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**Abstract:**

This paper discusses a previously unknown but potentially significant vendetta in the seventeenth-century French Midi. On 15 July 1674, François de Nogaret, vicomte de Trelans, was abducted by forty men from the parish church of La Bastide during mass; his killers subsequently murdered him. Within a month his killer, François de Sénégas, was himself killed in a revenge attack and his corpse burned. The story of the vendetta is important in itself, because the richness of the archival traces it left allows us to reconstruct the events in unparalleled detail. Four significant features emerge. First, the Sénégas were Protestants and the Trelans Catholics and their enmity can be traced back to the beginnings of the Wars of Religion. Second, the immediate cause of their dispute in the mid-seventeenth century was caused by clashes over seigneurial rights and royal taxation, and the evidence suggests that peasants played a major role in the drama. Third, litigation between the parties made the dispute worse and the judicial system failed to stop the violence escalating. Finally, the feud was brought to an end by a peace brokered by the intendant in 1678. This accord represents a rare archival discovery and accordingly I have published it as an appendix to the article. It demonstrates William Beik’s contention that the purview and activities of the intendants changed during the personal reign of Louis XIV, and as a consequence they became more effective agents of social control.
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If one follows the river Tarn thirty kilometres upstream from Albi one will eventually reach the confluence with the river Rance and the village of La Bastide. Today, the village lies on the edge of the region known at the Grand Causses, the southern section of the Massif Central, a region characterized by rugged mountains, high calciferous plateaus, river valleys and steep gorges. The village of La Bastide has always lain on a border, between the mountains of the Causses and the gentler plain of the Albigeois, where the provinces of the Rouergue and Languedoc, the dioceses of Vabres, Rodez and Albi, and the modern départements of the Tarn and the Aveyron meet. The region is today probably best known for its distinctive cheese, Roquefort, but historically the region was also a centre of heresy, delimiting the more Protestant Rouergue from the more Catholic Midi Toulousain, and it is this frontier which forms the backdrop to the events which occurred in village of La Bastide on Sunday 15 July 1674. On that day, the lord of La Bastide, François de Nogaret, vicomte de Trelans, went to do his customary devotions (Foulquier-Lavergne, 1874-1878). During Mass, forty men, armed and masked, entered the church and, following a scuffle, seized him, two servants and the local judge. They were taken across the river Rance, where there were horses waiting to take them up into the hills to the south, a dozen kilometres or so, to a farm [massage] at Alban. Here the vicomte and his two servants were murdered; the judge was freed.

Violence in sacred spaces was not as uncommon as one might imagine in Louis XIV’s France: churches were both a site for violent exchanges and a cause of bloody feuds among local elites. In *Blood and violence in early modern France*, I considered over fifty cases of violence in churches, arguing that it was phenomenon characteristic of the century that followed the outbreak of the French Religion Wars of Religion in 1562 (Carroll, 2006: 65-82, 122-124, 232). It was both the best place to catch your enemy unawares and also difficult to avoid meeting them face to face during a service. Much of the violence was low level, but nevertheless caused serious disruption to parish life. My research since 2006 has confirmed this pattern, but it is also clear that the problem of contested space in churches was a more widespread and persistent problem than I had originally imagined and that
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1 This account, which seems to be based on folk memory, is faulty. The events recounted in the judicial investigation of the bailli of Millau require treatment in a separate article: Bibliothèque Nationale M[anuscrit] S Clairambault 795, fos. S65-S88.

we need to extend our chronology into the eighteenth century (Atgier, 1908: 339; Bauchy, 1959: 23-30).

But the murder of the vicomte de Trelans belongs to a different category. There was no dispute over the church at La Bastide, its fabric or the sacred space within, and we can be certain of that because his killer, François de Durand de Sénegas, sieur de Saint-Pierre de Trivisy, was a Protestant. Nicolas-Joseph Foucault, intendant of the généralité of Montauban, picks up our story in a letter to Colbert on 29 August 1674:

The sieur de [Nogaret-] Trelans having been murdered in Languedoc by the sieur de Senegas Saint-Pierre, the kin of the former, assisted by the sieur de Senegas’s own vassals, entered the Rouergue and besieged him in a small country house [métairie], where he was cruelly murdered. I sent a commissioner there to investigate. I am sending you, Monsieur, a copy of the investigation that he did. The case will be placed in the hands of M. d’Aguessel, who I understand was commissioned to try the case of those guilty of the first crime which happened in his department, this second case being a consequence [of the first]. (Baudry, 1862: 397-398)

What intendant Foucault was describing was the consequence of a long running dispute, which historians and anthropologists would describe as a feud or faide, although no such term was available to the disputants at the time (Carroll, 2006: Introduction). We know this to be the case because of a remarkable document that exists in the Archives Départementales of the Tarn – an accord signed by the two families and representatives of their peasants in the Logis du Grand Soleil in Toulouse on 5 April 1678. Although we have long been aware of the significant role played by out of court or infra-judicial settlements in the Ancien Régime legal system, the practice, by its nature, remains largely undetected. What characterized the Ancien Régime legal system was the ubiquity of out of court settlements and arbitrations relative to judgments and punishments; in the court of the prévôté of Vaucouleurs in the eighteenth century, for example, this meant that 60% of lawsuits were abandoned before sentencing (Piant, 2006). Even when sentences were pronounced they were often without effect: only 2 of the 11 capital sentences issued there were carried out, which bears out Tocqueville’s maxim: «The whole of the Ancien Régime is there: rigid in rule, mild in practice, such is its character» (Wenzel, 2011: 509). Eric Wenzel has described the discovery of infra-justice as a ‘Copernican Revolution’ in our understanding of the law. However, it would be fair to say that this revolution rests on comparatively little evidence. We know that most lawsuits were abandoned before sentencing, but we are less well informed about the ways in which deals were negotiated and what they contained. Likewise, we know a lot about pardons, but almost nothing about the negotiations between the parties that were necessary before they could be registered and the partie civile satisfied. The accord is a highly unusual document and I have therefore published it in extenso as an appendix to this article.

