The History of the Ancient Vallenses and Albigenses

By George Stanley Faber

This e-book has been republished electronically by Tom Adams for “A Sweet Savor” web-site. It is being distributed free of charge for the edification of those that are of like precious faith. My hope is that it will prove a blessing to you as much as it has been to me!

Tom Adams

www.asweetsavor.info

AN INQUIRY INTO

THE HISTORY AND THEOLOGY

OF THE

ANCIENT VALLENSES AND ALBIGENSES;

AS EXHIBITING, AGREEABLY TO THE PROMISES,
THE PERPETUITY OF THE SINCERE
CHURCH OF CHRIST.

BY
GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B. D.
MASTER OF SHERBURN HOSPITAL
AND
PREBENDARY OF SALISBURY.

"Thou art Peter: and upon this Rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matthew 16:18.
"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matthew 28:19, 20

TO THE MOST REVEREND THE LORD PRIMATE,

And The Right Reverend And Reverend

THE BISHOPS AND CLERGY OF IRELAND,

THIS WORK,

Treating Of The Divinely Appointed Office And The Fully
Corresponding Character Of The Two Ancient And
Long Suffering Churches Of The

VALLENSES AND ALBIGENSES,

Is, With Every Sentiment Of Respect And Admiration, Fitly Inscribed,
BY THEIR SERVANT IN CHRIST,

THE AUTHOR..

Table of Contents

PREFACE....8
BOOK 1....17
INTRODUCTORY MATTER....17
CHAPTER 1....17
THE NATURE AND AMOUNT OF CHRIST'S PROMISES OF AN ECCLESIASTICAL PERPETUITY AND PURITY....17
CHAPTER 2....21
THE POSITION, RESPECTIVELY, OF THE ROMANIST AND OF THE REFORMED, AS PRODUCED BY THE TENOR OF CHRIST'S PROMISES....21
BOOK 2....24
THE ALBIGENSES....24
CHAPTER 1....24
THE PAULICIANS OF ARMENIA....24
CHAPTER 2....31
THE ALBIGENSES OF SOUTHERN FRANCE....31
CHAPTER 3....40
THE GROUNDS OF THE ALLEGATION OF MANICHEISM AGAINST THE PAULICIANS AND THE ALBIGENSES....40
CHAPTER 4....45
THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION OF MANICHEISM AGAINST THE ALBIGENSES, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE CASE OF THE CANONS OF ORLEANS....45
CHAPTER 5....52
THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE HISTORY OF BERENGER....52
CHAPTER 6....54
THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE CASE OF PETER DE BRUIS AND HENRY....54
CHAPTER 7....60
THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATIONI DEMONSTRATED FROM THE STATEMENT OF BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX....60
CHAPTER 8....63
THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION DEMONSTRATED FROM THE STATEMENT OF WILLIAM OF NEWBURY....63
CHAPTER 9....68
THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE CASE OF THE ALBIGENSES AT LOMBERS....68
CHAPTER 10....75
THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE CONFESSIONS OF THE ALBIGENSES....75
CHAPTER 11....77
THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF HISTORY....77

CHAPTER 12....79
THE ALBIGENSES DID NOT APPEAR IN FRANCE UNTIL AFTER THE CLOSE OF THE TENTH CENTURY....79
BOOK 3....82
THE VALLENSES....82
CHAPTER 1....82
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF THE TESTIMONY OF REINERIUS RESPECTING THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES, WITH REMARKS ON THEIR DIALECT AND THEIR OWN CONCURRING TRADITIONS....82
CHAPTER 2....88
THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHEWN FROM THE TESTIMONY OF JEROME....88
CHAPTER 3....91
THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHEWN FROM THE TESTIMONY RECORDED BY PILICHDORF....91
CHAPTER 4....93
THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHEWN FROM THE HISTORY OF CLAUDE OF TURIN....93
CHAPTER 5....98
THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHEWN FROM THE LANGUAGE OF ATTO OF VERCELLI....98
CHAPTER 6....102
THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHOWN FROM THE LANGUAGE OF PETER DAMIAN....102
CHAPTER 7....103
THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHEWN FROM THE LANGUAGE OF RODOLPH OF ST. TRUDON....103
CHAPTER 8....105
THE RISE OF THE FRENCH VALDENSES IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY....105
CHAPTER 9....107
THE THEOLOGY OF THE VALLENSES DURING THE PERIOD OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY....107
CHAPTER 10....118
THE THEOLOGY OF THE VALLENSES DURING THE PERIOD OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY....118
CHAPTER 11....120
THE THEOLOGY OF THE VALLENSES AT AND IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE TIME OF THE REFORMATION....120
CHAPTER 12....126
RESPECTING THE POOR MEN OF LYONS OR THE MISSIONARY VALDENSES OF FRANCE....126
BOOK 4....137
SUPPLEMENTAL MATTER....137
CHAPTER 1....137
RESPECTING THE ANCIENT INTERCOURSE AND FINAL GEOGRAPHICALLY ECCLESIASTICAL JUNCTION OF THE ALBIGENSES AND THE VALLENSES....137

CHAPTER 2....145
RESPECTING THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE SCRIPTURAL PROMISES OF PERPETUITY TO A SINCERE CHURCH, IN THE CASE OF THE TWO ANCIENT CHURCHES OF THE VALLENSES AND THE ALBIGENSES....145
CHAPTER 3....152
RESPECTING THE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY OF THE VALLENSES AND THE ALBIGENSES....152
CHAPTER 4....156
RESPECTING THE OCCASIONAL DISCREPANCE OF THE CHURCHES OF THE VALLENSES AND THE ALBIGENSES FROM THE CHURCHES OF THE REFORMATION....156
CHAPTER 5....162
CONCLUSION....162
FOOTNOTES:....164
PREFACE....164
BOOK 1....169
CHAPTER 1....169
CHAPTER 2....172
BOOK 2....175
CHAPTER 1....175
CHAPTER 2....181
CHAPTER 3....190
CHAPTER 4....194
CHAPTER 5....200
CHAPTER 6....202
CHAPTER 7....207
CHAPTER 8....210
CHAPTER 9....213
CHAPTER 10....217
CHAPTER 11....219
CHAPTER 12....220
BOOK 3....223
CHAPTER 1....223
CHAPTER 2....226
CHAPTER 3....227
CHAPTER 4....228
CHAPTER 5....233
CHAPTER 6....235
CHAPTER 7....237
CHAPTER 8....237
CHAPTER 9....240
CHAPTER 10....249
CHAPTER 11....251
CHAPTER 12....257
BOOK 4....267
CHAPTER 1....267

CHAPTER 2.....274
CHAPTER 3.....276
CHAPTER 4.....281
CHAPTER 5.....282

PREFACE

THE Bishop of Meaux, the very able and acute Bossuet, has constructed an ingenious argument from the Prophetic Promises of Christ, which is for ever to establish the Roman Church and the Churches in communion with her as the sole visible Church Catholic, while it is for ever to exclude the Protestant Churches from all share and participation of that venerable title. His argument cannot be given with more of fairness and propriety than in his own words.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH SUBSISTS IN FOUR POINTS: THE CONNECTION OF WHICH IS INVIOLABLE.

> The first point is: that The Church is visible.
>
> The second point is: that It always exists.
>
> The third point is: that The truth of the Gospel is there always professed by the whole Society.
>
> The fourth point is: that It is not permitted to depart from its doctrine; or, in other terms, that It is infallible.

The first point is founded upon the constant fact: that The term CHURCH, in Scripture and thence in the common language of the Faithful, always signifies A VISIBLE SOCIETY.--

The second point, that, The Church always exists, is no less certain: because it is founded on the Promises of Jesus Christ, respecting which all parties are agreed.

Hence we clearly must infer the third point, that The truth is always professed by the Society of the Church for the Church being only visible in the profession of the truth, it follows; that If it always exists, and if it is always visible, it cannot possibly do otherwise than always teach and profess the truth of the Gospel.

Whence, with equal clearness, will follow the fourth point: that We cannot be permitted to say, that The Church is in error, or that It has departed from its doctrine.

And all this is founded upon the Promise, which is confessed among all parties. For the same Promise which causes that, The Church should always exist, causes likewise that It should always be in the state imported by the term CHURCH: and, consequently, it causes also, that The Church should always be visible, and should always teach the truth. Nothing can be more simple and more clear and more consecutive than this doctrine. This doctrine is so clear, that the Protestants cannot deny it: and it imports their condemnation so clearly, that they have also not been able to acknowledge it. Therefore it is, that they have thought of nothing, save to throw it into confusion. [1]

To what particular Promise or Promises of Christ the Bishop alludes, he does not distinctly specify: but I conclude that he can only refer to the two following texts.

> Thou art Peter: and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. (Matthew 16:18.)

> Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you. And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen. [2]

Such is the celebrated argument of Bossuet: and such, If I mistake not, are the promises, upon which it claims to be founded. [3]

I. Now, with these promises before us, it seems only reasonable to inquire: How far the Roman Church, — the term being used to denote collectively both the Diocesan Church of Rome and all the various National Churches or Fragments of Churches in communion with her, — can be viewed as answering to their descriptive requisitions.

As the promises are two in number, so are they two-fold in nature. Whatever may be the precise reference of the term ROCK, the first promise clearly imports: that Christ would never cease to have a Visible Church upon earth. Consequently, the first promise is a promise of Visible Ecclesiastical Perpetuity.

The second promise declares: that Christ would always be spiritually present with his Church, through the medium of a succession of faithful Pastors from the time of the Apostles down to the end of the world. Consequently, the second promise is a promise of Ecclesiastical Purity both Doctrinal and Practical.

That the first promise is a promise of Visible Ecclesiastical Perpetuity, requires no proof: though there may be a diversity of opinion, as to the character and nature of this Perpetuity, involved in the import of the word ROCK.

And, that the second promise is a promise of Ecclesiastical Purity both Doctrinal and Practical requires almost as little proof: for though, of course, all due allowance must be made for human imperfection and sinfulness: yet, if any particular Branch of the Church Catholic shall have become palpably corrupt both in Doctrine and in Practice, we shall, on any intelligible principles, find it difficult to believe, that Christ has still never ceased to be spiritually present with such a Branch. For instance, some particular Pastor, at the head of some particular Church or some particular Ecclesiastical Communion, is clearly intended by the Man of Sin: because he is described, as sitting in the temple of God, or as presiding in a See of the Visible Church of Christ; because he is stigmatized, as the governing ringleader of a great collective apostasy from the faith; and because he is awfully exhibited to us, as being the Son of Perdition, a graphical name the very same as that which our Lord himself bestowed upon a fallen Apostle, even upon the mercenary wretch who turned away from him and who for filthy lucre’s sake betrayed him to his enemies. Now, with an Ecclesiastical Community thus characterized; a Community, whose head and instructor is said to have come after the working of Satan himself, and is thence doomed to be destroyed by the brightness of the Lord’s advent, — with such an Ecclesiastical Community, apostate under an apostate governor, to suppose that Christ has never ceased to be spiritually present, is, so far as I can perceive, a direct contradiction in terms. For, what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols. (2 Corinthians 6:14-16.) And how can Christ come to destroy in his anger that which he has incessantly preserved from all doctrinal and practical obliquity by the direct influence of his spiritual presence?

Matters having been brought to this point, we may now turn to the Bishop’s argument, which, with parental fondness, he pronounces to be so clear, that no Protestant can controvert it.

1. With all respect for the very superior talents of Bossuet, his argument, on two several grounds, I cannot but deem sophistical.

(1.) When he speaks of the Church, being always visible, and always existent, and always professing the truth of the Gospel, and always incapable of departing from sound doctrine: it is clear, from the immediate context, that he exhibits himself as speaking of the Catholic Church.

But what is it, that he would have us to understand by the Catholic Church, thus described and thus characterized? Does he mean the Entire Collective Body of those, who believe in the name of Christ and who acknowledge him as their Savior, in whatever parts of the world they may be seated?

Or does he mean that Exclusive Portion of professed believers in Christ, who are in communion with the Church of Rome, and who acknowledge the Pope as their head upon earth and as the indubitable center of ecclesiastical unity?

If the former: then we may reasonably ask; Why, in that case, he and his associates stigmatize so many members of the Church Catholic, a Church described under four several points as he describes it, by the somewhat inconsistent appellations of SCHISMATICS and HERETICS?

If the latter: then we may also reasonably ask; What proof there is, beyond their own confident assertion, that the members of the Romish Church, to the exclusion of the Churches of Constantinople and Antioch and Armenia and Egypt, not to mention the various Reformed Churches of Europe and America, ALONE constitute the Catholic Church of Christ? In putting this alternative, I speak not as entertaining any doubt, as to what the Bishop really meant by the Catholic Church. Unquestionably he would have us understand by the title that Exclusive Portion of professed believers in Christ, who are in communion with the Church of Rome, who acknowledge the Pope as their head upon earth, and who pronounce him to be the indubitable center of ecclesiastical unity. Still, however, though such is palpably the case, the sufficiently obvious remark will not therefore the less be: that, before he predicated of the Romish or Papal Church his four distinguishing points, he surely, in all fairness, ought, by something more tangible than mere confident assertion, to have satisfactorily demonstrated; both that The Romish Church EXCLUSIVELY is the Catholic Church, and that The Romish Church ALONE is the particular Church to which our Lord’s two promises are addressed.

