

**Raymond de Sainte-Foy**  
**Deacon of the Vaudois Sect**  
**Confession 3**

Confession of Raymond de la Côte, a deacon in the sect of the Vaudois:

The year of the Lord 1318, the Thursday before the feast of Saint Lawrence (August 9th). Because Raymond de la Côte, also known as Sainte-Foy, a deacon in the diocese of Vienne, has come to live in Pamiers with Agnes, the widow of Etienne Francou of Vermelle, Jean de Vienne, a carpenter of Vienne and Huguette, the wife of the latter, and because he was living with them in the same house and because of his comportment and certain books and writings found in his house he is strongly suspected of heresy, and especially of being a member of the sect of the Vaudois.

The Reverend Father in Christ my lord Jacques, by the divine grace bishop of Pamiers, wishing, according to his duty, to make an inquest concerning the faith of the said Raymond; having his seat at the château of Allemans in which he had Raymond detained for these deeds; assisted by Brother Gaillard de Pomiès, Order of Preachers of the convent of Pamiers, helping by virtue of the commission below in the matter of the Inquisition which he hold from Brother Jean de Beaune, inquisitor of heresy in the realm of France appointed by the Apostolic See, had the said Raymond brought before him in a judicial appearance at which time he was presented with a book of the Gospels and the bishop enjoined and told him to tell the plain and entire truth without reticence or deceit, as much concerning himself, as accused, as concerning others living or dead as witness, on all the facts touching the Catholic faith concerning which he was to be interrogated by the said lord bishop.

The said Raymond said and responded that he did not dare to take an oath of any sort and that he would not swear, alleging that he had fallen ill one day and had an epileptic fit, because of an oath he had taken, even though he had taken the oath in order to tell the truth.

Then my said lord bishop told him to promise to tell the truth concerning these facts on his good faith. He expressly refused nonetheless to do so.

Upon interrogation:

-Do you believe that to take an oath to tell the truth is a mortal sin? -Yes.

-Do you believe that one should tell the truth to save one's life? -I believe there is no need to take an oath. It would be a sin if I were to swear, since this went badly for me.

-Have you been instructed by anyone concerning this, that you should not take an oath under any circumstances? -I made my confession once to a priest, a curé or a vicar of Eclose, in the diocese of Vienne, named Pierre, whose family name I do not know and who has been dead these ten years, I believe. He taught me never to swear in any case, because it was a sin, and it went badly for me when I did.

-Have you taught any person or persons not to swear in any case? -I believe I have told this to several people whose names I have forgotten; but I believe I certainly told this to Huguette and Petronilla, the women who live with me; I do not believe I told it

to my cousin Jean de la Côte, nor to the woman Agnes, who lived with me and was arrested.

-A parchment scroll commencing with the line: "We humbly appeal to His Majesty the King..." and finishing on the last page with "...he is asked to say to my lord the Pope." was found in the house you lived in in Pamiers along with your effects. Is it yours? -I carried it with me. I found it on the road near Loupian.

-Was it you who made the markings on it? -No, and I do not know who made them.

-Why do you have this scroll? -For no other reason than I love to read it because it is written in a beautiful, calligraphic script.

-For how long have you believed that it is a sin to take an oath? -Before I confessed to the curé or vicar I spoke of above, I was in doubt concerning this point, but after that confession, I believed that I should not take an oath and I still believe it, and I take it as a sign that if I were to take an oath, I think that I would fall again into this malady (epilepsy).

-Do you believe that my lord the bishop could remove your sin if you were to swear? -Yes, the same as an archbishop or any priest ordained according to the manner and rite observed by the Roman Church at his ordination, but I do not believe that anyone else, who is not a priest, such as a deacon or anyone of lower rank could do it. No one can confer the holy orders, except the bishop or archbishop.

-Can anyone consecrate the body of the Lord without being a priest? -No. If a man or women, after confession, dies before having accomplished the penance prescribed (or that ought to be prescribed) or dies in a state of venial sin, will he go to purgatory in the next world? -I believe that if he has completed his penance he will go to paradise; if he has not completed it, God can have pity on him and he will go to paradise; if God decides otherwise, to hell.

-The masses, prayers, and alms that are given for the dead, are they beneficial in anyway? - I believe that if they are in paradise, those things do no good at all; and the same if they are in hell. And, since everyone is either in heaven or hell, they are not beneficial. But I think they are only profitable for the living.

(Upon interrogation) - I believe that it is necessary for a man to do useful penance in this world, but that he cannot do it in the next, and I do not know of any passage of Holy Scripture that speaks of purgatory. I do not understand how the soul can do useful penance in the next world, without being united to a body.

-Do you believe that someone who possesses a good himself, either a prelate or curé who administers the goods of the church, can be spiritually pure doing so? -Yes.

-Did anyone teach you what you just said? -I found this out myself by reading the Scripture and meditating on it. A Burgundian named Pierre "lo Clergue" taught me this also about five or six years ago, I believe. I do not know what area he comes from and I have forgotten the place where he told me this.

-Have you spoken of this to anyone else? -No.

-For how long have you remained in this belief, as you have explained in your deposition above? -Five or six years.

-Have you been the companion of anyone who said the same thing, do you know of anyone or have you given anything to any persons of this sort? -No.

Interrogated concerning faith in God, he said:

I believe that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are three persons and one God; and that these persons are equal in the nature of their divinity, although the Son is inferior to the Father according to the nature of their humanity.

-Do you believe that all of the Trinity was incarnated and if not, which person was? -I believe that only the Son was incarnated and not the Father or the Holy Spirit.

After this, the following Saturday, the day after the Feast of Saint Lawrence (August 11, 1319), the said Raymond appeared at the said place of Allemans before my lord the bishop.

Correcting and retracting what he said on Thursday, he spoke as follows and declared:

-If on that day he affirmed that he was called Raymond de la Côte, he today corrected and said that he was called Raymond Sainte-Foy and came originally from la Côte-Saint-André in the diocese of Vienne.

-If he said that he believed to take an oath to tell the truth was a sin, he wished to retract that today, believing, he said, that it was not a sin. But, according to him, he would not take an oath, in these circumstances nor in any other, and he did not wish to take an oath on command of the bishop, offering as pretext, as on Thursday, his epilepsy.

-If he confessed to have told Huguette and Petronilla that they should not take an oath under any circumstances, he retracted that today, affirming that he had never told this to these women or to anyone.

-If he said Thursday that he did not believe that there is a purgatory in the next world, and that one could not do penance there, that the souls of those who die go at once to paradise, if they have done penance, and if not, to hell, at least if God does not wish to take pity on them, he then said, in correction, that he believed in the existence of purgatory in the next world and that one could do penance there, if, at least, one had confessed these sins before one's death.

-If he said that the masses and prayers which are said for the dead are worth nothing and are only useful for the living, he corrected himself now and said that this is beneficial for the dead, and permits them to be liberated more quickly from purgatory.

-If he swore and deposed that day to have been in error for a certain period of time, he retracted it, saying he had never held such a belief.

After this he was interrogated:

-Have you ever been to Castelsarrasin or to Beaumont de Lomagne or any other places in Gascony? -No.

-Did you have any other companions in Pamiers than those with whom you were arrested? -Two men, one called André Guiraud, and the other Jean Guilhem, and two women, named Guillelme Pascal and Pétrone Pascal, all of them are from the region of Vienne.

-Where are these men and women? -They left Pamiers about a month ago, with all their things, for Carcassonne and Narbonne. I do not know where they are now or where they went after that.

-What were they doing in Pamiers with you? -Nothing in particular; they were working for their bread.

-What did they have among their possessions? Any books or tablets? -I do not know. I didn't meddle with that.

Interrogated concerning whether he believed that it would be permissible to execute a man as punishment for murder or for any other crime or misdeed he said, after many hesitations and in a halting voice that this was permissible.

On the incarnation of Christ, he said the same thing as on Thursday.

-When were you at Pamiers? -This year before Ascension.

-Why? -Because it is a city with very few tariffs and life there is inexpensive.

-What did you do there? -Nothing. I read in my books and dispensed my goods, because life is inexpensive.

-Did you make a trip to the seat of the Roman court, since it has been on this side of the mountains? -No, I have never been there, except in passing through Avignon last year. From there I left for Agde where I lived before I came to Pamiers.

-Why did you bring with you these women and this man Jean? -To have company. They earned their bread by spinning and other occupations.

After this, the same year as above (1318) on December 17th, the said Raymond appeared in the presence of my said lord bishop and of Brother Gaillard de Pomiès, his assistant by virtue of the commission of Brother Jean de Beaune, inquisitor into the heretical deviation in the realm of France, above-named. He begged them to listen to him and examine him concerning the Catholic faith, the articles of faith and the sacraments, and said he was ready to state what he believed. Upon interrogation by my lord the bishop and Brother Gaillard, he said:

1. I believe that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are three persons, one single God, as witnessed by John in his first epistle, "Three bear witness in the heavens, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one." (I John 5:7)
2. I believe that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one single God, the creator of the heavens and the earth and everything which is not God, as Moses says in the beginning of Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" and according to the Apocalypse, "Let us adore the one who has made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all sources of water." (Apocalypse 14:7).
3. I believe that God gave the Ancient Law to Moses his servant on Mount Sinai so that the law could be taught to the sons of Israel according to the passage in Exodus: "Mount up to me on the mountain and I will give you two tablets of stone on which I have written the laws and rules that you shall teach to the children of Israel." (Exodus 24:12). And Paul to the Romans: "Wherefore the Law is just and good and the commandment holy, just, and good." (Romans 7:12)
4. I believe in the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ according to Isaiah: "A virgin shall conceive and bear a son and he shall be called Emmanuel" (Isaiah 7:14) and according to the Gospel: "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son and his name shall be called Emmanuel" (Matthew 1:23)
5. I believe that our Lord Jesus Christ himself chose the glorious Church of which the Apostle Paul spoke to the Ephesians: "Even as Christ has loved the Church and gave himself for it, purifying her in the Word of life, to make appear before him a

glorious church, having neither spot nor wrinkle nor any such thing.” (Ephesians 5:25-27).

6. I believe that all men will rise again in the flesh for the universal judgment, where they are, were or will be, according to Job: “I know that my Redeemer liveth and that I will be raised from the earth on the last day, and in my flesh I will see God my Savior, that I will be called to see myself and no other and my eyes will see the living God.” (Job 5:28-29)
7. I believe in the judgment to come on both the good and the wicked in which each one will be rewarded according to his deeds, according to the Psalm: “From the sky he has made his judgment known. The earth feared and was still.” (Psalm 76:8) and the Apocalypse: “Adore Him who has made the heavens and the earth and all the sources of the waters, and see here is come the hour of his judgment.” (Apocalypse 14:7)

I believe also in the seven sacraments of the Catholic faith or church:

-The first is the baptism by water in the following form: “I baptize you in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit” according to the Gospel: “Teach to all the nations all that I have taught you, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.” (Matthew 28:19)

-The second is penance, when the sinner, with a heart contrite over what he has done against the precepts of God, confesses with his mouth to a priest or the bishop. If he does the penance assigned by them, he obtains the remission of his sin; if he falls again into sin, he can once again be forgiven by a comparable penance, according to the Gospel: “Do penance, the kingdom of the heavens is drawing nigh” (Matthew 3:2) and in Saint Luke: “If you do not do penance, you will certainly perish.” (Luke 13:5)

-The third is the Eucharist, which is performed by the priest or the bishop in saying the words that our Lord said at the Last Supper over the bread and the wine; when these words are said by the priest or bishop, the bread and the wine become the body and the blood of Christ, and this is the same body of Christ which is born of the Virgin, as in the Gospel: “Taking the bread, Jesus said, Take; eat; this is my body which is given for you. And then taking the cup after having eaten, he said, Take; drink; this is my blood, which is shed for you for the forgiveness of sins. Do this in remembrance of me. (Luke 22:17-20).

-The fourth sacrament is marriage, which is done when a man and a woman not united to anyone else say these words with mutual consent and free will to contract marriage: “I take you for my wife, I take you for my husband” although it is preferable to do this at the door of the church, by the intermediary of a priest. After this mutual consent has been expressed, carnal relations are allowed between the spouses without sin, as in Genesis: “Bone of my bone, flesh of my flesh” (Genesis 2:23) and the Gospel “Let no man set asunder what God has joined” (Matthew 19:6).

-The fifth is supreme unction in which the sick are anointed with oil by priests to provide the sanctification of the body and the soul, concerning which Matthew (*sic*) says: “They anoint the sick with oil and they are cured” (Mark 6:13) and the epistle of James: “If any one of you is sick, then let him call the priests of the church and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord and the prayer of faith will heal him and if he is in a state of sin, his sins will be removed from him (James 5:14).

-The sixth is the imposition of hands, which is done by the bishops, in the ordination of deacons, priests and bishops, imposing their hands on the head of the ordinands and also when the priests impose their hands on the head of those who ought to be ordained into the priesthood, of which the virtue is the gift of the Holy Spirit, according to Acts: "When the apostles learned that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent Peter and John there, who once they arrived prayed that they might receive the Holy Spirit," and later "And when they imposed their hands upon them, they received the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:14-17). And in the book of Numbers it is said that Moses imposed his hands on the head of Joshua when he ordained him to be his successor (Numbers 27:23).

-The seventh is ordination as a deacon, priest or bishop, according to Acts: "Take heed then of yourselves and over the whole group because the Holy Spirit has instituted bishops and priests to govern the holy church of God." (Acts 20:28). Only the bishop ordinarily can ordain the priest and the deacon. But if it happens that all the bishops are absent, then the deacons and priests by a unanimous election can elect a bishop and ordain him by praying for him, as was done for Matthias (Acts 1:26) and as Moses, equivalent to a deacon one might say, ordained Aaron as a grand priest (Leviticus 8:12-13). That it belongs to bishops to ordain deacons and priests can be proved by what the Apostle says to Titus (1:5) "This is why I left you in Crete, so that you could ordain in the cities both bishops and priests." and it is also said in Acts (6) that the apostles instituted seven men to serve at the tables.

I have spoken of these three orders, because in my opinion, they are sufficient.

But he was interrogated further:

-The subdeacon, the acolyte and the other minor orders, do they need necessarily to be received in order to receive the diaconate? -Yes.

-Why? -Because the subdeacon, the acolyte and the other minor orders are necessary parts of the arrangement of the diaconate. This is why the latter should not be received if the subdeacon and the acolyte have not been received as a prerequisite.

And he claimed to believe all that precedes and that such was the faith in which he had been baptized and in which he wished to live and die.

After this my lord the bishop told him to swear that he believed and had believed what he just confessed. He responded that he believed what he just confessed but that he would not take an oath of any kind. And he did not wish to take an oath.

Witnesses: my lord Pierre du Verdier, archdeacon of Majorca and Brother Pierre Duprat of the order of Preachers.

After this, on Tuesday December 18th, the said Raymond appearing at the château of Allemans before my lord the bishop and the said Brother Gaillard de Pomiès said, and added to his last declarations and to prove the first article of faith:

I believe that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are three persons, one sole God, as stated in Genesis: "Let us make man in our image and likeness" (1:26) which would be inappropriate if there were not several persons in the Trinity. And that God the Father is one, as is proven by Deuteronomy, "Hear O Israel, the Lord God, your God is one" (Deuteronomy 6:4).

He was interrogated by the bishop:

-Are you a deacon? -Yes.

-From whom did you receive this rank? -From the bishop of Maurienne, named Jean.

-In which church? -In the church of Vienne.

-What did this bishop transmit to you and what did he do concerning this subject when he made you a deacon? -I no longer remember.

-Was he dressed in holy vestments or in ordinary vestments when he made you a deacon? -In the vestments of a priest.

-When he ordained you did he wear other holy vestments than those the priests wear when they celebrate? -Yes, the mitre and he held a cross and had other pontifical ornaments.

-You yourself, when you were ordained, were you dressed in holy vestments or were you dressed in ordinary clothes? -I no longer remember, but I believe that I had the vestments a deacon should have when he is ordained. For the rest, I do not know.

-For how long have you been a deacon? -I think it has been around 20 years and I was 20 years old at that time.

-Were you ever ordained as a subdeacon by any bishop? -No.

-Were you ever made doorkeeper, lector, exorcist and acolyte by a bishop or by anyone else? -No, unless mentally, but not in point of fact.

He was interrogated concerning the first article of faith:

-Do you know "I believe in God" (the Apostle's Creed) and "I believe in one God" (the Nicæan Creed)? -I know how to read them and I believe all that is contained in the *Credo* but I do not know them by heart.

-Since you say you know and believe both creeds, why do you distinguish the articles of faith differently from the way the creeds distinguish them? -I draw from holy Scripture and the authorities that I have mentioned and expressed above.

-Why did you say in expounding the first article of faith that you believe that "the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit are three persons, one God" and suppress the conjunction "and"? -So that no one would believe that I propose three persons in the deity and then one God separated from these three persons.

-Do you believe that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are truly distinct persons and that nevertheless they all partake of one divine nature? -Yes.

December 21st. He declared that the faith contained in all the articles of faith, in the seven sacraments, in the two creeds and in the *Quicumque vult* (another name for the Athanasian creed) he believed more in his heart than he was able to express with his mouth. He added that if, in the faith that he confessed above, he had added anything that he ought not to have added, or said that anything was an article of faith that could not be one, he revoked it; he had said it out of ignorance or simplicity; he held and believed firmly in the faith of the holy apostle Peter.

He was interrogated concerning the third article of faith that he affirmed, that is that God gave the ancient Law to Moses his servant so that he could teach the children of Israel.

-Do you believe that before the coming of Christ all the precepts of the Law, such as rituals, and laws as well as morals, ought to be observed and that those who observe

them are acting well and legitimately? -They were required to observe them at that time and those who observe them act well and legitimately.

-Since the coming of Christ, do the precepts of the Decalogue of the Law of Moses need to be observed by those faithful to Christ? -Yes.

-If then the precepts of the Decalogue ought to be observed today, why do you not wish to take an oath in order to tell the truth, since in the second commandment (Exodus 19:12), the taking of oaths is not forbidden entirely, but it is stated only that one ought not to swear or take the name of God without cause or in vain. -Because we must observe the precepts of the Lord and the Lord has ordained this in the Gospel by saying: "You have heard what was said among the ancients: 'You must not bear false witness, you must render your oaths to the Lord.' But I say to you not to swear by anything, neither by the sky, because it is the throne of God, nor by the earth, because it is the footstool of His feet, nor by Jerusalem because it is the city of a great kingdom, nor by the head, because no one can make a single hair black or white. But let your speech be: yes, yes, no, no. Anything more than this comes from evil." (Matthew 5:33-35) This is why I do not wish to take an oath contrary to the precept of the Lord.