However, the Sénègàs-Trelans feud is worth considering in some detail for other reasons. First, the case highlights the corrosive effects of the French Wars of Religion on local life and the fact that, although the religious wars came to an end with the accession of Henri IV, the civil conflicts they caused continued to be a feature of rural life in many parts of France for most of the seventeenth century. The second feature of this dispute is the role played by the peasantry. The dispute between their respective lords had an immense impact on their daily lives, but the peasants were not passive in the dispute and, as Foucault’s report above makes clear, they were major actors in the final drama. The dispute between their respective lords had an immense impact on their daily lives, but the peasants were not passive in the dispute and, as Foucault’s report above makes clear, they were major actors in the final drama. Thirdly, we can follow the dispute through the courts of law and show why it was not possible to prevent the dispute from escalating. The law was subject to political interference and both parties mobilized its networks of support and petitioned competing jurisdictions. Fourthly, we shall see how the logic of peace emerged from judicial deadlock. Historians have traditionally been very impressed by the repression of aristocratic violence carried out by the Grands Jours of the Parlements of Toulouse and Paris, which operated in the Midi and the Auvergne in the 1660s respectively, but as I have argued elsewhere, their importance lay in the symbolic reassertion of royal authority and most of the sentences they issued were never carried out (Carroll, 3 AD Tarn, B 100.
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The law was subject to social and political imperatives and crimes committed by members of the aristocracy were always treated differently. More important in our case was the role played by intermediaries, in particular Henri d’Aguesseau, the intendant of Languedoc from 1673 to 1685. His peace-making role lends support to William Beik’s contention that the purview and activities of the intendants changed during the personal reign of Louis XIV, and as a consequence they became more effective agents of social control (Beik, 1998; Carroll, 2003: 112). Finally, we shall need to consider the significance of the seizure of François de Nogaret in a church during Mass, an act of sacrilege which sheds light on the practice of the feud in early modern Europe more widely.

From the very beginning of the French Wars of Religion in 1562 the families of Sénégas and Trelans found themselves on opposite sides of the conflict. The Rouergue and Languedoc were heartlands of the Calvinist movement and the civil wars in the region were to be particularly bloody and prolonged. The Nogaret de Trelans family leaves less of a trace in the documentation.

The vicomté of Trelans lay in the Gévaudan (presently the département of the Lozère) close to the border with the Rouergue, and it was in the Gévaudan where the Trelans made their name as one of the fiercest opponents of Protestantism. As governor, the vicomte de Trelans was responsible for the burning of three heretics in 1557. On 3 August 1562 he retook the provincial capital, Mende, from the Huguenots (Ferdinand, 1876-1893, II: 35, 475). He was also accused of committing atrocities against Catholics. The Protestant Histoire ecclésiastique talks of the desultory war in the region, which «several took advantage of, some as an opportunity for booty, and others to carry out revenge and their individual passions» (Béze, 1974, III: 234-235).

However, it is the barons of Sénégas who emerge from the sources with more clarity. The Durand family were of comparatively modest origins, but in 1566 Charles Durand, a second son, married the heiress, Anne de Bonne. As part of the marriage contract he adopted his wife’s name and arms as well as acquiring her property, becoming Charles Durand de Bonne, baron de Sénégas, which lies 20 kilometres to the north east of Castres (Guerny, 2007). The match was certainly a reward for his services to the Protestant cause and to the young Henri de Navarre, in particular, in whose household he served as gentilhomme de la chambre and later chambellan. He was one of the most important Protestant captains in the Midi, appearing as colonel of a regiment of 1,000 foot, which was raised in Castres in 1568, and playing a prominent role in the fighting in Languedoc over the next decade (De Vic - Vaissete, 2003, XI: 508, 517, 556, 565, 614, 655). He was a commissioner for the implementation of the peace edicts in 1577, 1579 and 1580 and in 1582 was sent on an embassy to England. During the wars of succession (1584-1596), in which Navarre was opposed by the Catholic League, the region was divided between Albi, which held for the League, and Castres, which had long been a bastion of Protestantism – Sénégas is recorded in the thick of the fighting (Pradel, 1894: 67). Albi held out against Navarre, now Henri IV, until in 1596, when it capitulated by the treaty of Folembray.

Across large parts of France, this was a war characterized less by the movements of field armies than a fragmented and highly localized struggle for every stronghold and château, pitting village against village and neighbour against neighbour; it constituted the most destructive phase of the Wars of Religion. This was no less true of the Rance valley, where the strategic château of La Bastide dominated the confluence with the Tarn. It was held for the Catholic League by the vicomte of Trelans against his neighbours, many of whom were Protestants. On 13 February 1587, at the head of 800 men, he took the neighbouring château of Plaisance (Foulquier-Lavergne, 1874-1878: 167). And over the next few years he seized several other Protestant strongholds. The importance of this for our story is that, if they had not done so before, Sénégas and Trelans would soon come face to face. In July 1595 Sénégas received a commission to receive the submission of the forts and châteaux still in Trelans’s possession, including that at Curvalle (Guerny, 2007: 22). The fate of both Plaisance and Curvalle will later become crucial to our story.

Charles Durand baron de Sénégas emerged from the Wars of Religion very much a victor: not only had his freedom to worship been guaranteed, but his social position had been significantly enhanced. In 1598, his son Jean was married to
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the daughter of the sénéchal of Castres who paid a dowry of 30,000 livres, a sum worthy of a member of the provincial elite (Guerny, 2007: 17). In 1608 Charles purchased the seigneuries and châteaux of Plaisance and Curvalle for the comparatively small sum of 4,200 livres, which suggests that the properties were heavily mortgaged and/or damaged during the civil war. Charles seems to have moved his principle residence to Curvalle, as he died there in 1618, drawing up his will on 3 October in favour of his grandson, Charles (Barrau, 1853-1860: 604).

However, the reconciliation effected by Henri IV, was always tenuous. Beyond Paris civil conflict continued: in 1607 Charles’s youngest son was murdered on the open road (Dumont, 1969-1971, II: n. 13338, 3 December 1607). And the uneasy settlement began to unravel with the royal minority and dynastic instability that followed the king’s assassination in 1610. By 1615 Sénégas was mustering troops and, in the year before his death, was forbidden by the Parlement of Toulouse from fortifying his ‘vieux château’ at Curvalle (Extrait, 1883: 238; Pradel, 1894b: 16). His son, Jean, was among the supporters of the Protestant rebel Rohan in 1621-1622, but hesitated to rejoin the duke in 1627 (Vaissete - De Vic, 2003, XI: 947, 962, 1008). There is some evidence that by the mid seventeenth century the deteriorating political situation for Protestants was having an economic impact, as the avenues for office-holding were narrowed and the steady flow of converts to Catholicism among the nobility drained the pool of potential marriage partners and depressed dowries (Mentzer, 1994). When, in 1638, Charles de Durand, Jean’s son, married Marthe de Montcalm, daughter of a judge in the Chambre de l’Edit at Castres, he received a dowry 10,000 livres less than his father had received (Guerny, 2007: 17). However, this marriage into the local magisterial elite would provide great support in his struggles to come.

