethren of the same order may possess wealth in common. For, they say, this would be to fall from a greater and higher condition of perfection or virtue to a lesser and lower one, which would be to pull down, not to build up, while the power of the pope was given only for constructive, not for destructive use. Also, they say that if any Friar Minor should ever go over to another religious brotherhood or order, he is bound, notwithstanding any papal permission, always to observe the vow of poverty taken by him earlier under the rule of St. Francis.
Thus, he can never own anything personally or in common, beyond bare necessity.

2. Saint or heretic?: Armanno Pungilupo of Ferrara

Introduction

Armanno Pungilupo was a holy man who lived in Ferrara for at least twenty years. The Dominican Inquisition considered him to be a Cathar believer and perfect. However, at his death he was buried in the cathedral and healing miracles took place at his tomb. For that reason, the cathedral clergy sought to have him made a saint. These readings are excerpts from two accounts of Armanno, the testimony to his postmortem miracles, used to try to get him made a saint, and the testimony that he was a Cathar, used to try to get him condemned for heresy. Ultimately, Pope Boniface VIII heard the case and ruled him a heretic.

I) Examination of twenty-two miracles claimed to have been performed at the tomb of Armanno of Ferrara (collected for a canonization process)

In the name of our lord Jesus Christ, Amen. In the year of his birth 1269 on 16 December. The man of God, the blessed Armanno of Ferrara...having persevered for a long time before God and men in praiseworthy penitence, in vigils, fasts and speeches ... faithful; chaste, humble, patient, merciful, benign and simple ... devoted to God and the glorious Virgin ... was miraculously called to Him and ended his days. In the briefest space of time, his contented death,... became known to the Ferrarese people, and crowds of men and women immediately flocked to the cathedral, where his lifeless body was laid out. When this worthy body had been reverently taken to its tomb with funeral ceremonies... the Almighty King soon began to make this man of God, Armanno, famous with miracles, as is declared below.

19 December: Madonna Nova, daughter of Mainardino da Maderio, and wife of Giovannino da Achille, of the parish of Santa Maria in Vado, Ferrara, swore in the presence of ... lord Alberto ... bishop of Ferrara, and of lords Federico, archpriest, Ferrarino, canon, and the noblemen Aldigerio Fontana, Petrocino Menabuoi, his son Pietro and many others, to tell the truth regarding her infirmity and cure, confirming under oath..., that she had suffered for about nine years in her right eye and that from about eight days ago the swelling and pain in that eye grew stronger, such that she could not see out of it. And today she came in person to the cathedral, where the body of Armanno, the man of god, lay, and three times with devotion she kneeled before his tomb, devoutly beseeching God the Father that, through the merits of this man of God, Armanno, he would cure her of this infirmity and restore her sight. Having said which, she made an offering and soon the swelling vanished from her eye and she recovered her sight...

On the same day, in the presence of the above witnesses, Gisla,widow of Castellano, of the parish of Santa Maria in Vado, a sworn witness, said on oath
that she had known Nova for seven years, and had seen the affliction in her eye, until today...

20 December: Gisla, formerly of Lendinara, wife of Stefano da Villanova, who lives in the parish of Borgonuovo, swore in the presence of the lord bishop, of Lords Federico archpriest, Amedeo and Ferrarino canons, the chaplain Alberto and the mansionary Cossa, and on oath said that for eighteen years she had been crippled in her right arm, until today, and had not been able to raise it to her mouth, nor hold anything in it. And yesterday... she vowed to God and the blessed Armanno that she would offer at his tomb a waxen arm and hand and a candle in the shape of an old woman, as she is, and that on his vigil she would always for the rest of her life fast on bread and water, and would watch at his tomb that night. And, having formally made this vow, she came to the tomb of the blessed Armanno and watched there throughout the night in pure devotion and reverence. And this morning, while the body of Christ was being elevated by the priest in the cathedral, Gisla, who was still there, stood up out of reverence... and raised both her arms up high and was freed from the infirmity in her arm.

On the same day, Stefano, Gisla's husband, attested, having first given his oath, that his wife Gisla up to today suffered in her right arm, as stated above, but he does not know how she recovered health in it ...

20 December: Gerardo, a porter of Borgonuovo, sworn in the presence of the above lords, said on oath that his daughter Marchesina, a girl of eight years, there present, from the time of her birth had limped on both sides, And last Wednesday this girl, at the hour of vespers, asked him in tears to take her to the tomb of the blessed Armanno, because she hoped that he would make her upright. And so he took her up in his arms and carried her to the tomb of the blessed Armanno, and placed her reverently on the box in which the body lay. And when the girl had been there for an hour, he asked her how she felt, and she replied: 'Well', And then he lifted her down into the church, and, in the sight of all the onlookers, she began to walk upright. The girl, present, said that, when she was released, she felt her pains pass like pins and needles...