(2.) But, instead of settling these necessary preliminaries, the Bishop shows himself equally sophistical on yet another ground. From the unvarying soundness both of her Doctrine and of her Practice, he ought, I apprehend, to have proved: that The Romish Church, exclusively of all other Churches which differ from her, is the alone Church to which our Lord’s promises are addressed; and thence all other professing Christians being either Heretics or Schismatics, or both, that The Romish Church exclusively is the Church Catholic. But, instead of adopting this obvious and satisfactory line of argument, the Bishop exactly inverts the process: and, instead of proving his Church to be the alone true Church Catholic, from the solitary unvarying soundness of her doctrine and practice; by a singular sort of Hysteron-Proteron, he would prove the solitary unvarying soundness of her doctrine

and practice, and thence her assured infallibility, from the alleged circumstance of her being the Church Catholic to the exclusion of all other Churches.

Hence, in such an unusual mode of demonstration, there is evidently this great inconvenience. The Bishop assumes the precise point which he ought to have proved; namely, The Exclusive Catholicity of the Romish Church: and then, for the purpose of confounding the whole race of Protestants, he, from this very assumption which of course his adversaries do not admit, argues; that His Church must needs be infallible, and that Her doctrine and practice cannot but be perfectly sound.

No doubt, he would seek to establish his assumption upon the very terms of the first promise, by contending: that The Rock, upon which Christ builds his perpetually existent Church, is Peter con-jointly with his alleged line of successors the Bishops of Rome.

But this is merely to build one assumption upon another assumption, to pile an ecclesiastical Ossa upon an ecclesiastical Pelion, to place (after the manner of the Hindu legend) his spiritual universe upon the horns of the bull and the bull upon the back of the tortoise and the tortoise itself upon vacuity. What PROOF has the learned Bossuet, that Peter and his alleged successors the Bishops of Rome are conjointly the Rock upon which Christ promised that he would build his Church? A man of his attainments must have known full well, that the Church of the three first centuries was profoundly ignorant of any such speculation. Some of the old writers deemed the individual Peter to be the Rock; some pronounced the Rock to be Christ himself; and some, which is the most ancient interpretation, asserted the Rock to be Peter's Confession of Christ in his two-fold character human and divine, the Messiah born a true man of the Virgin and yet the essential Son of the living God: but NONE of the writers of the three first centuries ever imagined or allowed, that the Rock is complexly Peter and his fancied successors the Bishops of Rome. The notion rests purely upon the unauthoritative speculation of a later age: and, upon that unauthoritative speculation, like the tortoise upon vacuity, rests the proof; that The Romish Church is the alone Catholic Church, and thence (as the Bishop's argument proceeds) that The Romish Church is infallible and therefore that she has invariably been sound both in doctrine and in practice.

2. Such being the true state of the case, if a Romanist wishes to work any conviction in a mind which is little influenced by the mere boldness of assumption that forms the true basis of Bossuet's inverted process, a Protestant will naturally invite him to demonstrate: that The Latin Church, from its invariable soundness both in doctrine and in practice, MUST be the Church to which Christ addressed his promises. Meanwhile, until such demonstration shall be effected (which, even in pretense, the Protestant perceives to be impossible, save through the ridiculously inadmissible medium of infallibility, the medium itself resting ultimately upon a mere unproved and unproveable assumption), the Protestant, from the gross corruption both of religious doctrine and of religious practice (corrupt doctrine, as in the case of Transubstantiation, introducing corrupt practice) which characterizes the Romish Church, infers: that Christ's second promise (the promise, to wit, that Even to the end of the world, the Lord would never cease to be spiritually present with the Church and her Pastors to whom that promise refers) can never have been accomplished in the Church of Rome.

With the Romanist, no doubt, the doctrines and concomitantly dependent practices of his Church will be no impediment to his believing: that That Church is the ALONE Church, to which the promise of Christ's Perpetual Spiritual Presence relates.

But, with the Protestant, viewing the doctrine and consequent practice of the Romish Church as he views them, the impediment is so great, that he cannot believe the Savior to have been always spiritually present with a Church thus circumstanced: and, thence, he cannot believe, that the two promises of Christ (the one, of Visible Perpetuity; the other of Spiritual Purity) should alike have been accomplished in the Church of Rome and in the several Churches in communion with her.

II. The promises of Christ, however, cannot fail. Therefore, since, in the apprehension of a Protestant at least, they have not been jointly accomplished in the Romish Church; we must seek some other Church or Churches, in which they have been jointly accomplished for, unless we can effect the object of such a search, we shall be compelled to own that the promises of Christ have failed of their accomplishment. [4]

1. Now, that all who profess the name of Christ appertain not to that Church which alone is interested in the promises of Christ, is acknowledged, or rather indeed stiffly maintained, by none more vehemently than by the Romanists themselves. Hence, of all persons, they can have no right to object, if, to the exclusion of various other professed Christians, some one particular Church is pointed out, as the depository and proprietor of Christ's promises; for, in truth, they make precisely this exclusive claim on behalf of their own Communion; contending, that the promises have not been accomplished in the great General Body of professed Christians to which collectively they systematically refuse the name of the Catholic Church, but that they have been fulfilled in their own Communion alone upon which alone they would confer the title of the Church Catholic.

Therefore, on their own avowed and cherished principles, no valid objection can lie to the bare abstract production of a single Church, which, still on their own principles, may be alleged as the true depository of Christ's promises.

In reality all parties are agreed: that Those promises have NOT been accomplished in EVERY Society which claims to itself the name of CHRISTIAN.

Whence it plainly must follow: that, IF accomplished, the promises can ONLY have been accomplished in some PARTICULAR Church or Churches, to the EXCLUSION of all other Societies which may make a profession of Christianity.

Such, therefore, confessedly on all hands, being the case, the simple question is: Whether the promises have been fulfilled in the particular Romish Church or in some other particular Church. But, as I have just hinted, the whole conduct of the Romish Church, as respects both doctrine and practice, has, through all the middle ages, been uniformly such (save only, as the dreary uniformity has been varied by regularly progressive deterioration down to the crowning Council of Trent), that the most profuse credulity must be beggared in the attempt to believe: that, With the Romish Church, through all the middle ages, and through the whole course both of her teachings and of her doings, the holy and pure and merciful Redeemer never ceased to be spiritually, and therefore approvingly, present.

Consequently, the claim of the Romish Church being thus, of plain necessity, set aside, we stand bound to produce some other Visible Church whose claim may be more satisfactory: lest, otherwise, the promises of Christ himself should seem to have failed in their accomplishment.

2. Accordingly, the Church, which I would produce, is that of the Vallenses or Valde or Vaudois.

From the apostolic age itself down to the present, that venerable Church has been seated in the Valleys of the Cottian Alps. There it has never ceased to profess one and the same unvarying Theological System, thus faithfully reflecting the sincere unadulterated Gospel of primitive Christianity: and there, both ecclesiastically and morally, the practice of its members has happily corresponded with their religious profession. This very remarkable Church forms, in the first instance, the chain of connection, between the Primitive Church and the Church of the Albigenses; for the rise of the Albigensic or Paulician Church was itself not earlier than about the middle of the seventh century: and, in the second instance, it similarly forms the chain of connection, between the Primitive Church and the Reformed Churches of the sixteenth century.

Thus, in a Visible Church, the promises of Perpetuity and Purity, as made by our blessed Savior, have been punctually fulfilled: nor, in the abstract, can any objection be made to this arrangement, which does not equally apply to the arrangement that selects the Roman Church as the depository of the Promises; for, according to neither arrangement, nor indeed according to History, have the promises been fulfilled in that whole Collective body, which indifferently distinguishes itself by the common name of Christian.

Some objections, however, have been made to the proposed arrangement, which it may be proper briefly to notice and to answer.

1. In general, the Romanists object: that The Valdenses, whatever might be their antiquity, were a mere handful of sectaries, separated from the Catholic Church, and therefore out of the legitimate pale of Christian Communion.

Respecting this objection, the latter part of it is obviously founded upon a mere begging of the question: the assumption, to wit, that The Romish Church exclusively is the Catholic Church of Christ. And, as for the former part of it, namely, The paucity of the secluded Vallenses at least during many ages: so far from occasioning any difficulty, it, in truth, is an actual corroboration of the opinion. The voice of Prophecy, as interpreted by the Romanists themselves, distinctly states: that The real Catholic Church, or the Church of real Catholic Christians, should, during a certain disastrous period, be reduced within very narrow limits, and should be driven to preach the Gospel in a state of great affliction or depression; while the wide extent of the Visible Nominal Church should be occupied by a new race of usurping Gentiles, the determined enemies of the now grievously contracted Spiritual Church Catholic. (Revelation 11:1-3.)

Accordingly, the Romish Bishop Walmesley, who wrote under the fictitious name of Pastorini, very rightly, in the abstract, thus understands the sacred oracle of the treading down of the Holy City. The Churches consecrated to the true service of God, are, at this time, so far diminished in number, or so little flied on account of the general apostasy and degeneracy of mankind, that all these Churches are here represented by St. John as reduced into one single Church or temple. The faithful ministers of God are also become so few, as to be represented as officiating at one altar in this Church: and all the good and zealous Christians make up so small a number with respect to the whole bulk of mankind, that they are shown to St. John, as collected in this one temple paying their adoration to God. There is, therefore, given to St. John a reed or a small measuring rod, as sufficient for the few inconsiderable measures he has to take: and he is told to measure the temple of God and the altar and them that adore therein, that the small size of both temple and altar may appear, and the little compass in which are comprised those

who are there adoring God. But, for the court which is without the temple, that is the great multitude of those, who, for want of the spirit of religion, enter not the temple, but stand in the court without the temple, St. John is told, not to measure them, but to cast them out or to banish them from the neighborhood of the temple, because it (the court) is given to the Gentiles. [5]

Thus, with whatever mistakes in regard to a singular sort of literal interpretation of the temple and the altar, Bishop Walmesley, very correctly in the abstract, views the oracle, as declaring, that the true Catholic Church of Christ, would, during a predicted season of calamitous depression be reduced within narrow limits, and that the great bulk of those, who made a profession of Christianity, would fall away into such a grievous apostasy that they would justly be deemed unworthy of being reckoned among the faithful followers of the Lamb. Nor was this view of the matter at all peculiar to that Prelate. A celebrated Abbot of the Cestertian Order, Joachim of Calabria, in his conversation with our own lion-hearted Richard at Messina, held, at the latter end of the twelfth century, much the same language. Certain wicked nations, called Gog and Magog, says he, shall rise up and destroy the Church of God, and shall subvert the race of Christians' and then shall be the day of judgment. But, in the time of this Antichrist, many Christians, sojourning in caverns of the earth and in the solitudes of the rocks, shall preserve the Christian Faith in the fear of the Lord, until the consummation of Antichrist. And this is meant by the saying of St. John: that the woman fled into the wilderness of Egypt, where she has a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there one thousand two hundred and sixty days. [6]

Hence, even by the showing of the Romanists themselves, it appears: that the reduction of the sincere Church within very narrow limits, and the circumstance of its true members being driven to profess the faith in mountainous deserts and solitudes, while their enemies are mighty and numerous and triumphant, afford no just ground for denying the title of The Genuine Church of Christ to the Vallenses and the Albigenses. Accordingly, their claim, to this very effect, produced no small wrath among the Pontificials; who, reprobating their opponents as manifest and inveterate heretics, put in precisely the same claim on their own behalf for the Vallenses and the Albigenses asserted themselves alone to be the real Catholic Church in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation; and they viewed the Roman Church, which they identified with the apocalyptic Harlot, as no real or sincere Church of Christ, but purely as a Synagogue of irreclaimable Malignants. [7]

(2.) A much more serious objection is preferred by Bossuet, which, if it could be substantiated, would immediately be fatal to the arrangement here proposed. He contends: that The Albigenses, and their predecessors the old Paulicians, were Manicheans; who, through a long succession of ages, handed down the impious heresy of a paganizing Orientalism; and who, therefore, cannot, without great want of prudence, be claimed by the Reformed Churches of the sixteenth century, as a branch of their theological predecessors. [8]

And he further contends: that The Waldenses, instead of being a remotely ancient Community who had ever held much the same sentiments as those which generally distinguished Protestant Orthodoxy, were, in truth, only the comparatively modern disciples of Peter Waldo who flourished between the years 1160 and 1179, or at the most cannot be deemed earlier than the time of Peter de Bruis who lived during the first quarter of the twelfth century; and, originally, differed little or nothing, in point of doctrine, from the Church of Rome, being rather a sort of Donatists, than, in absolute strictness of speech, a sect of Heretics. [9]

Now, even if he could establish the first of these two positions; namely, that The Paulicians and Albigenses were Manicheans: he would not affect my proposed arrangement itself, unless he could also

establish the second; namely, that The Valdenses were a mere modern sect, differing originally but little from the Church of Rome: for the true alleged line of Perpetuity and Purity, from the apostolic age downward, is with the Valdenses, not with the Albigenses.

But I trust, that not one of the Bishop's positions is tenable. I trust, that the Paulicians and Albigenses will be found, upon sufficient historical evidence, to have not been Manicheans: and I also trust, that, upon.16 sufficient historical evidence likewise, the Valdenses may be distinctly shown, to have tenanted their Alpine Valleys from the age of primitive persecution, and to have always held a system of doctrine and practice, the same, in all grand fundamentals and essentials, as that of the Reformed Churches of the sixteenth century.

The proof of these matters will, of course, form the main part of the following Inquiry.

III. Meanwhile, some few preliminary remarks may be found not altogether useless.

1. Usher and Mezeray and Allix, influenced (I suppose) by the conflicting evidence, valid or invalid, which lay before them, have stated: that, In the south of France, two entirely different classes of religionists, the one composed of what sound Protestants would deem pious orthodox believers, the other consisting of the relics of emigrated oriental Manicheans, were, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, from the town of Albi, alike denominated Albigenses.