-Since you believe that to take an oath, even to speak the truth, is a transgression against a precept of the Lord, do you believe that to take an oath to tell the truth is a sin? -If not to take an oath is a precept of the Lord I believe that if I were to take an oath I would transgress this precept and sin mortally although, according to what I believe, not too seriously.

-Do you believe that any man could give you a dispensation or authorization to take an oath and that, enjoying this dispensation or authorization, you would not sin mortally if you took an oath to tell the truth? -I do not know.

-If you yourself or anyone else were to be persecuted because you have not wished to take an oath to tell the truth, do you believe that in suffering this persecution you would acquire merit from God, and if for that reason one were to kill you, you would be martyrs? -I believe I would acquire merit from God for this persecution and if one were to kill me for this, I believe I would be a martyr for God.

-Do you believe that those who would kill you, because you did not wish to swear to tell the truth, would sin as gravely as those who kill martyrs, particularly if they were Christians who were to kill you? -That one or those who would kill me because I did not wish to take an oath would be going against the precept of the Lord, "Thou shalt not kill" and they would sin more than if they were to kill a brigand or another man who was not a malefactor, not because of a judicial decision but for some other reason.

-Since you say that this person would sin more in killing you than if he killed a brigand, do you believe that a temporal lord who has the right to administer justice, sins when he puts to death a brigand and goes against the precept of the Lord: "Thou shalt not kill."? -A temporal lord who has the right to administer justice does not sin in making a brigand or another malefactor die and does not go against the precept of the Lord "Thou shalt not kill" and no more does the man who condemns him to death.

-Has any saint ever taken an oath since the time of Christ? -I do not know, but I believe that Saint Peter, Saint Paul and the other saints have never taken oaths, wishing to observe the precept of the Lord, "Myself, in truth, I tell you not to swear by anything."

-If it is not permitted to take an oath and the saints, as you say, have not done so, why then does the Angel in the Apocalypse (Apocalypse 10:6) swear “by the Living God from age to age”; why has the Apostle Paul said to the Roman (Romans 1:9) “God is my witness”; and why has he said to the Hebrews, (Hebrews 7:21) in speaking of God that he has promised him according to his promise (*sic*), “You are a priest for all eternity”? -I do not know. But they did not sin.

-Did the saints of the Old Testament swear without sin? -The saints of the Old Testament took oaths without sinning. But after Christ gave his precept not to take an oath, no one was able then to swear without sinning.

-If the saints of the Old Testament, in swearing, not only did not sin, but did well, and if the men of the New Testament could not swear without sinning, do you believe those moral precepts that were good in the Old Testament are now bad and sinful for the men of the New Testament? -Yes, because God has given the commandment to swear in the Old Testament and not to swear in the New.

Witnesses: my lord Guillaume Hugou, prior of Frontignan and Brother Pierre du Prat, of the Order of Preachers.

December 29th.

-Since you believe that it is not permitted for anyone to take an oath in the New Testament, in such a way that those who do swear commit a sin, then is it true now that someone who gives an order to swear also sins? -Since under the new Law to swear is a sin, then to give an order to swear is also a sin.

-If it is a sin, is it a mortal sin? -It is a mortal sin, though there are many sins more serious.

-If then someone who gives an order to swear to tell the truth sins mortally, and the Roman church ordains the taking of oaths to tell the truth and for many other reasons, do you believe that all the Roman church sins mortally? -Since in giving a command to swear, the church transgresses a precept of the Lord, to not swear at all, it sins mortally, but not too gravely.

-Is someone who ordains as legal something that is not legal in error? -I believe that such a person, who believes to be legal that which is illegal, and ordains that it be done legally, is in error.

-Do you believe that the Roman church is in error, since it prescribes oath-taking as legal, to tell the truth, even though this is illegal according to you? -I believe that the Roman church is in error in saying this, but not too seriously.

-Do you believe that an error concerning holy Scripture or any other point contained therein is an error of faith? -I do not know.

-Do you believe that the Roman church, when it says that it is permitted to take an oath to tell the truth and for other reasons, and being thus in error according to you, is in error concerning the faith of Christ? -I believe than in this instance the Roman church is in error concerning the faith, although not too gravely.

Witnesses: Brother Jean de Rieux of the Order of Preachers and my lord Guillaume Hugou, prior of Frontignan.

December 31st.

He said, revoking his avowals concerning others, that he did not say nor did he wish to say, that he did not believe nor did he wish to believe that anyone else besides himself was in sin or error concerning faith and morals when they swore, ordered someone to swear or constrained someone to swear. But he himself, he said, believed and had believed for 16 years that if he were to swear he would sin mortally, although not too gravely, by reason of the precept of the Lord not to swear at all; he believed also that anyone who would order him to swear or wished to force him to swear would sin mortally, although not too gravely.

-Why do you believe that you sin mortally in swearing and yet do not believe that others sin in the same manner when they swear, since the precept of the Lord not to swear at all is general for all Christians and that God has not made any difference between men in establishing this precept, when he said generally, "Myself I tell you not to swear at all."? -I believe that to swear in any manner whatsoever, for me, as for all Christians, is a mortal sin, although not too serious, because it is a transgression against the precept of the Lord given equally to all Christians.

-If this is the case, do you believe that those who order someone to take an oath to tell the truth or compel someone to do so sin mortally? -Anyone who orders me to take an oath, or compels me to do so, sins mortally, although not too gravely, because I am aware that if I take an oath I commit a mortal sin by reason of the precept of the Lord; anyone who causes any other Christian to swear, or compels him to, sins mortally, but also not too seriously as the one who compels or orders me to do so, because I myself am aware that I should not do this because of the precept of the Lord. There are many other people who are not aware of this injunction against taking an oath. If one were to order or compel one of them, one would not sin the same way as one would in ordering or compelling me.

He said again that he wished to persevere in the responses made to questions concerning the Roman church concerning this matter on December 29th, although he revoked them today.

-If you were to be excommunicated by the Roman church because you did not wish to take an oath, do you believe this sentence would be just? Would you be bound by this sentence to take an oath, since by not taking an oath you would be committing a mortal sin? -Since no one can be excommunicated for doing a good work and since refusing to swear is a good work, since it is a precept of the Lord, I believe that anyone who excommunicated me for this reason would be acting unjustly and that his sentence would be unjust. I do not believe that I would be sinning, but on the contrary I would be doing a good deed, if being excommunicated because I did not wish to swear, I persisted in not taking an oath.

-Do you believe that one should obey a church which is in error concerning a precept of the Lord in going against this precept? Do you believe that if one believes the church is in error about a precept of the Lord that one should obey the church in a matter where she goes against that which one believes is a precept of the Lord? - If the Church errs against a precept of the Lord, one is not bound to obey her, particularly if what she prescribes is an evil forbidden by God. If one believes therefore that something is forbidden by God and the church orders you as a faithful member to do

something that God has forbidden, one ought not obey the church because it “is better to obey God than men.” (Acts 5:29)

-In conclusion then, since the church, errs truly in saying that it is permitted to swear in certain cases (since the Lord said “I myself tell you not to swear at all”) or errs according to you, are you obliged to obey the church and take an oath? -I ought not to obey the Church when she orders me to swear because I am violating the precept of the Lord to not swear at all.

Witnesses: my lord Guillaume Hugou, prior of Frontignan and Brother Aicret of the Order of Preachers.

January 2, 1320. He said that all Christians ought to obey the Roman Church, in anything that does not go against a precept of the Lord, but that a person should not obey the Church or anyone else in any case that would violate a precept of God.

-The Roman church can excommunicate me or anyone else if I do not wish to do what God commands, and if I am rebellious, and the sentence is just, then it binds the disobedient. That man sins who who does not wish to correct himself according to the Church when it asks him to do something according to the precepts of the Lord. One ought to consider oneself as “a pagan and a publican” (Matthew 18:17). But if the Church commands something that is against the precept of the Lord, or something that I believe and know to be against a precept of the Lord, i.e. to swear, I am not bound to obey her and she cannot excommunicate me justly, and if she does so, I do not consider myself excommunicated because she acts against this precept.

Anyone who persecutes me because I do not wish to take an oath, and for the same reason delivers me to death will be guilty of a double sin, first because he goes against the precept of the Lord “You shall not kill the just and the innocent” (Daniel 13:53) and in the second place against the precept “Thou shalt not kill.”

-Do you believe you are bound to obey a Church that errs concerning the faith on even one point? -I am not bound and I do not believe I am bound to obey anyone who errs concerning the faith of Christ, in any matter relating to the precepts of Christ, as is stated in the Epistle to John (II John 10:11): “To one who does not follow this doctrine one should not even say good morning; because he who even says good morning to him participates in his evil works.” But if someone who errs concerning the faith or a heretic commands me the same thing that God commands me, I am bound to obey, not because this is the order of a heretic, but because it is the precept of God, as the Apostle Paul said to the Philippians (Philippians 1:18): “Whether Christ is announced by truth or by chance, I rejoice in it and I will rejoice in it.”

-You have said you believe that the Roman church errs concerning the faith when it says that it is permitted to take an oath to tell the truth or when it commands or compels anyone to do so, because it goes against the precept of the Lord not to swear at all. Are you bound or do you believe yourself bound to obey it in any specific act that it prescribes for you? -I believe that I ought to obey the Roman church if it prescribes what the Lord prescribes and equally in human precepts, insofar as they are based on divine precepts. But in what it itself prescribes I am not bound to obey it, at least not in anything unrelated to what is posited as a rule by holy Scripture.

-In those matters where you are bound to obey the church, are you bound for the sole reason that it is prescribing the same thing as God or because it has prescribed it?

-I am bound to obey the Church when it prescribes for me the same things as God and because it has the authority to prescribe what God prescribes, on the condition above all that what it prescribes must be more or less according to God.

-When you were made a deacon, did you believe what you have stated above and, in particular, that you ought not to take an oath? -Yes.

-Do you know if the bishop who made you a deacon also believed that one ought not to take an oath in any circumstances? -I do not know what he believed. But I believe firmly and I believed then that this bishop held this belief.

-Why? -Because I heard him say that one ought not to take an oath in any circumstances.

-Was anyone else present when the bishop told you that one ought not to take an oath in any circumstances? -No, there was only me and this bishop. Taking up the book of the Gospels he showed me the chapter of the gospel where it is said, "But I myself tell you not to take an oath at all." and he told me, Raymond, to observe this precept fastidiously if I wanted to go to Paradise.

-This person who ordained you a deacon, was he called a bishop? -He was called a majoral, elected by God and by men.

-How was he elected by God and by men? -His companions had elected him, deeming that he was a good Catholic and a good cleric. And after the election, they prayed over him and placed their hands on his head, so that he might receive the Holy Spirit and they made him their majoral, as the apostles did for Mathias (Acts 1:24-26) and as they ordained their successor bishops.

-Were you present when this majoral was ordained thus? -No, and I have never assisted at the ordination of any majoral.

-Are there many among you or just one, two or three? -There are not very many. He did not wish to say if they had even one or two.

-Was your majoral subject to my lord John XXII, the Sovereign Pontiff who actually governs the Roman church? -Our majoral did not receive his power or his abilities from my lord the Pope John nor of any Sovereign Pontiff.

-What is your majoral's name, where does he reside and in what region is he major? -I do not wish to reply. This knowledge has nothing to do with the salvation of the soul. It might result in scandal and "Bad luck to the one by whom scandal arrives!" (Matthew 18:7)

-Do you know the manner in which your majoral was ordained? -In the same manner that Mathias was ordained by the apostles. When our majoral dies, then we deacons and we priests come together and when we are assembled in a house, the oldest one of the Order says to the Brothers, "We are without a majoral, and we must ordain the one among us who has the authority and the knowledge required to govern the band of God. We must elect him as the apostles have done for Mathias, because our rule is not perfect, and it consists of three orders, the episcopacy, the presbytery and the diaconate, not counting the one who holds the order of majoral (which is a pontifical grade) and we do not have a majoral who governs us according to God." Then someone makes the oldest among the priests, the one who spoke before, leave and he says, "Such a man (the one who just left) has been among us for so many years, he is very well instructed in holy Scripture and is also a wise man who conducts himself well and since he has been among us, we know that he has lived and

comported himself with justice, holiness and honor, and is a man filled with the Holy Spirit, insofar as what one can judge from his appearance and his comportment. Do you wish him to be our superior in God, if God wishes it?"

He asks first the oldest after him. If he says, yes, and it pleases God, then he asks each of them in turn in the same manner until the last. When all have responded in one accord and one voice that he be placed at their head if it pleases God and that he appears to be good and capable, the one who has been elected is called by one of the Brothers and he comes back into the assembly. The eldest then says, "You have been elected unanimously by the brothers, may it please God. We wish you to be our superior after God." He then refuses the charge and alleges his own incapacity, but finally they all enjoin him to obey and respect the obedience that he has promised to God and to men. He then consents, but constrained by obedience.

When this is done, everyone kneels down and says the Our Father. While saying it, they hold hands with their thumbs under their chins. Then the one who was just elected stands up and all the others; the newly-elected confesses all of his sins by category, asks God for the remission of his sins, and prays him to give him the means to do a useful penance and to render him worthy to receive the Holy Spirit. But before the general confession, he confesses in secret what he can remember to another majoral, if there is one present (or if not, someone is sent to fetch one, if there is another one in the Order), if not he confesses to another superior, even though this person may not have pontifical rank.

After these confessions and prayers, the one elected kneels in the middle of the Brother and before the majoral of pontifical rank, if there is one present -- if not before a superior who does not have this rank -- and then the superior imposes his hands on his head, and the Brothers, if they wish, praying over him that he may receive the Holy Spirit. And after the superior, then all the priests and deacons present impose their hands upon him. This is how one ordains the majoral.

The majoral needs to be ordained into pontifical rank by another majoral who have the same rank, if there is one in the order. If there is not one, the eldest of the priests with the consent and authorization of the other priests and deacons ordains him into this rank after a unanimous election.

The elected one, when he is ordained, does not wear ordinary vestments, but is clothed in good works, fasts and prayers. He has a spiritual robe, but not a material one, to know the power of governing by God and by the men who have elected him, as the Apostle Paul says, "Every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God." (Hebrews 5:1) This power embraces the divine knowledge to govern subordinates, the holiness of life, and this ordination in which he received the gifts of the Holy Spirit. This majoral has a pastoral cross or baton, not a material one, but a spiritual one to know the injunctions of Holy Scripture against those who sin, the holy exhortations, and the foundations of the divine promises, by which the sick are sustained as the Apostle Paul says, "The bishop must know the holy word which is according to faith, so that he may be strong to exhort in the holy doctrine and to refute those who contradict it." (Titus 1:7,9) He also has a ring, not a material one, but a spiritual one to know the integrity of the faith with which he girds himself as well as others, so that he may not turn away from faith, as the Apostle says, "Without faith it is impossible to be pleasing to God." (Hebrews 11:6)

Same witnesses as in the preceding confession.

January 3rd.

-After the majoral has been ordained, as has been recounted, he is then able to ordain priests and deacons into their state. He ordains deacons in the following manner. When someone has been amongst us for six years or more, and we see that he comports himself well, in the sense that according to all appearance he is a man for whom we have good reports, a man worthy of praise, who has been instructed in holy Scripture for some years, all the Brothers unanimously elect him deacon, the majoral present and taking part in the vote with the others, that is to say, voting for him first. If it is pleasing to all that he be elected deacon, the majoral, with the consent and accord of all the Brothers, ordains him as deacon by praying and imposing his hands on his head, so that he may receive the Holy Spirit, the same as one reads in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 6:5) where the first seven deacons were ordained (amongst whom we find Saint Stephen, the first martyr) by the apostles. And in all things we observe, in the ordination of deacons, the procedure that the apostles observed.

The prayer that we say when we ordain a deacon is the Our Father and the Hail Mary. This is the same procedure that the Brothers observe, in praying that the ordinand might receive the Holy Spirit, with the ordinand kneeling before the majoral and confessing his sins, the majoral imposes his hands on his hand and prays that he might receive the Holy Spirit, as I have described being observed when the majoral receives his higher or pontifical rank. There is nothing else done when a deacon is ordained in our state.

This is how I was ordained deacon by a majoral of our state. This is done in a time of fasting and not at any time of the year, when it is pleasing to the majoral and the Brothers.

The priests, amongst us, are ordained in the same manner, by a unanimous vote, prayer and the imposition of the hands of the majoral on the head. The difference between the ordinations of the majoral, the priest and the deacon comes from the simple choice of whether one is being elected majoral, the other priest, the other deacon. Regardless, whoever receives these orders is elected by all the deacons, priests and one or all the majorals if there are any present. There is a difference regarding the imposition of hands on the head of the ordinand because the sole majoral, or the several if they are present, imposes his hand on the deacon to ordain him; in the ordination of the priest, the majoral and all the priests impose their hands; but in the ordination of the majoral, the hands are imposed on his head by a majoral ordained into pontifical rank, if there is one; if not, then the oldest of the priests who is a majoral, even though not ordained to pontifical rank, and after him the priests and deacons who are present.

By the imposition of hands of the majoral, the order is conferred and in the ordinations we perform, by faith, even though this may not be materially exact and word for word, it is the same that the apostles performed in the ordination of Mathias and their successors. We perform all this following the manner and the form that the apostles used in the ordination of bishops, priests and deacons:

for bishops, as one reads in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 1:24-26) about the ordination of Mathias and as Paul and Barnabas were ordained, over whom the other

apostles “fasted and prayed, imposing their hands.” (Acts 13:3) so that they might receive the Holy Spirit,

for priests, as one reads in the Epistle to Titus (1:5) “and I have left you in Crete, so that you might ordain in the cities priests and deacons according to the plan I have given you”

for deacons as one read in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 6) of the seven deacons upon whom the apostles imposed their hands while praying.

As for myself, and the others who are in our state, we believe and say that the bishops obedient to the Roman Church do well when they ordain bishops, priests and deacons according to the rite and manner observed by the Roman church in ordination. Those who are ordained by them are truly bishops, priests and deacons and if I myself or one of those who are in our state, after having entered into it, were to receive the order of bishop, priest or deacon by a bishop obedient to the Roman church and according to the rite and manner that they observe in their ordinations, we would believe ourselves to have received this order as well as the Holy Spirit. And if my majoral were to confer upon me myself or anyone else these orders according to this rite and this manner, I believe that these orders as well as the Holy Spirit would be truly and perfectly received by me or by anyone else.