28 December: Marinello, shoemaker of Boccacanale, swore in the presence of the lord bishop and lords Federico archpriest, and Ferrarino and Amedeo canons, and said on oath that for eighteen months he was immobile with gout, from his groin to his feet, until Christmas eve just passed. And he had hardly been able to turn over in bed, and was strongly tormented in his legs and hips, and he had no relief day or night. And on Christmas eve, before daybreak, he came to the tomb of the blessed Armanno, and stayed there in supplication and devotion all day until Nones, praying to god to release him from this gout through the merits of the blessed Armanno. And when the bell rang out, he felt free of the usual pain in his hips and legs, and he began to walk about freely and without a stick, which previously he had not been able to do ... ...
January 1270: Madonna Candiana, wife of Petrocino di Mazzò of the parish of San Romano, Ferrara, in the presence of the lord bishop and many others, clerical and lay, swore to tell the truth regarding the infirmity and liberation of her daughter Tommasina aged two years, whom she showed to the lord bishop. On oath she confirmed that her daughter was for four months afflicted with the disease of multiple ulcers on both sides of her hips, such that she was in despair of release. And thus she remained afflicted until Christmas eve just passed. At which time Candiana vowed her girl to God and the blessed Armanno, that if he liberated her, she would bring her to his tomb and offer a waxen image in her likeness. Having made this vow, on Christmas day Tommasina was liberated, the ulcerations having healed. And she showed the ulcerations, which appeared totally healed, to the bishop and to a great number of people.

On the same day, Master Enoch, medical doctor and citizen of Ferrara, as a sworn witness, asserted on oath that he had had this girl, Candiana's daughter, who was there present, in his care, and had done much over a month and more to liberate and treat her. And he knew for certain that she had been afflicted with terrible pain from the ulcers on her hips. And when he saw that her infirmity was incurable, he had discharged and left her. And he had told the girl's mother to bind her and do the best she could for her. And this was just before the Christmas just passed.

II) Examination of witnesses against Armanno Pungilupo, Ferrarese heretic, 1270-1288 (collected by the Inquisition)

Among the twenty-six general charges were the following:

1. that he was a, heretic
2. that he said that there was no salvation in the Roman church, but, only in the heretics
5. that he spoke ill of the body of Christ
6. that he gave and received the consolamentum to and from heretics according to their rite
7. that he had friendship, familiarity, acquaintance and conversation with heretics
8. that he said heretical things, speaking ill of ministers of the Church, calling them demons and wolves because they persecuted the 'good men', that is, the heretics...
10. that he relapsed into heresy after he had sworn to obey the inquisition...
11. that he abjured heresy before the inquisition in 1254 ...
13. that he was a messenger for heretics, taking them bread blessed by heretics...
16. that heretics came to him and revered him after his death.

Master Ferrarino da Lignamine, on 8 August 1270, said on oath that Pungilupo was a believer of the heretics and loved them. And he saw him with Martino da Campitello, who was a heretic.
Fra Tebaldino, on 40 November 1270, said on oath that he heard it said many times and from many persons that Pungilupo was a believer of the heretics and that he said words against the Catholic faith ...

Fra Bonfadino of the Dominican order, on 28 November 1270, said on oath that before he entered the Order, he knew Pungilupo and that he was reputed a believer of heretics.

Madonna Veneria, who was a believer of the heretics, on 29 November 1274, said on oath that Pungilupo was a believer, receiver and familiar of heretics. The reasons for her saying this are that two years or so before his death Pungilupo knowingly took heretics to her house; and that she saw him make reverence to a female heretic; and that she saw him give the consolamentum to a woman; and that Pungilupo often said heretical things to her...

Madonna Bengpare, who was a believer of the heretics, on 10 November 1274, said on oath that Pungilupo was a believer of the heretics of the sect of Bagnolo, And she said that she heard the Cathars do many tricks and say derisory things of the Roman church, including 'How, after this, will those of the Roman church say that we are bad men, when they make one of us a saint?'

Gavino da Satta, who was with lord Menabo of Ferrara who kept heretics in his house, said on oath that he heard heretics say 'Whatever friars or others of the Roman church might say, Pungilupo was one of our people and was our believer.' And that this was common knowledge among them.

Lord Jacobino, a judge, on 5 July 1270, said on oath that he believed Pungilupo to be a believer of the heretics. Asked why, he replied, because he only rarely went to church, because he did not take advice from any wise churchmen, and because he said many bad things about clerics.

Rengarda of Verona, on 26 April 1285, said on oath that eighteen or twenty years ago, roughly, she saw Armanno of Ferrara... in Verona. And, as a believer and friend of the heretics, he came to the house of the witness to visit her mother, for she was a believer of the heretics and received him, and he stayed there...

Albertino, who was a heretic, on 3 August 1273, said on oath that Pungilupo was a 'consoled' Cathar, And he said that Pungilupo did him reverence in his own house and many times elsewhere. And that Pungilupo came to Verona about six years ago, on account, so he said, of a prisoner who had fled there, And there Pungilupo received the laying on of hands in the house of the Cathars ... from Alberto bishop of the sect of Bagnolo and from Albertino himself, who was... an elder son and visitor of their sect in Lombardy...