The accuracy of this division I have been led to doubt: and, from the best examination of witnesses which I have been able to accomplish, I am finally induced to believe; that no more than a single class of religionists in the South of France was distinguished by the name of Albigenses; and that the perpetually self-contradicting charges of Manicheism, brought against this single class by writers of the Church of Rome, are entirely unsubstantiated and thence unworthy of the least credit. This one class, for there was only one class (whatever minor subdivisions there might be of the same class), consisted of the innocent descendants, either natural or theological, either hereditary or proselyted, of the innocent Paulicians.

Previous to the thirteenth century, though the number of associated Cathari, whom I take to have been the natural descendants of the oriental Paulicians, scarcely amounted to four thousand, they had Churches planted all the way from Thrace to Gascony and their proselytes, whom they called Believers, were a multitude, the tale of which could not be calculated. [10] What finally became of their more eastern European Churches or Communities, it is not very easy to say. Their grand Ecclesiastical Settlement was in the South of France: and, after the murderous crusade of Simon de Montfort, those, who escaped the sword or the flames, with the exception of some poor wandering individuals, were finally absorbed into and united with the ancient Church of the Vallenses.

2. As for the Vallenses or Valdenses, the religionists, properly so called, tenanted, from a most remote period, the Alpine Valleys of Piedmont: whence they obviously derived their name, which is equivalent to the English Valesmen or Dalesmen.

There was, however, a French Branch of the old Italian Tree, which, as a Branch, could claim only a comparatively modern origin. These Gallican Valdenses were the proselytes of Peter of Lyons in the twelfth century: and, as the wealthy merchant either by birth or by descent was a Vallensis; he, at once, both received himself, and communicated to his disciples, the name of Vaudois, from the primeval Mother-Church of Italy.

The circumstance, of there thus being both Italian or Proper Vaudois and French or Improper Vaudois, has led to a want of precision, in sorting, if I may so speak, the Albigenses of Southern France and the Vallenses subsequent to the time of Peter the Valdo. Hence, the Valdenses have been mistaken for Albigenses: and the Albigenses have been mistaken for Valdenses. The two, in short, have been, more or less, perpetually jumbled together.

No doubt, the confusion has arisen from the humor of later writers: who, in consequence of the name of Albigenses being finally lost in the name of Valdenses, have been led, when treating of an earlier period, to call, by the general name of Valdenses, all the dissidents from the Roman Church in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Such was the phraseology of the Jesuits Gretser and Mariana: but its incorrectness has been very justly pointed out by Bossuet, who himself accurately distinguishes the Valdenses from the Albigenses. [11] This distinction is systematically preserved throughout the whole of the present Work. Sherburn-House, May 26, 1836.

BOOK 1

INTRODUCTORY MATTER

CHAPTER 1

THE NATURE AND AMOUNT OF CHRIST'S PROMISES OF AN ECCLESIASTICAL PERPETUITY AND PURITY.

Two remarkable prophetic promises stand upon record, as having been personally made by our Blessed Savior himself: the one, before his passion; the other, after it: promises, which involve matter of very serious consideration to all the members of those various Churches which profess to have been Reformed in the sixteenth century.

I. The first of these two promises was made in the course of a conversation with his disciples relative to the opinions which were entertained of him.

> When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea-Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying: Whom do men say, that I, the Son of man, am? And they said: Some say, that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias or one of the prophets. He saith unto them: But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee: That thou art Peter: and upon this rock, I will build my Church: and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it.(Matthew 16:13-18.)

The promise before us obviously contains two distinct clauses. Of these, the first clause respects The foundation upon which Christ would build his Church: while the second clause respects The perpetuity of the Church when built.

1. With regard to the first clause, the Rock, upon which the Lord here declares that he will found his Church, is, according to the most authoritative, because the most ancient, interpretation, Peter's heaven-inspired Confession that his Master is at once the promised Messiah and the Son of the Living God. [1]

Now, in the judgment of the Primitive Church, The Son of the Living God is a phrase, which denotes the proper and essential divinity of Christ: because it exhibits the only-begotten Son of the Father, as being consubstantial with the Father, and thence as being true God from true God begotten not made. [2]

Hence the first clause of the promise imports: that Christ would found his Church upon the vital complex doctrine of his human Messiahship and his proper Divinity.

2. From the foundation of the Church thus constituted, the second clause advances to Its perpetuity in such a constitution.

Agreeably to the tenor of this second clause, Christ would not only build his Church upon a doctrine of such vital importance that it might justly be deemed its foundation; but likewise, when viewed as thus

doctrinally founded, he would effectually provide, that the gates of Hades should never prevail against it.

For a better understanding of the second clause, it will be proper to observe, that the imagery, which marks it, refers, in point of ideality, to the invisible condition of disembodied spirits previous to the reuniting day of the resurrection: while, in point of poetical machinery, it is clearly borrowed from those large excavated catacombs, which were used for the interment of the dead, and which were securely closed with ponderous doors or gates of solid stone or iron. [3]

Hence, when associated with the first clause, the plain import of the second clause will be that A condition of Sepulchral Invisibility, or a state of Utter Disappearance from off the face of the earth, shall never be the lot of the Church which Christ would build upon the complex doctrine of his human Messiahship and his proper essential Divinity. In other words, its import will be: that, To the very end of time, there shall always be in the worm a Visible Church, holding and teaching the fundamental complex doctrine of the human Messiahship and the true Divinity of its blessed Master-Builder.

II. The second of the two promises was made, either immediately before, or very shortly before, Christ's ascension to glory.

> Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the-Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you. And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen. (Matthew 28:19, 20.)

1. This second promise obviously comprehends all the provisions of the first promise: but, then, in point of spiritual superstructure upon an indispensable foundation, it advances considerably beyond it. The justice of such a remark will readily appear from the following analysis.

As the first promise laid the foundation of a Visible Church in the complex doctrine of Christ's Messiahship and Divinity; while it declared, that that Church should never disappear from off the face of the earth: so the second promise, while it similarly announces a condition or a privilege of unfailing perpetuity, harmoniously suspends an admission into the same Church upon a baptism in the name of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, which involves the doctrine of Christ's Godhead, and which in its ecclesiastical application involves also the doctrine of his Messiahship.

Thus far, therefore, the second promise, in a manner, repeats and confirms the declaration of the first promise. But here it stops not. On the contrary, it additionally sets forth: that Christ would be always with his Apostles, even unto the end of the world. Whence, since his promised perpetual presence is chronologically concurrent with the world's duration, it likewise sets forth: that Christ, even to the end of the world, would be always spiritually present, in the way of ordinary support and assistance and sanction and approbation, with the ministerial successors of the Apostles, no less than with the Apostles themselves.

Now, though a Visible Church may hold sound doctrine, respecting the person and character of Christ: it does not therefore, of necessity, follow, that it must also be sound in every other essential doctrine and in every other enjoined practice of the Gospel; so as to warrant a rationally scriptural belief, that Christ has always continued to be, with itself and its Clergy, with the taught and the teachers, spiritually and approbatively present.

For some visible Branches of the visible Church Catholic may, both in doctrine and in practice, corrupt themselves; while other visible Branches may, both doctrinally and practically, remain in-corrupt:

though all, nevertheless, continue to hold the indispensable fundamental doctrine of Christ's Godhead and Messiahship. Nay, so far as the tenor of the first promise is strictly concerned, that promise would not have failed of its accomplishment, even if the entire Visible Church should have lapsed into grievous errors both of doctrine and of practice, so long as it held the indispensable complex doctrine upon which professedly it was founded.

Hence we may perceive the immense importance and absolute necessity of the second promise. Christ declares: not only, as in the first promise, that His Church shall never disappear from off the face of the earth: but likewise that He himself WILL BE SPIRITUALLY PRESENT, with his Apostles and their ministerial successors, always, even unto the end of the world.

But, where erroneous doctrine, in vital essentials, prevails; and where a line of doctrinally dependent practice, directly opposed to Holy Scripture, is inculcated and adopted: it certainly seems, even though the fundamental tenet of Christ's Godhead and Messiahship be still soundly maintained, nothing less than a contradiction in terms to say, that Christ is there always SPIRITUALLY PRESENT.

Consequently, unless an inquirer be prepared boldly to assert, that the Visible Church, in no one of its branches, has ever lapsed into vitally erroneous doctrine and practice, we are compelled, by the stubborn necessity of historical facts, to interpret Christ's second promise partially, not universally.

By the joint consent, therefore, as we may well say, both of the Romanist and of the Reformed, the second promise can only be understood as intimating: that Christ would so be SPIRITUALLY PRESENT with his Apostles and their successors, that, always and even to the end of the world, there should never, in the worst of times, be wanting some one Visible Church or Churches, which, whatever might be the condition of other Branches of the Catholic Church, should evince that SPIRITUAL PRESENCE, by a faithful adherence to all the grand essential doctrines of Christianity, and by a due rejection of all those tenets and practices that on full evidence stand directly opposed to the teaching and temper of the Gospel. [4]

2. That such is the true explanation of the second promise, is certain: both from matter of Fact, as I have already hinted; and, likewise from the concurrent voice of prophecy.

> (1.) In regard to mere historical matter of fact, if Christ meant to intimate, that he would so be always spiritually present with his apostles and their successors as to preclude the possibility of even any one particular Church ever falling into mortal error either doctrinal or practical: then, plainly, there never could have been such a thing as an ecclesiastical lapse into heresy. But both the Romanist and the Reformed equally admit and even contend, that this circumstance has actually occurred. For the Romanist contends; that the national Churches of England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, and many others, have thus lapsed: while the Reformed contends; that such a lapse, both doctrinal and practical, is justly chargeable upon the Church of Rome and all the Churches which are in communion with her.
>
> Hence, by common consent based upon the undeniable necessity of facts, it is, on all sides, fully allowed: that The second promise can only relate to some Branch or Branches of the Universal Church, and can in no wise be extended to the entire Universal Church itself. Nor can the Romanist be permitted to draw back from this acknowledgment, on the plea: that the Catholic Church, meaning his own particular Church, never fell into error either doctrinal or practical; and that those Communities, which differ from her, are not to be

esteemed Churches. For, even if, for the sake of argument, we were to admit this absurd assumption; still the real state of the case will remain just as it was: because it cannot be denied, that the Reformed Churches, which in the estimation of a Romanist have fallen into heresy, were once in communion with the Church of Rome, and therefore once, also in the estimation of a Romanist, real Churches. Whence it clearly follows: that, on the very principles of Romanism itself, branches of the true Church may lapse; and thus may show, even practically, that Christ has not always been present with them.

(2.) In like manner, so far as the concurrent voice of prophecy is concerned, exactly the same result is brought out. It matters not, in regard to the present question: how St. Paul's prophecy of a great apostasy from sound faith, immediately associated with a sitting of some eminent apostate in the temple of God, and therefore obviously associated with error and heresy within the very pale of a Visible Church, is specifically expounded; or how the apocalyptic prediction of the two witnesses, defined to be two candlesticks, and thence of necessity representing two Churches, is actually interpreted. (2 Thessalonians 2:3, 4. Revelation 11:1-4. Compare Revelation 11:4 with Revelation 1:20.) Let the true application of these oracles be what it may, their general drift and purport are so plain, as to enforce alike the agreement of the Romanist and of the Reformed: for both parties concur in believing, that they foretell a season, when, on account of the widely spread apostasy and degeneracy of mankind (I use the words of the popish Bishop Walmesley), all Christian Churches should be reduced to a single Church, all faithful ministers of god should become so few as to officiate at one altar, and all good and zealous Christians should make up so small a number that they might well be represented as collected in only a single temple paying their adoration to god: while the great multitude of those, who, for want of the spirit of religion, enter not into the temple, stand unmeasured, as it were, in the outer court. [5]

But it is clear, that no such general apostasy either could or can occur, unless there were many apostates: and it is equally clear, that there could never be such a multitude of apostates, who yet, under their predicted head the Man of Sin, should take possession of the very temple of God or (in a manner) of almost the entire Visible Church, unless whole Churches and Districts lapsed into heresy and misbelief and impiety. Such apostate Churches, however, were once, by the very terms of the proposition, true and sincere Churches.

Yet, in the day of their apostatic heresy and impiety, whatever may be the precise nature of their too evident lapse from sound faith and from scriptural practice, they assuredly cannot be said to have enjoyed the promised perpetual presence of Christ. [6] Therefore the second promise must inevitably be interpreted with the limitations which have been specified. Its import, consequently, will be this: that, With one Branch or other of the Catholic Church, so that, either singly or severally, a succession of Witnesses to the truth may be kept up, Christ will be present always, even to the very end of the world; providentially precluding a total lapse into gross and deadly error either of faith or of practice; though not interfering to such an extent, as to produce a perfect agreement at all times in points unessential.

This incapability of falling universally into mortal error, which is promised by Christ to his Church, and which in truth of necessity enters into the very idea of a Church in the legitimate acceptation of the term, Bossuet, we may note, would transmute into perfect infallibility, vesting it exclusively in the single Church of Rome. [7]

CHAPTER 2

THE POSITION, RESPECTIVELY, OF THE ROMANIST AND OF THE REFORMED, AS PRODUCED BY THE TENOR OF CHRIST'S PROMISES

The promises of our lord to his Church place both the Romanist and the Reformed in a situation of some difficulty or at least of some delicacy: for, upon each party alike, they impose the necessity of showing, in some visible Church or Churches from the primitive ages down to the present, a perpetuity of sound doctrine and of sound dependent practice such as may warrant the belief of Christ's continual approving spiritual presence.

