

## Historical Order and Dramatic Embodiment in the Characterization of *Beatrice de Planissoles*

Ian BROWN (Dramaturge et PR, Kingston University)

This chapter explores aspects of transtextuality with regard to the one-woman play, *Beatrice*, first produced in 1989 by Monstrous Regiment, the British touring theatre company. The play focuses on Beatrice de Planissoles, one-time chatelaine of the Languedoc village of Montailou high in the Pyrenees, a prominent member of the population Émmanuel Le Roy Ladurie explores in his landmark study of a community rightly suspected of supporting Cathar ‘heresy’: *Montailou, village occitan de 1294 à 1324* (1975).<sup>1</sup> It touches on questions of the embodiment and ‘voicing’ of ‘character’ in the one-person form, the ways in which evidence to enliven the monodramatic form may be derived, the differences and similarities between the dramaturgical and historiographical method, and the ways a dramatic characterisation may embody the life of many.

A little historical background may help provide context for this chapter. Catharism, while this is not the place to discuss its theological details, was deemed a heretical version of Catholic Christianity. Particularly widespread in the Languedoc by the beginning of the thirteenth century, Pope Innocent III declared what came to be called the Albigensian Crusade against it in 1209. This led to religious wars involving sieges, massacres and burnings of ‘heretics’ which, despite intermittent fightbacks by Cathars, led by 1229 to their defeat. The crusade also had a politico-economic dimension. In 1209 significant parts of the region were feudally subject to the Kingdom of Aragon and the conflict was fed – to an extent driven – by the incentive offered to northern French lords of the expropriated lands of Cathar nobles. It may, then, be read as a process by which the kings in Paris, who became fully involved under Louis VIII only as late as 1226, asserted their dominion over the Languedoc, then a highly autonomous, urbanised and

prosperous territory. The Inquisition against the Cathars was established in Toulouse in 1229 and for the next century proceeded stage by stage to investigate, interrogate and punish any Cathars found in the region. Around 1320, Jacques Fournier, Bishop of Pamiers from 1318 to 1325, led the inquisition's interrogation of Montaignou villagers, which can be seen as one of its final flurries, the last known Cathar burning occurring in 1321.<sup>2</sup> Fournier kept careful notes of his inquisition and took them with him, on becoming Pope Benedict XII, to Avignon whence they entered the Vatican archives in Rome at the end of the Great Schism.

In June 1320, allegations of heresy were laid against Beatrice, who had left Montaignou nearly twenty years earlier.<sup>3</sup> As a result, she appeared before Fournier on Saturday 26 July 1320 and was questioned, though not on oath, saying nothing of moment, but responding with what in modern terms would be 'no comment'. Cited to appear on the following Tuesday, 29 July, she did not appear. Bailiffs and justices were alerted and she was arrested in flight, hiding in Mas-Saintes-Puelles, less than twenty miles north-east of Pamiers. Brought before the bishop on Friday 1 August, she denied on oath any substantial involvement at all with Cathars, claiming to have forgotten any names. Whatever then ensued in terms of imprisonment or persuasion, when she appeared again on Thursday 7 August, she began revealing all. Interrogation continued on Saturday 9 August when she continued giving substantial evidence. In the next session on Tuesday 12, she seemed to become obstructive again and proceedings were adjourned until the next day when she again gave evidence against herself and her friends. Her inquisition continued on Friday 22 August when she appeared very ill and was concluded on the following Monday. She appeared before the bishop, found guilty of heresy and witchcraft, on 5 March 1321 and was sentenced to imprisonment on March 8. On July 4, 1322 her sentence was commuted to the public wearing of double yellow crosses, sign of a Cathar heretic.

Le Roy Ladurie works from the evidence of Fournier's inquisition depositions. Le Roy Ladurie is, of course, a leader of the *Annales* school of historiography emphasising social, economic, and