Lord Enrico, who was a Cathar-catcher and officer of the Inquisition, on 28
November 1270, said on oath that he heard say and it was common knowledge that Pungilupo was a believer of the heretics. And he had heard say that he thought ill of the body of Christ. So, when he found Pungilupo on the piazza of Ferrara, he said to him, 'I have heard of you, Pungilupo, that you think ill of the body of Christ. I have the office of arresting heretics. I arrest you,' And Pungilupo replied, 'What do you believe?' To which he replied, 'I believe that it is truly the body of Christ, after it is consecrated by the priest' and Pungilupo said, 'And I, for love of you, will so believe from now on.'

Fra Bonfadino ...on 28 November 1270, said on oath that after he entered the Order, he heard Pungilupo say many times, 'If the body of our Lord Jesus Christ were as big as a mountain, it would all have been eaten up by now.' And he said that Pungilupo refused to pray towards the east, but prayed towards the west, saying publicly that he did not want to pray in the same direction as the fat, plundering clergy ...

Grazio da Bergamo. who lives in Ferrara, on 12 December 1270, said on oath that, at the time of Pungilupo's death, some men from Bergamo came and lodged in his house. Among them were some heretics; one of whom pretended to be dumb and then to have been cured, though the witness knows well that he was not dumb before, nor had he used to be. And he said that many heretical believers from Bergamo, whom he knew well, came to Ferrara in order to see Pungilupo's deeds and they did him great reverence.

Fra Atasio da Bergamo of the Dominican order, on 12 January 1270, said on oath that while he was in the convent in Ferrara he saw many heretical believers, who had never been used to going to church, coming to the body of Pungilupo. carrying votive offerings and glorying in him, that one of their own had been made a saint.

QUESTIONS
1. Cathars were dualists who believed that our true selves are pure spirit; human beings are angels, spiritual beings, cruelly trapped for a time in matter. The goal of life is to escape the body and the physical world. What would Cathars think of healing miracles at a tomb?
2. Why would the cathedral clergy want to make Armano a saint?
3. What kinds of witnesses did they produce and what evidence did they offer for his sainthood?
4. Why would the Inquisitors want him condemned as a heretic?
5. What kind of witnesses did the Inquisitors produce and what kinds of evidence for his heresy?
6. Judging from these brief vignettes, what was Armano like?

3. Heresy Trials
Arnoada da Lamatha of Montauban (1244)
Introduction
The most widespread heretical sect in medieval Europe was the Albigensians or Cathars, whose members were concentrated particularly in southern France and northern Italy. They had gained such wide public acceptance in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries that they were able to hold public councils of their bishops, establish convents, run several municipal governments, and secure the protection of the nobility and episcopate. In 1208, taking advantage of the assassination of the papal legate Peter of Castelnau, Pope Innocent III called a crusade against the heretics and their protectors, enlisting the support of the northern French nobility. By about 1229 the Inquisition had begun to undertake the systematic investigation, apprehension, and punishment of the heretics and their confederates. The following testimony comes from one of the earliest surviving such trials of heretics, held by the inquisitor Ferrarius in 1244, and describes the experiences of a Cathar perfecta [holy woman], who lived a life of stringent asceticism and spent some time in a Cathar convent. Arnauda was heard again in 1245/46 by the Inquisitor Bernard de Caux; the trial protocol incorrectly labels Arnauda a Waldensian.

On July 30, 1244 Arnauda da Lamotha of Montauban, a conversa in the diocese of Cahors, was called to swear to the truth before all those living and dead, concerning the crime of heresy and Waldensianism. The witness testified that one day two heretical women, whose names she does not know, came to the home of her mother Austorga at Montauban and preached there. "This witness, her sister Peirona, their mother Austorga, and Lombarda, the wife of the witness’s uncle Isame Daussac, were present. After the sermon, Austorga and Lombarda "worshiped" the two heretics by making three genuflections [bows] before them, and with each genuflection said to them, "Bless me," and they added, "Lord, pray to God for me, a sinner, that He may make me a good Christian and lead me to a good end." And the heretics replied to each benediction, "May God bless you," and they added after the end of the benediction, "God grant that you become a good Christian and have a good end." When this was done, the heretical women left and went their way. . . . Not only the witness herself, but also her sister Peirona worshipped these heretics, more than thirty-five years ago. One day, Raymund Aymeric, the heretical deacon of Villemur, and the heretic Bernard de Lamotha came to Montauban to the home of her mother, Austorga, and preached there. The witness, her sister Peirona, and their mother Austorga were present, and after the sermon, Austorga "worshiped" those heretics, as is said, and gave the witness and her sister to them. They took the witness and her Sister from Montauban and brought them to Villemur to the home of the heretic Poncia and her heretical companions, who lived there openly. They remained with them for three years, eating at the same table from the bread blessed by the heretics and of whatever else was placed on the table. At any meal of whatever kind of food, at the first libation she said to each of them, "Bless me," and the heretical women replied to each benediction, "May God bless you." The witness and her sister Peirona frequently "worshiped" these heretics there, as is said. They took the witness and Peirona to the house of Raymund Aymeric, the heretical deacon, who lived openly at Villemur. There
the witness and her sister took part in the consolamentum in this way. First, the heretics asked the witness and her sister Peirona whether they wanted to devote themselves to God and the Gospel, to which they replied in the affirmative. Next, after being questioned by the heretics, the witness and her sister promised to abstain from eating meat, eggs, cheese, and anything oily, except olives and fish; that they would not swear or lie, give themselves to any passion throughout their lives, and never leave the heretical sect as a result of the fear of punishment by fire or water or any other kind of death. Afterward, the heretics placed their hands and a book over the head of the witness and her sister Peirona and read, making the witness recite a Paternoster in accordance with their ritual. These heretics made many genuflections in their presence and prayed and "gave them peace" with the book. Afterward, their shoulders turned sideways, they kissed them twice on the mouth in turns, and many heretics were present at this consolamentum. When this was done, the heretics, the aforementioned Poncia and her heretical companions, returned the witness and Peirona to their home. The witness and her sister remained in that house as members of the heretical sect for a year or more, eating, praying, fasting, blessing the bread at the table, taking part in the apparellamentum ceremony, worshiping those heretics, and doing everything else which male and female heretics are accustomed to do, more than thirty-five years ago. . . . When she had been at Villemur for a year, crusaders came to that region, and out of fear Raymund Aymeric left Villemur with all the heretical men and women of the village. On the first day after leaving Villemur they came to Roquemaure to the home of the heretical women, whose names she does not know, stayed there, and then hid themselves early in a cave. . . whence they went to Lavaur . . . and stayed there for about a year. . . . As a result of great fear of persecution, they returned to Montauban and abandoned the heretical sect, ate meat, and were reconciled by the bishop of Cahors more than thirty-two years ago [ca. 1212]. . . . On a certain day the witness, her sister Peirona, and her mother, Austorga, who had fallen ill, gathered together with the heretical Bernard de Lamotha and his heretical companion, left Montauban, and took the road to Linars, where heretical women lived in monastic garb. The women decided to receive the habit of the nuns and to visit the prioress of Linars and her heretical companion. They left Montauban with the aforementioned heretics and came to Linars and remained there. One day, Gerard Abit came along with his heretical companions, who performed the apparellamentum for the heretical women, i.e., all those who lived in that house at Linars, as many as sixteen women. . . twenty years ago.