The trouble began in the following year. This was year in which the royal domain in the village of Curvalle was pawned to Louis de Manelphe, canon of Albi cathedral, one of the many financial expedients used by the crown to meet the demands of the war against Spain (1635-1659). The taxpayers wished to buy Manelphe out, but they did not have the wherewithal to do so. In 1647 Sénégas agreed to advance them 11,600 livres on condition that he enjoyed the revenues of the domain for six years. However, at the end of the period contention arose over the «various fees and expenses» that he had incurred, giving rise to «several encounters (rencontres) between the said sieur de Sénégas, dame Marthe de Montcalm his wife and Messieurs their children on one hand and the deceased Messire François de Nogaret vicomte de Trelans, Messires Jean-Luc and another François de Nogaret his children and others».

More detail can be gleaned from the judgement issued by the royal Conseil d’Etat in 1664. This ruling, which confirmed the evocation of the affair to the Chambre de Justice (established by Colbert in 1661 to investigate financial malpractice and peculation) was hostile to Sénégas and needs to be used with caution: not only was he charged with fraud, but also murder and sacrilege. The religious aspect to the case is foregrounded at the beginning of the judgement, which mentions Sénégas’s Protestantism, and that «in order to render himself master and lord of this community [Curvalle], and its domain, which is held by His Majesty, he spared no effort to violate all human and divine laws» (Arrest du Conseil d’Estat, 1664: 1). The agents [syndics] of the community complained that, once the six years were up, he refused to return the village’s property and that his demand for interest and fees was nothing more than extortion. They also complained that Sénégas used his connections in the Chambre de l’Edit, which had been established under the provisions of the Edict of Nantes in 1598 to provide impartial justice for Protestants, to coerce them. First, he had some villagers killed and intimidated the rest, covering his actions in the legal judgements of this court. Second, he imposed village consuls and syndics «by his own private authority, all under his control, and by this means excluded all the inhabitants from control over the business, taxes and levies of His Majesty» (Arrest du Conseil d’Estat, 1664: 2). Over the next four years the collections of these dues was contested between the villagers and Sénégas’s henchmen, resulting in several affrays and murders. His opponents in the village addressed their complaints to other courts, most notably, the Parlement of Toulouse, which had a reputation for hostility to Protestantism.

5 AD Tarn, B 100, p. 1.
The village represented itself as a ‘poor’ community bravely struggling against a petty tyrant and heretic, who resorted to chicanery to achieve his ends. We should be wary of this rhetoric. Sénégas’s supporters were among the dead and it is clear that the peasants were able to call on outside muscle to resist him. This included the local head of police, the prévôt des maréchaux of Albi, also called Louis de Manelphe, and almost certainly a relative of the original holder of the usufruct and therefore hardly a disinterested party. Secondly, and more significantly for our story, was François vicomte de Trelans, who was first named in the blizzard of legal judgment emanating from the competing courts in September 1658 (Arrest du Conseil d’Estat, 1664: 7). Trelans and his sons joined Manelphe’s attempts to arrest Sénégas, but entry to the château of Curvalle was resisted by Sénégas’s wife and sons. Sénégas stuck back on 7 December 1663, «chasing Trelans and his family from his house at La Bastide […] seizing it and placing a garrison of rascals in it, all Religionnaires like Sénégas, who pillaged everything, and carried off furniture, papers, titles and money; not content with this they pulled down the bell-tower of the Church» (Arrest du Conseil d’Estat, 1664: 11).

This incident makes Trelans’s involvement in the dispute clear. Bells marked time and their inappropriate ringing was a cause of tension among neighbours. As Alain Corbin has shown, even in the nineteenth century, disputes arose «over the power to decide when the bells were to be rung and when they were to remain silent during the rites of passage» (Carroll, 2006: 78-79). In the sixteenth century bell-ringing caused particular irritation to Protestants. Catholics were aware of this and they also tried to drown out Protestant services; it was the cause of the Saint-Médard riots in Paris in 1561. La Bastide was only a couple of kilometres from Curvalle and perhaps Sénégas was exasperated by the bells attracting his tenants to worship on his enemy’s domain. The complexity of feudal law was such that they shared many tenants and that either man could consider the other his subject. Curvalle «was part of the justice and seigneurie of Verdun in the sénéchaussée of the Rouergue, which contained three mills, woods, mastage, and in addition a house or château at Curvalle which is noble and fortified […] rents and dues on the inhabitants of Curvalle […] the seigneurie of Plaisance and its whole justice, high, medium and low […] and in the land of the seigneur de la Bastide the fief of Bousquet» (Guerny, 2007: 34-35). In the early modern period we disentangle the sacred from more material concerns at our peril. The primary reason for Sénégas’s occupation of La Bastide, as the 1678 accord makes clear, was his desire to recover stolen cattle and legal damages owed by Trelans.

Moreover, François de Trelans was an unlikely Counter-Reformation warrior. He had been involved in the resistance of the civic elite of Mende against attempts by the bishop to increase ecclesiastical authority in the town. On 30 April 1645 he led 80 men into the cathedral in Mende and approached the altar while the bishop was administering Holy Communion; they would have killed him had the canons and choristers not promptly closed the doors, separating the altar from the knave, and bundled the bishop out of the church (Porée, 1901: LI-LVII). Trelans was also involved in a long running feud with neighbours in his properties in the Gévaudan, which led him to be interrogated by the Grand Jours of Languedoc on suspicion of the murder of twenty men. Although he was condemned in absentia and technically an outlaw, he still had managed to have recourse to justice: the Chambre de Justice found in his favour, ordering Sénégas’s men to quit the château of La Bastide and the judges of the présidial of Villefranche-de-Rouergue to open a criminal investigation. This court soon issued a capital sentence against Sénégas, his mother, his sons and his niece, Catherine Guirard, and sequestered property, including a tapestry and other furniture.

The case against Sénégas was sent to the Grand Jours of the Auvergne at Clermont. Sénégas «greatly embarrassed Messieurs des Grand Jours, as much as for the great number of charges as for his comportment, who defended himself with a great deal of spirit and resolve» (Chéruel, 1856: 210). His interrogation on 7 January 1666 gives us more detail on the accusations. Not only was he charged with three murders, violence, false imprisonment, the usurpation of royal rights and levying his own taxes by force, but also of «taking down a [church] banner, demolishing a chapel consecrated to the virgin and using the material to fortify
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6 Prévôt Manelphe was himself murdered in 1670.
one of his houses [...] of appropriating the tithe of a prior in one of his territories». The diarist Esperit Fléchier was impressed: «the accused defended himself very skilfully, although he appeared to be very wicked and deceitful» (Chéruel, 1856: 211). He turned the tables on his accusers and protested that the charge of sacrilege was fabricated by his enemies. Everyone, according Fléchier, expected him to be executed, but the judges were divided. It was fortunate for Sénégas that the case was heard by the magistrates of the Parlement Paris and not those of Toulouse, who held their Grands Jours of Languedoc at Le Puy, and who were particularly sensitive to the crime of sacrilege and severe on Protestants (Le Blanc, 1869). The President of the Grand Jours at Clermont opined for the death sentence, but Sénégas had friends in the capital and it was «certain political considerations which led the other judges to let him live» (Chéruel, 1865: 212). He was condemned to be banished from the kingdom, fined 20,000 livres and the fortifications at Plaisance and Curvalle were to be razed to the ground.