cultural rather than political, diplomatic and military history. This approach downplays Marxist historians' emphasis on material factors and emphasises the 'authenticity of the material' and, for Le Roy Ladurie particularly, 'microhistory' and *mentalités* – the common people's 'mentalities', their intellectual worldview or mindsets – which shape decisions. In *Montaillou* he sets out to produce, in his words, both an 'ecology' and an 'archaeology' of the politics, economics, social organisation and beliefs of the mainly Cathar people of Montaillou. His method is to trawl across all the depositions and collate evidence on related topics to provide a composite picture of aspects of the society of Montaillou. Le Roy Ladurie's method parallels that of an anthropologist or sociologist who interviews a wide range of members of a society in order to develop a picture of that society's operations and values as perceived by its members. In other words, the depositions given to the Inquisition by the Montaillou villagers become primary evidence for this modern historian to seek to 'reconstruct' a version of their society based on their first-hand evidence. Or, rather, he creates his own construction to the best his modern abilities and sensibilities allow. His volume is organised in two sections. The first, of seven chapters, is entitled 'The ecology of Montaillou: the house and the shepherd', its first four chapters having such titles as 'Environment and authority', 'The domus', 'A dominant house: the Clergue family' and 'The shepherds'. It considers issues of socio-economic structures and power and the significance of the household – the domus or *ostal*, a primary unit of social and economic organisation in this medieval pastoral economy. His second section, 'An ecology of Montaillou: from body language to myth', explores in fourteen chapters aspects of the villagers' social, personal, political and spiritual values. Its chapters range in topic from the first four, entitled 'Body language and sex', 'The libido of the Clergues', 'Temporary unions' and 'Marriage and love', through to the last two, 'Morality, wealth and labour' and 'Magic and the other world'.

*Beatrice* came about initially because in 1984 a Cheshire actor approached me to write a one-woman play for her. Remembering *Montaillou* and, within that book, the character of Beatrice de Plannissoles as it emerged through the diffused structure of Le Roy

Ladurie's text, I proposed focusing on her life and experience. I would seek to find my own words for her, to be spoken through an actor's voice, based on my reading of her through her translated words. These, presumably originally in Occitan, had to be read and re-imagined through the lens of the Inquisition's formal Latin text<sup>4</sup>, edited by Jean Duvernoy in 1965-1966 and translated by him into French as *Inquisition à Pamiers* (1966),<sup>5</sup> analysed by Le Roy Ladurie (1975) and finally translated into English by Barbara Bray (1978).<sup>6</sup> The process of playwriting, then, was based on Beatrice's own words, though at four removes in Bray's English text, and on Le Roy Ladurie's detailed research into her ambience and economic circumstance derived from his close study not only of her words, but those of her companion villagers. Through all these layers of (re-)interpretation, discussed later, what drew me as playwright to her was that, as I came to 'listen to' her words, I heard a human being who, as an individual, had somehow survived ecclesiastical and state oppression and, as a woman, resisted male hegemony and violence. She became a potential body, or at least embodiment, in theatrical space and I sought a linguistic and dramaturgic rhythm to express this identity, imaginary, but grounded on her own distinct, if distanced, words.

The dramaturgical task was to find contemporary words through which to embody her experience and so express her theatrically. It was also important that what emerged in the text was not simply a paraphrase of Bray's translation of Le Roy Ladurie's selections from the texts prepared by Duvernoy. The theatrical jargon for developing a character through finding an imaginative idiolect for their speech is finding their 'voice.' In order to find a dramatic voice, I extracted every quotation by the historic Beatrice in Le Roy Ladurie's text. Through these I sought a sense of her character: her grittiness, wit, strength and capacity for love, both maternal and sexual. Given that what survives of her is a transcribed deposition to the Inquisition, I developed a script based on her confessing and enacting her life to the audience, as if it were made up of her neighbours, who must be persuaded to let her return

home. She was conceived as having this as a condition of release from the bishop's prison. The first draft began:

My louse killer. You watch for the creatures on your friends' bodies or hair and then... dead. Sometimes fleas are full of blood, aren't they? They burst like a bag of dye, scarlet on the skin. If you're close friends, you never know if it's your blood or your friends', do you? It doesn't matter. It's the act of friends to delouse one another. Or of lovers. (259)<sup>7</sup>

This speech exemplifies one of the dramaturgic techniques, synthesis of the general and personal, employed in this play, as in much historical drama. Generalised information on delousing as a social act found in Le Roy Ladurie's text is embodied and makes the audience complicit in Beatrice's imaginatively shared 'memory'. This draft was closely concerned with Beatrice's personal life, concluding, as now, with a paragraph concerning her love for her daughters and her resolution as a woman:

There, if I look at it, is my thumb, my louse killer, and to kill the lice, the fleas on my friends, my daughters, my lovers, to release the mingling of our blood, is an act of untidiness, an act of affection and health. And however the Catholic Inquisition with its search for sin may see that act, and however the Cathars with their world belonging to the devil may see it, this is the act of a woman, an act of love. (281)