Questions:
1. Judging from this account, how did cathars live and what rituals did they practice?
2. What roles were available to women who were cathars?


Fra Michele
Introduction
This is an eyewitness account of the condemnation and execution of a radical Franciscan in Florence, Fra Michele of Calci.

THE EXECUTION OF FRA MICHELE OF CALCI, 1389
April 30, 1389] This is the condemnation of Giovanni, called Fra Michele di Berti of Calci, in the territory of Pisa, a man of low condition, evil conversation, life, and reputation, and a heretic against the Catholic faith, against whom we have proceeded by means of inquisition.... It has come to our attention that this Giovanni... with the spirit and intent of being a heretic, had relations with the Fraticelli, called the Little Brothers of Poverty, heretics and schismatics and denounced by the Holy Roman Church, and that he joined that depraved sect in a…grotto…in which place they congregated and stayed....

With the intention of proclaiming this heresy and of contaminating faithful Christians, the accused came to the city of Florence and in public places he did maintain, affirm, and preach the heretical teachings hereby stated: Item, that Christ, our Redeemer, possessed no property either individually or in common but divested himself of all things, as the Holy Scripture testifies. Item, that Christ and his Apostles, according to the Scriptures, denounced the taking, holding, or exchanging of goods as against divine law. Item, that Pope John XXII [d. 1334] of blessed memory was a heretic and lost all power and ecclesiastical authority as pope and as a heretic had no authority to appoint bishops or prelates, and that all prelates so appointed by him do not legally hold their office and that they sin by pretending to do so. Item, that all cardinals, prelates, and clerics who accepted the teaching of John XXII on apostolic poverty, and who should resist these teachings and who do not resist, are also heretics and have lost all authority as priests of Christ. Item, that this Giovanni, a heretic and schismatic, not content with all this mentioned above, but desiring also the damnation of others, in the months of March and April sought to persuade many men and women of the city of Florence, to induce them to believe inland to enter the above-mentioned sect of the Fraticelli. He told them about the above-mentioned sect; with false words and with erroneous reasons he claimed that this sect was the true religion and the true observance of the rule and life of the blessed Francis; and that all those who observe this doctrine and life are in a state of grace, and that all other friars and priests are heretics and schismatics and are damned.

And since this Giovanni appeared before us and our court and confessed to the above-mentioned charges... and refused to recant or to reject these teachings, we hereby decree that unless this Giovanni gives up his false teaching and beliefs, that as an example to others, he be taken to the place of justice and there he is to be burned with fire and the flames of fire so that he shall die and his spirit be separated from his body. Now everything which I here describe, I who write both saw or heard.

Fra Michele, having come into the courtyard, waited attentively to hear the
condemnation. And the vicar [general of the bishop] spoke: "The bishop and the Inquisitor have sent me here to tell you that if you wish to return to the Holy Church and renounce your errors, then do so, in order that the people may see that the church is merciful." And Fra Michele replied, "I believe in the poor crucified Christ, and I believe that Christ, showing the way to perfection, possessed nothing...." Having read his confession, the judge turned his back upon Fra Michele... and the guards seized him and with great force pushed him outside of the gate of the judge's palace. He remained there alone, surrounded by scoundrels, appearing in truth as one of the martyrs. And there was such a great crowd that one could scarcely see. And the throng increased in size, shouting: "You don't want to die!" And Fra Michele replied, "I will die for Christ." And the crowd answered: "Oh! You aren't dying for Christ! You don't believe in God!" And Fra Michele replied: "I believe in God, in the Virgin Mary, and in the Holy Church!" And someone said to him, "You wretch! The devil is pushing you from behind!"