Now I will tell you how those who are to become perfects are received in our state. When an adolescent wishes to embrace our state, we find out amongst ourselves if he comes from a good, faithful family, because if not, we do not let anyone enter into our state. We examine then to see if he is of a good life and good conduct, and if he is capable of learning. If he is found to be such, we welcome him and we observe his conduct during 5 or 6 years. During this time, we instruct him in Holy Scripture, and we teach him how he must live amongst us. If during this time he is judged to be of good life and honorable conduct, we receive him as a brother into our state; if not, we expel him from us.

When it is time to receive him, he is then elected deacon by the majoral and the other companions. But no one can be elected deacon before attaining twenty years of age and having been approved as I have described above. Then, after the election to the diaconate, which is the first rank among us, and the imposition of hands, he takes a vow of poverty, chastity and obedience to the majoral. If he violates one of these vows, he will be sent away from the community to do penance according to the decision of the majoral. This penance accomplished, he will be reconciled and reintegrated into the community by the imposition of hands, but he is not ordained anew. If he was at one time a deacon, he is placed back into that rank; when he is the appropriate age, he is elected and ordained a priest in the above-described manner. And then, if his merits call him to the rank, he can be elected and ordained a majoral. Even a deacon can be elected majoral, but he will be ordained a priest before being ordained a majoral.

-What can a majoral do amongst you, according to his rank, that a priest and a deacon cannot do? -He can ordain another majoral, priests and deacons; he can also impose penance on those Brothers who have committed a fault.

-Is it he who excommunicates the delinquent? -It is evil works that excommunicate the evil man and place him outside the communion of the faithful. But our majoral does not excommunicate anyone.

-Does he consecrate churches and cemeteries, bless virgins, confer any other orders than those described above, bless the holy vessels and vestments, the altars, the oil of holy chrism and the oil of the sick? -He does not do this and has no occasion to do it, not because he does not have the power, but because he does not have the opportunity.

-Because the priest can, in your sect, ordain a majoral when there is no other majoral ordained to pontifical rank, why do you say that the majoral has more power than a priest, in that he can ordain majoral, priest and deacon? The priest can ordain the majoral; it seems then that he can ordain priest and deacon, thus it seems that the majoral ordained to pontifical rank has no more power than a simple priest. -For the time that there is a living majoral, another majoral cannot be ordained to pontifical rank other than this one. But when it happens that there is no living majoral, the priests and deacons can ordain a majoral in the manner described, the same as Moses, who was a Levite or deacon ordained as pontiff his brother Aaron, as one reads in Leviticus (Leviticus 8). In ordinary times, it is the majoral who ordains a major, priest and deacon, but in the case of necessity, that is to say when all the majorals are dead, the priests and deacons can ordain a majoral.

-If all your majorals were dead, why would you not ordain a majoral by a bishop obedient to the Roman church, since you say that such a bishop is truly a bishop? -The only reason why we do not do so is that we would perhaps be immediately arrested by the bishops of the Roman church.

-No one, even under threat of death, should do what does not conform to the Gospel and Holy Scripture, above all as concerns the sacraments, or the pontifical rank. Since one does not find in the New Testament that anyone was made a bishop or apostle other than by a bishop, why do you say that one can ordain a majoral and why do you ordain one by someone other than a bishop, when you could have a bishop, even under dangerous circumstances? -In such a case of necessity, our priests and deacons can ordain a majoral, because they are in the same state and order as were Peter and Andrew, who, after having been called by the Lord, left everything in order to follow him. Because our priests and deacons leave everything for Christ, they are of apostolic order and rank. This is why, like the apostles, they can ordain a majoral in a similar circumstance.

-Do your majoral or your priests ordained by him celebrate the mass and do they consecrate or make the body of Christ? -Our majoral can make the body of Christ and he does so, but I have not seen it. But he does not observe, when he does it, the rite of the bishops and priests of the Roman church, and he does not celebrate the mass in a church, vested in sacred garments, before an altar, while saying the office, the Gospel and the Epistle and all the rest which is habitually said in the mass. Among us the priests do not make the body of Christ. I do not know why.

-What rite does your majoral observe when he makes the body of Christ? -I do not know when he makes the body of Christ if he vests himself in other garments than those he usually wears, but I believe that this is not the case, because such vestments are needed only for solemnity and are not necessary for the sacrament of the body of Christ. He does not go to the altar, but he takes the chalice, the bread, the wine and the water and make over them the sign of the cross and said the words that our Lord Jesus Christ said at the Last Supper when he transformed the bread and the wine into his

body and blood. And with the body of the Lord, he himself communes and shares communion with his companions just as the Lord did at Supper. Our majoral, when he consecrates the body of the Lord, does absolutely nothing beyond what the Lord did at Supper when he transformed the bread and the wine into his body and blood.

He takes a host which he has made into the body of Christ, just as the bishops and priests obedient to the Roman church do.

I believe that the major rarely consecrates the body of Christ and I believe, mostly at Easter, to commune and share communion with the brothers and to adore the body of Christ; he does it then because he is better disposed by the fast of Lent, which he himself has followed and if he can, three days per week on bread and water and also on that day when Christ who raised the dead is adored.

-Does the majoral administer any other sacraments to his companions or to anyone else? -He does not administer to anyone the sacraments of baptism or confirmation because it suffices for him that they have been received into the Roman church. But he does administer the sacrament of penance, which he administers in the following way:

The penitent sinner comes to him and kneels before him; the majoral says to him "What have you done, what sins have you committed against the divine precepts?" The penitent says what seems fitting to him and what he remembers. The majoral then, according to the condition of the person who is confessing, asks him about his sins, if he has committed such-and-so a sin; according to his affirmative or negative response, the majoral reprimands him for his sins and shows him according to Holy Scripture how he has offended God in committing these sins and encourages him to weep internal as well as external tears for his offenses, then orders him to be contrite in his heart and to accomplish his penance right to the end. The majoral imposes penance on him according to the nature and quantity of his faults and says to him, "I order you, on the part of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has instituted the holy sacrament of penance in his church, encouraged by the authority of the good apostles Peter and Paul, to do such penance as I impose upon you and to accomplish it to the very end."

Saying this, he imposes his hand on the head of the one confessing, as a sign of those words the Lord said, according to the spirit, "They shall impose their hands upon the sick and they shall be healed." (Mark 16:18) He does not say "I absolve you of your sins." This is how he administers this sacrament, acting in accordance with the spirit as Peter did when he absolved sins.

The majoral only administers this sacrament to his companions and to believers, because he is afraid, even though he could absolve all Christians if they would confess to him and repent of all of their sins.

Witnesses: same as in the deposition immediately above.

January 3rd.

-Our majoral does not administer the sacrament of marriage nor of extreme unction, nor any other sacrament, except, as I have said, the body of Christ and penance, not because he cannot administer them, but it is sufficient for him and for those of his state as well as their believers that these other sacraments be received from the hands of the bishops and priests obedient to the Roman church.

I believe that the seven sacraments of the Church, conferred by the bishops or priests obedient to the Roman church (and those of my state believe this also) have the same efficacy and the same virtue as those administered by our majoral; likewise, I believe and we believe that those sacraments administered by our majoral have the same virtue and efficacy as those administered by the bishops and priests obedient to the Roman church. In effect, no Christian can be saved without the sacraments. If our majoral or we ourselves did not think that one or another of the sacraments were of equal efficacy and virtue, neither he nor we who are obedient to him would receive these sacraments nor permit that they be received by us or by our believers from the hands of the bishops and priests of the Roman church. But since our majoral (and the others of our sect) believe them to have an equal virtue, he permits, wishes, orders and constrains us to receive these sacraments from the bishops and priests of the Roman church.

-If this is your opinion, why does this majoral administer the sacrament of ordination to the diaconate, the priesthood and the rank of majoral, the sacraments of the body of Christ and of penance, and not the others, even though he could administer them? -Our majoral ordains deacons, priests and the superior ordains the majoral so that they may receive the Holy Spirit, as did the apostles, and so that they may remain firm in the pursuit of the way of the apostles Peter and Paul, and he administers penance because he is able to.

(He did not wish to respond to why the majoral would prefer to administer penance, and not baptism, confirmation, marriage or extreme unction.)

-You have said that the orders of the diaconate, the priesthood, and the episcopacy and the Holy Spirit contained therein are conferred equally by the bishops of the Roman church and your majoral. Why do you say that the majoral confers so that the ordinands might receive the Holy Spirit and be more firm in the way of Peter and Paul? -I do not know.

-Do you believe that a bishop, even a manifestly grave sinner, can confer the orders of the diaconate, the priesthood and the episcopacy, and that the one who receives these orders also receives the Holy Spirit, and that to the same degree as if this bishop were a holy man; likewise, do you believe that if your majoral were a manifest sinner, he could confer these orders and, if he were to confer them, that the one receiving them would receive the Holy Spirit, and that to the same degree as if he were a holy man (supposing that he had an equal ability to receive the Holy Spirit)? -A bad man and a saint confer these orders equally and the Holy Spirit is given equally by their ministrations to those who are ordained, because the Holy Spirit is only given by the virtue of the sacrament.

-Does someone who is ordained deacon, priest and majoral by your majoral always receive the Holy Spirit? -I believe so.

-Do you believe that they all receive it in the same fashion? -I believe that they all receive it equally, because the virtue of the sacrament is the same.

Do you believe that those who confess all their sins when they remember them to your majoral, with contrition of heart and word of repentance, obtain remission of all their sins, so that they are then clean from all sin? -I believe that those who confess their sins to our majoral in the way described, once their penance is accomplished, obtain remission of all their sins.

-Are they absolved of all sins as far as the fault confessed to the majoral before they have finished their penance? -They are absolved in regards to the fault but not of the punishment which is imposed upon them as penance, not until they have completed it.

-Can your majoral release the penitent from all punishment due because of his sins or a part of the punishment, so that the penitent is not required to do any punishment or is given a smaller punishment for humane reasons, for the sins which he has confessed? -I believe that our majoral, who has the same power to absolve that Saint Peter had, can remit all external punishment due for reason of sins, if he wishes. But he always imposes on his penitents a penance proportional to the quality and quantity of sins, and the condition and power of those who have confessed to him. Because "the measure of the sin ought to be that of the punishments" (II Corinthians 11:23).

-Do you believe that the Roman church can give indulgences in remitting the penances imposed or about to be imposed for those who do pious works in the judgment of the said Roman church? -I believe that the church can give them, so that these indulgences serve those who do pious works.

-Do you believe that the Roman church can absolve a penitent confessed of every fault and can it grant him remission or grace from all external punishment given by reason of sin? -Yes.

-Do you believe that someone who is not able to complete his penance in the present world, because he is prevented by death, can and ought to complete his remaining penance in the next world? -I do not believe that he can accomplish in the next world a penance useful for his sins. I do not believe it because I know of no authority in Scripture which says that he can have a useful penance in the next world.

-If you do not believe this, do you believe that a person who dies will enter into paradise without having rendered satisfaction for his sins, or will be sent to hell, or sent into yet another place which is neither paradise nor hell? -If the penitent has a good will to accomplish the penance imposed by his confession and dies before he can accomplish it, his soul mounts immediately to paradise, without having to complete this penance in this world or the next. I do not believe there is any other place for men besides paradise or hell. I believe that there is no purgatory at all in the next world.

Same witnesses.

January 5th.

-Our majoral has received his power directly from God, the same power that Peter and Paul received from God. He is subject to the Roman church in everything that accords with God, according to the Apostle: "Be subject to all human ordinance for the sake of God." (I Peter 2:13)

-If it were to happen that someone died without any mortal sin, but with venial sins that he had never repented or confessed, do you believe that such a man would go to paradise immediately after his death or to hell? -I do not know where he would be sent immediately after his death.

-What do you believe on this subject? (He refused to respond.)

-Since you do not believe that there is a purgatory after this life, do you believe that prayers, sacrifices, and alms are useful for the souls of the dead? -Since they are

not useful for souls who are in hell, nor either for those who are in paradise, I do not know for which souls those prayers and sacrifices are useful.

-Do you believe that there might be souls for whom these prayers, sacrifices and alms are useful? -I do not believe that they are useful for the souls of the dead and in particular for the souls of my father and mother.

-Do you yourself, your majoral or those of your state pray to God or give alms for the soul of your dead? -I do not pray nor give alms for the soul of my parents. I would do it and I should do it if I believed that it would serve any good. For the others of our state, I do not know. (He refused to say exactly what he believed on this subject.)

-When your companions die, do you have masses celebrated before they are buried? -I believe so. In any case, I have never seen anyone of our society die, and I have not assisted at a burial or a funeral service for anyone.

-If you do not believe that masses are beneficial for the souls of the dead, as they likewise are not beneficial for their bodies, why do you have masses celebrated for the dead? -I believe that others do this for the good thereof, but I do not know what that good is. For myself, I would not have a mass celebrated for the dead.

-You have often no doubt found yourself among the Christians obedient to the Roman church, who habitually celebrate masses and do other pious works for the dead. Why do you think they do it? -They do it for the good thereof, because they themselves believe that such things are useful for the souls of the dead, who they believe are in purgatory.

-Do you believe that bequests for pious works to be done for those who die are useful to the soul after death? -I believe that they are useful for them, because they have decided while alive to increase their merits in the present life and for the redemption of their sins in the present life. But I do not believe that this will serve for them to be more or less quickly liberated from the pains of purgatory in the other world.

-Do you believe that it is good that the bodies of Christians and also those of your society are interred in a cemetery consecrated by bishops or in churches? -I believe that it is good, because this is also what the patriarchs did with their bodies, which they would not have done had it not been a good thing. But I do not know what good it is to be buried in a cemetery nor if that type of burial has some advantage for those who are so buried.

-Do you believe that there is some virtue to the good works that one does in honor of the body, the bones or the ashes of the holy apostles, martyrs and the other righteous dead? -I believe, because it is said in Ecclesiasticus (49:18) that Joseph prophesied after his death and in the Book of Kings (VI 13:21) that in touching the bones of Elisha a dead man was resuscitated. I believe the same of the bones of all the saints.

-Do you believe that genuflections, kisses and other signs of respect ought to be given to the bones of the saints? -Yes.

-Is it good and just that the anniversaries of the death of the saints be celebrated in the church by Christians, and that menial labor is forbidden on those days? -Yes.

-Do you believe that the souls of the saints in paradise know what is done in their honor? -I believe it.

-Do you believe that the saints hear our prayers and that their souls pray for men in this present life? -I believe it.

-Do you believe that your majoral, or my lord the pope in the Roman church, can judge and declare someone a saint and cause him to have the honor due to saints in the future? -My lord the pope can do it, but our majoral cannot.

-What can the priests do in your sect by virtue of their office that is particular to their station? - The priest, in our sect, when he is ordained by the majoral, can hear the confession of the majoral, priests, deacons and their believers and absolve those who confess to him of all sins, and impose penances, just like the majoral. But there may be a case where he would return a penitent to the majoral. The priest does not give indulgences and does not remove the penance for sin of those who confess to him, which is done instead by the majoral.

-Can a priest in your sect consecrate the body of Christ? -I do not believe that he can. But he never does it, whether he can or not, nor does he administer any other sacrament than penance. And, in case of necessity, if all the majorals are dead, he can ordain a majoral to the pontifical grade and that with the authority, consent and permission of all his companions, with priests and deacons present, according to the example of Moses when he ordained his brother Aaron as pontiff.

-Since the priest in your sect cannot consecrate the body of Christ nor does so, can he bless the bread and wine, not in the sacrificial offering, but in memory of the benediction of bread and wine that Christ performed at the Last Supper when he changed the bread and wine into his body and blood? -He does not do so. But our majoral, on the day of the Last Supper, after the hour of nones, the meal already prepared, washes the feet of his companions and dries their feet with the linen around his waist. When this is done, he sits at table with them and taking then the bread, the fish and the wine, he blesses, not in the sacrificial offering, but in memory of the Last Supper of the Lord and says this prayer:

“Lord God of Abraham, God of Isaac and God of Jacob, God of our fathers and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, you have have established the offering of sacrifices and burnt offerings and multiple oblations by the hands of bishops and the priests their servants; Lord Jesus Christ who blessed five loaves of barley and two fish in the desert, who blessed the water which was changed into wine, bless in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit this bread, this fish and this wine, not as a sacrifice or a burnt offering, but in simple commemoration of the most holy Last Supper of Jesus Christ our Lord and his disciples. Oh Lord I do not dare to offer you such an offering from my impure hands, nor consume with a polluted mouth the very holy body of our Lord Jesus Christ your Son, most holy Father. But we ask you to bless this bread and the substance of this fish and this wine in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, amen. And maybe the communion of this bread be pleasing to you as a sacrificial victim, eternal Father. Guide my soul, my body and all my senses, and, in your clemency, make my deeds to be such that I may be worth to offer you this very holy Body which is adored by the Angels, Oh God who lives and reigns from age to age, amen.”

(This prayer was written in a book of this Raymond's.)

-This blessing of bread, of fish and of wine being made by my lord the majoral, he himself then eats and drinks of it, then gives to all his companions and they eat and drink all the bread, the fish and the wine. It is not given to our believers and we do not even wish that they know about it.

Even though we say in our prayer "I do not dare to offer you the most holy sacrifice of the body and blood of your Son Jesus Christ", the majoral nevertheless sometimes is allowed to consecrate the body and blood of Christ at Easter, as I have said.

-What efficacy and virtue do this blessed bread, fish and wine have for your majoral? -They do not acquire any virtue because of this benediction, since this is done solely in memory of the Last Supper of the Lord.

Same witnesses.

January 7th. The following was corrected and added to what Raymond said about their majoral and the priest hearing the confessions of those who confess to them:

-The majoral or the priest have the one confessing to them sit next to them and when he has confessed all the sins he remembers and when he has interrogated him on everything according to his good judgment, after having considered the quality of the person and of the sins already avowed, he incites the penitent as far as he is able to tears both internal and external by showing him in the threats of the holy Scripture how he has offended God in committing these sins, how he has lost the kingdom of God and has made himself worthy of hell. He tells him to have continual sorrow in his heart for his sins, citing the Apostle: (Romans 9:2) "I have in my heart a continual sorrow" and continues by mentioning to the penitent all the various Scriptural menaces against sinners, until the penitent weeps and he can see that he is very sad and sorrowing. He then asks him if he deplores greatly the sins he has committed. If he says yes, and manifests this by external signs, he asks him if he wishes to guard against the sins he has committed and all others, and tells him to remember the wife of Lot, who was changed into a statue of salt for having looked back and "Go and sin no more, lest a worse thing may happen to you." (John 5:14). He also mentions what the Lord said to the woman taken in adultery, "Neither do I condemn you. Go and sin no more." (John 8:11) When the penitent says to him that he does not intend to return to his past sins or to any other, the majoral or priest asks him if he will have continual sorrow for his sins until his death, citing the Psalm, "According to the multitude of sorrows that I have in my heart, your consolations have assuaged my spirit." (Psalm 93:19)

When this is done, the majoral or priest, with his eyes lifted to heaven, recalling in his heart what the Lord has done, when he raised Lazarus from the grave, invokes God saying, "May the almighty Lord God who can remove all sins and 'from whom all good and excellent things come' (James 1:17) absolve you by his mercy of all your sins, all those that you have committed from the day of your birth until this very hour. I enjoin your for all your sins such penance up until this time, on the condition above all, that you have contrition of heart for your sins up until death."