I. On this point, the Romanist usually displays a considerable measure of triumphant confidence.

1. His own Church, he urges, has stood forth, confessedly and notoriously, as a Visible Church, from the time of the Apostles down to the present time.

Now, to this Church was promised, specially and peculiarly, an exemption from any taint of heresy, when Christ declared that he would build his Church upon a Rock. For the rock in question, is Peter himself, in the first instance: but, in the second instance, it is Peter viewed as transmitting his high prerogative to his canonical Successors the Bishops of Rome. The Church of Rome, thus divinely constituted as the center of unity and as the standard of orthodoxy, has always sincerely professed the genuine truth of the Gospel, both in its influential faith and in its dependent practice: and, through the promised superintending agency of Christ, has never been permitted to depart from soundness, either doctrinal or practical.

Hence the very position, undeniably occupied by the Church of Rome, is in itself a direct proof: that Both her faith and her practice exhibit the real mind of the Gospel. For, if her faith and her practice be contrary to the Gospel: then the promise of Christ, made to Peter and his successors, will have failed of its accomplishment.

2. Such is the case of perpetuity, as respects soundness of faith and of practice, which is made out by the Romanist on behalf of his Church. With it, no doubt, he himself is perfectly satisfied: but, to the Reformed, it appears in no better light, than that of a mere string of inconsistencies suspended from a purely gratuitous assumption. That the Roman Church has been a Visible Church from the apostolic age to the present, is readily admitted: for, in truth, it is a simple fact of history.

But the assumption, on which is constructed the entire argument in favor of her complete purity both doctrinal and practical, I mean the wholly gratuitous assumption, that the Rock on which Christ promised to build His Church, is Peter conjointly with His successors the Bishops of Rome: this assumption is positively disallowed; because, when examined, it rests upon no evidential foundation.

We have already seen: that, according to the oldest extant interpretation of the text, I mean that of Justin Martyr, the Rock denotes Peter's confession of Christ's human Messiahship and proper Divinity. In this interpretation, he is followed by Chrysostom and Hilary: and, though Athanasius and Jerome and Augustine pronounce the Rock to be Christ himself; their exposition, proceeding on the principle that Christ is at once both true God and true Man, is still virtually the same as the more ancient exposition preserved by Justin. [1] Some of the early fathers, no doubt, such as Tertullian and Cyprian and Chrysostom himself in another passage of his writings, suppose Peter to have been intended by the Rock. [2] But absolutely not one of the most ancient ecclesiastics, by which expression I mean those

who flourished during the three first centuries, ever imagines the rock to be Peter conjointly with his Successors at Rome. Nay, (what is altogether fatal to the common Popish assumption), when, toward the end of the second century or the beginning of the third, the then Roman Bishop ventured to apply the text to himself as the successor of Peter, Tertullian plainly told him: that, in advancing such a groundless pretense, he was a palpable usurper; inasmuch as, if Peter were the Rock on which Christ would build his Church, the promise was addressed to Peter personally, and not to Peter conjointly, either with him or with any other in the line of the Apostle's alleged Successors. [3]

To argue, therefore, that the truth of the Gospel has always been professed by the whole society of the Roman Church, on the ground, that our Lord, in his address to Peter, constituted that particular Church the center of unity and the standard of orthodoxy, is plainly nothing more, than to assert its doctrinal and practical soundness on the strength of a mere gratuitous assumption.

Accordingly, the assertions of Bossuet, that The truth of the Gospel has always been professed by the whole Society of which the Roman Church claims to be the head, and that This Society has never been permitted to fall away from sound doctrine which is a virtual conferring upon it of the privilege of Infallibility; assertions which he attempts to link in what he calls an inviolable chain: these assertions are contradicted by absolute matter of fact. [4] For, in numerous instances both of faith and of practice the Roman Church, which may be characterized by its love of innovation much more fitly than by its pretended immutability, has apostatized from the Primitive Church and both the nature and the amount of this apostasy may readily be ascertained by any one, who will take the trouble to examine the yet extant works of the early ecclesiastical writers. [5]

Hence, when it is found, that the Romanists, by introducing the groundless novelty of transubstantiation, have thence, by a sort of necessary consequence, fallen into the rank idolatry of worshipping, as God, the merely symbolical creatures of bread and wine; when it is further found, that, in their addresses to the Virgin and the Saints, they have repeatedly besought them to grant gifts and graces which god alone can bestow, even turning, with blasphemous impiety, the whole book of Psalms into a series of prayers and thanksgivings to the mother of our Lord, by changing throughout, the name Jehovah into the name Mary, and the compellation Lord into the compellation Lady; when it is also found, that they have subverted the very foundation of evangelical faith, by alleging, in the way of justification, not only the meritoriousness of human works, but the possibility that frail man can assist his fellow by placing to his account an imagined surplus of supererogatory deserts: when it is found, in short, that these and many other matters, both doctrinal and practical, which might easily be named, now characterize and have long characterized the Roman Church and the Churches in communion with her; the Reformed deem it morally impossible, if there be any truth and consistency in Scripture, that Christ approvingly should have always been present with a Society, while it was thus teaching, and while it was thus practicing. Were the adoption of any such monstrous notion rendered imperative in Holy Writ; a circumstance, which would make the Bible contradict the Bible: they would be driven into inevitable infidelity.

On these perfectly intelligible grounds, they admit, indeed, the perpetuity of the Roman Church, as a visible society, professing to be Christian by that maintenance of Peter's confession without which a Church would cease to be even externally a Church: but they cannot admit its sound theological and spiritual perpetuity; because they cannot believe, unless they cease to believe the unambiguous declarations of Scripture itself, that Christ has been always present with it, sanctioning and approving, doctrines fundamentally heretical, and practices essentially idolatrous. [6]

Thus, so far as respects the tenor of Christ's second promise, they deny the perpetuity of the Roman Church, inasmuch as it has notoriously and flagrantly departed from the well recorded faith and practice of the Primitive Church: nor do they perceive, how the justice of their denial can be disproved, so long as scripture and ecclesiastical history lie open to the perusal of mankind.

II. But, while the Reformed, under this aspect, deny the perpetuity of Christ's presence with the Church of Rome, they may fairly be called upon to establish the perpetuity of a Church or Churches, which, by the maintenance of their own doctrine in all grand essentials, shall connect them with the Primitive Church, and thus show, that, in their case, neither of the two promises of Christ has failed of its accomplishment.

1. This call they answer, by the adduction of the two ancient protesting Churches of Southern France and Piedmont: the members of which, at least in comparatively modern times, have generally borne the names, respectively, of Albigenses and Vallenses: the former title being derived from the town of Albi in Languedoc, the latter from the valleys of the Cottian Alps.

Through these Churches, either severally or concurrently or unitedly, they suppose the succession of a pure Church to have been preserved: and thus, either, in this country or in that country, in this Church, or in that Church, they maintain, that Christ's promise of his perpetual spiritual presence with some one or other visible Church has been amply and exactly fulfilled.

2. But here an objection is made. According to the ingenious and acute Bossuet, the Albigenses were the theological and in a measure also the natural descendants of the Paulicians of Armenia; Manicheans themselves, sprung from an old stock of Manicheans while the Vallenses or Valdenses were a body of mere comparatively modern sectaries; who, about the year 1160 or 1170, owed alike both their name and their origin to Peter Valdo of Lyons; and who, in doctrine, differed originally but little from the Church of Rome, being, at first, a community of Donatistical Schismatics, rather than a synagogue of Heretical Speculatists. [7]

If, then, the Albigenses were Manicheans; and if the Vallenses were but a sort of modern popish schismatics' it is quite clear, on the doctrinal principles of the Reformed Churches, that their communions could not have preserved the required perpetuity of Christ's spiritual presence in some Visible Church, between the early uncorrupted ages of primitive Christianity and the later age of the great Reformation from Popery. But, if the doctrinal perpetuity of the Reformed cannot be established; then they are forthwith brought to the somewhat formidable dilemma; either that their system of faith and practice must be deemed erroneous; or else that in their case at least, whatever may be the case of the Romanists, the promise of Christ has failed to be accomplished.

Hence it must be inquired: Whether, in point of fact, there is as much reason to deny the perpetuity of a line which shall doctrinally connect the Reformed Churches with the primitive Church; as there is to deny the perpetuity of the roman Church, in regard to the promised continual presence of Christ with some one or other branch of his Church Catholic.

BOOK 2

THE ALBIGENSES

CHAPTER 1

THE PAULICIANS OF ARMENIA

FOR the purpose of exhibiting the Albigenses of Southern France in the character of hereditary Manicheans, the Bishop of Meaux has produced a considerable variety of authorities. The learned Mosheim, indeed, denies them to be, upon this point, the true sources of knowledge and, at the same time, charges the dexterous Prelate, with having, by the spirit of party, been manifestly led even into voluntary errors. But, doubtless, on a hasty survey, the authorities in question have a somewhat startling aspect. [1]

Of the more modern Albigenses of France, the ancient Paulicians of Armenia were clearly, I think, the theological ancestors. Hence the first point of inquiry must obviously be this: Whether, from the beginning, the Paulicians were a Community of sound believers, who faithfully maintained all the grand essential truths of the Gospel; or Whether, springing mainly as they did out of a Society of Manicheans, they were themselves originally Manicheans also, though afterward, having migrated into the west, they protested (if I may employ the language of Gibbon) against the tyranny of Rome, embraced the Bible as the alone authoritative rule of faith, and purified their once erroneous creed from all the visions of the Gnostic Theology.

I. About the middle of the seventh century (I take up the History of Peter Siculus), Constantine, a native of Armenia and an inhabitant of Mananalis, received from a Deacon, whom he had hospitably entertained while returning from captivity in Syria, a present of two volumes: the one, containing the four Gospels; the other, the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul. [2]

To the perusal of these sacred books, hitherto locked up from him, he diligently applied himself the perusal of them led, both to a great revolution in his own sentiments, and to the founding of a new Church on the principle of a reformation from error: proselytes rapidly gathered around him: and, from their special admiration of the great Apostle of the Gentiles (the name of whose friend Sylvanus he had assumed), rather than from an obscure and disowned individual of Samosata denominated Paul, they seem evidently, I think, to have adopted or received the title of Paulicians. [3]

1. In the holy volumes, then, which he had thus obtained, Constantine, surrounded with the growing superstition of the age, honestly sought for the genuine creed of early Christianity; and, what he learned himself from those volumes, he was eager to communicate to others.

That a diligent perusal of the hitherto unknown new testament, even under the defective form wherein our inquirer originally possessed it, should lead a person to reject the worship of the Virgin and the Saints and the Cross, and to deny the material presence of Christ in the consecrated elements of the Eucharist (for such is evidently the purport of the furious declamation of Peter Siculus): it is quite easy to conceive and to understand.[4] But the unsuspecting reader, who happens not to have particularly studied this part of ecclesiastical history, will probably be surprised to learn: that the process of reading,

with care and attention, the four Gospels in connection with the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, actually converted Constantine into a Manichean; and that the same process, universally and unanimously (so distinctly is Manicheism written in the New Testament), either confirmed or introduced, according to the nature of their previous opinions, the gnosticizing system of Manes among his variously proselyted followers!

It is true, indeed, that Constantine, deeply imbued with the discourses of Christ and with the writings of Paul, openly rejected the books of the ancient Manicheans: it is true also, that this disciple of Manes, as he is termed by Peter Siculus, discarded the theology of Manes, together with the whole theory of the thirty celestial eons and the marvelous formation of rain-water. Still, nevertheless, if we may credit the historian, nothing can be more clear and more certain, than, that, from the study of the New Testament, whence he had learned the catholic doctrines of the Trinity and of Christ's godhead and incarnation, the man rose a hardened and inveterate Manichean! [5]

Accordingly, though his ministerial success was not confined to his gnosticizing neighbors round Mananalis, it appears to have lain very eminently among them: for these, no doubt, whatever might be the ease with the converted Catholics, reasonably thought, as we gather from the veritable narrative of Peter Siculus, that the most effectual mode of preserving and improving their long cherished system was to flock round a teacher, who had avowedly rejected their books, and who had unreservedly and unceremoniously discarded Manes himself! Yet this extraordinary adhesion of the original Manicheans, all the while actually remaining Manicheans, to the new Sylvanus, who so rashly acknowledged his preference of St. Paul to the slighted and disregarded heresiarch of Persia, is not the only paradox, wherewith, in the present strange eventful history, we are destined to be encountered.