And when he arrived in the district of the Proconsolo, there was a great press of people who came to watch. And one of the faithful cried: "Fra Michele! Pray to God for us...." When he arrived at S. Giovanni, they shouted to him: "Repent, repent! You don't want to die." And he said: "I have repented of my sins...." And at the Mercato Vecchio, they shouted even louder: "Save yourself! Save yourself!" And he replied, "Save yourselves from damnation." And at the Mercato Nuovo, the shouts grew louder: "Repent, repent!" And he replied, "Repent of your sins; repent of your usury and your false merchandising....And at the Piazza del Grano, there were many women in the windows of the houses who cried to him: "Repent, repent!" And he replied, "Repent of your sins, your usury, your gambling, your fornication...." When he arrived at S. Croce, near the gate of the friars, the image of St. Francis was shown to him and he raised his eyes to heaven and said, "St. Francis, my father, pray to Christ for me." And then moving toward the gate of Justice, the crowd cried in unison: "Recant, recant! You don't want to die!" And he replied, "Christ died for us." And some said to him, mocking: "Ho, you're not Christ and you don't have to die for us." And he replied, "I wish to die for Him." And then another shouted, "Ho, you're not among pagans," and he answered, "I wish to die for the truth.... And when he arrived at the gate near the place of execution, one of the faithful began to cry, "Remain firm, martyr of Christ, for soon you will receive the crown...."

And arriving at the place of execution, there was a great turmoil and the crowd urged him to repent and save himself and he refused.... And the guards pushed the crowd back and formed a circle of horsemen around the pyre so that no one could enter. I myself did not enter but climbed upon the river bank to see, but I was unable to hear.... And he was bound to the stake... and the crowd begged him to recant, except one of the faithful, who comforted him. And they set fire to the wood... and Fra Michele began to recite the Te Deum.... And when he had said, "In your hands, 0 Lord, I commend my spirit," the fire burned the cords which bound him and he fell dead... to the earth. And many of the onlookers said,
"He seems to be a saint." Even his enemies whispered it... and then they slowly began to return to their homes. They talked about Michele and the majority said that he was wrong and that no one should speak such evil of the priests. And some said, "He is a martyr," and others said, "He is a saint," and still others denied it. And there was a greater tumult and disturbance in Florence than there had ever been.

Questions
1. Which of Fra Michele's actions and beliefs led the Inquisition to condemn him for heresy?
2. Did he have the opportunity to recant and deny those beliefs?
3. How did the Florentines react? Why was there a great disturbance?


4. Nahmanides, Debate with a Christian

Introduction
At times, rulers held debates between Jews and Christians, in order to persuade Jews to convert. In 1263, the Christian king James I of Aragon arranged for a public debate between two representatives of the major religions—Christianity and Judaism—in his realm. The Christian side was represented by Friar Paulo Cristia, a Jew who had converted to Christianity earlier; the Jewish side, by Nahmanides (1195?-1270), a famous scholar and biblical interpreter from Catalonia. The debate revolved around a vexed question among Jews and Christians—whether the messiah promised in the Hebrew scriptures and revered by both sides had arrived or not. By this time, Jews had begun to make their arguments on the basis of Christian (New Testament) scriptures. Similarly, Christians, especially those who had converted from Judaism, began to use references found in authoritative Jewish texts such as the Talmud to argue the Christian case. Here Nahmanides distinguishes between various kinds of Jewish writings and their degree of authority. The Halakah, legal traditions based on interpretations of the Hebrew Bible, are authoritative for Jews. The Haggadah, sermons and legends, are inspiring but not binding on Jews; therefore, Christians could not establish a convincing case by arguing from them. Nahmanides composed the account excerpted here to describe the event for the benefit of Jews in Spain and elsewhere.

On the day appointed, the king came to a convent that was within the city bounds, where was assembled all the male population, both Gentiles and Jews. There were present the bishop, all the priests, the scholars of the Minorites [the Franciscans] and the Preaching Friars [the Dominicans]. Fra Paulo, my opponent, stood up to speak, when I, intervening, requested our lord the king that I should now be heard. The king replied that Fra Paulo should speak first because he was the petitioner. But I urged that I should now be allowed to express my opinion on the subject of the Messiah and then afterwards he, Fra
Paulo, could reply on the question of accuracy.