But he does not say, "I absolve you" nor does he name Saint Peter or Saint Paul. Nonetheless he has their authority when he does this.

The majoral or the priest imposes his hands on the head of the one confessing his sins; but everything that one does manually or verbally for the penitents in the Roman church, he has present in his heart and faith, even if not in the external act. He has present in his heart and faith all that Saint Peter had when he remitted sins.

The name for the dignity of our superior is “minister”, according to the Gospel: “He who is your superior is your servant” (Mark 10:43) although he is not called such but rather is called nothing more than Brother So-and-so.

Although it has been said that those of our sect are destroyers of faith, sowers of error and traitors to Christ, in fact, and with all respect due to those who say this, it is not true and in fact the contrary is true. We are sustainers of the faith, we believe it in our hearts and confess it with our mouths, we accomplish it in every act we perform because we know that “Without faith it is impossible to be pleasing to God” and “faith without works is dead” (James 2: 20, 26) as James says in his Epistle. We are not sowers of errors, but the dissipators of errors and we overturn them, like Jeremiah: “Behold today I establish you over nations and realms, so that you may throw them over and destroy them, that you may disperse and dissipate, that you may build and plant” (Jeremiah 1:10); we are not traitors to Christ, but the friends and the poor of Christ, in loving him and following him and accomplishing his precepts wherever possible, according to His word: “If you wish to be perfect, go, sell all that you have and give it to the poor, and follow me and you will have treasure in heaven.” (Matthew 19:21)

-Can the priest in your sect, when there is no majoral, consecrate the body of Christ and does he do it on Easter? -No.

-Do you believe that priests subject to the Roman church can consecrate and do consecrate the body of Christ? -Yes, I believe that even if they are great sinners, they can and do consecrate the body of Christ, when they say the words that the Lord spoke at the Last Supper.

-How is it possible that in your sect only the majoral can and does consecrate the body of Christ and not your priests? -I do not know, but I believe this is because the majoral does not give them any power besides the hearing of confessions.

-Do you believe that according to the nature of their ministry the priest or the bishop can remit sins? -I believe it.

-If you believe this, why does your majoral or your priest not say, when they absolve their penitent: “I absolve you of your sins”, but rather “May God remit your sins.”? -I do not know.

-Does your majoral speak different words when he ordains a priest or a deacon or does he do anything differently in the sacrament of the order that they have received or does he impose his hands differently for the deacon versus the priest? -I do not know what they do when they ordain priests or a majoral, but I know that when I was made a deacon, the majoral had fasted with his companions, as well as myself, and they prayed, saying the Our Father and the Hail Mary, then the majoral placed his hands on my head, saying some words very low, that I nevertheless heard, but in which there was no mention of the diaconate, as far as I know. I do not remember these words. But in ordaining me deacon he did not give me a Gospel book nor a robe, nor anything else.

-Do you believe that the other deacons are ordained by the majoral in the same way that you were ordained? -Yes.

-What are the responsibilities of the deacon in your sect? -They have nothing to do except to provide what is necessary to eat and the other bodily necessities for the majoral and the priests, as in Acts, which says that the deacons are elected to serve at table, (Acts 6:2); on the other hand, the deacons are the first in our sect, because in our sect we have only deacons, priests and majorals.

-Can a deacon in your sect, with the permission of the majoral, hear the confessions of the believers? -In our sect the deacon cannot hear confessions, nor carry the body of the Lord in a vessel. But he has the power to read the Gospel in the churches, although they do not exercise this ability. Myself, I have never done it.

-Can someone be of your Church and your sect before having received the order of deacon, if he has entirely abandoned his goods by a vow of poverty and also made a vow of chastity and obedience? -No one is a member of our Church if he has not been ordained a deacon.

-Do you believe that someone can be in a state of perfection in your sect if he has not been promoted to the order of the diaconate and if he has not taken a vow of poverty, chastity and obedience? -A person is not perfect, if he has not at least been ordained a deacon and if, being a deacon, he has not taken the vow of poverty, chastity and obedience.

-What does the perfection of man consist of in your sect: in the reception into the diaconate or in the taking of the vow of poverty, chastity and obedience? -Our perfection lies more in the diaconate than in the vows.

-Do you think that a non-deacon who took these vows would be in a state of perfection? -In our sect, we ordain someone a deacon on the sole condition that he knows the Our Father and the Hail Mary and also that he leads a good life. When he is named deacon, he takes the vows and is then in a state of perfection. But if, before having been made deacon, he took the vows, he would not be in a state of perfection, because to be a deacon is the first degree of perfection.

-How do you understand the nature of the vow of poverty? -He who has taken a vow of poverty should own nothing at all, whether privately or in common; he should not need to live from the work of his hands, as the Lord says, "Do not be preoccupied with what you eat or drink, or with the work that you do, but consider the lilies of the valley, which do not work, nor weave, nor store up seed in their granaries." (Matthew 6:28,31)

-Paul lived by the work of his hands and he earned his subsistence thereby and that of his companions. He was doubtless in a state of perfection. Why do you say that those who are perfect ought not work with their hands? -I do not know why the Apostle did that, but we, we do not believe that we can be in a state of perfection if we live by the work of our hands.

-Do you believe that the only way to be in a state of perfection according to the Gospel is by living as a mendicant and asking for bread and other necessities from door to door? -One is in either case in a state of perfection, but I believe those who live as mendicants are living more closely in accordance with the Gospel.

-Do you believe that those who live as mendicants can, without any diminution of the perfection of their state, put aside things necessary to them, and that for a long time? -Yes.

Witnesses as above.

(January 8th)

-I have the faith and the doctrine of those whom Saul persecuted before his conversion. Anyone who persecutes me or delivers me to death will be the companion and the accomplice to those who stoned the first martyr Saint Stephen "and there shall

come upon him all the innocent blood that has been spilled on the earth since the blood of Abel the just until the blood of Zachariah the son of Barachus, whom you have assassinated between the temple and the altar” (Matthew 23:35).

-Do you believe that he who persecutes you or delivers you up to death could be absolved by a priest subject to the Roman church? -Yes.

-If he were to die without confession, nor repentance because he did not have a bad conscience, would he be damned? -I believe he would be damned.

-If someone were to kill you, in such a way that he believed himself to be doing good; suppose he were instructed in holy Scripture, would he be an obstinate heretic? -I do not believe he would be a heretic.

-Could your majoral absolve this persecutor? -Our majoral could absolve him if he were to confess to him and if he himself were to repent.

Your superior, or those who take the vow of poverty, can they in any way, without breaking their vow, have possessions, lands and real property? -Our superior can in no way have real possessions without breaking his vow of poverty; on the contrary, he scorns them, as the Gospel says: “If you wish to be perfect, go and sell all that you have and give it to the poor,” (Matthew 19:21). “The foxes have their dens and the birds of the sky their nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to place his head.” (Matthew 8:20) and “Do not think about tomorrow, to each day is sufficient the evil thereof.” (Matthew 6:34)

-Do you believe that the apostles could have owned real property and money in gold or silver without a diminution of their perfection and a breaking of their vow of poverty particularly if they held them not individually, but in common? -The apostles could have, without diminution of their state of perfection and without breaking their vow of poverty, owned the movable goods necessary for their subsistence, not only for a day, but for a long time; they would possess them not singly, but in common. But real property, I believe they could not possess, as is stated in Acts: “Everything of their real possessions, they sold and placed the price thereof at the feet of the apostles, and all of it was their common good. It was divided according to the need of each one.” (Acts 4:34-35)

-Since you have thus observed the poverty of the apostles and their state, why do you not share movable goods in common? -We do not do it, not because we would not be able to possess it, if we had it, not singly but in common, but simply because we do not have it.

-If you were to have such goods in abundance, would you observe the precept of the Lord, “Go, sell all that you have and give it to the poor” and “Do not worry about tomorrow”? -If we had a thousand pounds, it is not for that that we would break the precepts of the Lord, because we would not own it individually, but in common.

-Do you believe someone can be in a state of perfection who has movable goods not of his own, but in common? -Yes.

-Could such a person be in the state of perfection of the apostles? -Yes.

-Those who have movable goods (not individually, but in common) are they in a state of perfection, regarding a vow of poverty, to a degree equal to that of your superior, who can not have and does not have movable goods? -I believe so.

-Can your superior give to someone of your estate the permission to have movable goods individually and not in common? -No.

-Can your superior or others of your estate, legitimately live the Gospel? -Yes.

-Can your majoral preach the Gospel, without anyone else giving him the order or commission? -The majoral, who holds the same power that God gave to Saint Peter, can preach the Gospel without being sent by any other man.

-Can your superior give the authorization and power to those of your estate to preach the Gospel? -Yes.

-Does your majoral have a defined territory, parish or diocese, in which he can preach the Gospel on his own authority, or can he preach and administer the other sacraments, which you have said he can administer when he wishes, anywhere? -His power is not limited to a territory, parish or diocese. He can preach and administer the other sacraments to his companions everywhere. But he can not do it without the permission of my lord the pope, if he wishes to get on with him. Since the pope persecutes him and his, he does not ask his permission to do it, but he does it of his own authority which he receives from God and he can do it.

-Can the superior, the priest or the deacon have a wife? -No. On the contrary, they do not dare even to touch a woman with their hands; they do not permit women to kiss their hands; they do not permit a women to sleep in the room where they sleep, unless there is no other way to do otherwise.

-Are there any virgin women and can they be received into your estate? -No. We do not do this in any way.

-Why? -Because women cannot preach the word of God and they cannot receive the orders of priest, deacon and majoral.

-If a married man wished to pass into your state, would you receive him? -No, because he is married. And if the wife wished to leave her husband and give him his liberty and the husband the same, we still would not receive him into our estate, but we would say to him that which the Lord said, "Let no men set apart what God has joined together" (Matthew 19:6). I have not seen or heard tell that we have received into our sect someone who had a wife and had children by her, even after her death. We do not receive widows amongst us, nor other women and they do not live with us. It is not permitted for someone of our estate to live with a mother, a sister, a female cousin or any other female relative.

-In your sect are the sins of fornication or adultery reputed to be more grave than any other extraordinary depravities? - I do not know what extraordinary depravities are.

-On what point and in what do you need to obey your majoral? -In all things that are according to God; first to God, then to the majoral.

-In a case where it is difficult to know what is according to God, or even in a less important matter, are you bound to obey the majoral? -I ought to obey him in all things as least as long as it is evident that he has not ordained something which is contrary to divine precepts.

-In a matter that is doubtful concerning divine law, for example to swear or not to swear in order to tell the truth, whether one has a mission to preach among men or not, do you believe more in the interpretation of my lord the pope or that of your majoral? And if they explicate the Law in a contrary sense and ordain the contrary according to their contrary interpretations, which interpretation will you follow, that of my lord the pope or that of your majoral and whom will you obey? -I do not wish at all to take an oath, because I believe I execute a precept of God in not swearing at all. On this point I

will not obey my lord the pope, nor the majoral who would order me to do the opposite. But I obey the majoral in this, because he ordains for me, in my opinion, the same thing as God.

-If there were another doubt about the Law, in which no opinion had been given by my lord the pope or by your majoral, and then later they interpret the doubtful point in contrary ways, which interpretation would you follow, that of my lord the pope or that of your majoral? -I do not know.

-Do you believe that the secular arm of the law has the power to put to death or mutilate a man for theft or another crime against morals? -I believe that it is permitted to the secular power to execute or mutilate malefactors because without that there can be no peace and security among men.

-Is it permitted to an individual to accuse such malefactors to the (secular) powers and provoke their death according to juridical procedure? -I believe I would be sinning if I would accuse a man to the secular powers of a crime if I knew that he who committed it would be put to death or mutilated. I do not know if such a sin would be mortal or venial, but I would not do it under any circumstances.

-Do you believe it is permitted to the Church to put to death a Christian who errs concerning the faith, even if he does not err in his morals? -It is neither licit nor just that I or those who are of my estate be put to death under the pretext that we do not wish to return to the unity of the Roman church. For other heretics, the Manichees for example, I believe that it is licit and just to put them to death, if they do not wish to return to the faith and the unity of the Roman church.

-If you had the power to kill a heretic who did not wish to return to the faith, would you kill him or have him killed? -I would not kill nor have him killed; I would hold him in prison and I would provide for his needs, so that he would not die and his life would not be abridged by reason of his fault. But in no way would I kill him, because I believe I would be sinning if I were to do so.

-If a brigand wished to steal your money or some other possession, or wish even to kill you do you believe you would be sinning if you were to impeded him physically? -I would impede him physically and with a stick or a sword, if I had one, but I would not try to kill him for it, and if I killed him I believe I would be sinning, but not as gravely as if I were to kill a good man.

-Do you believe that those who kill or condemn to death malefactors or heretics can be in a state of salvation? -I believe that they can be in a state of salvation. But if anyone were to put me to death, myself or anyone of our estate and who follows our path, I believe that he would go to hell if he did not repent.

-Do you believe that it is permitted to Christians to make war against pagans, heretics and infidels? -If the pagans or heretics, warned by the Church, refuse to convert, I believe that it is permitted to Christians to make war upon them and I believe that such a war is just. But I believe it would be unjust to make war against those of our estate.

Do you believe that to pay back insults, for violent attacks, for violated faith, or for disobedience a Christian prince or the Church can justly and legitimately make war on other Christians? -I believe that it is licit to have wars against Christians for such causes. But the Roman church can not make a just war against us, even though we do not obey it.

-Is it allowed to kill brute beasts? -Yes.

Same witnesses.

January 9th.

-The secular powers and the ecclesiastical persons who hold temporal justice can legitimately and justly put to death malefactors. This is what I believe, as well as those of our estate, and we prove it by what the Apostle said, "Power does not wear the sword for no reason, because anger is vengeance against those who do ill." (Romans 13:4)

-If your superior had the power to put malefactors to death, could he without sin kill them or give the order to have them killed or have officers who would kill these malefactors? -If he had such power, he would not sin in ordering malefactors to be killed or in having officers who would kill them.

-Would your majoral accept this power and use it, if the king of France or someone else who had the power to confer it would give it to him? -I do not know and I have no opinion on this question one way or the other.

-Would you receive into your estate someone who had had a spouse, who was now dead, and who did not have with her either a son or daughter? -No, because we say that the flesh carries him away by reason of the fact that he has engaged in the work of the flesh while he was in a state of marriage and drags him along in works of the flesh which he performed in this state.

-Would you knowingly receive into your estate a person of a libertine or debauched state in regards to the flesh? -No, no more him than one who had had a wife.

-Is it believed in your sect that it is better for someone who was married when one of the spouses dies, to take a wife or husband, rather than to rest in a state of widowhood? -I believe, as do those who are in our estate, that if, after the death of one of the spouses, the surviving one can live chastely without a wife, it is better that he rest chastely in the state of widowhood rather than remarry. But if he cannot live chastely, I believe it is better if he were to marry, according to what the Apostle said, "It is better to marry than to burn." (I Corinthians 7:9)

-If, according to you, a man who was married can live chastely in a state of widowhood after the death of his wife, why do you say that you will not receive him into your estate because the flesh drags down those who have the experience of carnal intercourse in marriage? -Although we might well receive such a man as our Brother, we do not do so and we have never done so. We fear that he will fall into the sin of the flesh because of his earlier habituation. A man of this sort, indeed, cannot follow his studies.

-Do you believe it is contrary to the Gospels that a bishop and a priest can have a wife? -I believe that according to the Gospel and the New Testament, the bishop and the priest cannot have a wife, and cannot be ordained if they do have one. If they were ordained, this ordination would be worth nothing.

-But the Apostles says, "It is necessary that the bishop be the husband of just one woman and likewise the deacons..." (I Timothy 3:2). -It seems that by this wife he is referring not to a woman, but rather to the Church. But one might ordain a bishop or

priest someone who had had a wife, after her death. It would be the same for our majoral.

-Do you believe you sin if you denounce heretics, their believers and their instigators? -Right now, I would have qualms about denouncing them. I would rather let them save themselves, in giving everything to God, than denounce them.

-Has someone other than the priest or the majoral in your sect given you the mission to preach? -No.

-Can your majoral give the power to preach everywhere to his priests? -He can give them the power to preach to their companions and their believers, if there are any, in whatever place they wish. He says always to the priests to incite their believers to obey their curates who are subject to the Roman church.

-This power to send priests to preach, does your superior hold it from my lord the pope or immediately from God? -Our superior would have received it from my lord the pope if he wished to get on with him. Since he does not wish to do so, he holds it immediately from God.

-My lord the pope has forbidden anyone to have a commission to preach unless he has gotten this commission from him or has been invested by him in the office of preaching. Why does your superior send to preach those who have not received this power from my lord the pope, who are not instituted by him into this office and who hold this office of preaching in disregard? -Our superior would receive the power to send preachers from my lord the pope if he wished to get on with him. But because he does not want to get along with him, I believe that he holds this power from God, and I believe as well that he does well in giving this power to the priests and sending them as he does, or rather, as he has done; at this time, he does not give any commissions because he does not have places to send them.

-Do you believe that by the simple fact that your superior does not wish to get along with my lord the pope, he acquires this power from God? -I believe he acquires it by this simple fact, but I do not know why.

-Do you believe that the priests who are subject to your superior are right to obey him in preaching and in receiving this power from him? -I believe that they are right to obey the superior in holding from him the power to preach and in preaching on his order. But they preach rarely, because they do not have a public.

-If you were ordained priest by your superior, do you believe you would do well in receiving from him the power to preach and would you preach on his order? If I were made priest by him, I believe I would do well in receiving from him the power to preach and in preaching on his order, provided that I had a public to preach to, but now we do not have one.

-If you were already a priest and your superior were to order you to receive this commission and tell you to preach, and if you did not obey him, would you commit the sin of disobedience and thus violate your vow of obedience? -I believe that I would be committing the sin of disobedience.