As Constantine, though the undeniable disciple of Manes, avowedly renounced Manes; while though a decidedly confirmed Manichean, he openly rejected the whole theological system of Manicheism: so, with beautiful consistency, the Manicheans, who joined themselves to him, and who in his person venerated a true apostolical follower of St. Paul, with prompt minds (I use the very words of the careful historian), spat upon and detested Scythianus and Buddha and even Manes also, who were notoriously the princes of the whole sect; while yet, like their innovating reformer Sylvanus, they remained such staunch Manicheans, that, rather than renounce the creed of Manes which however they had already renounced, and rather than express an eternally-saving penitence which however they had already expressed, these most inexplicable religionists chose impiously to die as heretics in their already rejected and detested heresy! [6]

But we have not yet come to the end of this wonder-loving narrative. Constantine, while he discarded Manicheism without ceasing to be a Manichean, furthermore, while he led a life of most exemplary godliness, diligently, on scriptural authority, inculcated all the abominations and impurities of the gnostic Basilides. Like the primitive Christians, who were similarly accused by the soberly inquiring Pagans, he had clearly learned these abominations and these impurities from an habitually diligent perusal of the New Testament: and his acquiescent proselytes, at once unremittingly studying the Blessed Gospel themselves, and warmly recommending the study of it to the Laity as well as to the Clergy, with ready conviction adopted, from the sacred volume, the moral corruptions, which their master had thence taught them both by precept and by practice! In short, most diabolically and most cunningly to boot (as Peter Siculus remarks), the Paulicians, for the better establishment of their bad principles and worse conduct, were wont to insist: that both priests and people are in duty bound to the constant perusal of the Gospel; that God wishes all to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the

truth; and that the priests of the day adulterated God's holy word, garbling and concealing and omitting a great part of its contents![7] Nevertheless (so runs the testimony of our judicious and consistent historian), although these strangest of all strange Manicheans absolutely learned nothing from their professed rule of life, the Gospels and the Epistles, save the flagitiousness of Basilides: yet they peremptorily rejected every base lust; exhibited, in their whole practice, a consistent piety; and declared themselves, while alleged by their enemies to be the vigilant guardians and the unflinching champions of the speculative dogmas of Manicheism, entirely free from all the falsely imputed abominations of the Gnostic Theology. [8]

Such were Constantine and his Paulicians. As for their historian Peter, who in the year 870, spent nine months among them at Tibrica, he is fairly graveled with the oddity of the case.[9] But he offers a solution of the difficulty; which, since in all parallel cases of this perplexing description, it is uniformly adopted by the sagacious Bishop of Meaux, must needs be both respectable and satisfactory. The solution is this: All their specious piety was mere hypocrisy; and they themselves were undoubted wolves in the decent garb of harmless sheep! [10]

2. In an age of burning zeal, it was not likely, that the affair could be suffered to rest here. The divine and orthodox emperors (as Peter speaks) had, to their other illustrious deeds, already added the meritorious process, of consigning to the flames, wherever they could be found, the books which were used by the older Manicheans, of slaughtering without mercy the culprits themselves, and of dooming to well-deserved death and confiscation all who should presume to give them harbor.[11] But now their holy activity extended also to the Paulicians; that extraordinary race of new Manicheans, who had so undeniably established their right to the title by rejecting Manes and Manicheism.

A bloody persecution was, accordingly, raised against them: and Simeon, an imperial officer, was dispatched with orders to put Constantine to death. He was charged, at the same time, to disperse his disciples, singly or in small companies, throughout the Church: that so, however obstinately determined to the contrary, they might be duly instructed, and thus finally converted to the full sincerity of well accredited Catholicism. The ringleader, with his associates, was soon taken: and a command was forthwith issued, that the Paulician apostle should be stoned to death by his own disciples. All his proselytes, however, save one, disobeyed or evaded the sanguinary decree: but, in that one, a new David was not wanting to slay a new Goliath. Among the earliest converts of Sylvanus, was the disciple Justus. This highly-privileged instrument of divine vengeance, whose name (as the historian well remarks) so happily agrees with his deeds, repenting of the Manicheism in which he had long been deeply steeped, discharged a stone at his heretical seducer, and rapidly sent him into the pit which had been dug most appropriately by himself. [12]

II. But, from the martyrdom of Constantine, as from the martyrdom of Stephen, another Paul was raised up in the late persecutor Simeon. Three years, amidst the pleasures and blandishments of a court, he resisted his convictions: but, at the end of that term, he left all that he possessed, and fled privately from Constantinople. Peter Siculus promptly sets down his unaccountable conduct, as a clear case of diabolical possession. Whatever may be the value of that ingenious conjecture, Simeon became the successor of the man, over whose martyrdom he had presided: and, in imitation of Constantine who had assumed the name of St. Paul's friend Sylvanus, the new Paulician borrowed the appellation of St. Paul's disciple Titus. [13]

Meanwhile, the apostate murderer Justus seems, upon a profession of repentance, to have been unsuspectingly readmitted into the Society: for we find him disagreeing with the now spiritual ruler

Simeon, as to the true import of a remarkable text in the Epistle to the Colossians. (Colossians.56 1:15-17.) This led to an act of what looks very like intentional treachery. In consulting the Bishop of Colonia as to the sense of the litigated passage, he gave, to that prelate, a full account both of himself and of his fellows and of the discipline of the community. The bishop communicated the confession to the emperor: and the emperor, forthwith collecting together the Manicheans (as Peter calls them), devoutly burned all, who were pertinacious in error, upon one enormous funeral-pile. [14]

A certain Paul, however, with his two sons, having, some considerable time before, retired to Episparis, had thus fortunately made his escape: and, in him, and in his son Genesius upon whom he bestowed the name of St. Paul's disciple Timothy, the indomitable impiety revived and was continued.[15] In despite of internal dissention which too often showed itself, the sect still increased and flourished: and the historian has recorded the names of Zacharias and Epaphroditus and Bahanes (if the first ought not rather to be deemed an ambitious intruder), as its principal ministers or ecclesiastical superiors.[16]

III. At length, on the death of Bahanes, the Community fell under the spiritual government of Sergius, who took the scriptural name of Tychicus. [17]

Thirty and four years, this new Prelate (himself a convert, as it might seem, from among the Catholics) labored in the paradoxical vineyard of unmanicheanised Manicheism. He supplied his people with books written by himself in the form of epistles; which, though Peter Siculus declares them to be full of what he at least deemed all pride and impiety, were held in high veneration: he incessantly acted the missionary, in the same towns and through the same regions as those which had formed the oriental theater of the great Apostle's exertions; a circumstance which led (I suppose) to the transmission of the already mentioned pastoral epistles: and he thereby, as our historian pithily observes, turned many from the orthodox faith, and made numerous converts to the devil.[18] His active life he closed by martyrdom, being cut into two pieces with an axe: a remarkable instance, according to Peter Siculus, of the just judgment of God; that he, who had divided the Church, should himself be divided, and that thus his unholy spirit should be consigned to eternal fire.[19] After the death of Sergius, the historian gives us the names of Michael and Canacares and John and Theodotus and Basil and Zosimus and Carbeas and Chrysocheris.

Under the administration of Carbeas, the Community so greatly increased in number that they migrated to a new settlement which they called Tibrica and, while Chrysocheris was their chief pastor, Peter Siculus, in the service of the Imperial Court, spent, at that place, as I have already observed, nine months among them. [20]

IV. At this time, to their originally defective new testament, which, as received by Constantine from the deacon, contained only the four gospels and the fourteen epistles of St. Paul, they had added the acts of the apostles, the catholic epistles of James and Jude, and the three Epistles of St. John' so that, with the exception of the two Epistles of St. Peter and the mysterious book of the Apocalypse, they then, in its full completeness, possessed the entire volume.

Nor did they only possess it, thus far numerically complete what is absolutely and inherently fatal to the malignant calumny of their pretended Manicheism, they possessed it likewise, as their hostile historian himself admits, free from all interpolation and erasure and corruption, in the precise words of the genuine copies used by the whole church catholic. This, I need scarcely remark to the theological student, is a matter of prime importance: and thence, in the way of testimony, it must carefully be borne in remembrance.[21]

From their readiness to add what they originally wanted, I venture to believe, that they would have been equally glad to possess the remaining books of the New Testament: though their intemperate historian declares, that They reviled the Prince of the Apostles, and the key-bearer of the courts of heaven. His very phraseology shows the true nature of what he characteristically styles their evil-affectedness toward St. Peter: the Sicilian Divine was indignant, that the supremacy of Peter and his successors should be denied by the bold heretics of Armenia. Their theological descendants in Europe obtained that Apocalypse, which their asiatic forefathers had wanted: and, in the features of the predicted Babylonian Harlot, those descendants readily traced the lineaments of the corrupt and persecuting church of the seven hills.

With respect to the Old Testament, the language of the historian inevitably imports, though he plainly meant not to convey any such idea, that they were well acquainted with it. He tells us, that they admitted it not. Now this assertion, even if it be correct, implies, of necessity, a familiar knowledge of its contents: for a person can scarcely be said actively to reject a code, with which he is altogether unacquainted. His very objurgation, indeed, distinctly, from the mere terms in which it is conveyed, demonstrates their familiarity with it: for, in his wonted exaggerating and intemperate phraseology, he tells us, that they stigmatized the ancient Hebrew prophets as robbers and vagabonds. The existence, then, of the prophets was fully known to them: and, that they, who had read in the New Testament the attestations of Christ and the evangelical writers to their true character, should speak of them as Peter Siculus describes, will probably be more than doubted by all save those who wish to believe evil of the Paulicians. [22] For my own part, as they were indisputably acquainted with the Old Testament, so I think they likewise possessed it. The admission of the one circumstance seems, by a necessary consequence, to draw after it the admission of the other circumstance.

V. It will now, in conclusion, be useful to sum up the evidence, which, in regard both to the doctrines and to the principles of the much calumniated Paulicians, may be gathered from the history of Peter Siculus.

1. When the self-destroying violence and the determined misrepresentation and the undaunted inconsistency of this writer are put aside, the real and actual amount of his unwilling testimony to their doctrinal system will be as follows. [23]

The Paulicians, though perpetually by their enemies charged with the Manichean heresy, uniformly denied the justice of the accusation; and always rejected, with strong expressions of abhorrence, both Manes and Manicheism. [24]

They held the allied doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation: but they renounced the worship of the Cross and of the Virgin and of the Saints; while they evidently disbelieved that material presence of the Lord's body and blood in the consecrated elements which finally received the name of Transubstantiation.

The God-denying speculation, which explains away the doctrine of the trinity and which asserts Christ to be a mere man, they abhorred. Their laborious teachers, such as Constantine and Simeon and Sergius, they revered, as faithful ministers of Christ, and as devout imitators of the Apostle Paul.

They were anxious to make converts; on the ground, that they proclaimed the sincere doctrines of the Gospel: while, consistently, they had ever the sacred volume in their hands; and while they always contended, that it ought not to be exclusively locked up among the Priesthood, but that it ought to be freely open to universal perusal.

Nor did they derive their scheme of doctrine from a mutilated or interpolated or corrupted New Testament. The ancient Gnostics and Marcionites and Manicheans, conscious that their own allied systems and the genuine Gospel could not subsist together, were notorious for their unprincipled erasures and adulterations. [25] To the exhibition of anything like even a moderately plausible case, such management was absolutely necessary. Gnosticism or Manicheism, however modified, could not advance a step without it. Hence, where real Manicheism existed, there also was a garbled and spurious Gospel, arranged and prepared to suit the purposes of innovating heresy. But the Paulicians confessedly used the genuine Gospel: for, though, when the historian wrote, they had not as yet been able to complete the sacred volume by the sole requisite addition of the two epistles of St. Peter and the apocalypse of St. John; still their copies of the books which they possessed were free from all corruption, and verbally corresponded with the copies used by the whole Church Catholic. Now this single circumstance alone, independently of all other evidence, is amply sufficient to demonstrate the impossibility of their pretended Manicheism. Had they been Manicheans, their copies of the New Testament would have been variously curtailed and interpolated and corrupted, in order to suit the palpable necessities of their system. But their copies were, confessedly, genuine and unadulterated. Therefore, unless universally, they were absolute fools, they could not possibly have been Manicheans.

The proof acquires additional force from yet another circumstance. They did not receive their admitted genuine Gospel unwillingly, as a document, which they disliked indeed, but which they found it impracticable with any show of decency to reject. On the contrary, they were so fully convinced both of its truth and of its vital importance to salvation, that, rather than abandon it and embrace the unscriptural superstitions of their persecutors, they readily submitted to death under its most appalling aspect and under its most painful nature.

How persons, thus characterized even by an enemy, can have been Manicheans in doctrine, certainly exceeds my own skill to explain.[26]

2. As little, moreover, am I able to explain, how they can have been Basilidians in practice. The historian's reluctant attestation to their moral and religious principles is, I think, quite decisive and altogether satisfactory.

In their conduct, they were so grave and holy and consistent, that nothing is left for their enemy, save to pronounce the whole of their specious piety mere hypocrisy.

As they openly rejected with abhorrence the doctrinal errors of Manes: so they indignantly disallowed the allegation, that they were tainted with the impurities of Basilides.

In their labor of proselytizing they were so successful, that not only converts from among the less educated Laity, but even numbers of more learned Monks and Priests, joined their Community. These became preachers of the faith which they had adopted: and the fact itself experiences no change from the characteristic assertion of the historian, that they were transmuted from sheep into wolves, and that they learned to be devourers of men. [27]

The firmness of their religious adherence to principle was marked by their frequent and ready submission to martyrdom. Hundreds of them were burned alive upon one huge funeral pile: two, out of three more eminent presidents, were severally stoned and cut in sunder with the axe: and the third, that very remarkable character Simeon or Titus, after a full deliberation of three years amidst the honors and pleasures of a court, from a persecutor became a steady convert, appeared as the successor of the very man over whose martyrdom he had presided, and finally submitted himself to the flames rather than

abandon the faith which, by a sacrifice of all his worldly goods and prospects, he had embraced. In short, such mingled violence and inconsistency and absurdity, as distinguish the writer now before us, may well make a sober inquirer pause, before he admits the Paulicians to have been a sect of Manicheans. Palpable misrepresentation runs through every page of the work of Peter Siculus: and, upon my own mind at least, its effect is precisely the reverse of that which it was intended to produce. In listening to his rabid declamation, I seem to hear some furious modern popish priest, bellowing against Luther, and childishly propounding his manifest connection with Lucifer. The school, to which these calumniators belong (for, in every age, calumny has been the regular staple of an apostate church), is, graphically no less than prophetically, exhibited by the inspired seer of the apocalypse.

> I heard a loud voice, saying, in heaven: Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him, by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony: and they loved not their lives unto the death. (Revelation 12:10, 11.)