In 1985, for practical reasons, the first actor withdrew interest and I identified an actor friend, Mary McCusker, as the person I wished to perform this role. She offered comments on Beatrice's emotions and motivations. She also observed that there seemed too much emphasis on emotional relationships at the cost of the play's political context. A second draft in light of these comments emerged in 1987. This contained much more material concerning the position of the kings of France and the Pope and contemporary political, religious, economic and military pressures on the southern regions of France and their inhabitants. I then found a director, the late Clare Venables, and the final development phase of the script performed in April 1989 began. In this – as normal, iterative – script development process, the additional contextual material was reduced

and sharpened in expression. Final rehearsal cuts were almost all concerned with removing merely explanatory material and retaining material, whether personal or historical, which could be seen as perceived and expressed through Beatrice's 'own' experience. This meant that the original material, to do with Beatrice's own life, became again relatively more prominent, but now set in a clear historical context. Thus she is embodied as subject to outside forces that she can only partly understand:

Montaillou was my village, my home in the mountains, until I came down here. They came to it from the Lowlands, the orthodox Catholics, from the centre, from the King in Paris wherever that may be, from his Pope in Avignon who brought the Inquisition, the holy examination and punishment to the Cathars. They burned the good men [the Cathar holy men]. They persecuted. They massacred whole villages. When they came to Montaillou they arrested the whole village. They could have killed them all. They did elsewhere. I never understood. I never knew why it had to change, I don't understand why it came then or why it came with such fierceness. They say it began over a hundred years ago. Someone told me, I can't remember who now, that the Pope wanted to attack heresy and the king to subdue the rich south with its independent nobles. Well, they've certainly done that. (258)

This sense of Beatrice as an individual is, of course, itself emphasised by the decision to make the play a monodrama. The actor's holding attention and the constant focus of the audience's concentration on her embodiment is set in train by her first stage directions and lines:

BEATRICE DE PLANISSOLES ENTERS. SHE IS DRESSED IN A BLACK DRESS OF THE EARLY FOURTEENTH CENTURY. THE DRESS HAS, STITCHED ON TO IT, A DOUBLE YELLOW CROSS. SHE IS NOW IN HER LATE FORTIES OR EARLY FIFTIES, WAS A BEAUTIFUL YOUNG WOMAN AND IS NOW STRIKINGLY ATTRACTIVE, BUT WORN BY HER EXPERIENCES OF THE INQUISITION. SHE IS FRANK AND FRIENDLY, BUT AS SHE ENTERS IS STILL DISORIENTATED FROM THE CAPTIVITY FROM WHICH SHE HAS JUST BEEN RELEASED. IT IS THE

MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT AND SHE IS TRYING TO  
UNDERSTAND WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO HER.

SHE PACES ROUND THE ROOM

They let me out

CROSSES TO SEAT

I didn't expect. Release. I didn't expect.

STANDS AT TABLE

They said I was free to come back to my own home. They did. Free.

My own home.

LOOKS ROUND

Home

SITS DOWN. LOOKS AT AUDIENCE (257-258)

The audience is directly addressed from the start, drawn into a 'conversation' with Beatrice in which she assumes they know who she is and that, when she refers to 'They' or 'Release', the audience will understand. This device has two useful dramatic effects, besides the obvious one of buttonholing the audience and drawing them into an emotional involvement. One is that the lack of explanation of terms, used sparingly, is a way of intriguing and holding an audience that wants to find out to what they refer. The dramaturgy of the whole play depends on the release of information disguised as memory so that the audience is neither left too much in the dark nor flooded with new material at any given time. The other is that the skeletal language and action of the first lines sets out certain key words around which the play's dialectic will develop 'I', 'They', 'Release', 'Free', and 'Home'. The rest of the play can be seen to develop around those words and in particular the interaction of the 'I' of Beatrice and the 'They' of the individuals and groups that have impinged on her life. In the final speech of the play, as we have seen, these people are identified, in summary, as friends, daughters, lovers, the Catholic Inquisition and the Cathars 'with their world belonging to the devil'. Set against the initial image of a woman lost in turmoil at night in her wandering, confused mind and her nervous, busy movement on the stage is the final closing image of her sitting still, looking at her thumb, the louse-killer with which she cares for those she cares about. The final words of the play are then

set against the groups she has listed as she names herself embodied in action, ‘this is the act of a woman, an act of love’.