-You know that my lord the pope has commanded that anyone receiving an order to preach from such a superior should disobey it, and you say that you believe you would sin if you were to disobey your superior in this matter. Whom do you think you should obey in this matter, my lord the pope or your superior? -In this matter I would obey my superior, but with some anxiety.

-You have said that my lord the pope is superior to your majoral and that he ought to be subject to him if he could agree to get along with him. Why, given this uncertainty, would you not prefer to obey my lord the pope more than your majoral, since when a superior power and an inferior one command contrary things, one should obey the superior? -I would obey my superior and not my lord the pope, because I am bound to my superior by obedience, and not to my lord the pope.

-The Roman church and my lord the pope say that no one should confess to your majoral or your priests, and that those who do confess to them will not receive absolution from their sins. Do you believe that your companions and your believers can confess themselves to this majoral and that if they confess they will receive absolution from their sins? -I believe that those who confess to our majoral or priests are correct to do so and that they will be absolved of their sins.

-Do your superior and priests have the keys to the kingdom of heaven? I believe that our superior does not have the keys to the kingdom of heaven, but he has the same power to absolve sins, that the bishops subject to the Roman church have and our priests have the same power as the priests of the Roman church, because they are of the same faith and belief.

-Does anyone in our time have the keys to the kingdom of heaven? -It is my lord the pope who has the keys to the kingdom of heaven.

-If he has the keys to the kingdom of heaven, can he not bind by his sentence and his judgment your superior and all of you, in such a way that you would not be able to enter in the kingdom of heaven, if you were not to obey him? -The fact that my lord the pope has closed the kingdom of heaven to me with his excommunication notwithstanding, I persist in believing and hoping that I may enter in the kingdom of heaven.

-Is it legitimate and just that my lord the pope excommunicates your superior and your companions, believers, and inciters? -If there is anything evil amongst us, it is legitimate and just that he can excommunicate us and exclude us from the kingdom of heaven. If there is nothing evil among us, he cannot do it. And since, as I believe, there is nothing evil in our estate, and since I believe there is nothing evil or erroneous in what I have avowed above, I do not believe that this sentence is just and licit; I believe on the contrary that the pope who has excommunicated us has done ill, with all due respect.

-Do you believe that for disobedience in a doubtful matter of divine law or a matter of less importance, when the superior interprets the doubtful matter and reads the less important matter in a certain way, and the subordinate does not wish to obey and follow his interpretation, the superior can legitimately and justly excommunicate his subordinate if he has the keys to the kingdom of heaven? -If I do not understand a point of divine law very well, and my lord the pope interprets it better than I do, if I do not wish to follow his interpretation, and it is better, then my lord the pope can legitimately and justly excommunicate me. But nonetheless, I do not believe in the interpretation of my lord the pope on the subject of taking an oath to tell the truth nor on the existence of purgatory, not least because he has not given me any good reasons for his interpretation. And before he has demonstrated this, I do not believe he can legitimately and justly excommunicate me, with all due respect. In a less important matter, before it became a precept, once this matter has been made the object of a precept, if a subordinate did not wish to obey his superior, this latter can legitimately and justly

excommunicate him; for example, if my lord the pope were to prescribe that masses are to be celebrated in the manner in which they are celebrated, someone who did not wish to obey him could be excommunicated justly and legitimately.

-You and your superior do not obey my lord the pope in celebrating the mass and in giving rank nor in sending priests to preach. Do you believe that my lord the pope can legitimately and justly excommunicate you? -He can legitimately and justly excommunicate our superior and the others of our estate if we do not follow the tradition that my lord the pope prescribes in the celebration of masses. But he cannot excommunicate them if they do not obey him in ordinations, sending preachers, in giving power or preaching, because they have not received their commission from my lord the pope. But it would be better if they had done so.

-You have been excommunicated by my lord the pope. Do you believe this sentence to be just and legitimate by reason of anything that you have done or said? -I believe this sentence is just in just one respect: that we do not observe the tradition that my lord the pope has prescribed for the celebration of masses.

-You believe the sentence brought against those of your estate by lord the pope on this one issue to be just. Do you believe that those who were bound by this sentence and are dead without having been absolved or having asked for absolution of this sentence are saved? -I believe that from the time this sentence of excommunication was justly given against them, that they are damned, if they have not been released from this sentence and if they have not asked for absolution.

-Can your superior absolve you of this sentence of excommunication brought by my lord the pope? -He cannot do so and he would not involve himself in this.

-Do you believe yourself excommunicated for having received the order of the diaconate from your excommunicated superior and in receiving this in a prohibited manner? - I do not believe I am excommunicated.

Witnesses as above.

January 10th.

-The teaching of our superior, when he sends priests to preach, is the following: He says that they should teach their followers and encourage them to go to the mass of the priests subject to the Roman church, because, he says, they will hear the Epistles which the Holy Spirit has pronounced through the mouths of the apostles and prophets, and the Gospel spoken by our Lord, even though they will not be able to understand it since it is spoken in Latin, because it is good that they listen and that they be convinced that these are the words of the Holy Spirit. They can easily pray there more secretly and with more engagement than in their houses, where they are hindered by the affairs of the world, as it is written, "My house will be called a house of prayer." (Matthew 21:13) There also they will see the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which they should adore and pray that he may bring them to a good end and free them from their sins. There also they will hear the Our Father which they will know better than if they ignore it. And when the mass is finished they will receive the benediction of the priest in the name of the Holy Trinity. The superior will also tell the priests to engage their believers and send them to seek Roman catholic priests when they are sick, in order to confess their sins to them and receive the body of the Lord and extreme unction from their hands.

-Do you believe it would be better in the Roman church to recite the Epistles, Gospels and all the other things that are said in the vulgar tongue rather than in Latin? -I believe that it is better that these things be said in Latin rather than be recited in the vulgar tongue, because this is what is ordained by the Roman church.

-Why, when you speak to your believers about Scripture, in taking your text, do you expound on it word for word in the vulgar tongue? -We do this because not everyone is a cleric or a layperson, but everyone is mixed together.

-Do you believe that it is good to sing in the churches? -Yes.

-Is it good to pray to God exclusively in church because there one can pray God more secretly, being separated from the crowd of worries of the world, particularly also since the Lord said that one ought to pray in secret in one's room and not in church, as it is written: "But you, when you pray, enter into your room and with the door closed, pray to your Father in secret." (Matthew 6:6) -The sole advantage which I believe adheres to praying in a church rather than at home is that in church one is more separated from the cares of the world. But if one can equally separate oneself at home or elsewhere, as at church, I believe that a prayer there is equally good as a prayer at church.

-In church there is often a great crowd of people who distract the spirit of the one praying. Why do you believe that in church one can be better separated from the cares of the world than in one's room, where one is often alone? -I do not know.

-Do you believe that it is necessary to consecrate churches and why? -I believe that it is necessary to consecrate them according to the example of Moses and Solomon and what they did in the Old Testament, and also because one speaks holy words there and performs the sacraments.

-You do not believe that Roman catholic priests are good, because they persecute you. Do you believe that their blessing is valid? -I believe that it is good and holy, because priests bless by the authority of the apostles Peter and Paul, in saying the words of the Lord, which are good and holy in themselves, even if the priests themselves are bad, because they persecute us.

On the fourth article of faith that he spoke of, to wit, the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ:

-First of all, do you believe that the Son of God, existing from time immemorial with the Father, took human flesh at the end of time? -I believe that it is the person of the Son of God, and not the person of the Father or the Holy Spirit, who was incarnated or took human flesh at the end of time.

-Do you believe that a sole person was made of the eternal person of the Son of God and of the human flesh which he then took? -I believe that there was only one sole person after the Incarnation of the Son of God and his receiving of humanity, a humanity that was substituted for or personified by the personification or substitution of God the Eternal Son.

-Do you believe that the Son of God himself was a perfect man, having flesh, human bones and a human soul? -The Christ took everything that comprises the entire, integral human nature.

-Do you believe that the Holy Spirit was the father of the Son in his humanity? -No.

-Do you believe that Christ was conceived and born of the Virgin Mary? -Yes.

-Do you believe that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary in such a way that by giving him into the world she yet remained and is a virgin? -Yes.

-Do you believe that Christ was conceived in sin? -No.

-Do you believe that he lived in the world without any sin? -Yes.

-Do you believe that Christ wished to suffer death for the sins of humankind and that he truly suffered pain and crucifixion? -Yes.

-Do you believe that after his death his body rested in the tomb, and that his soul descended to hell, but in such a way that his divinity was not separated from his body and his soul? -Yes.

-Do you believe that Christ descended to hell to release certain souls? -He rescued the souls of the holy patriarchs from limbo, but he did not release any soul from purgatory, because purgatory does not exist, or so I believe.

-Do you believe that Christ was raised from the dead on the third day according to the flesh? - Yes.

-Do you believe that Christ was raised to immortal life, ineluctable and glorious? - Yes.

-Do you believe that Christ was raised to heaven in his humanity? -Yes.

-Do you believe that he sent the Holy Spirit over the apostles on the day of Pentecost? -Yes.

-Do you believe that Christ will come again to judge, and that he will appear then in his human form to judge all men? -Yes.

Concerning the fifth article of faith that he said he believed in, to wit, that our Lord Jesus Christ chose for himself a glorious Church which the Apostle speaks of to the Ephesians: "Christ loved the Church and bound himself to her, purifying her and washing her in the word of life, to manifest a glorious Church, having neither sin nor wrinkle, nor anything of that sort." (Ephesians 5:25,27)

-What do you understand by the word Church? -By the word Church I understand a gathering of men who have the true faith and live this faith by their works, and who preserve as far as possible the divine precepts.

-Do you believe that a gathering of men who do not have a precise faith can be called a church? -I believe that a gathering of heretics or other infidels, such as Jews or pagans, can not be called that Church which Christ has chosen. If such a gathering is called Church, it can only be a Church of the wicked (Psalm 25:5) which the verity of Christ has not chosen.

-Do you believe that someone who errs on a point of Scripture is a heretic? -I believe that he who is in error on a point of Scripture, especially if he is obstinate on this point, does not belong to the Church in regards to the point on which he is obstinate.

-Do you believe that such a man should be called an infidel? -He is an infidel regarding the point on which he is in error, but it does not follow from this point that he is in error concerning all things.

-If a gathering of men is obstinate concerning a certain point of Scripture, do you believe that this gathering should be called a gathering of infidels and Church of the wicked? -It would be so in regards to the point on which it is in error.

-Would it be the case that Christ would choose such a Church, that would err obstinately on only one point of Scripture? -The church was not elected by the Lord

while it remained in error, but also it would not be an enemy of God in the same degree as if it was in error concerning all the points of Scripture.

-Do you believe that this wicked Church, not chosen by God, has the power that Christ gave to the Church that he himself chose? -This Church loses the power that Christ gave to his Church while it remains in error. But it can more easily recover it than if it errs on all points of Scripture.

-Do you believe that Christ gave the Church that he himself chose the power to perform and administer all the sacraments? -I believe that he did so.

-Has Christ then given this power to a Church of errors and wickedness? -Christ did not give to such a church the power to perform and administer the sacraments.

-If someone is baptized, ordained, confirmed, if he has received the eucharist, penance, marriage and extreme unction from a Church erring on a single point, do you believe that he has received the sacraments? -I do not believe it, if he took the sacraments from a Church of heretics, because with them there are no sacraments, because they do not have faith.

-You believe, as you have said above, that the Roman church errs regarding the faith, in saying that it is permitted to take an oath (which according to you is illicit, because it is contrary to the precept of the Lord who said never to take an oath at all). Do you believe that this Church, which commits this error, has the power to administer the sacraments and that those sacraments it administers have virtue and efficacy? -I believe that the Roman church retains all the sacraments, and can administer all of them and that the sacraments given by it have the same efficacy and virtue as those which were given by Saint Peter.

-Well, either the Roman church or your church is in error regarding this point of divine Scripture. One says that it is permitted to take an oath to tell the truth; the other says that one must never take an oath at all. One says there is a purgatory; the other says there is none. One says that the sacred orders are given in the conferment of a corporeal thing under certain oral formulations; the other says that the imposition of hands alone confers divine orders. One says that no one may preach without apostolic authority; the other says that it can send preachers on its own without the authority of the pope. And the two churches say many other contradictory things concerning divine Scripture and the essence of the sacraments. You have said that a church that errs on one point of Scripture does not have the power to administer the sacraments and that you do not believe they are received if you receive them in a heretical Church. Which church do you think is in error on all these points: the Roman church or yours? Which one do you say has valid and efficacious sacraments, yours or the Roman? -I believe the Roman church is in error when it says there is a purgatory and that it is permitted to take an oath, although I do not think it errs greatly on this second point, with all due respect. But the Roman church as well as our own can administer the sacraments and the sacraments administered by one or the other have the same value and efficacy.

-Do you believe that those who do not have good works but who are baptized and believe all they one should believe are the Church or belong to the Church that Christ himself chose? -I believe them to be the Church and belong to the church as regards the faith, but they are not the church if they do not have charity. (I Corinthians 13:2)

-Is there an earthly head to the entire Church that Christ himself chose and does this head have the authority of Christ to administer all the sacraments and all that concerns salvation? -I believe that only Saint Peter was made the head of the Church after Christ and the Roman pontiffs were and are the head of the Church from the time of Saint Peter to this day.

-Do you believe that your superior is subordinate to the head of the Church, who rules it, to wit my lord John by divine Providence the 22nd pope of this name? -Our superior is subject to my lord the pope, and the pope is his leader.

-If this is so, why does he not follow the doctrine of the pope in all things, and obey him in all matters and why did he not receive his power from him, his superior rank and his jurisdiction? -I do not know.

Same witnesses.

January 11th.

-I have heard tell by my superior and my other companions, and I believe it myself, that if there were no Roman church, all the articles of faith concerning the sacraments would be suppressed and annihilated by men and all Christians would in fact be pagans.

-Why do you believe that your superior does not wish to be subject to and obey the Roman pontiff, as regards doctrine and all the rest? -Because my lord the pope says that there is a purgatory and that it is permitted to take an oath, which our superior denies. And also because my lord the pope does not permit him to follow the path of poverty which he has chosen, as well as his followers.

-Do you believe that by reason of the points on which my lord the pope and your superior cannot agree, your superior is exempt from the jurisdiction of the Roman church and his subordination to it, to the point of that he may cease to obey it in all things that are not contrary to God? -It is for these reasons that our superior is not subject to the Roman pontiff and that he does not wish to obey him, all of which is displeasing to me and is displeasing also, I believe, to my superior.

-If this displeases you as well as your superior, not to be in agreement on these points with the Roman church, why do you not abandon your belief and adhere to those of the Roman church and my lord the pope? -Because we believe that our belief is good and conforms to divine Scriptures and we have fear of offending God.

-Do you think that the Roman church and pope believe neither well nor according to the divine Scriptures on these points? -I do not wish to be disrespectful to my lord the pope on these points.

-You have said that the faith and sacraments would have disappeared without the Roman church and that men would have returned to paganism. And yet, from all evidence, you believe that the Roman church is in error on the points that it holds and believes contrary to your superior. Do you believe that a Church in error defends and upholds the true faith and sacraments, even though a Church that deceives itself destroys faith and does not perform, according to you, the sacraments? -Although the Roman Church, with all due respect, is misguided concerning purgatory and the rest, even so, in regard to the point on which it thinks and believes well, it can defend the faith, and it does so.

-If the Roman church were to convert to your faith on all these points, do you believe that it would be the church that Christ has chosen "having neither stain nor wrinkle nor anything of this sort, but holy and immaculate"? -If the Roman church returned to all the points of faith and was in the same state as our church, it would be the Church that Christ has chosen and that the Apostle described in that passage.

-Do you believe that your church is the one that Christ chose "having neither stain nor wrinkle," "holy and immaculate"? -I believe that our church follows the path that Saint Peter followed, although it does not live as perfectly and justly as Saint Peter lived.

Was the church that Saint Peter and Saint Peter himself led or the Church that Christ chose, the church having neither stain....etc.? -I believe that Saint Peter belonged to the church that Christ chose and the Apostle described and also the church that Saint Peter led was the church that Christ chose and the Apostle described.

-Do you believe that your church or those who live according to the precepts and faith of your church are without stain or wrinkle, holy and immaculate? -I do not believe them to be so, according to what is said in Proverbs: "The just fall seven times a day and pick themselves up." (Proverbs 24:16) But I believe that in doing penance for one's sins, one obtains their remission.

-You believe that if the Roman church were to convert to your church, it would be the one that Christ chose, holy and immaculate; supposing the Roman church did not convert to your church, but rather persecuted your church, do you believe that it is the church that Christ chose? -I believe it to be good and holy when it does good. But insofar as it persecutes our Church and does not believe what our church believes, I believe it not to be good.

-Can someone be holy without believing what your church teaches, or in believing the opposite and in persecuting you, without repenting? -I do not believe that a man who does not believe what our church believes and who persecutes it can be good and can enter into paradise, at least unless he repents.

-If the church were to canonize such a man, would you hold him to be a saint, knowing that he has persecuted you and has not believed what your church believed? Would you show him, after his canonization, the respect which one usually gives to saints? -I would not hold him to be a saint, at least unless he repented concerning these things.

-Do you believe that a man who persecutes can be good? -He who persecutes the good is evil, but he who persecutes the wicked is good.

-Do you believe that anyone subject to persecution is good? -The one who is subject to persecutions because of his misdeeds is not good, unless he repents of his misdeeds and suffers with patience. But if he is good and subject to persecutions for justice, he is blessed, as is written: "Blessed are those who suffer persecution for righteousness, because the kingdom of heaven is theirs." (Matthew 5:10)

-Can someone be blessed without suffering external persecutions? -If he is good otherwise or does penance for his sins, then it is not because he has suffered external persecution that he is blessed.

-Do you believe that someone who suffers persecution because his faith is not correct can be blessed? -He cannot be blessed, but on the contrary will be damned in hell, whatever sort of persecution he has endured.

-Can someone who persecutes such infidels unto death, because they do not wish to convert, be blessed? And if you, Raymond, were able to, would you persecute them and would you believe you would merit eternal life for doing it? -I believe that those who persecute them unto death, if they do not wish otherwise to convert, merit eternal life. (But as for himself, he declared the same thing that he said above concerning homicide.)

-Do you believe that the saints of the Old Testament and the faithful of the New Testament are one church, which Christ has chosen? -Yes.