CHAPTER 2

THE ALBIGENSES OF SOUTHERN FRANCE

WEARIED out with incessant persecution in the East, the suffering Paulicians meditated, at length, a retreat into the West.

The earliest flight of expatriated emigrants seems to have occurred in the year 755, during the reign of Constantine the son of Leo Isauricus. These fugitives were followed by others: for, shortly after the community was visited by Peter Siculus in the year 870, a considerable body of them passed over, from Asia into Thrace, whence they advanced into Bulgaria; and, if we may judge from the historian's monitory address to the Archbishop of the latter province, he appears to have known and anticipated their intention. [1]

But, in Bulgaria, as might be expected from its dependence upon the Constantinopolitan Empire, they found little rest for the soles of their feet. Some, however, notwithstanding the persecution which there again relentlessly dogged them, still remained in that district: while others, fondly hoping, I suppose, to experience greater kindness in the papal regions of Europe, migrated further westward into Germany and Italy and France. Here they were distinguished by a variety of names, such as Patarins, Publicans, Gazarians, Turlupins, Runcarians or Dungarians apparently from Hungary, and Bulgarians certainly from Bulgaria: among which, that of Cathari or Puritans seems chiefly to have predominated, until, at length, from their abounding in the neighborhood of Albi, they received the appellation, by which they are now most commonly known, of Albigenses or Albisenses or Albigeois. [2]

In accordance with their acquisition of this last name, a very large proportion of them settled in Gascony and Languedoc and Provence and Aquitaine: and their original number was swelled by the rapid addition of myriads of native converts, whom the disciples of St. Paul successfully proselyted throughout those districts of Southern France, which, long maintaining a sort of independence upon the papacy, zealously opposed the idolatrous ordinances of the second Nicene Council, and showed small inclination to adopt the wild reveries of the nascent Transubstantialists. Here, at the beginning of the eleventh century, they attracted the notice of the dominant Church: and the language of the Council of Tours which sat in the year 1163, concurring with that of Pope Innocent III in the year 1199 and with that of the Archbishop of Narbonne in the year 1213 and with that of Louis IX in the year 1228, distinctly intimates, both that they had already been long in the country, and that their doctrine had infected well nigh the entire population. [3]

But, though their chief establishment appears to have been in the South of France, they had, on the whole, in the twelfth century, no fewer than sixteen Churches loosely scattered over the country which extends from Bulgaria to Gascony. Of these, the names and locality are given, with much precision, by the Inquisitor Reinerius: and that writer, who is commonly said to have composed his Work about the year 1254, additionally remarks; that, while the entire regularly associated Community scarcely amounted to four thousand members, those more loosely connected proselytes, whom they styled Believers, were absolutely innumerable. [4]

Every calumny, which had assailed them in the East, attended them into the West: and Peter Siculus himself cannot be more violent, than the multiplicity of concurring authors adduced by Bossuet. Those authors he cites, for the purpose of showing, that they were profligate Manicheans; and thence that they cannot be safely claimed by the Reformed Churches as part of an ecclesiastical succession in which the

promises of Christ have been accomplished. But, in every point of view, there is such a mass of inconsistency in the evidence, that, if any person wishes to frame his belief upon it, he will find himself beset with difficulties and contradictions, which are more sensibly felt than they are easily surmounted.

I. The first difficulty, by which he will be encountered, may be stated in manner following.

The Albigenses are asserted to have been habitually guilty of the vilest abominations: nevertheless, as Bossnet himself is constrained to allow, while they themselves invariably repelled, with a firm denial, the charges brought against them; their very accusers admitted, that these monsters of profligacy and impiety might always be known by the peculiar strictness of their walk and conversation.

1. Most curious is the effect produced by bringing together the discordant statements in question.

(1.) Let us begin with the testimony of the universal doctor, Alan the Great. These heretics are variously styled Catharri, from the word Catha which signifies a flux; on account of their utter abandonment to dissoluteness of manners: or Cathari, as it were Casti; because they pretend to be chaste and just: or Catari, from the word Catus; because they are in the habit of kissing the hinder parts of a cat, under the form of which animal, as we are well assured, Lucifer is wont to appear to them. [5]

(2.) After Alan, let us proceed to hear Bernard of Clairvaux. It is asserted of them, that in secret they practice unutterable obscenities. – In order to hide their real baseness, they make themselves remarkable by a vow of continence. – Yet is their familiarity with women so scandalous, that no one can believe them to be chaste. [6]

(3.) We may next attend to the apostate Inquisitor Reinerius, who gives us some yet further insight into their base practices.

They make a cake of meal mixed with the blood of an infant. If the infant dies', it is deemed a martyr: if it lives, it is styled a saint. They meet together naked to pray, both men and women promiscuously. [7] Many of their believers of both sexes, scruple no more to approach their nearest relatives, than their respective wives or husbands. [8] It is their common opinion, that marriage is a mortal sin: but they think, that no person is hereafter more severely punished for adultery and incest, than for lawful matrimony. [9] Whatever sins they have committed before their making a profession of heresy, they never repent of them. This is manifest from the circumstance, that they never make restitution of what they have gained by usury or theft or rapine. Rather, indeed, they reserve it: or else they leave it to their children and grandchildren remaining in the worm, because usury, they say, is no sin. [10]

(4.) Yet, to this very same Reinerius, are we indebted for the following most graphic account of those identical Cathari, whom, immediately before, he had been busily describing as the worst and most profligate of mankind.

Heretics are known by their manners and their words. In their manners, they are composed and modest. They admit no pride of dress: holding a just mean, between the expensive and the squalid. In order that they may the better avoid lies and oaths and trickery, they dislike entering into trade; but, by the labor of their hands, they live like ordinary hired workmen. Their very teachers are mere artizans. Riches they seek not to multiply, but they are content with things necessary. They are chaste also: a virtue, in which the Leonists particularly

excel. In meat and drink they are temperate. They resort, neither to taverns, nor to dances, nor to any other vanities. From anger they carefully restrain themselves. They are always engaged, either in working, or in learning, or in teaching: and, therefore, they spend but little time in prayer. Under fictitious pretences, nevertheless, they will attend church, and offer, and confess, and communicate, and hear sermons: but this they do merely to cavil at the preacher's discourse. They may likewise be known by their precise and modest words: for they avoid all scurrility and detraction and lies and oaths and levity of speech. [11]

(5.) Much of the statement, respecting their occasional conformity, I suspect to be pure misrepresentation. Reinerius, however, goes on to give us a very curious account of the mode, in which this vile and rustic and illiterate race (as Bernard contemptuously styles them [12]) made converts even among the great ones of the earth: a mode so successful, that they are known to have proselyted, not only the Princes of the House of Toulouse with other nobles, but likewise the King of Aragon himself; proselyted them, that is to say, if we may believe the calumniators of the Albigenses, to the doctrinal follies and the practical impurities of Manicheism.

The heretics cunningly devise, how they may insinuate themselves into the familiarity of the noble and the great: and this they do in manner following. They exhibit for sale, to the lords and the ladies, rings and robes and other wares which are likely to be acceptable. When they have sold them, if asked whether they have any more goods for sale, one of these travelling peddlers will answer: I have jewels far more precious than these, which I will readily give you, if you will secure me against being betrayed to the priests. The security being pledged, the heretic then proceeds to say: it possess a brilliant gem from God himself; for, through it, man comes to the knowledge of God: and I have another, which casts out so ruddy a heat, that it forthwith kindles the love of God in the heart of the owner. In like manner proceeds he to speak of all his other metaphorical gems. Then he recites a chapter from scripture or from some part of our Lord's discourses. When he finds his auditor to be pleased, he will proceed to rehearse the twenty-third chapter of Matthew and the parallel passages in the twelfth chapter of Mark: wherein the Scribes and Pharisees are described, as sitting in the seat of Moses; and wherein a woe is denounced against those who shut up the kingdom of heaven against men, neither entering themselves, nor suffering the persons who wish it to enter. After this, the heretic draws a comparison between the state of the Roman Church and the state of the ancient Pharisees: applying, to the former, all that is said by Christ of the latter. Among the priests, he will remark, you can scarcely, find a single doctor, who is able to repeat by heart three chapters of the new testament: but, among us, you can scarcely find either a man or a woman, who knows not how to recite the whole text in the vulgar tongue. Yet, because we possess the true faith of Christ, and because we inculcate upon all our people holiness of life and soundness of doctrine: therefore do these modern Scribes and Pharisees gratuitously persecute us to the death, even as their Jewish predecessors persecuted Christ. Besides: they say and do not: but we practice all, that we teach. Moreover: they enforce the traditions of men, rather than the commandments of God: but we persuade persons only to observe the doctrine of Christ and the apostles. They impose upon their penitents heavy punishments, which they will not alleviate with so much as a single finger: but we, after the example of Christ, say to a sinner; go, and sin no more. Furthermore: we transmit souls, by death to heaven: but they send almost all souls to the infernal region of hell. [13] These matters being thus

> propounded, the heretic puts the question: judge ye, what state and what faith is the more perfect; that of our community, or that of the Church of Rome? And, when you have honestly judged, choose that which you deem the best. Thus, through their errors, is a person subverted from the catholic faith: and thus, believing and harboring and favoring and defending and for many months hiding a vagabond of this description, he learns, in his own house, the several particulars respecting their sect. [14]
>
> (6.) A similar character of the Albigenses, though remarkably intermingled with determined prejudice, is given by Bernard. If you, interrogate them respecting their faith, nothing can be more Christian: if you inquire into their conversation, nothing can be more irreprehensible; and, what they say, they confirm by their deeds. – As for what regards life and manners, they attack no one, they circumvent no one, they defraud no one. Their faces are pale with fasting: they eat not the bread of idleness; but they labor with their own hands for the support of life. Yet mark the fox. – Women leave their husbands, and husbands forsake their wives, in order to join their assemblies. Nay many even of the very Clergy and Priesthood, quitting their people and their churches, are perpetually form among them, unshorn and unshaven, herding with unlettered weavers. [15]

2. Now what are the inferences, which any reasonable and sober-minded man, well acquainted with the principles and practices of the Romish Ecclesiastics, would draw from these most curiously mottled statements? When we recollect, that, against the primitive Christians, every babbling Pagan was ready to bring charges of a nature exactly similar to those which were brought against the Albigenses; and when we note the concurrent admission, that nothing could be more exemplary than their whole conduct and conversation: we may perhaps, on our Lord's wise system of judging a tree by its fruits, find it not very easy to believe, that these hated religionists were such monsters of iniquity as their enemies would fain have us to admit. [16]

Nor is this all. As we have heard their adversaries, it seems only fair to hear themselves.

What, then, did they say to the allegations brought against them?

By the acknowledgment of Bernard, they flatly and steadily denied their truth.

Was the Abbot of Clairvaux, when he combined their admitted conduct with their admitted denials, convinced of their innocence?

Nothing of the sort. Prejudice was far too strong for plain common sense. In consequence of their denim of the atrocities laid to their charge, they were sagaciously subjected to the water-ordeal: and, when they found themselves unable to sink, they then, if we may credit the tales reported to Bernard, not merely confessed their impiety, but even gloried in it. [17] On such solid and well-authenticated grounds, the tales, to wit, of an ignorant and infuriated mob of brutal persecutors, he pronounces the whole of their specious piety to be mere dissimulation: and Bossuet, at the end of the seventeenth century, was content, with high encomiums upon Bernard's clear-sightedness, to adopt the same mode of solving the difficulty by a gratuitous hypothesis of systematic hypocrisy. [18]

II. But the Albigenses were not only pious in their lives; pious, at least, externally, as their enemies themselves admit: they also steadfastly maintained what they held to be the true faith of the Gospel; and, rather than renounce it, cheerfully suffered martyrdom even under its most formidable aspect.

Active courage in battle may, no doubt, subsist along with great profligacy of manners' but the natural tendency of habitual vice is to weaken and destroy that passive courage, which, in cold blood, for conscience-sake, induces a man calmly to suffer death rather than relinquish what he is persuaded is the vital truth of God. Persons may live debauched hypocrites: but, I should think, few such characters would be much disposed to be burned alive from an extraordinary love for the speculations of Manicheism. Mistaken men may die for what they honestly deem the Gospel. But immoral men are not the precise individuals, who commonly lay down their lives for their faith.

How, then, in the case of the grossly profligate and hypocritical Albigenses, is this second difficulty to be solved?

Bossuet finds the task ready accomplished to his hand by the wisdom of the twelfth century, as displayed by the same most serviceable Bernard: and he might have yet additionally brought forward the sagacity of the thirteenth century, as exemplified by Lucas of Tuy; for the solution of this ingenious Prelate perfectly quadrates with that of Bernard, and is indeed, with due acknowledgments, professedly and modestly borrowed from it. Notwithstanding that the Albigenses are somewhat incongruously described, as being ready to say and to swear anything in order that they might escape punishment: still, somehow or other, it was a public fact too notorious to be denied, that this most paradoxical race submitted, even joyfully and triumphantly, to martyrdom, rather than apostatize from the creed of their forefathers. [19]

For the marked discrepance which characterizes these two strangely inconsistent particulars, Bossuet attempts not to account: but, the naked fact of voluntary and triumphant suffering for alleged conscience-sake on the part of the sufferers, he is content to explain in the manner recommended by Bernard.