I then rose and calling upon all the people to attend said: "Fra Paulo has asked me if the Messiah of whom the prophets have spoken has already come and I have asserted that he has not come. Also a Haggadic work, in which someone states that on the very day on which the temple was destroyed the Messiah was born, was brought by Fra Paulo as evidence on his behalf. I then stated that I gave no credence to this pronouncement of the Haggadah but that it lent support to my contention. And now I am going to explain to you why I said that I do not believe it. I would have you know that we Jews have three kinds of writings-first, the Bible in which we all believe with perfect faith. The second kind is that which is called Talmud which provides a commentary to the commandments of the Law, for in the Law there are six hundred and thirteen commandments and there is not a single one of them which is not expounded in the Talmud and we believe in it in regard to the exposition of the commandments. Further, there is a third kind of writing, which we have, called Midrash, that is to say sermonic literature [sermones] of the sort that would be produced if the bishop here should stand up and deliver a sermon which someone in the audience who liked it should write down. To a document of this sort, should any of us extend belief, then well and good, but if he refuses to do so no one will do him any harm. For we have scholars who in their writings say that the Messiah will not be born until the approach of the End-time when he will come to deliver us from exile. For this reason I do not believe in this book (which Fra Paulo cites) when it makes the assertion that the Messiah was born on the day of the destruction of the temple."

. . . My opponent. . . said: "I shall bring further evidence that the Messianic age has already been." But I craved my lord the king to be allowed to speak a little longer and spoke as follows: "Religion and truth, and justice which for us Jews is the substance of religion, does not depend upon a Messiah. For you, our lord the king, are, in my view, more profitable than a Messiah. You are a king and he is a king, you a Gentile, and he (to be) king of Israel-for a Messiah is but a human monarch as you are. And when I, in exile and in affliction and servitude, under the reproach of the peoples who reproach us continually, can yet worship my Creator with your permission, my gain is great. For now I make of my body a whole-burnt offering to God and thus become more and more worthy of the life of the world to come. But when there shall be a king of Israel of my own religion ruling over all peoples then I would be forced to abide in the law of the Jews, and my gain would not be so much increased. But the core of the contention and the disagreement between Jews and Christians lies in what you Christians assert in regard to the chief topic of faith, namely the deity, for here you make an assertion that is exceedingly distasteful. And you, our lord the king, are a Christian born of a Christian [man and of a Christian woman] and all your days you have listened to priests [and Minorites and Preaching Friars talking of the nativity of Jesus] and they have filled your brain and the marrow of your bones with this doctrine and I would set you free again from that realm of habit and custom.
Of a certainty the doctrine which you believe and which is a dogma of your faith cannot be accepted by reason. Nature does not admit of it. The prophets have never said anything that would support it. Also the miracle itself cannot be made intelligible by the doctrine in question as I shall make clear with ample proofs at the proper time and place. That the Creator of heaven and earth and all that in them is should withdraw into and pass through the womb of a certain Jewess and should grow there for seven months and be born a small child and after this grow up to be handed over to his enemies who condemn him to death and kill him, after which, you say, he came to life and returned to his former abode--neither the mind of Jew nor of any man will sustain this. Hence vain and fruitless is your arguing with us, for here lies the root of our disagreement. However, as it is your wish, let us further discuss the question of the Messiah." Fra Paulo then said to me: "Then you do believe that the Messiah has come?" I replied: "No, but I believe and am convinced that he has not come and there never has been anyone who has said concerning himself that he was Messiah--nor will there ever be such who will say so [concerning themselves]--except Jesus. And it is impossible for me to believe in the Messiahship of Jesus, because the prophet says of the Messiah (in Ps. 72:8) that 'he shall have dominion from sea to sea and from the River until the ends of the earth.' Jesus, on the other hand, never had dominion, but in his lifetime he was pursued by his enemies and hid himself from them, falling finally into their power whence he was not able to liberate himself. How then could he save all Israel? Moreover, after his death dominion was not his. For in regard to the Empire of Rome, he had no part in the growth of that. Since, before men believed in him the city of Rome ruled over most of the world and after faith in him had spread, Rome lost many lands over which it once held sovereign power. And now the followers of Muhammad possess a larger empire than Rome has. In like manner the prophet Jeremiah (31:34) says that in the Messianic age 'they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know Me: while in Isaiah (11:9) it is written, that 'the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.' Moreover the latter prophet states (2:4) that, in this time, 'they shall beat their swords into ploughshares . . . nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' But since the days of Jesus up to the present the whole world has been full of violence and rapine, the Christians more than other peoples being shedders of blood and revealers likewise of indecencies. And how hard it would be for you, my lord the king, and for those knights of yours, if they should learn war no more! And yet another oracle of the prophet Isaiah (11:4) is to this effect: 'He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth.' In the Haggadic work in the hands of Fra Paulo this verse receives the following commentary: 'It was reported to the king Messiah that a certain province had rebelled against him. The king Messiah commanded the locusts to come and destroy the province. He was told that such and such an eparchyl had rebelled against him. He commanded a swarm of insects to come and consume it.' But it was not thus in the case of Jesus. And you his servants deem to be better for your purposes horses that are clad in armor; and sometimes even all this proves to be of no avail for you. But I would yet submit
for your attention many other arguments drawn from what the prophets have said."