But there was no such thing as a final judgement in the Ancien Régime legal system; for those with the wherewithal there was always another court, another avenue to pursue. In 1669, after five years in prison, Sénégas had the judgement, obtained «by his enemies and their pernicious designs», against him quashed. He seems to have died soon thereafter, as it was his widow, Marthe de Montcalm, the daughter of a judge, who set about mobilizing her considerable contacts in the legal world to restore the patrimony. In 1670 she obtained a judgement from the Parlement of Toulouse which absolved her and her sons and returned Plaisance and Curvalle. Their opponents immediately appealed to the Parlement of Paris. But the financial cost to the Sénégas was now taking its toll and they were forced to mortgage their property (Guerny, 2007: 31). The crown also had no intention of repeating the failures of the past and in 1674 the royal chancery issued an order forbidding any court to receive the plaintiffs. The agreement of the parties to accept the arbitration of the intendant of Languedoc, Henri d’Aguesseau, was seen by Louis XIV on 3 August 1674. The accord tells us that the parties wished to avoid more expense.

Alas, the truce was almost immediately broken by the murder of the vicomte of Trelans and his son’s revenge. François de Nogaret de Trelans married in 1628 and must have been well over sixty at the time of his murder. We know more about his killers at this stage, because of the richness of the Sénégas family archive. Charles de Durand de Bonne was succeeded by five sons, three of whom held commissions in the armies of Louis XIV. There seems to have been a disagreement between the brothers over the peace negotiations. It was the second son François, sieur de Saint-Pierre, captain of dragoons on the ill-fated French mission to Candia in 1668-1669, who carried out the abduction and murder. Saint-Pierre must have felt secure from a counter-attack for he and his men repaired to the farmhouse at Verdun only a few kilometres up the Rance from La Bastide, ostensibly to help with the harvest. But, on 9 August 1674, the house was invested by his victim’s son, Jean-Luc de Trelans with 200 peasants and soldiers. On the morning of the 14th Saint-Pierre and his men, lacking water, tried to break out. He was captured and taken to Trelans’s territory, where he was murdered and his body subsequently burned.

During the siege, he managed to smuggle out a letter, dated 12 August 1674, to his sister-in-law. The letter contains a pitiful plea: «in the name of God to take particular care of the children, wives and kin of the poor men whose throats will be cut with mine should God not take pity on us». He further requested that the rest of his papers were to be sent to the sieur de Saint-Maurice, «being assured that I die honouring [you] more than any other person and the sieur de Saint-Maurice who I loved more than a brother». The likeliest candidate for this show of affection was Guillaume de Passemar, sieur de Saint-Maurice and baron d’Alban. The fact that Trelans had been taken to Alban in order to be murdered implicates Saint-Maurice in the conspiracy (Guerny, 2007: 20).

The letter confirms the split in the Sénégas family, for Saint-Pierre begged his «dear» sister-in-law «to forget all that has passed between us, and I make the same plea to my brother, your husband». His elder brother, Jean-Louis, was in Paris at the time of the murder, presumably lobbying on behalf of the peace deal and, although he was arrested under suspicion of complicity, he was subsequently
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released. The logic of peace was strengthened by the deaths of two of the main protagonists on either side, a symmetry which preserved the equilibrium between the two feuding families. In any case, the new vicomte de Trelans, Jean-Luc, had other fish to fry; in pursuit of his claim to the château of Lafox in the Agenais he installed a garrison of 25-30 men, which occasioned another «endless lawsuit» (Marboutin, 1910: 304). Moreover, the agents of the crown had no intention of repeating the mistakes of the past and using punitive measures that might prove counter-productive. The peace-making activities of the prince de Conti, governor of Languedoc, who held twice weekly arbitration audiences in the 1660s, were widely known and celebrated as model to be imitated (Carroll, 2003: 96).

The 1678 accord, which encompassed the kin, tenants and vassals of each faction, was the work of three arbiters – Jacques de Loubens comte de Verdalle, Jacques de Châteauverdun seigneur de Belvèze and André de Retz seigneur de Bressolles – who interviewed both parties and inspected written depositions.

The haggling centred mainly on the amount of reparations that were due to Sénégas from his tenants for the destruction of his property and the loss of revenue since 1664. He demanded 3,400 livres plus interest and damages. The peasants countered that these were void and demanded the return, among others things, of a hundredweight of Roquefort cheese. They demanded the reinstatement of Sénégas’s non-noble fiefs onto the tax rolls. This was a region of the taille réelle, where the tax was owed on property and did not depend on social status. While this is usually considered to be a fairer way of apportioning the taille, it was clearly open to abuse. Their complaint is redolent of long-standing peasant grievances, and royal ministers and intendants were well aware of the deleterious effects of the erosion of communal rights on royal revenues. Royal bureaucracy had a vested interest in supporting peasant attempts to erode the power of the seigneur (Root, 1987).

The peasants also required that Sénégas meet the obligations of the lordship of Plaisance to provide annually for the poor and to support a preacher in the local church. To what extent this supports the confessional as opposed to economic underpinnings of the dispute is difficult to say. Louis XIV’s hostility to Protestantism undoubtedly improved the villagers’ case and they were careful to deploy the rhetoric of confessional difference when appealing to the Chambre de Justice. This underlines how the policy of harassment and violence towards Protestants, which culminated in the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, might be exploited locally. But overall the evidence does not support such an interpretation. The peasants were divided – Sénégas had supporters among them – but there is no evidence that this was along confessional lines. The complaint against the ‘Religionaires’ in 1664 was made at the behest of Trelans, following the trashing of his château. The 1674 murder investigation made no mention of religion and the fact the Sénégas’s had the support of the rector of Miolles and the curé of Curvalle reinforces the view that confessional identity was a secondary factor in factional allegiance. The spectre of heresy was raised in 1664 for tactical reasons, but otherwise the peasants were more concerned to assert their ancient right of provision for alms and a preacher. That said, there is no doubt that the Sénégas felt pressured by the climate of hostility into concessions. In 1669 they had come to an agreement when an enterprising priest from Toulouse found a pious bequest in the archives and sued for 5,000 livres in arrears and interest (Guerny, 2007: 36). The bequest had remained unpaid since the destruction of the church at Sénégas by the Protestants in 1568. The priest settled out of court for an annual pension of 200 livres.