-Do you believe that there is remission for sins only in a church holding the true faith and not in any other? - I believe that there is remission for sins in the Roman church, even though in my opinion it is in error on the above points, just as there is remission in our church which I do not believe to be in error. But I do not believe that there is remission for sins in the church of the heretics.

-Do you believe that there is remission for sins equally in the Roman church and in yours? -Yes.

-Do you believe that the bishops and priests subject to the Roman church, by the fact that they administer the sacraments to the people subject to them, can legitimately have tithes and first fruits and receive them from the people? -I believe so, because one reads in Exodus (25:2) that the tithes and first fruits belong to the priests.

-Can bishops and priests legitimately demand and collect by force these tithes and first fruits from those who do not wish to give them? -Yes.

-Were the apostles permitted to do this? -Yes.

-Can your superior, because he administers sacraments, also demand tithes and first fruits from his believers? -He can not do so, nor does he do so, because he wishes to live always in the poverty to which he took a vow.

-Can my lord the pope approve or condemn the ordinations or states of the religious or people who live under these vows? -Yes.

-My lord the pope has condemned your state. Do you believe that those who follow it after this condemnation sin mortally and are in a state of mortal sin because they are disobeying the pope after he has condemned their state? -I do not believe that I nor those who belong to my state are in mortal sin, even though we do not obey my lord the pope in this matter. My lord the pope did not act well and was not well inspired when he condemned our state, with all due respect.

On the sixth article of faith which he said he held, to wit, that he believed all men would be raised up in the general resurrection in the same flesh where they are, were and will be:

-First of all, do you believe that men will be resurrected in the same flesh, bone, nerves and members that they had in the present life, so that the same soul will receive the same body? -Yes.

-Do you believe that the human soul has but one body with which and in which it will be raised? -Yes.

-Do you believe that after the resurrection all men will be immortal? -Yes.

-Do you believe that the bodies of the damned can be perpetually in the fire of hell without alteration or consumption, so that they will burn but not be consumed? -Yes.

-Will all human souls who here below had their own body, whether they were born or not, receive their bodies at the resurrection? -Yes.

-Do you believe that women will be resurrected in the feminine sex or that all will be resurrected in the masculine sex? -Each one will be resurrected with one's own sex.

-Do you believe that all those resurrected will have a body of the perfect age? - They will be resurrected in the state corresponding to the age at which Christ was resurrected.

-Do you believe that all those resurrected will be of the same height? -They will not be of the same height at all, but each one will have the height appropriate to him according to the condition and quality of his nature.

-Will the saints have ineluctable bodies, luminous, subtle and filled with the spirit? -Yes, just like the one that Christ has after the resurrection, but differing according to the diversity of their merits.

-Do you believe that the bodies of the saints will be in heaven after Judgment? - They will be in the same heaven that exists currently, because when the sky and the elements change their quality, they will no longer live according to their substance, as the Lord says, "The heaven and the earth will pass away, but God will make a new heaven and a new earth." (Matthew 24:35); the bodies of the saints will be in the new heaven, after Judgment, according to the Apocalypse, "And behold I saw a new heaven and a new earth." (Apocalypse 21:1) and which Peter describes in his canonical letter: "The heavens that exist now are promised to the fire and a new heaven and a new earth will be announced." (II Peter 3:7)

-Will the bodies of the saints be perpetual and eternal, without need of nourishment? -Yes.

-Will the bodies of the damned have need of material nourishment? No, because one does not find nourishment in hell.

On the seventh article of faith that he spoke of, to wit, that he believes there will be a universal Judgment, which will be given to each according to his deeds, whether good or ill:

-Do you believe that all men will be judged in the Last Judgment? -Yes.

-Will certain men be the judges of others in the Judgment? -Yes, although it is Christ who will be the judge, there will also be apostles, assessors of some sort, who will approve and confirm this judgment according to the word: "When the Son of man sits on the seat of his majesty, you also will sit on 12 seats, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Matthew 19:28)

-After the judgment of God, can a saved soul be damned or a damned soul be saved? -The sentence of the judge is irrevocable according to the word, "They will go to eternal torment, but the just to eternal life" (Matthew 25:46)

-Do you believe that the fire to which the damned are sent is a real fire? -The fire is a real fire, in which demons and the bodies and souls of the impious will be tortured.

-What do you believe eternal life to be? -I believe that this is the clear and open sight of God. It will be given to all the saints after the Judgment, according to the word of the Lord, "This is the life eternal, that they will know you; You the true God, and the one that You have sent, Jesus Christ." (John 17:3)

-Do you believe that the soul of Saint Peter and all the saints who are dead see God right now? -Yes, but not as perfectly as they will after the resurrection.

-Do you believe that demons, after their fall by reason of sin, and that men, after dying in mortal sin, can return to the good? -No, nor can they repent usefully toward this end.

Witnesses as above.

January 12th. On the first sacrament that he said he held, to wit the sacrament of baptism:

-First of all, do you believe that baptism is a sacrament instituted for the remission of sins? -Yes.

-So anyone who receives baptism receives it for the remission of sins? -Yes.

-Does someone who has committed many faults before baptism obtain in baptism the remission of all his sin, no matter the fault and no matter the punishment? -Yes.

-If such a man dies right after baptism, do you believe that he goes to paradise, such that it is not even necessary for him to repent, be contrite or even do penance for his sins? -I believe that such a man is saved by the virtue of baptism, and that his soul goes immediately to paradise.

-Do you believe there is present in infants a sin for which they must be baptized for the remission of sins? -I believe that in every infant, there is original sin and it is necessary that they be baptized in order to have it washed from them.

-If an infant dies before baptism, do you believe that they are saved? -No, because the precept of the Lord is that all should be baptized. If they do not do so, they cannot enter into the kingdom of God; equally because without baptism they dwell in original sin. This is why these infants will be damned.

-Infants are not capable of understanding the precept of the Lord; they have not sinned, because they do not have the use of their reason yet. Why do you think, considering these two reasons, they ought to be damned if they are not baptized? -After the promulgation of this precept, no one is saved without baptism; and all the descendants of Adam have a part in his fault and his disobedience.

-Do you believe that since the promulgation of this precept someone can be saved who has not been baptized with water and the holy spirit? -No one can be saved without having received baptism, with water and the holy spirit, even if they suffer death for the faith of Christ, or if they have the will and intention to be baptized and if, because of some larger force, he cannot receive the sacrament, this verdict of the Lord is relevant: "Except a man be born anew of water and the holy spirit, etc." (John 3:5)

-The Lord, before commanding his disciples to baptize, first told them to teach, by saying, "Go, teach all the nations, baptize them in the name of the Father, etc." (Matthew 28:19); infants do not have the capacity to receive teaching. Why do you believe that they ought to be baptized? -Their parents have faith by the apostolic teaching in baptism and its effects; this is why infants are baptized in the faith of their parents, and they are faithful because they have received the sacrament of faith. If they die at this age, they are saved by the sacrament.

-Should the sacrament of baptism be done only with water or perhaps with some other liquid? -Only with water.

-Does it suffice for these words "I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" to be in the intention and the faith of the one baptizing, or

is it necessary, for the baptism to be perfect, that these words are spoken aloud? -It is necessary for these words to be in the intention and faith of the one baptizing, but also that they be spoken aloud, "I baptize you....etc."

-If it is necessary that these words be said aloud in baptism, why do you not believe that it is necessary that the words be said aloud expressly in the sacraments of ordination and penance, those sacraments that your superior administers, according to you? -One is not baptized if one does not observe this form, because Christ himself has defined it. But since the apostles in ordaining did nothing other than fast, pray while saying the Our Father and impose hands on those they were ordaining, we do nothing other than what they demonstrated for us. On the other hand, it is because God alone removes sins and not man, and because this is what the apostles did.

-Do you believe that virtues and grace are given in baptism? -Yes.

-Do you believe that one can baptize someone again who has already been baptized: -No.

-Before someone converts to your estate, can someone be perfectly baptized and perfect? -Yes.

-Can men find their salvation as well in holding the faith of the Roman church as that of your church? -Yes.

January 14th.

Those who belong to my estate and I myself are "an object of scorn before all men for the name of Christ. But he who remains faithful until the end will be saved."(Mark 13:13)

-Do you believe that all who are an object of scorn before all men are good? -No.

-Do you believe that you yourself and those of your estate are an object of scorn before all men because you respect and wish to respect the verity of the Gospels? -Yes.

-Do you believe that those who persecute and hate you, in doing this, also hate the Gospel because you follow it? -Those who persecute and hate us, in doing this, are not preserving the verity of the Gospel, with all due respect to my lord the pope and anyone else who persecutes and hates us.

-Is someone who does not preserve the verity of the Gospel, who hates and persecutes you because you preserve it in a state of damnation and ought he to be considered a heretic if he will not repent? (He did not wish to respond to this question other than to say: Let them worry about their own peril if they so wish!)

-If you yourself and those of your estate suffer persecution to the end for you have testified to be the verity of the Gospel, do you believe that you will be saved? -If I suffer death because I believe that it is a mortal sin to take an oath for any reason even not a serious one, and because I believe that there is no purgatory and that prayers, sacrifices and offerings are of no use to the souls of the dead, and I believe that I and those of my estate are not obliged to obey the pope in all matters that are not contrary to the will of God, I believe I will be saved.

-Do you believe that baptism is valid when it is given in the manner of the church, by heretics, Jews and pagans? - I believe that such a baptism is not valid.

On the second sacrament, which he said to be that of penance:

-Do you believe that a sinner who has lived badly all his life, in the course of a serious illness where he is dying rapidly, who is able to repent and confess his sins but

is not able to do make satisfaction for even one, let alone all, of his sins will be sent on the path of salvation or damnation? -I believe that insofar as the remission of his sins is doubtful so is his salvation. I do not know if he will be saved or damned. I believe he is probably on the path to salvation rather than damnation, otherwise the sacrament of penance would have no efficacy. But if this man is saved, he will not satisfy his penance in purgatory, because there is no purgatory, but immediately after death his soul will go to paradise.

-No one should gain benefit from his malice. This man, if he had confessed his sins in good health with an equal contrition, would still not be able to attain salvation without rendering satisfaction for his sins. Why do you believe that he should benefit from having deferred his penance until death, and thus being free of the obligation to render satisfaction for his sins? -Since I do not believe in purgatory, I do not know how to respond to this question.

-Is it possible, without satisfaction being done, with a heartfelt contrition sufficient to erase sins and their punishment, that God will remit the punishment of the prescribed penance in cases other than baptism? (He said that he did not know and did not wish to respond in any other way.)

-Can your superior absolve and does he absolve his companions of all their sins, without sending them to my lord the pope? -Our superior absolves us of all the sins, that we commit, both mine and those of my companions. But he sends the believers to my lord the pope.

-In your sect, are you given as penance pilgrimages to holy places, mortifications of the flesh, fasts, vigils, discipline, masses or offerings? -Yes.

-If someone of your society has stolen something or possesses something that belongs to someone else, do you enjoin him to return it? -Yes, but in our society we do not have any thieves.

On the third sacrament, which he said to be the eucharist:

-First of all, can a priest, regularly ordained according to the practice of the Roman church, consecrate the sacrament? -Only bishops and priests may consecrate. But our minister or superior, although he was not ordained according to the actual rite of the Roman church for the pontifical degree, but was rather ordained in the way that Paul and Barnabas were ordained by the apostles, with fasts, prayers, and the imposition of hands, can consecrate the sacrament of the eucharist and when he does it, he observes the same practice that Christ observed in the Last Supper. For this reason I believe that he does not sin, although he does not observe all that the Roman church observes in consecrating the sacrament. But I believe that what the Roman church does and prescribes for the consecration of the sacrament is good and respectable.

-Do you believe that it is necessary, for consecrating the sacrament, that the bishop or priest offer these words: "This is my body" with the intention of consecrating or does it suffice that he has the intention to consecrate and that these words exist only in his faith or his heart? -If these words are not proffered orally, there is no sacrament, even if the words are present in the heart or in faith.

-Do you believe that this sacrament is truly the body and blood of Christ, when the words that Christ spoke at the Last Supper are proffered and when in taking the bread, he says, "This is my body" and when taking the chalice he says "This is my blood."? -Yes, and all of those in our estate believe it, companions as well as believers.

-Do you believe that what is present in the sacrament of the altar is the same body of Christ which was born of the Virgin and resides in heaven, glorious? -Yes.

-Do you believe that the same body of Christ is present in different altars? -Yes.

-Do you believe that the body of Christ, consumed in the form of bread and wine by the faithful, lives in itself entire and intact? -Yes.

-Should this sacrament be performed only with bread of wheat and wine of the grape? -Yes.

-Does it carry with it the remission of sins? -Yes, if it is received with reverence. But if it is received in a state of mortal sin, it does not bring with it the remission of sins, but rather they are aggravated.

-Do you believe that this sacrament is necessary for salvation? -Yes.

-Do you believe that this sacrament is valid only for those in this present life or can it also serve to remit the sins of those who are in the next life, or for remission of the penalties assigned for sins, as given by the Roman church, in the canon of the mass, after the eating of the body of Christ, in the special prayer for the dead, as follows:

“Remember also, Lord, your followers and your servants, who have preceded us with the sign of faith and who sleep in peace. To them, Lord, and to all those who repose in Christ, we pray that you may grant them a place of repose, of light and of peace.”? -I do not believe that there is a purgatory. I believe therefore that this sacrament is only valid for the remission of sins of men living in this present life, and not for the souls of the dead, neither for the remission of the fault, nor of the punishment. This prayer is good for the living, but it has no value for the dead.

-This prayer talks of the dead throughout. -It would be of value if it could be, but it is not.

-Do you believe that the Church is in error in making and saying this prayer for the dead? (He did not wish to respond.)

-Would someone who prayed for the devil be in error? -Yes, because a prayer for the devil would have no value.

-The prayer for the dead, according to you, has no value. Why do you not give the same answer for those who pray for the dead as for those who pray for the devil? I do not want to increase the denigration of the Roman church to the point of saying that it is in error. But I believe that this prayer ought to have been composed thus:

“Remember, Lord, your followers and your servants, who live with you under the sign of faith....” because this prayer is only useful for the living. In reality, it has no use for the dead.

On the fourth sacrament, which he said to be marriage.

-Do you believe that the sacrament of marriage requires as participants a male and a female human? -Marriage only takes place between a male and a female human.

-Is there a valid marriage transacted between any male and female who simply say to each other “I take you for my wife” and “I take you for my husband”? -Yes, as long as there is no reason for the non-validity of this marriage, such as consanguinity or a previous alliance or some other impediment.

-Can my lord make a prohibition such that those who could have married under divine law without this prohibition can now no longer marry, even if they pronounce these words? - I believe that the only prohibition that my lord the pope can enact so that there can be no marriage between people would be for example, if my lord the pope

had forbidden marriage to the second or third degree of consanguinity, then such a marriage would be valid according to the Scriptures.

-Why do you not believe in the same way that your superior cannot send someone to preach nor hear confessions and confer orders against the prohibition of the pope, and if he does so, it is not valid, the same way that you believe that the sacrament of marriage between first cousins is not valid because the pope has forbidden this type of marriage? -A marriage between such people is not valid because my lord the pope has forbidden according to justice and reason, because it brings much good and averts much evil; but he does not do well, with all respect, when he forbids to our superior what he has forbidden, and for this reason I believe that what our superior does against the prohibition of my lord the pope is valid.

-Do you believe that after marriage has been enacted between legitimate persons the acts of the flesh are just and licit? -Yes.

-Do you believe that spiritual paternity is an impediment to marriage? -Yes.

-Can a spouse, for purposes of entering into religion or for the perfection of his life, leave a spouse without his or her agreement? -No.

-Can my lord the pope grant dispensation to someone who has taken a vow of chastity and now wishes to marry? -Yes, but our superior cannot do so and does not. Same witnesses as above.

January 15th.

-The Lord said in the Gospel: "You will find in this world suffering, but in me peace; have confidence, I have conquered the world." (John 16:23) I tell you this, my lord, to warn you. It is said in the same Gospel of John: "If they have persecuted me, they will persecute you; if they have kept my word, they will keep yours" (John 15:20).

-Have you and those who are in your estate suffered persecution for the same reason as Christ and the apostles? -Christians suffer persecution for the truth of the Gospel; if they wish to transgress this truth, they will not suffer persecution.

-Are all carnal acts sinful, except for those with a legitimate spouse? -Yes.

On the sixth sacrament of the faith, which he said was the imposition of hands, a sacrament which takes place, as he claimed to believe above, during the ordination of deacons, priests and bishops, by the bishop imposing his hands, he now retracts, and says instead that the sacrament he calls the imposition of hands is not the imposition of hands of the bishop, which he does during the ordination of deacons, priests and bishops, but is simply the ordination because it is by the imposition of hands that these orders are conferred. But the imposition of hands is a sacrament in itself, distinct from the sacrament of ordination, although in both sacraments the bishops impose their hands on those who receive the order.

-What sort of imposition of hands is the sixth sacrament, since it involves an imposition of hands in the sacrament of ordination? -I do not see that this imposition of hands is anything different than confirmation in which one makes the sign of the cross on the forehead with the chrism and one imposes one's hands on the one receiving the sacrament.

-Why do you put this forward as a separate sacrament and say that one ought to make the sign of the cross with chrism on the forehead when we do not read of this in the Gospel or the New Testament? -I put forward this sacrament because of what is

said in the Acts of the Apostles, that “the apostles sent Peter and John to the Samaritans who believed and imposed their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit.” (Acts 8:37). This is why it suffices that the imposition of hands be done with a certain verbal formula and is a sacrament and is received, even without making the sign of the cross on the forehead with chrism; because in Acts one does not read that the apostles did anything other than impose their hands and pray for those people and they received the Holy Spirit. Therefore, although it may be good to make the sign of the cross with chrism on the forehead, this does not concern the necessity of the sacrament but merely the solemnity.

-What is this sacrament called? -I do not know the name, unless it is simply, imposition of hands, according to the passage, “Then they imposed their hands.....”.

-Do you believe that those baptized have received the Holy Spirit before the reception of this sacrament? -Yes.

-But in Acts it is said that the Samaritan believers were baptized and the Holy Spirit had not yet come upon a single one of them; they had perhaps been baptized in the name of Lord Jesus, and after the imposition of hands they received the Holy Spirit, from which it seems that before the reception of this sacrament they had not yet received the Holy Spirit. -I do not know why this was said, but I believe that it is good.

-You said that the Holy Spirit is given in baptism as well as in the imposition of hands. Do you believe that the Holy Spirit is given in baptism and confirmation to the same effect, or to different effects? -I believe that in the sacrament one gives the Holy Spirit so that the one to be baptized can be confirmed and that a man can be stronger against diabolical, worldly and carnal temptations in the pursuit of the way of Christ. It is not in view of its effects that the Holy Spirit is given in baptism, but for the remission of sins.