At this juncture my opponent called out: "Such is always his method-to make a long speech when I have a question to put to him." The king thereupon told me to cease speaking on the ground that he, Fra Paulo, was asking a question. So I was silent. Fra Paulo said: "The Jewish scholars say of the Messiah that he is to be more honored than the angels. This cannot apply to any but Jesus who in his one person was both the Messiah and God." Then he adduced the Haggadic interpretation of the words "My servant shall be exalted and lifted up and shall be very high" (Isa. 52:13), namely, that the Messiah is exalted above Abraham, lifted up above Moses and higher than the ministering angels. My answer to him on this point was: "Our scholars constantly speak in this manner of all the eminently righteous, saying that they are more righteous than the ministering angels. Our teacher Moses said to an angel: 'In the place where I have my dwelling, you have not authority to stand.' And, in general, Israel avers that Israel is more beloved of God than are the angelic ministrants. But what the author of this Haggadic passage on the Messiah proposes to say is that Abraham, our father, on whom be blessing, wrought the conversion of Gentiles, explained to the peoples his faith in the Holy One, and in debate opposed Nimrod without fear. Yet, Moses did more than he. For Moses in his meekness stood before the great and wicked king Pharaoh and did not spare him in the mighty plagues with which he smote him, and brought Israel out beyond the range of Pharaoh's power. But exceedingly zealous were the ministering angels in the task of redemption. As is written in the Book of Daniel (10:21): 'And now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia.' Yet more than these all will the Messiah do. For his courage will be high in the performance of the purposes of the Lord. For he will come and command the Pope and all the kings of the nations in the name of God, saying: 'Let my people go that they may serve me.' And he will do among them many mighty signs and wonders and in no wise will he be afraid of them. He will make his abode (will stand) in their city of Rome until he has destroyed it." Having spoken thus, I said to Fra Paulo that I would give an exposition of the whole of the Haggadic passage if he cared to have it; but he did not so desire.

Fra Paulo now submitted another Haggadic passage where it is said about the Messiah that he prays for Israel that the Holy One may pardon their iniquities and undertakes to endure sufferings in behalf of others. In his prayer he says to God: "I undertake to endure sufferings on condition that the resurrection of the dead be in my days, and I undertake this not only on account of the dead of my generation but for all the dead who have died from the days of the first men up to the present, and not only those who died [and whom the earth received] but even those who were cast into the sea and drowned or who were devoured by wolves and wild beasts."

"Now:" claimed Fra Paulo, "the suffering which the Messiah took upon himself to endure refers to the death of Jesus which Jesus willingly bore." To that argument I replied: "Woe be to him who is shameless! All that is spoken of in the prayer of
the Messiah was not performed by Jesus. Jesus has not raised to life those who have died from the time of Adam up till now, nor has he done anything at all of this sort. Furthermore that a prayer is spoken of in the passage shows that he, the Messiah, is human and not divine and that he has not power to raise from the dead. Moreover those so-named sufferings of the Messiah signify nothing other than the grief he endures because his advent is exceeding long delayed and he sees his people in exile and he has not power (to deliver them). Also he beholds brought to honor above his own people them that worship that which is not God and who have denied him and make for themselves a Messiah other than himself.

QUESTIONS
1. What is Fra Paulo's main argument in support of the messiahship of Jesus? How does Nahmanides counter it?
2. How does Fra Paulo use texts belonging to the Jewish tradition? How does Nahmanides use texts of the Christian tradition?
3. Consider the impact that such a debate might have had in Christian Spain in the thirteenth century. How might it have affected Christians, Jews, and Christian-Jewish relations?


5. Letters between Students and Their Fathers

Introduction
European universities first emerged in the thirteenth century. Modern universities, including the administrative structure, system of degrees, and even the robes worn at graduation are vestiges of them. The following selections suggest personal and social aspects of college life.

FATHERS TO SONS

I.
I have recently discovered that you live dissolutely and slothfully, preferring license to restraint and play to work and strumming a guitar while the others are at their studies, whence it happens that you have read but one volume of law while your more industrious companions have read several. Therefore I have decided to exhort you herewith to repent utterly of your dissolute and careless ways, that you may no longer be called a waster and your shame may be turned to good repute.

II.
I have learned-not from your master, although he ought not to hide such things from me, but from a certain trustworthy source-that you do not study in your room or act in the schools as a good student should, but play and wander about, disobedient to your master and indulging in sport and in certain other dishonorable practices which I do not now care to explain by letter.
SONS TO FATHERS
I. "Well-beloved father, I have not a penny, nor can I get any save through you, for all things at the University are so dear: nor can I study in my Code or my Digest [law textbooks], for they are all tattered. Moreover, I owe ten crowns in dues to the Provost, and can find no man to lend them to me; I send you word of greetings and of money.

The Student has need of many things if he will profit here; his father and his kin must needs supply him freely, so that he is not compelled to pawn his books, but have ready money in his purse, with gowns and furs and decent clothing, or he will be damned for a beggar; therefore, that men may not take me for a beast, I send you word of greetings and of money.
Wines are dear, and hostels, and other good things; I owe in every street, and am hard pressed to free myself from such snares. Dear father, plan to help me! I fear to be excommunicated; already have I been cited, and there is not even a dry bone in my larder. If I do not find the money before this feast of Easter, the church door will be shut in my face: therefore grant my supplication, for I send you word of greetings and of money.