The 1678 accord was a far from comprehensive settlement. It settled the dispute between Sénégas and the village of Plaisance; they agreed to pay him 3,000 livres and return his property and, in turn, were given control over the pious bequests. Trelans relinquished a meadow, fields and a castletet (châteauret). Although the rights and property of the commune had been settled, the comte de Verdalle was left to arbitrate the many suits between individuals. In addition, neither side renounced its right to pursue the murderers of their respective kin, nor did any of the parties drop their pursuit for civil damages. This indicates that the 1678 accord was only a part of the process and that a comprehensive settlement would require further negotiation, pressure and persuasion from the mediators. The settlement of
the murders was, in many respects, probably the most straightforward element of this. Pardons were ubiquitous and for felons of high social status registration was largely a formality once the victim’s family had been satisfied. If this were the case, the Trelans had already been effectively satisfied by revenge, and what remained was the wrangling over civil reparations, costs and legal fees, which could be significant (Carroll, 2005).

The word used to describe the settlement was «une rémission». This was a term synonymous with pardon letters, which through the bestowal of royal grace obliged the victim’s family to forgive the offender. But the tenor of the document in question is different: «Les amis communs desd[ites] parties les auroient oblige a remetre tous les differens» 11. In some parts of Italy formal distinction was made between paci (peace pacts) and rinunce, a strictly legal term which referred to the cessation of lawsuits (Niccoli, 2007). The 1678 accord seems to be similar to the latter. The 1678 remission was not an act redolent of the Christian obligation to renounce enmity, but rather it arranged for the mutual abandonment of some of lawsuits.

I have argued in this paper that the study of the feud offers a wider purview on the early modern Midi: it reveals the long-term effects of civil war, a phenomenon that we are more aware of today than twenty years ago; the continuing importance of peasants as participants in rural politics; the Janus-faced nature of the law, which embroiled litigants in seemingly endless disputes because of contradictory judgements in competing courts; the logic of peace brought about by financial exhaustion, the pressure of mediators and a monarchy keen to repair social relations and avoid the dislocations caused by the policies of the Cardinal Ministers. What of Sénégas’s violation of sacred space? I would argue that this was less significant than we might assume even in the febrile religious atmosphere of the 1670s. Violence in churches was more frequent in early modern France than commonly supposed, because they were often at the heart of political and social conflicts, particularly in rural areas. In these disputes, the concern over the violation of sacred space was usually secondary to matters of honour and, since the crimes were in most circumstances justifiable, rarely subject to the full force of the law. The phenomenon of assassinations in churches has been explored by Italian historians since Burckhardt. «So well was the tyrant guarded, he noted, that it was almost impossible to lay hands upon him elsewhere than at solemn religious services; and on no other occasion was the whole family to be found assembled together» (Burckhardt, 1990: 54). This describes well the motivation of François de Saint-Pierre in 1674; he was getting rid of a tyrant. But there remains more work to be done. The killings of Trelans and Saint-Pierre went beyond the normal boundaries of vindicatory violence (Carroll, 2006: chapter 7). In particular, the burning of Saint-Pierre brings to mind the rites of sixteenth-century religious violence in which the corpses of heretics were desecrated and then scourged by fire (Davis, 1975: 163).