Throughout the play Beatrice’s own understandings and perceptions are a means of leading the audience into her history and, through that, the history of the time. When she says,

They say the King in Paris wanted to reduce the whole of the South to his control, and that the Inquisition and taxes were part of his plans for suppression and control. I don’t know. These levels of power are beyond me. I just live my life in the midst of what I see, partial, limited, incomplete as that is. (265)

she marks her position as mediator of experience, rather than explicator. Nevertheless, it is through her everyday partial experience, that of common humanity, that the realities of her society and its values are revealed. It is from the matter-of-fact way that Beatrice discusses the brutality of the men in her society to women – including her husbands, Berenger de Rocquefort and Orthon de Lagleize, and her lovers, who included Montailou’s priest, Pierre Clergue, a secret Cathar – or the power of the Church or the arrangement of marriages or the everyday use of charms that the audience is informed of the systems, values and relationships within which she lives. The play holds the audience’s attention both by arousing its curiosity at the unfamiliar she takes for granted and intermingling this unfamiliarity with material presumably familiar to the audience, such as details of sexual activity. Even the familiar, however, is set in a different society, so that common concerns – contraception or abortion, say – are revealed in the different light of other practices. The integration of such revelations, such as the assumption that if she is found to have had an abortion she will be burned, is an important way of both involving the audience and contextualising the play’s content.

The process of the play, its dramaturgical impetus, arises from the unfolding of Beatrice’s experience. She makes it clear early what she is doing:

I must tell you, explain, talk to you, and then, if you forgive, do not drive me away, I may stay here. My home, my ostal. (258)

Having established the convention of confessing on the Inquisition's instructions to the audience as her neighbours, she returns throughout the play to this device. In this way, the emotional and intellectual impetus of the play is derived from her experience and the dramatic action can unfold through the vagaries of 'her' memory:

I want to stay. I do. This is all the home I have now. I'll try. I'll try to tell this in order. Please, I'm confused. Only just from the prison. (260)

or later,

What next, what must I say? I've told you of Pierre, my marriage, my daughters, my heresy. I'm trying to understand why I'm here, trying to make an order out of my confession. What next? What next? (268)

or again,

We made love a lot, a lot. It's coming clearer. This is Pierre. This is how I came to sin. This is a pattern. (272)

Time and again, throughout the play, as Beatrice exposes her life, the words 'confession' and 'repentance' and their related verbs recur. As Beatrice works through the duty of confession laid upon her by the Inquisition, she enacts her own confession to the bishop. The dramatic effect of this is underlined by the repeated hesitations, the questions to herself, 'How did I come down to the lowlands?' (269), the suggestion of memory working, 'I remember something else about Mengarde' (266) and the use of 'you' both in addressing the audience, 'You know how men are' (261) and later in addressing, in her memory, her father and Pierre.

The process of confession is, however, also a progress for Beatrice. Her references to pattern and order change about two thirds of the way through the play just as her memory seems to flow more freely and she has to prompt herself less often with questions:

I'm trying to make sense, find a pattern, because the bishop says I must, his pattern. I want my pattern, my sense. (275)

The structure of the play becomes more direct, less following vagrant memories, as Beatrice becomes clearer in her mind as to

who she is and what she believes in contradistinction to the authoritarian, centralist structures of a totalitarian patriarchy. Her confession, the apparently random progress of her memory, comes to show a pattern – both the play’s and hers – where the recurring themes are those of individual responsibility and loving interaction as opposed to the various authoritarian acts of powerful figures and institutions. The apparently random memories in the first part of the play contribute to the impact of the final sequence. There, Beatrice tells of her betrayals (both *by* her later lowland lover, the priest-teacher Barthelemy, and *of* her highland priest-lover, the dangerously double-dealing secret Cathar Pierre) and of the Inquisition’s oppressiveness that led to her wearing the double cross. She says of this, ‘It is a weight on my mind’. (280) The shadowy historical figure of Beatrice de Plannissoles is created in a modern version by drawing strands of experience, evidence and contextual information together in the mind and body enacted by the actor before those who become in performance not only audience, but neighbours. A final passage demonstrates the point she reaches in her journey of confession:

The men have sought the tidiness of dogma and authority and control. In my life I know how untidy it is to be beaten by a husband or have a beloved daughter beaten, how untidy it is to crave a good life for one’s children, how untidy it is to love. They wrote down all my words in neat notes and they tidied away Pierre into his death cell, but death is mess and life is mess and I have never made sense of my contradictions nor do I have faith that sense exists. I have tried now to make an order, make a pattern in my confession, but it is not my pattern. I am not in this order. Every ordering has caused suffering and left another form of disorder. I must wear these crosses of my confusion. (280)

The crosses imposed by the Inquisition become transformed here into an assertion that she rejects the order imposed on her and that she recognises, accepts and celebrates the necessary disorder, ‘confusion’, that opposes authoritarian control. Beyond this dialectic, and underpinning it, are others: lowlands/highlands, centre/regions, male/female, town/village, bishop/priest, Catholic/Cathar, sexual exploitation/love, lover/parent, Paris-

Pamiers-Foix-Rome/Montailou, dankness/freshness. Beatrice comes to embody alternative hierarchies and matriarchal compassion.