II. L'Envoy
Well-beloved father, to ease my debts contracted at the tavern, at the baker's, with the doctor and the bedells [a minor college official], and to pay my subscriptions to the laundress and the barber, I send you word of greetings and of money."

Sing unto tho Lord a new song, praise him with stringed instruments and organs, rejoice upon the high-sounding cymbals, for your son has held a glorious disputation, which was attended by a great number of teachers and scholars. He answered all questions without a mistake, and no one could get the better of him or prevail against his argument. Moreover he celebrated a glorious banquet, at which both rich and poor were honored as never before, and he has duly begun to give lectures which are already so popular that others' classrooms are deserted and his own filled.


*Introduction*
Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) was a leading scholastic who was deeply interested in the problem of reconciling Christian theology and classical philosophy. This was highly controversial; the writings of Aristotle were repeatedly condemned by the Bishop of Paris. In this excerpt, Aquinas defined the relationship between truths known by reason and truths known by faith.

BOOK1 CHAPTER 3: Two Ways of Knowing the Truth about God.
There are two ways of knowing what we hold to be true about God. There are some truths about God that exceed the capacity of human reason—for example the fact that God is three and one. There are also some truths that natural reason can attain, such as that God exists, that he is one, and other truths of this kind. These are truths about God that have been conclusively proved by philosophers making use of their natural reason. It is evident that there are some things to be known about God that completely exceed the capacity of human reason. Since all the knowledge that a person has about a thing is based on his understanding of its substance (according to the Philosopher [Aristotle] the basis for any argument is "what a thing is"), I the way the substance of a thing is understood must determine what is known about it. Thus if the human intellect comprehends the substance of, say, a stone or a triangle, no intelligible aspect of that thing is beyond the capacity of the human reason. However this is not the case for us with God. The human intellect can not achieve the understanding of God's substance by means of its natural capacity because in this life all knowledge that is in our intellects originates in the senses. Hence things that are not perceived by the senses cannot be grasped by the human intellect except in so far as knowledge of them is gathered from the senses. But the objects of the senses cannot lead the human intellect to the point that in them it can see the divine substance as it is, for they are effects that are not equal in power to their cause. However our intellect is led from the objects of the senses to the knowledge of the existence of God—as well as to other attributes of the First Principle. Therefore there are some things that can be known about God that are available to human reason, but there are others that totally exceed its power.

CHAPTER 4: Truths about God that are Known by Reason are also Properly Made Available to Man by Faith.
If it were left solely to reason to seek the truth about God, few men would possess a knowledge of God. There are three reasons why most men are prevented from carrying out the diligent inquiry that leads to the discovery of truth. Some are prevented from doing so because of their physical disinclination—as a result of which many men by nature are not disposed to learning. And so however earnest they are, they cannot attain the highest level of human knowledge which consists in knowing God. Others are prevented from doing so by the pressures of family life. Some men must devote themselves to managing temporal affairs and thus are not able to spend time in leisurely contemplative inquiry, so as to reach the highest point of human inquiry—the knowledge of God. Laziness prevents others. To know what reason can investigate concerning God requires that one already have a knowledge of many things, since almost all of philosophy is directed towards the knowledge of God. This is why we learn metaphysics, which is concerned with the divine, last among the subjects in the field of philosophy. The study of truth requires a considerable effort—which is why few are willing to undertake it out of love of knowledge—despite the fact that God has implanted a natural appetite for such knowledge in the minds of men.

CHAPTER 7: Truths Based on Reason Are Not Contrary to the Truth of the
Christian Faith.
Although the truth of the Christian faith exceeds the capacity of human reason, truths that reason is fitted by nature to know cannot be contrary to the truth of faith. The things that reason is fitted by nature to know are clearly most true, and it would be impossible to think of them as false. It is also wrong to think that something that is held by faith could be false since it is clearly confirmed by God. Since we know by definition that what is false is contrary to the truth, it is impossible for the principles that reason knows by nature to be contrary to the truth of faith.

We conclude therefore that any arguments made against the doctrines of faith are incorrectly derived from the self-evident first principles of nature. Such conclusions do not have the force of proofs, but are either doubtful opinions or sophistries, and so it is possible to answer them.

CHAPTER 8: The Relationship between the Human Reason and the Primary Truth of Faith. There is a further point to be considered. The objects of the senses on which human reason bases its knowledge retain some traces of likeness to God, since they exist and are good. This resemblance is inadequate because it is completely insufficient to manifest the substance of God. Effects possess a resemblance to causes in their own particular way because everything that acts does so in ways like itself, but effects do not always exhibit a perfect likeness to their cause. Now human reason is related to the knowledge of the truth of faith—which can only be known fully by those who see the divine substance—in such a way that reason can attain likenesses of it that are true but not sufficient to comprehend the truth conclusively or as known in itself. Yet it is useful for the human mind to exercise its powers of reasoning, however weak, in this way provided that there is no presumption that it can comprehend or demonstrate [the substance of the divine]. For it is most pleasing to be able to see some aspect of the loftiest things, however weak and inadequate our consideration of them may be.

Questions:
1. What truths about God can only be known by faith? What can reason tell us about God? How?
2. Are there truths known both by faith and by reason?
3. Is it appropriate in his view to apply logical analysis to the Christian religion?