In the aftermath, the remaining Sénégas brothers were once again divided: in 1685 two, Balthazar and Auguste, chose exile and service in foreign armies against Louis XIV, while Jean-Louis converted to Catholicism and received a pension from the king (Guerny, 2007: 27). Whether this was a deliberate strategy or indicative of the divisions that already apparent in 1674 is moot. The feud was over, but feuds, although tempered by a more judicious and vigilant bureaucracy, continued in the region. The removal of Protestantism did not spell the immediate end to the problem. Pew disputes, one of the most common causes of conflict among French elites, were symptomatic of this. As a member of the Sénégas kin network, Jean Guirard de Montarnal (1643-1710) was a signatory of the 1678 accord. Problems occurred, however, when he converted to Catholicism in 1687 and found that another family was occupying the family pew in the church on his domain at Sénérgues. Guirard was not a man to be trifled with – he too had once been outlawed by the Grand Jours – and backed up his claims with force. His sons continued the feud until 1727, when the abbot of Conques made peace. Relevant here is that, although there were numerous affrays and skirmishes, no one was killed, suggesting that the disputants had learned from their experience and adapted to the new political realities of absolutism (Gras, 1998).
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Comme soit ainsin et aye esté dit par les parties souscriptes qu’a causes des contestations d’entre feu Messire charles de durand et de bonne baron de senegas et les tailhables de la communauté de curvalle au diocese d’alby pour raison de Remboursement des sommes que ledit sieur de senegas pretendoit avoir fournies et advances pour ladite Communauté tant pour le rachapt du domaine du Roy Engagé par sa majesté en faveur de Monseigneur Louis de manelphe chanoine en leseglise cathedrale d’alby en lannnee mil six cens trente neuf, que pour divers frais et despens exposés par ledit sieur de senegas a leffect dudit Rachapt. Il seroit ar-
rive plusieurs rencontres entre ledit sieur de senegas, dame Marie de montcalm son espouse et messieurs leurs enfans dune part, et feu messire francois de nogaret viscomte de trelans, Messires Jean Luc et autre francois de nogaret ses enfans et autres qui autodit donné lieu a plusieurs accusations et procedures criminelles res-
pectives en diverses cours et soubz le nom de diverses personnes tierces et autres sur lesquelles il estoit pretendeu qu’il estoit intervene divers arretz par defaut en la cour des aydes de Montpellier, chambre de ledit de languedoc, parlement de tho-
lose et autres mesmes aud[it] parlement de tholose a la requeste de monsieurs[leurs] le procureur general et autres. Soubz pretexte duquel arrest que led[it] s[ieu]r de se-
egnias pretendoit avoir fait casser en la chambre de ledit, il auroit este execute sur
les cabans a la requeste d’anthoine poulhé par l[e]xploit du vingtseptieme[me] avril mil six cens soixante un. De laquelle execution led[it] sieur de senegas la prenant
pour une voye de fait de la part dudit sieur de trelans en ayant aporte sa plainte
en lad[it] chambre de ledit et auroit obtenu trois arretz du vingt huitieme[me] avril, sixiemes[me] juillet et unzie[me] mai aud[it] an mil six cens soixante un. Par les-
quels led s[eigneu]r de trelans, francois colan, (p. 2) sindic de lad[it] comm[unauté]
and autres auoiront esté condamnés a la restitu[ut]ion desd[ites] bestieauz avec des-
pense et espices. En consequence dequoy led[it] s[eigneu]r auroit poursuivy decr
execute le dernier juillet mil six cens soixante trois sur la maison et seigneurie de
la bastide apartenant aud[it] s[eigneu]r de trelans et en auroit jouy pendant lespace
de neuf mois. Mais led[it] sieur de trelans prenant lad[it] mise de possession pour
une violence et voye de fait, et pretendant led s[ieu]r de senegas, lad[ite] dame de
montcalm et messieurs leurs enfans luy avoir enlepvé soubz pretext de lexecu-
tion dudit arrest tous les meubles, grains, vaisselle, bestiaux titres et documents
qu’il avoit dans led[it] chateau de la bastide et ses metheries, se seroit randu plain-
tif en lad[it] cour de parlement de tholose. Et par arrest du vingtseptieme aoust mil six cens soixante trois auroit obtenu la recreance de sad[ite] meubles, cabans, et papiers. Et parceque toutes les instances d’entre led[it] syndic et autres
tailhables dud[it] Curvalle auroit esté renvoyées en la Chambre de Justice, lad[it]
Chambre ayant decreté prinse de corps contre led s[ieu]r de senegas. Estant arres-
té prisonier il seroit pourveu au Conseil par deux arretz du troisieme[me] octobre mil six cens soixante deux et vingtieme[me] fevrier mil six cens soixante trois soub le
nom de gautran et meliere et fait renvoyeur led[ites] instances en lad[ite] Chambre
de ledit. A suite dequoy led. syndic desiroit pourveu de nouveau contre led. arretz
et par autres du treizieme[me] fevrier mil six cens soixante quatre auroit fait renvo-
yer en lad. Chambre de Justice toutes Instances criminales faites contre led. s[ieu]r de
senegas, et autres au nom dudit. syndic et au[tres] pour estre procedé. Tout ainsin
qu’il est peut estre fait avant led. arretz des troisieme[me] octobre mil six cens soixante
deux, et vingtieme[me] fevrier mil six cens soixante trois, et tous autres arretz du
Conseil et (p. 3) autres que led. s[ieu]r de senegas auroit fait rendre en lad. chambre de ledit, tant a son nom que au nom de lad. dame de montcalm, marge-
ritie quatrain, anne meliere, yzac vieu, pierre bonnet, jean bermond, jean, sentoul,
georges fabre, gilles Carrie, martel Bethelies et au[tres]portant divers condamna-
tions a mort par defautz contre led s[ieu]r de trelans ses enfans et plusieurs habi-
tans de plaisance et curvalle. Et cependant que led s[ieu]r de trelans seroient reinte-
gré de son chateau de la bastide en consequence dequoy led s[ieu]r de trelans
auroit poursuivi autre arrest en lad. Chambre de Justice du septie[me] mil six cens
soixante quatre, ordonnant que led sr. de trelans seroit reintegré de ses meubles, et
papiers et ensuite lad. Chambre auroit de nouveau decré de prinse de corps contre
lad. dame de senegas lesd. sieur ses enfans et autres leurs consortz. Et comme les
sieurs de resseguyer et dupuy procureurs du Roy au presidial de Villefranche pour leur faire le procès, et postérieurement le sr. de la griffoul siege de la guyole, et lesd. sieur de Resseguyer et dupuy sestants transportes au plaisance pour cest effet a la requete de francois blanc sr. de lafargues syndic dud curvalle. Ayant procede a la description et sequestration des biens de lad. dame et ses enfans le cinquieme Juin aud an mil six cens soixante quatre II auroir este fait plusieurs informations a la requete de demoiselle Catherine de giuradu mere dud. sr. de senegas accusant lesd. srs de trelans, le sr. de Resseguyer, led. sr dupuy at autres d’avoir enlevé de la maison de plaisance apartenant aud. srs de senegas une tapisserie et plusieurs autres meubles. Et led sr. de la griffoul ayant rendu sentence le neufvieme avril mil six cens soixante cinq portant condemnation a mort contre lad. dame et les sieurs ses enfans at autres en nombre de quatre vingt ou cent. Le proces auroir est renvoye en la cour des granz jours dauvernhe, ou seroit intervenu (p. 4) arrest le septieme Janvier mil six cens soixante six par lequel entre autres choses led. feu sieur de senegas feut condamné au Banissement perpetual hors du Royaume avec confiscation de ses biens et vingt mil livres damandes envers le roy, et ordonne que le chateau du fort situe en la ville de plaisance, la tour de Curvalle et toutes les fortifications des maison apartenantes aud. sieur seront demolish et razees. Et que lad sentence de la griffoul auroir este execute selon la forme et teneur contre lad. dame, les sieurs, les enfans, et autre leurs consortz. Et que les minutes des informations dont les