If Judas might be successfully tempted by the devil to lay violent hands upon himself: surely Satan, with at least equal facility, might tempt the Albigenses to brave death at the hands of others. [20] This truly logical argument, from the less to the greater, must needs, with all close thinkers, be invincibly conclusive. Satan was clearly the foul inspirer of the spurious martyrdoms of the Albigenses: because their unshaken fortitude could spring from no other quarter. The contempt of death, in genuine martyrs, as Bernard judiciously makes the distinction, is true piety; but, in heretics, it is simply produced by a diabolically infused hardness of heart.

Certainly, the Bishop of Meaux, by joyfully adopting, in the seventeenth century, the cherished solution of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, has shown the amiable quality of being very easily satisfied.

III. A third difficulty yet remains to be solved: the evidential difficulty, I mean, when the whole matter is fairly considered, of admitting the sufficiency and satisfactoriness of the testimony, which is adduced for the purpose of establishing the asserted fact, that The Albigenses were doctrinal Manicheans.

Like the primitive Christians, these religionists, as we have seen, were charged with the secret practice of various impurities. Yet they are admitted to have led holy and honest lives of habitual temperance and chastity and self-denial: and they are still further admitted to have always repelled the accusation, as a base falsehood concocted by their enemies. They were moreover charged, as we have also seen, with a time-serving readiness to avow and to swear anything that might be required of them: in order that, by such unscriptural dissimulation, they might escape the punishment which was awarded to heresy. Yet, even by the confession of their adversaries, they cheerfully and triumphantly laid down

their lives, rather than renounce the doctrinal system, which, whether correctly or incorrectly, they themselves at least deemed the sincere truth of the Gospel.

We have now to learn, what, by their bigoted opponents, that system was alleged to be: in order that we may judge, how far the difficulty of attaching any credit to the testimony of such inconsistent witnesses may be fairly thought capable of a reasonable solution.

1. With this view, I shall pass on to certain of those ancient accounts of the doctrinal system of the Cathari or Albigenses, which have come down to us from the middle ages: premising only, that, to avoid the wearisomeness of unprofitable repetition, I do not conceive it necessary to give the whole of them.

(1.) Though the title, affixed (I suppose) by the Jesuit Mariana to the rambling Work of Lucas of Tuy, purports that it is a Treatise against the Albigenses, the author really says very little about their alleged peculiar opinions. That little, however, is sufficient to show, that he wishes to charge them with having adopted, as their creed, the impious speculations of Manicheism.

These heretics, says he, falsely assert, that the body of man was created by the devil. Glorying in the name of philosophers or naturalists, they propound many doctrines contrary to the truth. But their object is to introduce the Manichean Heresy and to acknowledge two Gods: of whom, the malignant, as they saucily pretend, created all things visible. – Thus they assert: that every visible object in this worm was made by the devil: whence they argue, that it matters not, whether money be gained well or ill. – They likewise contend: that the Prelates of the Church can give no assistance, by indulgences of remission, to the souls of the faithful who have died in Christ; that the soul of no holy person ascends to heaven before the day of judgment; and that souls suffer no punishment, save in hell alone: adding, that they know nothing about the condition of those survivors, whom, while they lived in the body, they loved in this world. [21]

(2.) Lucas of Tuy flourished in the thirteenth century: but the testimony of an earlier writer, Radulphus Ardens, who lived towards the close of the eleventh century, is somewhat more compact and explicit.

Such, at this day, are those Manichean Heretics, who by their heresy have polluted their native country of Agenois. They falsely pretend that they lead the life of the Apostles; saying, that they will neither lie nor swear at all; and, under the pretext of abstinence and continence, condemning marriage and the eating of animal food: for they assert, that it is as great a sin to approach to a wife as to a mother or a daughter. They likewise condemn the Old Testament: but of the New, they receive some books, and not others. What, however, is still more horrible, they propound two creators of the universe: believing God to be the author of things invisible, while they hold the devil to be the author of things visible. Hence they secretly worship the devil, whom they esteem the creator of their own bodies. The sacrament of the altar they assert to be mere bread. Baptism they deny, as also the resurrection of the body: and they preach, that no one can be saved except through their hands. [22]

(3.) Much the same account is given in a fragment of the ancient History of Aquitaine, edited by Peter Pitheus, where it treats of the year 1017.

Forthwith sprang up, throughout Aquitaine, certain Manicheans, seducing promiscuously the people from truth to error. They persuaded them to deny Baptism, the sign of the Holy Cross, the Church, and the Redeemer of the world himself; together with the veneration of the Saints of God, lawful marriage, and the eating of flesh, whence they turned away, many simple persons from the faith. [23]

(4.) We may trace again the alleged Manicheans of Aquitaine and the South of France, in the account given of the Publicans or Cathari of Gascony by the monk Robert of Auxerre, who flourished during the latter half of the twelfth century.

The heresy of those, whom they call Publicans or Cathari or Paterins, denies the sacraments of Christ. This had clandestinely sprung up in many places: but, in Gascony, it had openly taken possession of the people to a very great extent. For, there, the heretics, being cut off from the catholic communion, possess many castles fortified against the Catholics: rejecting the Catholic rites and ceremonies, serving their own inventions, and poisoning by their virulence whomsoever they can. Wherefore, to crush their madness, Henry, who from being Abbot of Clairvaux had become Bishop of Alba, a man of a very eloquent tongue, was sent by Pope Alexander: and, accordingly, having gathered together, by the preaching of the word, both cavalry and infantry from various quarters, he attacked and conquered the aforesaid heretics. But his efforts were fruitless: for, as soon as ever they became masters of their own actions, they forthwith returned to wallowing in the filth of their pristine error. [24]

(5.) What, however, will perhaps be deemed the most important testimony to the Manicheism of the Cathari or Albigenses, is that of the Inquisitor Reinerius Sacco, who had been a member of their communion during the space of no less than seventeen years, who afterward conformed to the Roman Church, and who at length became a priest in the order of preaching friars. This peculiarly circumstanced individual is thought to have written about the year 1254 and, if we suppose him to have composed his treatise toward the close of a long life, he may not improbably be the Friar Reinerius, whom Pope Innocent III, in his decretal epistles of the year 1199, mentions, as being employed by him, in conjunction with Friar Guido, for the purpose of hunting out the heretical Valdenses and Cathari throughout the South of France and the North of Spain. [25]

The opinions in common to all the Cathari are these.

This world, and all things that are in it, were created by the devil. All the sacraments of the Church, to wit, the sacrament of Baptism by material water, and the other sacraments, profit nothing to salvation, and are false sacraments: inasmuch as they are not the true sacraments of Christ and his Church, but deceptive and diabolical and appertaining only to a Church of malignants. Carnal matrimony is a mortal sin: and, in the future world, a person is not punished more heavily for adultery and incest, than for lawful wedlock. There is no future resurrection of the body. To eat flesh or eggs or cheese, even in a case of urgent necessity, is a mortal sin.

The secular authorities act sinfully, when they punish with death malefactors or heretics.

No one can be saved, except through their ministration. All unbaptized infants suffer eternal punishment no less severely, than homicides and robbers.

There is no purgatory. [26]

The additional opinions of some of the Cathari, which they entertain beside the above-mentioned common opinions, are the following. There are two principles from the Deity: a principle of good; and a principle of evil.

The Trinity, namely, the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, is not one God: but the Father is greater than the Son and the Holy Ghost.

Each Principle, or each God, created his own angels and his own world.

This world, and all things that are in it, was created and made and formed by the evil God.

The devil, with his angels, ascended to heaven: and, when war there took place with Michael the Archangel, the angel of the good God thence extracted a part of the creatures of God, and daily infuses them into human and brutal bodies and even from one body into another, until the said creatures are brought back to heaven. From the blessed Virgin, who was an angel, the Son of God took not true human nature, but only its similitude. Hence he did not truly eat and drink: neither did he truly suffer or die: neither was he truly buried: neither did he truly rise again: but all these matters were only putative or apparitional. The same must be said also of his miracles.

Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and Moses and the old fathers and John the Baptist were all enemies of God and ministers of the devil. The devil was the author of the entire Old Testament, save only the books of Job, the Psalms, Solomon, wisdom, the Son of Sirach, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve minor Prophets. This world will never have an end.

The alleged future judgment has already occurred, and will never take place again.

Hell and eternal fire and eternal punishments are in this world, and not elsewhere. [27]

2. Such, in point of doctrine, if we may credit the writers who have passed before us, were the Albigenses. According to the evidence, which in all fairness has been adduced, they were rank Manicheans. But here the question is: whether the witnesses against them are to be credited.

(1.) Now, even without the adduction of any counter-testimony (which, however, shall appear in its proper place), I should fearlessly say: that no confidence can be placed in such evidence. Upon its very front, it bears impressed the dark brand of determined prejudice or of interested calumny.

We have seen how entirely Peter Siculus has failed in attempting to fix the charge of Manicheism upon the oriental Paulicians; and equally vain are the efforts of the Romish enemies of the Albigenses. Finding, that the Paulicians had most incongruously been set down as Manicheans, for the very reason, which, according to plain common sense, should have effectually determined them to be not Manicheans; namely, because a large proportion of them had, in the first instance, been actually converted from Manicheism to what was plainly the sound faith of the gospel; finding this, the prejudiced or interested bigots of Romanism readily caught up the same convenient cry against the Albigenses or Cathari; and, so far as minute particularity was concerned, had small difficulty in filling up the

outline, with much specious and plausible exactness, from the ancient writings of Ireneus or Epiphanius.

Such is very eminently and clearly the case with the wretched apostate and persecutor Reinerius Sacco. His very minuteness convicts him of being a mere retailer from the works of the primitive writers against the real Gnostic and Docetic and Manichean Heresies: and his horrible appeal to god, as a witness of his veracity, serves only to throw a greater discredit upon his foully calumnious statements; for no honest historian thinks it necessary to appeal to heaven for the purpose of establishing his trustworthiness. [28] The consciousness of his apostasy (an apostasy, the guilt of which was tremendously aggravated by the persecution of his former brethren) is ever present to his view: and thrice, in a work of only ten not very long chapters, does he refer to it. [29] Having quitted his own communion for that of the Roman Church, and being forthwith required to show the sincerity of his conversion by undertaking the office of inquisitor among those with whom he had once walked in the bonds of the gospel, he resolutely determined to make out a strong case against them, both to please his employers, and to vindicate his own foul apostasy. Yet so clumsy is he in the management of that very minuteness which was designed to make most strongly against them, that he more than once blunders into gross inconsistencies or into palpable contradictions. Thus he tells us that the Cathari rejected the sacrament of Baptism, as no true sacrament of Christ, but as a deceptive and diabolical ordinance instituted by a church of Malignants. Yet, in the judgment of these very Cathari, if we are to believe this veracious witness to what he knew from an experience of seventeen years, all unbaptized infants suffer the same intensity of eternal punishment as homicides and robbers.

Thus he asserts, that, with some considerable exceptions, they rejected the Old Testament as the work of the devil, while he is totally silent respecting any rejection of any part of the New Testament: an assertion and a silence, which evidently imply; that, like the old Paulicians, they received the latter just as the Catholic Church receives it; and that they did not, like the Marcionites and real Manicheans, corrupt it into another Gospel that so it might serve their own purposes. Yet he requires us to credit him, when he says: that, with the whole New Testament and with confessedly the greater part of the Old Testament in their hands, they deemed Abraham and the fathers to be servants of the devil; maintained, as a scriptural truth, the doctrine of two Independent Principles; adopted all the absurdities of the Docetae, respecting the visionary character of Christ; maintained, that the whole material world was created by the devil; and broached a farrago of fables, all of which are hopelessly irreconcilable with that Gospel, which they not only had in their hands, but which, by this egregious blunderer's own confession, they could well nigh say by heart from one end to the other. [30]

A witness, thus circumstanced and thus giving his testimony, who will believe? The easy faith of Bossuet may admit his evidence: but the stubborn incredulity of a Protestant will laugh at the clumsy fraud and easily recognize the scrinia whence this compiler of calumnies has pillaged his materials. His whole account of the Cathari smacks of Ireneus and Epiphanius. From them he has borrowed a bungling account of the ancient Gnostics and Manicheans, who had fabricated for their own purposes a gospel of their own: and then, not perceiving the grossness of his inconsistency, he saddles it upon a body of

Christians, who possessed the genuine Gospel, and who, instead of seeking to corrupt it, could actually say almost the whole of it by heart.

(2.) But this is not all. A prudent inquirer, before he gives credit to these repeated allegations of doctrinal Manicheism against the Albigenses, will naturally ask: What answer did they themselves make to the charge?

In good sooth, like their asiatic predecessors the Paulicians, who, as we have seen, renounced both Manes and Manicheism, the Albigenses stoutly denied the truth of the allegations. [31] Nor did they deny it merely once or twice: nor yet was the denial confined to a few individuals. It was, we are assured, their universal custom, whenever they were questioned concerning their faith, promptly to deny all the various matters of which they were suspected. [32]

The evidence, then, at present, will stand as follows. By their enemies, the whole of whose concurrent testimony is hopelessly inconsistent and contradictory, the Albigenses are charged with having adopted and maintained the creed of Manicheism.

But, by the confession of their very enemies, it was their universal custom to deny the truth of the charge: for they disclaimed altogether any participation or approbation of that heresy; and, their adversaries themselves being judges, the strictness of their lives might well vouch for their honesty.