-Is the one to be baptized perfect before the reception of this sacrament and if the sacrament is not received, can the sacrament of baptism be valid? -If the baptized did not receive the sacrament of the imposition of hands when he became an adult, this does not mean that the sacrament of baptism was any less valid; but if he did not receive this sacrament in his mind, he would be in danger were he to die. It would be better if he received it effectively.

-Can only the bishop confer this sacrament? -Only the bishop can confer it, because one reads that it was conferred by Peter and John, who were apostles.

-Does your superior administer this sacrament? -No.

-Why does he not administer it, since he can? -He does not do it because it suffices for him that the bishops subject to the Roman church administer it as well to him and his companions as to believers.

-Why does it not suffice in the same way to your superior that the sacrament of the order of the majorate, the presbyterate and the diaconate be exclusively administered by the Roman catholic bishops, just as it suffices for him regarding the sacrament of the imposition of hands? -Our superior does it because he wishes to administer this sacrament of order to his subordinates, the same as not just any bishop ordains his subordinates; and equally because in the collation of orders of diaconate, the superior receives into his estate (the estate that is called the Poor of Christ), the one whom he ordains deacons. This is because before the reception of the diaconal order, no one belongs to our estate. But then, as much by the reception of this order as by the

vow of poverty that one takes on this occasion, one enters into our estate and then is bound to it. If one is ordained deacon, priest or bishop in the Roman church and wishes to enter into our estate, our superior will not re-ordain him; he takes only the vow of poverty, chastity and obedience to God, to the superior and our companions and then he is bound unto our estate. This obligation consists of promising, if God gives him the grace, to live and persevere in our estate until death. Then he embraces the superior and then all the other companions. Before he takes this vow though, one describes for him the austerity and poverty of our estate, the persecution that we habitually suffer and when this has been explained, one tells him that if he wishes to adopt our estate he will do so only if he enters into it willingly. If he says that he wishes to undertake all of this, with the help of God, he is received and ordained deacon by the superior in the manner described above. If he had any goods before being made deacon, he must dispose of them and give them as alms for God, because someone in our estate must own nothing at all. Our superior owns nothing of his own; we do not make any testament or will; the superior does not think about tomorrow; if something is given, he accepts only what will suffice for him and his companions to live and be clothed on the day it is given. He accepts nothing given to him except a bit of food and clothing and if someone wishes to give him something more than would suffice for that day, he says in response: "I do not wish to accept any benefits, beyond what suffices for me."

Doing this he believes he observes the apostolic life and follows the path in which he is engaged. All those who belong to our estate follow this life and ought to follow it.

On the seventh sacrament, which he called order, he was not interrogated because he had discussed it sufficiently elsewhere.

-For how long have you lived in this way and this estate? -I began when I was 27 years old although I have not resided continuously since then with a master or companions.

-Were you brought to this estate by your father, your mother or by friends? -No, and they are neither of this estate, nor believers. But one companion, who was in this estate befriended me and instructed me in what they said and did in this estate and I followed him.

-What is his name? Is he living or dead? -He is dead. (He did not wish to give his name.)

-Where did you meet him and where did he take you? (He did not wish to respond.)

-Where did he die and how long ago? -He died in the diocese of Lyon about 18 years ago. (He did not wish to state in which town of this diocese).

-What did he teach you? -He taught me among other things never to take an oath for any reason and how to follow the vow of poverty.

-Was there a long delay between the moment you met this companion and the one who ordained you deacon? -During the two years after I met him, I lived with my father and this companion came often to see me in the schools where I was studying. After these two years, he brought me to their minister and his companions. I remained with them for about five years before being ordained deacon. It was Jean Lorrain, who was minister at that time, who ordained me deacon. Afterwards I remained with him for about two years and learned Holy Scripture from him. After these two years, Jean sent

me to other companions, to live with them and be instructed by them in Holy Scripture. I spent about seven years there and during that time Michael the Italian, who is dead, instructed me.

After these seven years, I returned to the minister Jean who sent me to do penance. After his death, I saw Christin, who was superior minister after Jean, although he was ordained majoral while Jean was still alive. He was "simple and without letters" (Acts 4:13). [Jacques succeeded him.]

After this Jacques, the current minister succeeded to this office. (He did not wish to give his name.) I have seen him often since he became minister.

-Where did these ministers die? Where do their graves lie? Where do you believe your minister is currently? (He did not wish to say in what places their graves lie.) They do not travel to any predetermined places but the superior goes from place to place. Myself, I traveled for two years with Jean, whom I loved very much and whom I still love after his death. I went with him to Italy. He preached to companions, when he found them, in their houses, explicating the Scriptures to them. He did not recruit any believers, as far as I know, while I was with him.

-Did your superior ever call together a chapter where he would assemble all the companions? -No, the ministers let his companions know his will, not by letter, but in traveling to them himself or sending a companion to them, because he knew where each companion lived.

-With which member of your estate did you sojourn the most? -With the minister Jean, the priest Michel, the deacon Barthélemy and the priest Jean Moran. They are all dead. (He did not wish to say in which locality.)

-Have you yourself ever taught anyone that one ought not to take an oath, that there is no purgatory, etc.? - No, I never had the power to preach and teach.

-Have you recruited or had other believers? -No.

-In what other part of Languedoc, besides Pamiers, have you sojourned? -I sojourned in the following towns: Vivers for two years, Orange one year where I studied grammar after having been ordained deacon; Montpellier for one year where I studied grammar and went now and again to the theology schools of the Minor Friars, Agde for a fortnight, and I went through Castres d'Albigeois. (He did not wish to say in which cities he had been since Castres d'Albigeois up to the time he came to Pamiers.) Since I have been in Pamiers, I have gone two times to Vienne to reclaim money that was owed to me.

Witnesses as above.

January 16th.

-Which Scriptures do you and those of your estate accept as true and authentic?

-We accept all the Bible, from beginning to end. As for myself, I do not accept the following chapter of the Second Book of Maccabees, "Judas the very valiant made a quest and sent two thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem as an offering for the sins of the dead" and further, "It is a holy and salutary meditation to pray for the dead, so that they may be delivered from their sins." (II Maccabees 12:43, 46). This book is non-canonical, though otherwise it is good and true.

-Can my lord the pope decide that books which are not part of the Hebrew canon are nonetheless canonical in the Roman Catholic church? -He can canonize certain

books of the Old Testament that are not part of the Hebrew canon, just as did Pope Gelasius. (One can see that he did this for the books of the Wisdom of Jesus, son of Syrach, Ecclesiasticus, Tobias, Judith and Maccabees.)

-Do you believe that after these books were declared canonical by the church one ought to accept their authority? -Yes.

-Why then do you not believe in the authority of the chapter of the second book of Maccabees, which talks of alms and prayers for the dead, since the Church has declared it canonical? - I do not know.

-My lord has declared canonical in this same way the books of Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose and Gregory and many other teachers, just as Gelasius declared many books canonical that came to be read. These teachers have said in many places that there is a purgatory, that it is permitted to take an oath, that there is remission for sins only in the apostolic Roman church and many other things for which you claim to believe the contrary. Why do you not wish to believe these teachers when it comes to knowing whether one ought to take an oath or whether there is a purgatory? On these points, I do not wish to believe these teachers, because Christ, who has said one ought never to take an oath, also said to the thief on the cross, not "You will be in purgatory for some time", but rather "You will be with me today in paradise." (Luke 23:43)

-Do you believe that all those who have died, not having made satisfaction for venial sins, but having faith and love for Christ and as much contrition for their sins as the thief on the cross, can enter for this reason into paradise with no other penance, or for that matter Mary Magdalene, of whom it is said, "Many of her sins are forgiven because she has loved much" (Luke 7:47) or as is said in Proverbs "Love redeems all faults" (Proverbs 10:12)? -I do not believe that there is enough faith, love and contrition in most sinners as there was in the thief or Mary Magdalene; but if they have confessed their sins in all contrition of heart, and they die, I do not know if they will be damned or saved. I do not know what to believe on this point.

-Do you and yours observe the canonical law emanating from the Sovereign Pontiffs and do you believe it just? -I believe that we are bound to observe it, but only when it conforms to the Gospel and not otherwise.

-Do you believe that the papal constitutions against heretics are just? -They are against the manichees, but not against those who belong to our estate, because we are not heretics, with all respect to my lord the pope.

-Do you believe or do you know that the Roman church holds as heretics and pursues those who belong to your estate? -The church does not consider us heretics but she persecutes us because we do not obey her.

-Do you believe that it is simple disobedience to deny purgatory and to say that it is forbidden to take an oath? -It is because we do not believe in purgatory nor that it is permitted to take an oath that the Roman church persecutes us.

-Is not believing a sin against faith or against morals? -I do not know.

-Do you say the canonical hours? -Yes, in the following manner:

Beginning on Sunday mornings: *Deus in adjutorium, Gloria Patri, Kyrie eleison, Pater Noster, Ave Maria, Venite exultemus, and Beatus vir, up to Dominus illuminatio mea, with Gloria Patri said at the end of each psalm, then Te Deum laudamus, then Kyrie eleison, Pater noster, Ave Maria* and that is also how we finish the matins or the vigils of Sunday.

We say lauds in the following manner: *Deus in adjutorium, Gloria Patri, Kyrie eleison, Pater noster, Ave Maria, Deus Deus meus, Deus misereatur nostri, Dominus regnavit, Jubilate Deo, Laudate Dominum de coelis*, up to *Omnis spiritus laudet Dominum, Quicumque vult, Benedicite, Benedictus, Gloria Patri*, at the end of each and then *Kyrie eleison, Pater noster, Ave Maria*.

We say prime thus: *Deus in adjutorium, Gloria Patri, Kyrie eleison, Pater noster, Deus in nomine tuo, Beati immaculati*, up to *Legem pone*, and *Gloria Patri, Kyrie eleison, Pater noster*.

We do the same for tierce, saying: *Legem pone* up to *Defecit*; for sext, the same from *Defecit* up to *Mirabilia*, for none, the same from *Mirabilia* to *Ad Dominum cum tribularet*; for vespers the same, saying the psalms from *Dixit dominus* to *Dilexi quondam*, then *Magnificat, Kyrie eleison, Pater noster* and *Ave Maria*. We say compline the same way and afterward *Pater noster, Cum invocarem*, and one part of the psalm *In Te speravi, Benedixisti, Qui habit in adjutorio*, and *Ecce nunc, Nunc dimittis, Kyrie eleison, Pater noster*, and then *Christe qui lux*, then *Kyrie eleison, Pater noster*.

We do the same thing on Monday, but we say at matins *Dominus illuminatio mea* up to *Dixi custodiam*, and lauds in the same manner, saying the same psalms as Sunday, but we say the canticle, *Confitebor*, and thus following for the other days, saying each day a matins prayer from the psalter and *Te Deum laudamus*. We change nothing of the hours, unless it is after vespers where we say different psalms each day.

We do not say any anthems or responses, hymns or prayers and we do nothing different for the feasts of the saints, but we simply say at each hour, at least 50 *Pater noster*s and *Ave Marias*.

-Do you have a sign by which you know each other, you and your believers? -No.

-Do you bless the table before you eat? -Yes, in the following manner:

The one with the highest rank amongst us, upon arriving at the table, says: "*Benedicite*"; the others respond, "*Dominus*". He says *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Pater noster* and then: "May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the charity of God and the communicating presence of the Holy Spirit be with you all forever, amen."

He then says: "May the Lord Jesus Christ who blessed five loaves of bread and two fish in the desert, bless this food and the people who went to obtain it." In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, amen."

After the repast, we say; "Benediction, charity, the wisdom and embodiment of grace, honor, virtue and power be to God the Father from age to age, amen." We then say, *Kyrie eleison, Pater noster*, then the highest ranking among us says, "May God fill you with all peace and joy in faith and may the Holy Spirit abound in hope and consolation among you" or also: "To the eternal King, immortal invisible, to the one God, honor and glory from age to age, amen."

We always say the *Pater noster* on our knees before and after the meal, if the place is suitable for it, and we say it at least 50 times before the meal and as many times again after.

-Do you observe fasts, do you eat flesh during your fasts, and what days do you fast? -We fast for the 40 days from the beginning of Lent to Easter, the Four times (seasons?), Fridays the whole year, the vigils and feasts of the Virgin and all the apostles, All Saints', the feasts of Saint John and Saint Lawrence, Christmas, Ascension and Pentecost. On those days we do not eat meat.

-Do you celebrate these feasts? -Yes. How? - We protect ourselves as best we can from all manner of sin.

He was asked if three books, which were shown to him, belonged to him or were in his possession. The first, which begins, after the rubric, by "*Spiritus sanctus*", which he obtained from Jean le Lorrain, another that begins by "*Libre d-Esdras*", from Jacques, a *quistor* from Hautpas (see notes); another that begins with "*Discretis*", which he obtained from a certain André de Viennois, from whom he bought it.

After this my said lord bishop warned Raymond, one time, two times and three times, given that on many points, which can be seen as a result of that which precedes, he does not believe what the Roman church believes and teaches, and that he is not obedient in his subjection to the church, that he should change his heart and confess with his mouth what the Roman Church believes and preaches, that he should return to the unity of the Church from which he is separated by heresy and schism; that he should abjure the heresy in which he finds himself and all other heresy that rises against the knowledge of God and rebels against the Holy Roman church, head and mistress of all churches; that he should denounce and reveal all those of his sect, their believers, instigators, intermediaries, protectors and concealers, and that he should submit obediently to the Roman church and the said lord bishop; that he should promise and swear that he will accept and accomplish according to his power all punishment and penance that the bishop may wish to impose on him conforming to canonical sanctions, and with the result that, if he refuses to do so, the bishop signifies that he will proceed against him at the law intends and prescribes.

There are seven errors in which Raymond has found and currently finds himself, and which he has confessed to judicially before my said lord bishop and the said Brother Gaillard, as a result of the present inquiry and these seven are as follows:

"These are the errors that Raymond de la Côte, also called Sainte-Foy, deacon of the sect of the Poor of Lyons, has spontaneously sworn to in court, before the Reverend Father my lords Jacques, bishop of Pamiers, and Brother Gaillard de Pomiès of the order of the Preaching Friars, substitute for my lord the inquisitor of Carcassonne; the same Raymond, in response to the interrogations of my said lord bishop, has avowed the following errors:

Fist, he has said that if he were to take an oath to tell the truth, he would sin mortally, although not very gravely.

*Item* that in the New Testament, whoever swears for any reason whatsoever, sins mortally, because this goes against the precept of the Lord not to swear for any reason.

*Item* that whoever orders him to take an oath or someone else to take an oath, or constrains him or someone else to do so, sins in the same manner.

*Item* that the entire Roman church, which orders and even constrains people to take oaths, sins mortally.

*Item* that whoever suffers persecutions or death because he does not wish to take an oath is a martyr for Christ.

*Item* that someone who persecutes or delivers unto death anyone who does not wish to take an oath for any reason is a homicide, because he is killing someone who is just and innocent and is an accomplice to those who stoned Saint Stephen and "That upon him will fall all the just blood which has been spilled on the earth since the blood of Abel the just until the blood of Zachary, etc." (Matthew 23:35)

*Item*, that if the Roman church excommunicates someone because he does not wish to take an oath, he or someone else, he does not believe he is excommunicated (nor the other person), nor that the sentence is just, and he believes he is doing good, if, being excommunicated for this reason, he refuses to obey the church.

Errors of the Roman Church:

*Item*, that the Roman church errs in the faith, in saying that it is permitted to take an oath, and that there is a purgatory in the next world; and that he is not obliged to obey the church, unless she prescribes the same thing as God and that which is according to God; that in a doubtful matter on a certain point, or in an unimportant matter on which there is no decision, if my lord the pope and his superior order contrary things, he will follow the interpretation of his superior and not that of my lord the pope; and if they give contrary orders on an unimportant matter, he believes he would have the obligation to obey his superior and not my lord the pope.

*Item* that a church that errs concerning the faith even as little as possible is a “church of the wicked” (Psalm 25:5) and that she does not have the power to consecrate and administer the sacraments (although he admits that the Roman church can consecrate and administer the sacraments, he says it errs because it says that one is allowed to take an oath and that there is a purgatory.)

*Item* that if he received a sacrament in a church that errs concerning the faith he would believe himself not to have received it, even if it is given according to the rites of the church.

*Item* that their superior receives his power and jurisdiction directly from God and not from my lord the pope; that this may be because they do not wish to agree with one another; and for this reason he is not subject to the jurisdiction of my lord the pope and is not bound to obey him, unless he orders the same thing as God; although he admits that the Roman pontiffs are and were the head of the Church.

*Item* that the reason he does not return to the faith and unity of the Roman church is because he believes that their faith conforms to the Scriptures and he fears he would offend God if he returned to the Roman church. In any event, he does not want to be so disrespectful to the Roman church to the point of saying that it errs concerning the Holy Scriptures.

*Item* that if the Roman church were to turn to the faith of their church, she would then be the church that Christ himself chose.

*Item* that he believes their church is the one that Saint Peter led and that Christ himself chose.

*Item* that the Roman church is not good, because it does not believe what they believe and because it persecutes them.

*Item* that he does not believe anyone to be a saint, even if the Roman church has canonized him as such if he does not believe what their church believes and if he has persecuted them.

*Item* that there is remission for sins in the Roman church, even though it errs concerning the faith, but also in their church, which, according to him, does not err.

*Item* that even though the Roman church has condemned their estate and excommunicated him he does not believe that those who are part of their estate do ill in embracing it and remaining in it, nor that they sin mortally, in spite of their disobedience to my lord the pope in this.

*Item* that even though my lord the pope has the keys to the kingdom of heaven, and he has excommunicated them because they say that it is forbidden to take an oath and they deny purgatory, that the fact of their disobedience does not prevent them from entering into the kingdom of heaven, since there is nothing evil in them as regards the faith, nor as regards morals, he does not have the power to excommunicate them justly and legitimately and his sentence is thus neither just nor legitimate. Later he said nonetheless that this sentence is just because when their superior celebrates, he does not observe the prescriptions of the pope in the celebration of masses and since these superiors were not absolved by anyone of this sentence, he believed them damned; as for himself he did not believe himself to be excommunicated, even though he was ordained a deacon in their sect.

*Item* that a man is only excommunicated by evil works and that only these can place him outside the community of the faithful; that it is not necessary to be excommunicated by someone.