sieurs de senegas se trouva saizy et autres par luy produit demeuroir suprimées desquelles auroir est proced par Maitre jean drouët advocate en parlement et greffier le vingt avril mil six cens soixante sept consistant en nonante septe article. En vertu duquel arrest le sieur Greffier advocate a se depute assisté du sieur du tressan prevost de Languedoc auroir proced au razement desd. Maisons, tour et fortifications, et le syndic dud Curvalle fait proceder a la saizie des biens dud feud sr. de senegas, la dame sa femme et lesd. enfans. Apres quoy lexcution du surplus dud arrest auroir est renvoyé au parlement de paris par arrest du conseil du vingtseptieme juillet mil six cens soixante huit. Et lad dame et les srs. ses enfans au roient obtenu arrest le quinzieme may mil six cens soixante neuf avec monsieur le procureur general renvoyant toutes leurs accusations par devant le plus antien de messieurs les conseilhers du seneschal de tholose pour leur procès estre instruict juscques a sentence diffinitive exclusivement. En execution duquel arrest lad dame, Messieurs Jean-Louis de duran de bonne son fils ayéné, ses autres enfans et la plus grande partie des autres condamnés comprins en ladite sentence de defaut sestans rendus volontairement prisoniers dans les prisons dud tholose et ledit syndic, nayant pas fait remettre les procedures ny fait venir les tesmoins confrontables, le seigneur destadins entien conseilhier dud seneschal auroir rendu une ordonnance du vingt septembre mil six cens septante portant eslargissement desd. Sieurs, provision de deux mil livres et main levee ded. saisies. Surquoy led syndic sestant pourveu aud parlement de paris feut randu arrest le quatorze novembre mil six cens septante deux qui ordonne que la sentence randue par le juge de la guyolle seroit executer comme contradictoire et encore un ordre du Roy du vingt huit du mesme mois qui ordonne lexcution dud arrest arrest et autres esnonces en icelluy. Et lesdits sieurs de senegas ayant formé opposition envers led arrest et auroir obtenu un autre le unzieme fevrier mil six cens septante trois portant commission au lieutenant criminal dengolesme pour le transporter sur les lieux pour instruire les accusations respectives des parties. Lequel a faute de remettre les procedures et faire venir les tesmons, eslargit ladite dame, ledit sieur de senegas et ses fils, or donna la main levee desdites saisies par son ordonnance du douzieme decembre mil six cens septante quatre contre lequel arrest et ordonnance led syndic se seroit pourveu fondé sur cequ’il auoii obtenu et fait signifier audit sieur lieutenant des lettres du grand seau en reglement de juges qui luy faisoient defences de passer outre, et au parlement de paris et de tholose den cognositre juscques a ce que par sa maiesté en eut esté ordonné. Et les choses estant en cest estat Monsieur de Brou lors Intendant de Guyenne ayans voulu prendre soin de faire cesser ces conflits auroir prins des consentements desd. srs de senegas et de trelans pour faire renvoyer leurs difference, circonstances et dependances pard. Monsr. Daguesseau.
Intendant de languedoc. Surquoy par arrest (p. 6) du trois aoust mil six cens septante quatre, Le Roy veu led consentement auroit renvoyé le tout pardevant led sieur d’augesseau pour juger diffinitivement et en dernier resort. Mais parce que ledit sieur de trelans dans l’intervalle desdites consentemens et arretz auroit esté assassin et tué et que led sieur de senegas estoit accuse den estre complice quoy qu’il feut a paris. Le sieur viscomte fils, en vertu dun ordre du roy obtenu sur sa plainte auroit fait arrester led. sr baron de senegas aux prisons de fort levesque et conduit en la ville de Montpellier et dudit Montpellier a tholose a la suite dudit seigneur daguesseau Intendant, lequel avec messieurs les conseillers du seneschal de tholose auroit randu jugement le quinzieme juillet mil six cens septatante cinq, qui ordonne le confrontement des tesmoins contre ledit sieur de senegas. Et cependant ordonne son eslargissement et casse la sentence du sr cormières conseiller au senechaussée de rodes du…Et parceque dans le cour des procès le sieur de st pierre frere aud sieur de senegas auroit este tué et que ledit deffunt sieur de senegas, ladit dame de montcalm, leursdits enfans, la dame de gieus espouse dudit sieur baron, ledit defunt sieur de trelans et les sieurs les enfants, ledit blanc sieur de lasfargoux, en qualité de syndic dudit curvale et les habitans dudit plaisance auroient a leur nom ou sur le nom de diverses personnes fait diverses accusations les uns contre les autres pour raison de divers pretendas meurtres, emprisonnement des personnes, enlevemens de biens at autres crimes, et obtenu divers decretz, sentences, arretz en plusieurs lieux et juridictions tant contre lesdits parties et domestiques que autres personnes. Mesme ledit defunct sieur de senegas, ladit dame son espouse, lesdits sieur ses enfans, ladite dame de gieu a lencontre desdits sieurs de trelans, les habitans dudit plaisance et curvale leurs domestiques et autres personnes tant en leur nom des sieurs de senegas, les nepveu et niece de monsieur de saint verain conseiller en la chambre, la demoiselle de turin, vincens carrie, antoine turier, andre boucard et ses enfants, pierre carcenac sa femme et enfants, pierre connac, Bareihes martis ditz duroux, fabres de trebas pere et fils, gasilhou pere et fils, derrivis sa femme et enfants, bonnet notaire et ses enfants, la demoiselle du Plessis bourlasque, girard constans, roquereau pere et fils, et le coules sa femme, la saudarede, canac, anne meliere, marguerite de gautran, valery, velon, vaussiere, les sieurs de Preges pere et fils, maitre cazaleus rectur de Mioles, maitre thomas cure de st pierre, curvalle, albergé. Jacques marc, jean carles marcovelle et autres vassueaux et domestiques desdits sieur de senegas tant en la chambre deledit de languedoc, parlement de paris et tholose que cours de monsieur le seneschal de Carcassonne, juges de castres et senegas, caban, et autres ordres, et devant nos seigneurs les Intendants de Guyenne et languedoc, et les prevost des masreschaussées. Et lesdits sieurs de trelans autre part contre ledits sieurs et dame de senagas plusieurs leurs domestiques et vassueaux, parens et amis, tant au nom desdits sieurs de trelans que soubz le nom de Monsieur molevy prebstre, massebeuf prebstre, pierre sol, andre blanc, andre sourveze, maitre guilhume yzarn prebstre et les habitans dudit plaisance au nom des conseils et procureur du roy dudit plaisance, jean gasce, du village de la caze, Maitre penchencer prebstre, michel pierre lattes. Lesdits sieurs et dame de senegas, le nomme bonnes courreulx, Bonnetz turies, pierre carenac, combescure et autres, pardevant Monsiuer du puy Juge royal de saint serin et subdelegué de monsieur de pellet lors intendant de Guynene, dauthroite du parlement de tholose et dautroite des ordres des plaisance, prevost de Languedoc, et rouergue, et presidial de Rodez. Les amis communs desd[ites] parties les auroient obligé a remettr tous les differens pour Raison de ce dessus et autres a Messieurs Jacques de loubens comte de verdale, Jacques de chateau Verdun seigneur de belbeze (p. 8) de puech calvet, et andre deres seigneur de Bressoles cheminade. En consequence de laquelle remission chacun desdites parties auroient fait representer leurs droitz auxdites sieurs arbitres concernant lesdites differens crimes verbalement et par escript et en outre se seroient fait Respectivement plusieurs autres demandes: Mesme ledit sieur de senegas aux habitans de plaisance la somme de trois mil quatre cens livres contenues en deux obligations consentis audit feu de senegas son pere avec les intheretz, la restitution des fruitz de ses biens de plaisance depuis lannee mil six cens soixante quatre iusques a present et encore les domages et intheretz pour lour avoir achevé la demolition de sa maison de plaisance, deterioré, brullé et ruiné, ces