A crucial issue was, then, the development of an ‘individual’ in the play, a metaphorical entity, who would reveal and embody the effects of the oppressions the play explores. The naturalistic dramaturgy of the play derives its impact from the emotional involvement of the audience’s seeing a performed character enact, partially, but intensely, the effect of the unfolding of historical forces around her and her resisting those forces to the best of her ability. The play is concerned to suggest that through that process of resistance lies the possibility of personal and political survival despite totalitarian oppression. It must be added that it is entirely possible and defensible to see in Beatrice’s resistance to the hegemonic power of the ‘lowlands’ a metaphor for Scottish cultural and religious resistance to the hegemonic centralising power of London government and historic attacks on the Scottish Kirk. But it may also represent the resistance of Highland/Gaelic culture to the centralising hegemony of Lowland/Germanic Scots-English culture. Mary McCusker played Beatrice with a Scots accent and we indeed discussed the proposition she might play it with a Highland accent. While, however, such layers of meaning are deeply embedded in the play, it cannot be said that the play is about such concepts. Its central character represents human and humane resistance to any form of oppressive hegemony whether political, geographic, military, religious, sexual, gender-based or economic. The fundamental dramaturgic and ideological focus of *Beatrice* is, however, on the individual. The task as writer was to establish Beatrice as an ‘individual’. This led to a particular creative problem to be resolved in writing the play.

This problem, one of transtextuality, was that of disengaging a personal idiom for Beatrice from the formality of some of the words and expressions used in the transcript. First of all, Beatrice was speaking to an accuser and would probably have been guarded about her evidence even after her initial resistance was overcome. Secondly, the clerk transcribing was no doubt working in a form of

Latin translation with its own conventions that would to some extent, as in present day court records, elide some individual qualities. This process of finding an idiom for Beatrice continued until very late in the day. The accommodation and assimilation of the historical contextual material of the second draft was an important part of that process. Finding creative ways in which Beatrice might speak of those things she had experienced and lived through, but of course did not refer to in her inquisition, helped me to develop and strengthen a sense of her 'own' idiom derived from her words as recorded.

This process was reinforced when in January 1989 I was able to consult both the Latin transcript of Beatrice's evidence and Duvernoy's French translation. From both I was able to check the accuracy of Bray's translation and happy to find it apt. I also found one additional element, a piece of the transcript evidence not used by Le Roy Ladurie, the reference to Pierre's final gift of an engraved glass flask of sugar. Finding such a reference and using the knowledge that sugar might come from Moorish Spain, I could add background colour detail: 'He must have met a Saracen trader.' (278) From the start, I had moved away from Beatrice's language in Bray's translation to seek a basis for a separate idiom. By the time I came to the final draft very little of the material used is in the words of that translation and much material, like the Saracen trader, is additional to Ladurie, though based on research into the period. The dramaturgical challenge of finding a specific idiom that would be taken by the audience as 'hers' arose from a study and understanding of the original material. The fact that the original basis for the play is the very words of Beatrice, admittedly in a translation, but one I had come to have some confidence in, adds a particular resonance to it. This resonance relates partly to the Annaliste concept referred to already of 'authenticity of material', but more to the ideological importance, already discussed, of establishing the individuality of Beatrice. The play can be said, at least partially, to find its authenticity in that I had, with a French crib's help, read the Latin transcript of Beatrice's evidence myself, standing as it were at only one remove, that of the mediaeval notary, from her. I had been able

to relate my dramatic text to the written version of her evidence. The fact that I could come close to her very words enabled me to develop a sureness, a 'voice', in her language and experience that could speak to a present-day audience in relation to present-day oppressions and hierarchies. In short, *Beatrice* was not a play written out of a fascination with the nature of history and its manipulation, so much as out of a concern with the oppressions of our age. She spoke through the ages, to use a metaphor that embeds the actuality of my access to her words. From her I wrote a play not as a historian, but embodying in Beatrice and giving voice to the recurrent impact on the individual of oppression, exploitation and political, economic and religious hegemonies. *Beatrice* is developed as a personal story that parallels the experience of political, economic and religious victims today, presented in a play which, while using historical material, does not explicitly attempt to explore the nature of history. The most it does in that respect is to explore the nature of memory, and even that exploration is subservient to the transtextual embodiment, both from Latin transcript of evidence and Le Roy Ladurie's *Montaillou*, of the experience remembered.