Errors against the sacrament of orders:

*Item* that there are only three orders in the Church: the diaconate, the presbyterate and the episcopacy and the bishop in their sect is called majoral or minister.

*Item* that in their sect it is the bishop who normally should ordain the majoral, the priest and the deacon, but when there is no living majoral, a priest, with the accord of all the priests and deacons can ordain a majoral to the pontifical degree.

*Item* that in their sect the majoral is ordained in the following manner: After the majoral has been elected unanimously, all present pray on their knees and say several times the *Pater noster*. He confesses then in secret all his sins, then publicly the types of his sins. After this the superior, if there is one, and if not, a priest, while praying and saying the *Pater noster*, imposes his hands on his head so that he might receive the Holy Spirit, and all the others after him, whether priests or deacons, impose their hands on his head. This is also how someone is ordained to the episcopal rank. But he does not wear any special vestments, nor does this take place in a church, one does not impose the book of Gospel on his head and neck, one does not anoint his head and hands and one does not make over him pontifical signs. And he believes that a man so ordained is truly a bishop, just as if he were ordained in the Roman church. He said that Paul and Barnabas and others in the early church were ordained in the same way.

*Item* that the superior so ordained alone administers the sacraments of penance, the orders and the eucharist.

*Item* that the superior can absolve anyone of all sins that are confessed to him, no matter what they are. He can also remit all the punishment due for these sins, or part of it, though they do not usually do so. When he absolves, he says: "May God absolve you of all your sins, and I enjoin you to contrition for your sins until your death, and such penance: but he does not say: "I myself absolve you."

*Item* that the superior ordains the priest in the following manner: After he has been unanimously elected and all the companions have prayed by saying the *Pater noster*, and he has confessed all his sins, the superior imposes his hands on his head and after him all the priests present, so that he may receive the Holy Spirit. But the imposition of hands by the majoral confers the order, and they do nothing else; he believes that the person ordained so is a true priest, just as if he were ordained in the

Roman church, and this is how, according to him, priests were ordained in the early church. The priest so ordained cannot celebrate mass, but only hear confessions and he cannot remit punishments. He can however ordain a majoral if all the others are dead, because, he says, since the priests and deacons are in a state where they have left everything behind for Christ, they have the order and dignity of the apostles.

*Item* that the superior ordains a deacon in the following manner: after election and prayer, as above, and confession, the superior alone, saying the *Pater*, imposes his hands on his head so that he might receive the Holy Spirit and does nothing else. The deacon can do nothing but administer to what is physically necessary for the majoral and the priests; but because of the fact that he was made a deacon he becomes part of their estate, with a vow of poverty, chastity and obedience. This is how he himself was ordained by Jean le Lorrain twenty years ago. No one can belong to their estate without having received this order. And, he said, someone ordained in this manner is truly a deacon, just as if he were ordained in the Roman church. And both the superior and priests and deacons are taken from among people who are simple in spirit and that in his time there were two majorals named Christin and Jacques.

*Item* that their superior only consecrates the body of Christ on Easter, and does and says nothing more than what the Lord said and did at the Last Supper when he changed the bread and the wine into his body and blood. And on Maundy Thursday, it is appointed to their superior alone to bless the bread, the fish and the wine, which are given only to those who belong to their sect.

*Item* that no one can be received as bishop, priest or deacon who has a wife and if they were to be ordained, their ordination would be invalid.

Errors against Purgatory and the prayers of the Church for the dead:

*Item* that there is no purgatory after death, but the souls of men after their death go only to paradise or hell.

*Item* that he does not know where the soul of someone who has lived badly and who has plainly confessed his sins and repented of them during his final illness goes after death and he does not know what to believe about this.

*Item* that the prayers, offerings, alms and pious legacies are not useful to anyone after death and that he himself does not perform them nor have them performed for a friend who has died or is about to die.

*Item* that he does not believe in the second chapter of Maccabees: "Judas the strong sent to Jerusalem 12,000 drachmas of silver, after having collected them, to offer for the sins of the dead." and "It is a holy and salutary meditation to prayer for the dead, so that they might be delivered from their sins."

*Item* that this canonical prayer of the mass: "Remember also, oh Lord, your followers and your servants who have preceded us in the sign of the faith" ought to be corrected so: "who live with us in the sign of the faith" in order to be valid, and as currently said, it is not valid.

*Item* that concerning this he does not believe Augustine, nor Jerome, Ambrose, Gregory nor the Roman church because they are all in error on this point.

*Item* that he does not know what usefulness there is in having buried the faithful in church or cemeteries.

Errors against the vows:

*Item* that no one can be in a state of perfection, unless he has been ordained deacon, even if he has taken a vow of poverty, chastity and obedience.

*Item* that the perfection of the evangelical state resides, in those who have made this vow and received the deaconate, more in the deaconate than in the vow.

*Item* that it is the nature of the vow of poverty that someone who has made it does not live by the work of his hands, and that he must own nothing, on his own or in common.

*Item* that the apostles could not possess immovable goods without breaking their vow of poverty.

*Item* that they receive into their estate, under no circumstances, female virgins or widows, because they cannot receive the deaconate; nor do they receive anyone who has been married out of fear that he will not be able to live chastely and in continence.

*Item* that it is preferable to obey his superior than my lord the pope in receiving orders and the power to preach.

*Item* that concerning this point he will obey his superior and not the pope.

*Item* that their majoral can legitimately live the Gospel.

Errors against the mission of preaching:

*Item* that their superior can give the power to preach the Gospel of God which was given to Saint Peter, and this without it having been sent by a particular man.

*Item* that their superior can give the power to preach the Gospel and that he gives it to his priests.

*Item* that he can preach the Gospel anywhere by his own authority, because he does not agree with my lord the pope; if he would agree with him, then he would hold this power from him.

*Item* that even though my lord the pope has forbidden anyone to be sent to preach unless by his order he believes that their superior, who holds his power from God, rightfully gives this power to his priests and sends them to preach and that they do well in receiving this power; they sin if they do not receive this and if they do not preach. In this they are bound more to obey their majoral than my lord the pope and he believes that my lord the pope is unjust when he excommunicates them for this.

Errors against putting malefactors to death:

*Item* that if he were to accuse someone before secular judges in a case for which he could be killed or mutilated he believes he would be sinning.

*Item* that if he had the power to put to death an obstinate heretic, he would not do it under any circumstances, nor cause his life to be shortened, because he believes he would be sinning. He would have the same scruple over denouncing a heretic or a believer.

*Item* that those who persecute them persecute them because they are preserving the truth of the Gospel.

Errors against baptism:

*Item* that after the divulgation of this precept: "Unless a person is born again..." no one can be saved, even if he has suffered death for Christ or has found himself in a situation where he is unable to receive the sacrament by *force majeure*, if he was not baptized in water.

Errors against confirmation:

*Item* that one can be confirmed without receiving chrism on his forehead, because this is part of the solemnity of the sacrament and is not necessary.

Errors against the sacrament:

*Item* that all orders can be conferred without a determined verbal formula, solely by the imposition of hands and without the conferring of any other material by the bishop to the ordained.

Concerning the above, the said Raymond asked for a copy of these articles in which are contained the above-mentioned errors and an adjournment for deliberation, which was granted him by my said lord bishop, and the case was adjourned for eight days starting from today.

On January 19th, which was the day before the day assigned to this Raymond to convert to the faith and unity of the Church, my lord the bishop read to him from the original texts of the authorities Augustine and other saints.

First of all, he read to him concerning the fact that to take an oath in order to tell the truth is not a sin.

He cited the authority of Augustine in his 19th book *Against Faustus*, chapter 9, where he says: "To commit perjury is a grave sin; not to take an oath or to swear the truth is not a sin"; and later: "The apostle Paul, in his writings, which are of great benefit to meditate upon, found himself to have taken an oath in many places, so that he finally decided it is not a sin to take an oath to tell the truth."

*Item*, the bishop read to him the writings of Saint Augustine on perjury, where he claims clearly and several times that it is not a sin to take an oath to tell the truth.

*Item* the bishop read to him the authority of Augustine in his writings on Lying, which begins "The Apostle swore..." Chapter 25.

*Item* the bishop read to him the authority of Augustine in the first book on the Lord's Sermon on the Mount, Chapter 16.

*Item* the bishop read to him the authority of the Apostle to the Hebrews: "Men swear by greater things than they, and the end of all discussion amongst them, to decide, is the word. (Hebrews 6:16)

*Item*, on the existence of purgatory, the following were read to him:

First of all, the gloss to this verse: "This will not be forgiven him in this world nor the next" which begins "Some faults" and "nor in the other".

*Item* he was read the authority of Gregory in Book 4 of the *Dialogues*.

*Item* that which the Apostle said: "The fire will refine the works of each one" (1 Corinthians 3:13) and the corresponding gloss.

*Item* he was read the sermon of Augustine on purgatory.

*Item* he was read a sermon of Augustine on the Resurrection of the Lord and another one.

*Item* he was read the authorities of Augustine in Book 21 of the *City of God*, towards the end, and the *Enchiridion* on the fire of purgatory.

And on the utility of prayers for certain of the dead, he was read the authority of Augustine on the words of the Apostle in the sermon "*Humanum dico*, etc."

*Item* on the point that there is no remission of sins outside the church and the faith of the Roman church, and that the sacraments received outside of it do not confer any grace at all, although in certain instances the sacraments given in the form of the

church are true, he was read the authority of Augustine on the word of the Lord, Sermon 11; there are equally many authorities on this in the book *On Baptism against the Donatists*.

All of these authorities being read in the original to the said Raymond, the bishop warned him again to return to the faith and unity of the Roman church, to believe and to confess that which was shown to him by these writings, both of saints and of the Canon and to abjure all heresy and more generally to do what is contained in the below-stated admonition.

(January 23rd.) My said lord bishop warned and exhorted him by diverse authorities and passages of Scripture to return to the faith and unity of the Roman church, telling him that if he wished to have more time to deliberate on the abjuration of the errors confessed above, that he was ready to accord him this time, and that if he had authorities or reasons for which he persevered obstinately in these errors, he would offer to explain to him and reconcile these authorities and these reasons; that if he wished to defer his response until the day following the assigned day he was disposed to wait for him. Raymond responded that he was more disposed to die than to abjure these articles and he would not respond in any other way, because he believed in doing this he was following the truth and conforming to the holy Scripture and that his faith was exact; he did not believe anyone concerning this point, but only the teaching of Christ and that of the apostles Peter and Paul,

And since he was told that Paul had taken an oath many times in his epistles and indicated that some sins will be purged in the next world by fire; that Christ himself has said that the sin against the Holy Spirit will not be remitted in this world or the next, and that in denying it for this one sin, he was not denying it for others; that in the Old Testament, in both the Law and the Prophets, swearing was not forbidden as illicit; that in *Malachi* it is said that the Messiah at his coming “will be a fire blowing over the grass of the earth and it will besiege by blowing and purifying silver and gold and it will purge the sons of Levi and it will burn them like silver and gold” (Malachi 3:2-3) and that it is said in the second book of Maccabees that “it is a holy and salutary meditation to pray for the dead that they may be delivered from their sins”; that one reads that Christ swore frequently, such as when he said, “In truth I tell you...” in the Gospel of John and as he said in Luke “Because in truth I tell you this, there were many widows in the time of Elias...” (Luke 4:25), that the angel in Apocalypse “swore by the Living from age to age that there would be no more time...” (Apocalypse 10:6); that one sees by the works and the deeds of the Lord and the saints, particularly those whose words are preserved in the canon of Holy Scripture, that even one who interprets the words of the Lord precisely, will find some doubt there, as Augustine said in his book *On Lying*.

He said that he did not know how to respond to these authorities, and he did not wish to respond otherwise, but he persisted and declared himself ready to persist in what he said before, because of the word of Christ not to take any oath at all.

It is just to say here that he retracted what he said earlier, to wit, that if someone were to suffer martyrdom for Christ, before baptism, or by necessity was in a state where it was impossible to receive baptism, but had an active desire to repent of his sins, he would not be saved, according to what the Lord said: “If someone is not born

again....”; he said now that he believes that the martyrdom suffered for Christ replaces baptism and equally the contrition of the heart, if some necessity prevents baptism.

He said equally that he retracted something else he said earlier, to wit, that one can be confirmed without the sign of the cross being made on the forehead with chrism; he believes now that one cannot be confirmed without the sign of the cross being made on the forehead.

*Item*, he retracted what he said, to wit, that someone who had a spouse cannot be ordained deacon, priest and bishop and if he were to be ordained his ordination would not be valid, because, he said, he now believed that in the oriental church (i.e. Orthodox) someone who does not take a vow of chastity, having a single spouse that he took as a virgin, can receive orders and his ordination is valid. And he believes that in the Orthodox Church, if the spouse liberates her husband from his duty, he can be ordained and his ordination is valid.

*Item* he revokes what he said earlier, to wit, that no one can be in a state of perfection if he is not ordained deacon, supposing that he has expressed his vow of poverty, chastity and obedience and he said that he said this in accordance with his estate and his sect. But he believes that in the Roman Catholic church lay people of both sexes are in a state of perfection. He said also that in his sect, although they ordain as deacons some who do not know the *Pater noster* and *Ave Maria*, he thinks that if someone does not wish to be a deacon, but merely takes these vows and promises to be in and maintain this path until death, he will be in a state of perfection.

-Do you wish to take an oath that you have made these retractions and that you have stated this because you now believe these facts to be true? -I will not take an oath of any sort, but nonetheless this is what I believe.

-Which members of your sect are living in Gascony and recruiting believers there? -Robert Motier and Etienne Maurin, who were both priests. They died about six years ago, I believe.

-Were you sent into this region here by your superior and are you obedient to him? -I did not come into this region by his order, and I am no longer under obligation to obey him, because I have rebelled against him.

-Why did you rebel against him, and for what reason? -I rebelled against him because I wished to and I wish to follow my own will.

The tenure of the commission of the said Brother Gaillard, mentioned above, is the following:

To the Reverend Father in Christ my lord Jacques, by the grace of God bishop of Pamiers, Brother Jean de Beaune, inquisitor of the heretical depravity in the realm of France, commissioned by the Apostolic See, sends health and respectful, devoted reverence. Since in your diocese, with the permission of the Lord, cases of heresy, alas, are frequently discovered, and since we can not easily come into your presence, being very busy, we remit to Your Paternity, to the great wisdom and circumspect judgment that has made you our trusted confidant, full tenure at the present time and, having called Brother Gaillard from our order, the convent of Pamiers, we consent that he may report to you, without having to consult with us, to proceed freely as regards the sentencing, and imposing of penance of the cross, but not including imprisonment in the dungeon, or to making good on a penance already imposed by you.

Given at Carcassonne, the second Sunday of Advent, the 10th of December in the year of the Lord 1318.

On April 24, 1320, the said Raymond appearing in the château of Allemans before my said lord bishop, assisted by the venerable religious person my lord Brother Jean de Beaune, inquisitor of the heretical depravity in the realm of France, commissioned by the Apostolic See,

they warned, asked and ordered him one time, two times, three times and one time more for charity, even though it had already been done by my lord the bishop, to abandon and quit the errors and heresies that he had avowed to have held and still to hold before my lord the bishop, judicially and now again before my lord the inquisitor; and that he might swear and abjure all heresy of the Vaudois and the sect of the Poor of Lyons, in which he has remained for a long time, that he reveal his accomplices and his companions, as well as their believers and that he return to the faith and unity of the Roman church.

And they protested that if he did not wish to return and abandon these errors and heresies, that he said he believed and held, they would proceed against him as against a heretic, conforming to canonical sanctions and the law.

And we said lords bishop and inquisitor assigned him a day to respond and deliberate precisely on the above said accusations, to wit, next Sunday. Those present are my lord Germain de Castelnau, archdeacon of the Church of Pamiers, Brother Gaillard de Pomiès, Brother Arnaud du Carla, of the order of the Preachers of the Convent of Pamiers, Brother Jean Estève of the same order, companion of my said lord inquisitor and master Barthélemy Adalbert, notary of the Inquisition and master Guillaume Peyre-Barthe, notary, etc.

On the assigned Sunday, the said Raymond appearing judicially before my said lords bishop and inquisitor, with the above enumerated witnesses present, at the château des Allemans,

the articles above mentioned were read to the said Raymond in the present procedure and drawn from his avowals, in which particulars he has erred and errs against the Catholic faith, the power and the authority of the Roman church, articles of which the tenor is once again reproduced hereafter; to the end that the said Raymond, in these articles, might correct, amend and retract that which seems to him to be necessary; articles of which he has been given a copy so that he may respond after reflection and in full knowledge of his case; when these articles were read, corrected, retracted, amended and added to according to what he wished, our said lords bishop and inquisitor warned him and prayed him again one time, two times, three times and for charity and attempted to persuade him by reasoning, authorities and finally by ordering him to retract the errors contained in these articles, which he had amended and corrected, and to abjure all heresy raising itself against the holy Roman church, mother and mistress of all churches and to denounce the believers, instigators, concealers and all others of his sect, signifying to him that if he remained intransigent they would proceed against him according to the law and canonical sanction, as against an obstinate and impenitent heretic.

When this was done the said Raymond responded that he did not wish to retract his errors except for the ones he had already retracted, nor to abjure a single one of the above-mentioned articles, nor to take any type of oath, nor either, as he said, to denounce his accomplices, believers, instigators, concealers, defenders and intermediaries, but that he wished to live and die in this belief and that in everything relevant to himself he wished to have this affair renounced and concluded and he asked for sentence to be passed.

On Wednesday the 30th, the last day of April 1320, I myself, master Guillaume Peyre-Barthe, notary of my lord the bishop of Pamiers, came in person to the château of Allemans and cited the said Raymond on the order of my said lords bishop and inquisitor, to appear the following day in person before my said lords bishop and inquisitor in the said place des Allemans, before the church there, to hear his sentence on what he had confessed before them. Raymond accepted this date purely and simply.

Witnesses for this citation and this response were Marc Rivel, notary of the region, Raymond Gasc des Allemans, and Jean Boyer de Mazères.

The tenor of these articles is as follows:

(Here the list of articles already summarized is listed again.)

And I, Rainaud Jabbaud, cleric of Toulouse, sworn in the matter of the Inquisition, have faithfully corrected this confession against the original by the order of my lord the bishop above-mentioned.

## NOTES

Duvernoy's note: a *quistor* was allowed to preach in order to gather donations for some good work -- a bridge, a church --. In fact they were often more like vendors or pedlars than preachers and by their excessive zeal often aroused the suspicions of the Inquisition.

The text of the sentence has not been preserved. Raymond was burned on May , 1320.