autres maisons de plaisance et curvalle et celles de sa metherie de Verdun, ou pour larrachement des vignes qu’il avert audit plaisance, coupements d’arbres, fruitiers et autres et sauvages enlepvé dauthorité privée, les meubles et denrées des ses maisons et de celle dartuzoux et les bestiaux de ses metheries. Aquoy lesdits habitants defendoit disant que sur estant moins de ladit somme de trois mil quatre cens livres auroit esté paye celle de quartorze cens livres audit feu sieur de senegas et le surplus auroit esté rayé par arrest du conseil du quinzieme fevrier mil six cens soixante huit et demandit la cancellation desdites deux obligations et restitution des Intheretz dicelles et de plus la restitution dun quintal de fromage de Roquefort et de dix huit livres argent que ledit feu sieur de senegas auroit exigé de ladite communauté de plaisance depuis vingtneuf ans avant linstance faite pour raison de ce devant messieurs les commissaires verifications des debtes, comme aussi la restitution des biens rureaux dudit sieur de senegas situés dans la tailhable dudit plaisance depuis vingtneuf ans, une pipe vin, et six solz bled segle et trente cestiers avoine grosse d’aumosne annuelle pretendant deu aux pauvres dudit plaisance annuellement pour le feu sieur de senegas comme bien tenant de feu noble Raymond de navas son auteur et les arrerages auu de la somme de trente livres, lesdits sieur des senegas nyant quil nest heritier ny bien tenant dudit Ray mond de navas, et alesgard des tailles que les biens fons par luy possedéz au thai lhabale dudit plaisance plusieurs sont nobles et exemptz de taille et pour ce qui est du homage et dix huit livres argent que led feu sieur de senegas avoit acquis la justice dudit plaisance du feu sieur vicomte de panat avec lesdits droitz et pour ce qui concerna la somme de trois mil quatre cens livres qu’il est en voye de la faire restablir sauf a tenir en compte ce qui se trouvera legitime payé audit feu sieur de senegas son pere soustenant au surplus que ledits habitants auroit ruiné ledits maisons, vignes, bergers et bois ainsin qu’il auroit appareillé en sa maison de plaisance depuis vingtneuf ans avant ladite instance jusques en lannee mil six cens soixante quatre en encore les arrerages (p. 9), de trente cestiers segle et trente cestiers avoine grosse d’aumosne annuelle pretendant deu aux pauvres dudit plaisance annuellement pour le feu sieur de senegas comme bien tenant de feu noble Raymond de navas son auteur et les arrerages aussy de la somme de trente livres.
entendent qu'il nen soit fait aucune poursuite directement ny indirectement ce. Ce faisant ont consantz le consentez aux relaxes respectif de tours lesdites decretés accusés et condamnés de part et dautre pour lesquelles accusés aui seront pursuivis chacun a ses coups et despens sans Esperance de repition, ils donnent dors et desja donneront tous les consentez requis et necessaires et toutes procurations en toutes les cours ou besoin sera se despartant lesdites partie de toutes plaints, informations, arretz et condamnations par eux obtenir les uns contre les autres exprimés (p. 11) ou non exprimés en la narrative de la presente transaction consentant que le tout demeure nul et pour non advenu. En second lieu a esté convenu et acordâ que lesdits seigneurs de senegas tout de leur chef que qu'en la qualité qu'ils precedent renoncent a toutes les demandes qu'ils se font pour nengue demande directement ny indirectement. En troisieme lieu a est convenu et acordé que moyennant la somme de trois mil livres que ledits sieurs de la catussié et pujol en ladit qualite de procureurs desdits blanc sindic et habitants de plaisance obligent de payer dans deux ans prochains a comptes de ce jourduy avec les Interetz audit sr. de senegas. Led sieur de senegas et ladite communauté de plaisance demureront respectivement quittes des demandes qu'elles faisoient les uns aux autres exprimés en la narrative de la presente transaction saf et excepté les sommes que les particuliers habitants dudit plaisance peuvent devoir audit sieur de senegas par de Contractz, obligations, arrerages, directe droitz et devoirs seigneuraux depuis vingt neuf ans. En quatrieme lieu a esté convenu que les jouissances que led sieur des senegas a audit lieu de plaisance du pré situé a Curvalle dit alalande et maurel faites depuis dix ans luy seront rendus par ceux qui ont jouy desdits biens et prins les fruitz sans titre legitime sans prejudice auxdites particuliers habitants dudit plaisance des demandes qu'ils ont a faire audit sieur de senegas et sans prejudice aussy de la pretension que led sieur de senegas et lesdits habitants de plaisance ont lun contre lautre, tant pour le regart du capital de la somme de trois mil quatre cens livres contenue aux deux obligations consenties en faveur dudit feu sieur de senegas sous le nom de noel et autres que la demande que lesdits habitants font audit sieur de senegas pour le bien fons qu'il possede audit plaisance. Toutes lesualles demandes cy dessus exprimés et non reglés lesdites parties ont remises et remetent au dire et au jugement dudit seigneur comte de verdalle pour les juger et regler en seul ou les faire juger sur les lieux a tells personne qui bon luy semblera. En cinquiesme lieu a esté convenu et acordé nonobstant la clause generalle cy dessus aposée que pour ce que consentez les demandes desdits habitants en consequence des fondations faites par feu Raymond de Navas lesdits habitants agiront comme bon leur semblera pour la rente obituaire et arrerages sur les biens dudit navas. En sixieme lieu il a esté convenu et accordé, nonobstant lesdites clauses generalles, que lesdits sieurs de trelans se reservent de pouvoir poursuivre la reparaison du meurtre dudit feu sieur de trelans leur pere contre les meurtriers et complices, et respectivement ledit (p. 12) sr. de senegas se reserve aussy de poursuivre la reparaison du meurtre dudit sieur saint pierre son frere contre les meurteres et complices, nentendant lesdites parties se prejudicier en maniere quelconque pour ce regard comme aussy se reservent lesdits srs. de senegas et de trelans comme a chacun les conserve les somme que la communauté de curvalle leur peut devoir. A quoy nentendant se prejudicier par le present acte, ny ledit sr. de senegas aprouver ledit arrest des grandz jours d’auvernhe, contre lequel il pretend au contraire se pouvoir par les voyes de droit et comme son conseil trouvera a propos. Ce que lesdites srs. de trelans et procureurs desdits habitants de plaisance et dudit blanc nentendant empescher conservant les condamnations criminelles continues contre ledit sr. de senegas, ses freres et autres se reservant neanmoins leurs exceptions pour ce qui regarde les condamnations civiles. Et led sr. de senegas se reserve aussy les affaires civiles qu’il a contre dudit blanc. Et icelluy blanc ou ledit pujol son procureur ses exceptions au contraire. Icy a este convenu et arresté que le pred, terre et chasteaurette de mousse vigne situé au vigneoble de la bastide dependant de la metherie del puech et le phief del bousquet apartiendront et demeureront en proprieté audit sieur de senegas et lesdits srs. de trelans deschargé de la restitution des fruitz quils en ont prins. Et pour lobservastion de tout ce dessus lesdites parties ont obliges tous et chacuns leurs biens, presens et
advenir soubmis aux Rigueur de Justice et lesdites sieurs de la catussie et pujol procureurs, ceux desdits blanc et habitans de plaisance en vertu desdits procurations fait et pases dans le logis du grand soleil ou loge ledit seigneur comte de verdalle ez presence de Maitre anthoine de miau procureur audit parlement de tholose, et le sieur Louis vareilhes du reclot habitant du fort de la fenasse diocese de Castres signes a la cede avec ledites parties et lesdits seigneurs arbitres assistans, et moy Mathieu campañaac notarie royal dudit tholose requise sobzne campañaac notaire ainsin signe.