The emphasis of the Annaliste historian Le Roy Ladurie is on using the evidence to explore the mindsets and worldviews of the people of Montaillou. For the dramatist, the emphasis is on the main character's attempts to disentangle – from the distortions of others, particularly men – her life (and her experience of others with whom she lived that life) and her own perception of what that life is and who she is. She says, as the play moves towards its conclusion and she has both faced the fact of her betrayal of Pierre and come to an accommodation with a view of herself which she feels represents her 'own' self-perception:

The men have sought the tidiness of dogma and authority and control [...] They wrote down all my words in neat notes and they tidied away Pierre into his death cell, but death is mess and life is mess and I have never made sense of my contradictions nor do I have faith that sense exists. I have tried now to make an order, make a pattern in my confession, but it is not my pattern, I am not in this order. (280)

In short, against the forces that seek artificial order, a single view, Beatrice asserts confusion, contradiction, and absence of ‘sense’, ‘pattern’ or ‘order’ as she considers her louse killing thumbnail, whose action embodies human need and care for others:

And however the Catholic Inquisition with its search for sin may see that act, and however the Cathars with their world belonging to the devil may see it, this is the act of a woman, an act of love. (281)

The problematics of what is ‘the act of a woman’ or ‘an act of love’ are for the time being suppressed in the theatrical transtextualisation and embodiment of Beatrice and her louse-killer.

In the representation of the experiences of the individual, ‘Beatrice de Planissoles’, we may, if we wish, see an image of historiography and the making of ‘history’ from evidence, but not as a professional historian makes ‘history’ from ‘evidence’. Beatrice, the dramatic character, searches her memory and the actuality of her life, like the historical Beatrice de Planissoles, to explore the conflict of ideologies. Thus she establishes for herself a provisional subjective identity that suits her (just as, one might observe, the professional historian does by a distinct, but parallel – and necessarily only partly objective – methodology). In this, she embodies human memory’s frailty and the contingent quality of the single identity set against the pressures of church, state and economic change. The play she enacts is a theatrical metaphor for personal history derived from the confusions, evasions and resistances which make up an individual’s experience, one which stands implicitly for the many experiences which make a society’s ‘history’. In this, it is a telling irony that Beatrice, known to us through Le Roy Ladurie’s *Montaillou* by the individual name of Beatrice de Planissoles, and clearly having lived a life of general resistance to the orthodox church, is called in the Latin transcript of her interrogation ‘Beatrix de Ecclesia’. Presumably, this name is taken from her second, empty, marriage to Orthon de Lagleize and appears to bind her to the Church. So the Inquisition imposed a historical confessional identity that the play *Beatrice* and its ‘Beatrice’ resist as, transmuted from the historical text, they achieve for the time being a new transtextual dramatic embodiment.

---

1 Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou, village occitan de 1294 à 1324*, Paris, Gallimard, 1975.

2 [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albigensian\\_Crusade](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albigensian_Crusade), last consulted 23 May 2009.

3 This information on key dates in the inquisition of Beatrice is to be found in a translation into English of her depositions available at [www.qudos.org.uk/Montaillou/Deplanis.htm](http://www.qudos.org.uk/Montaillou/Deplanis.htm)

and [www.qudos.org.uk/Montaillou/beat2.htm](http://www.qudos.org.uk/Montaillou/beat2.htm), last consulted 23 May 2009.

4 Benedict XII, *Le registre d'inquisition de Jacques Fournier, évêque de Pamiers (1318-1325): [texte de] manuscrit Vat. Latin 4030 de la Bibliothèque vaticane*, intro. and notes by Jean Duvernoy, Toulouse, Edition Privat [Bibliothèque méridionale, ser. historique, tom. 41, 41/2, 41/3], 3 vols, 1965-6.

5 Jean Duvernoy, ed. and trans., *Inquisition a Pamiers: Interrogatoires de Jacques Fournier, 1318-25*, Toulouse, Edition Privat, 1966.

6 The edition used in preparation of *Beatrice* was Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou*, trans. Barbara Bray, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1980 (1978).

7 All page references are made to this present edition of *Beatrice*.