To which party, even as the evidence now stands, ought we to give credit? Certainly not to the Albigenses, replies the Bishop of Meaux. From the Paulicians of the East to their Catharistic successors in the West, the whole generation are rank liars and equivocators. They may deny their Manicheism as often as they please: but a well practiced Catholic Inquisitor is not so easily cheated. Nay, the very pertinacity and uniformity of their denial, in all ages and countries, is itself a decided proof, that they ought not to be believed. It was the spirit of the Sect from its earliest commencement: and, since both Paulicians and Albigenses have invariably renounced Manes and disclaimed Manicheism, nothing can be more clear, than that the accusation is fully established by the simple and incontrovertible fact of their unvarying consistency. [33]

Now what were these unfortunate men to do? Their invariable disclaimer of Manicheism was the surest proof that they were hardened Manicheans: and their specific declaration, that they believed all the Articles of the Christian Faith, clearly demonstrated their unbelief, and thence most fully and satisfactorily established the confident assertion of their hypocrisy. Yet, paradoxical as it may seem, from the admitted fact, that, in all ages have the Paulicians and the Albigenses invariably denied themselves to be Manicheans, does Bossuet undertake to demonstrate the asserted fact of their inveterate Manicheism.

CHAPTER 3

THE GROUNDS OF THE ALLEGATION OF MANICHEISM AGAINST THE PAULICIANS AND THE ALBIGENSES.

BUT it will be said: that there must surely have been some plausible ground at least for fixing, upon the ancient Paulicians and Albigenses, the particular charge of Manicheism, rather than the charge of any

other heresy. Hence it will be asked: could their enemies have so pertinaciously brought against them the specific and well-defined accusation of Manicheism, if there had been nothing whatever, in their doctrinal system, which could give an apparent sanction to such an accusation?

That the charge, in the first instance, was built upon the circumstance of The infant Paulician community having been, to a considerable extent, composed of honest converts from Manicheism, is, I think, abundantly manifest: nor does the intrinsic absurdity and contradictoriness of the charge at all derogate from the certainty of the fact, when the character of blind and deaf and furious and unreasoning bigotry is considered.

From Asia, as I have already observed, the charge attended the emigrant Paulicians into Europe: and, whether from the intercourse of ordinary conversation, or from dishonestly distorted reports of occasional apostates (.such as Reinerius Sacco) eager to please their new friends, or from resolute misconstruction of unprincipled inquisitors in their examination of pretended heretics, nothing would be more easy than to fix a semblance of Manicheism, quite enough to satisfy vulgar ignorance and prejudiced bigotry, upon these hated reformers and provoking reprovers. [1] The view, which I take of the process, will be perfectly intelligible, when a few specimens of facile perversion shall have been produced: and, by such a system of management, I will readily undertake to convict St. Paul himself, the model of the genuine Christian so specially revered by the Paulicians, of rank and palpable Manicheism.

I. It was the doctrine of the Manicheans: that there are two independent Principles; the one, good; the other, evil: of whom, the material world was created by the evil Principle, while the spiritual world was the work of the good Principle.

Now an unfortunate Albigensis, well read (as the custom of the sect was [2]) in Holy Scripture, has been known and reported, we will suppose, to have designated Satan by the titles of Prince of this world and God of this world, to have expressed a hope that God would deliver him from this present evil world, to have declared that the kingdom of Christ is not of this world, to have asserted that the world hath not known the Father, to have pronounced that the friendship of the world is enmity with God, to have intimated that the devil is come down to his own peculium the inhabiters of the earth and the sea, to have described the Evil One as the Prince of the Power of the air and as the Spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience, to have stigmatized pharisaical hypocrites as being of their father the devil, to have spoken of a horrible worship paid to the dragon, and to have declared that he and his associates are of the Good God, while the whole world lieth in the Wicked One.

Let a hated Albigensis use this truly scriptural language: and it is quite easy to see, how malice or ignorance or a mixture of both might very plausibly exhibit him to the vulgar, as a Manichean; who believed in two Gods, a bad God and a good God; who declared the bad God to be the God and the Creator of this world, while the world to come was the work of the good God; and who worshipped the Devil or the bad God, as the Prince of the power of the air, and as the general father of all mankind so far as their material part is concerned. [3]

II. It was the doctrine of the ancient Manicheans and Docetae: that Christ was never really incarnate, his apparent flesh being a mere unsubstantial and visionary illusion; because, since matter was the work of the evil God and thence inherently bad itself, it were a contradiction to assert that Christ, the Son of the good God, could have assumed a true fleshly material body.

Some one, then, of the Albigenses happens to declare, that henceforth he knows no man after the flesh: adding, that although he had known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth he knows him no more under that carnal aspect. Or perhaps he asserts, that Christ is the living bread who descended from heaven. Or possibly he declares his conviction, that Christ is not of this world. Or very probably he may remark, that Christ walked upon the surface of the sea, and that he imperceptibly passed through the hands of those who wished to throw him down a precipice.

In such a reported ease, who does not perceive the inference, which would be joyfully drawn by a malignant Inquisitor, the iniquitous prejudger of his prisoner? The man, and the whole community to which he belongs, are, by the very purport of their own words, plainly convicted Docetae of the Manichean School. Assuredly they maintain, that the apparent body of Christ was altogether celestial, not substantially carnal. [4]

III. Through the consistent following out of their principles, it was the doctrine of the Manicheans: that Baptism by material water ought not to be administered; and that Marriage ought to be reviled and rejected.

The dreaded heretics are known to have remarked: that Baptism by water and the reception of the Spirit were not always inseparable; that he, who believes not, is damned, notwithstanding his baptism; that, unless a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God; and that that which is born of the flesh is flesh, while that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. They furthermore have been heard to deny, that Marriage is a sacrament; while they urged that the very gaze of concupiscence is virtual fornication; and while they asserted, that, in the resurrection, marriage altogether ceases to exist.

On such a foundation, it was no difficult matter to erect a charge: that the Albigenses were Manicheans, who rejected Baptism by water, who argued the inutility of baptizing infants on the ground that they can have no faith, and who reviled and denounced Marriage. [5]

IV. The principles of the Manicheans, which led them to deny the incarnation of Christ, led them also, by a plainly necessary consequence, to deny that the consecrated elements could properly, in any sense of the words, be styled Christ's body and blood.

Now, as a mere point of fact, the Albigenses denied altogether the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

This, no doubt, they did, because they understood the words of our Lord figuratively. But, by their enemies, the circumstance was confidently adduced as a certain proof that they denied the human flesh of Jesus Christ. [6]

V. The principles of the Manicheans led them, of course, to deny the crucifixion, no less than the incarnation of our Savior.

But the Albigenses paid no veneration to the Cross: and invoked neither the angels nor the saints nor even the Virgin Mary.

Hence they were pronounced to be Manicheans: who trampled upon the Cross, who despised the saints, who dishonored the virgin, who rejected the Holy Catholic Church, and who with unparalleled impiety renounced the crucified Redeemer himself. [7]

VI. The Manicheans held: that The independent Principle of good and the independent Principle of evil each created various angelic intelligences, severally in nature resembling their respective Creators.

Some of the Albigenses, in an unlucky hour, happen to speak of the Devil and his angels: and, what is still worse, they are furthermore known to have talked about a war in heaven, when Michael and his angels fought on one side, while the dragon and his angels fought on the other side. Misrepresentation is speedily at work: and, since it is predetermined to transmute the Scripture-loving Albigenses into indisputable Manicheans, their language is interpreted to import, that the angels of the Devil were created by the Devil; while, upon the war in heaven, is gratuitously built the gnostic fable, that spirits created by the good God are infused into material bodies created by the evil God, and that after performing the circle of the metempsychosis they finally return in a purified state to heaven. [8]

VII. The principles of the Manicheans obviously compelled them to deny the resurrection of the body.

It is reported to the Inquisitors and the Popish Clergy: that the Albigenses have been heard to speak of the resurrection of a spiritual body, as contradistinguished from that natural or carnal body which is sown in the grave of corruption; and that they are also known to have wickedly asserted the impossibility of flesh and blood inheriting the kingdom of heaven.

Now, although in truth they have said nothing but what St. Paul himself has said: yet, with the interested and prejudiced, the use of such language is quite sufficient to stamp them with undoubted Manicheism. Most indisputably, all the Cathari deny the future resurrection of the flesh. [9]

VIII. The Manicheans, like the Gnostics, denied the freedom of the will: contending, that, without any choice or preference, the Elect were fatally impelled to perform good deeds, while the Reprobate were no less fatally constrained to perform evil deeds.

A zealous Inquisitor hears: that the Albigenses have been known to quote a text of St. Paul in proof of this opinion; the heretic, all the while, quoting it, just as an ancient Augustinian or a modern Calvinist would do, for an entirely different purpose.

Nothing more is requisite, than to corrupt the text in question by the insertion of two antithetical words wholly unconscious of the pen of the Apostle: and the unlucky culprit, upon whom the blame of the interpolation is tacitly saddled, is duly exhibited, as establishing, by the express authority of Holy Writ, a fatal necessity of doing whether good or evil. The GOOD which I wish, that I do not: the EVIL which I hate, that I do. [10]

IX. In fine, the entire process of amalgamating misrepresentation may be briefly summed up after the following manner.

Certain pious dissidents from the Roman Church, denominated, in the South of France, Cathari and Publicans and Albigenses, spoke of the strife between the flesh and the spirit; described the God and Prince of this world, as waging an incessant though ultimately fruitless war against the God of heaven; denied, as a necessary and mechanical result, from the application of water, the spiritual or regenerative effect of Baptism; disbelieved any material change of the Eucharistic Bread and Wine into the literal and substantial Body and Blood of Christ; rejected the notion, that Marriage is a sacrament instituted as such by our Lord; believed the resurrection of a spiritual body, as contradistinguished from a gross natural body; asserted the inability of fallen man to do, by his own unassisted strength, that which is good; maintained, that, as God is served by myriads of holy angels, so numerous evil angels await the bidding of Satan; rejected the doctrine of a Purgatory; offered up no prayers either to the Virgin or to the Saints; and abhorred the superstitious worship of the Cross, deeming even the true wood (could it anywhere be found) nothing more valuable or more salutiferous than any other piece of wood,

inasmuch as the Savior of mankind (according to the excellent remark of Ambrose) was not The Cross but He who for our sake hung upon the Cross. [11]

Through the agency of a gross misrepresentation, these several tenets were easily made to appear the same as the well-known tenets of the Manicheans; and, though, confessedly, in every age and country, the Paulicians or Albigenses always denied that they were Manicheans; constantly, by the admission of their very enemies, led holy and godly lives; and were ready, when called upon, to seal their faith with their blood rather than abandon it for the wretched superstition of Rome or Constantinople: yet, with all the pertinacity of bigoted hatred, the charge of Manicheism was determinately brought against them; and the very constancy of their invariable disclaimer, both in Asia and in Europe, was strangely itself alleged as the surest proof of falsehood and hypocrisy. [12] Thus, to the entire satisfaction of the Papists at least, was the business accomplished: and thus was an ancient Church of faithful and suffering Christians, without a shadow of trustworthy evidence, pronounced to be a synagogue of profligate and wrong-headed Manicheans.

X. Hitherto, so far as concerns the Albigenses of Southern France, we have seen only the testimony which is adduced for the purpose of establishing their Manicheism: we must next proceed to exhibit a variety of facts and documents, which, tending as they do to the complete exculpation of this much slandered Community, serve also to show, that our already intimated suspicions respecting the fidelity of their accusers have in no wise been without sufficient foundation.

In prosecuting this inquiry, it will be useful to bear in mind the remarks which have been made, as to the great facility of perverting even scriptural expressions into a semblance of Manicheism; when, by malice or ignorance, it is predetermined to convict some obnoxious individual of an adhesion to that heresy.

CHAPTER 4

THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION OF MANICHEISM AGAINST THE ALBIGENSES, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE CASE OF THE CANONS OF ORLEANS

THE earliest instance, I believe, of the public attention being drawn to certain reputed Manicheans who had suddenly appeared in France, is that afforded by the remarkable case of the Canons of Holyrood in Orleans.

I. After the favorite manner of the Gallican Romish Clergy, Bossuet rapidly tells the story in his own way: suppressing all the gross contradictions, which occur in the several accounts of the matter; observing a prudent silence, as to the very suspicious method in which was procured the pretended confession of the culprits; and, instead of honestly exhibiting in his margin the original documents upon which his scanty and garbled narrative claims to be founded, loosely giving mere references to books of no general access, so as effectually to preclude a reader from judging for himself, unless he possesses the opportunity, and will encounter the trouble, of a patient verification.

I shall adopt a different mode of proceeding: and, though a full statement of the several accounts as they are variously given by Rodulphus Glaber and the Actuary of the Synod of Orleans and the ancient Historian of Aquitaine and John of Fleury, with the remarks appended to them, will, of necessity, occupy some considerable space; yet, by those conscientious inquirers whose object is the attainment of truth, my inability to imitate the convenient brevity of the Bishop of Meaux will readily, I trust, be pardoned. [1]

1. The narrative of Rodulphus Glaber is to the following effect.

In the year 1017, the existence of a heresy, which had long been secretly germinating, was detected in the city of Orleans. The heresy in question was said to have been originally brought into France by a woman from Italy: who seduced from the faith persons of every description, not only simple Laics, but likewise many even among the more learned of the Clergy. This woman, in the course of her pernicious ramblings, came to Orleans; where, for a considerable time, she took up her abode. Here she infected many with her poisonous doctrines: and, what is more especially deserving of notice, Heribert and Lisoye, who both in rank and in knowledge stood among the highest of the Clergy, becoming her proselytes, were peculiarly active in spreading her opinions not only throughout Orleans but likewise throughout the neighboring cities. While indefatigably engaged in this work, they attempted to convert a Priest of Rouen. But he, being a man of a sound mind, forthwith took the alarm: and thence communicated the circumstance to the Count of the city, Duke Richard of Normandy. That Prince, equally thunderstruck with such tidings, lost no time in conveying the information to King Robert.

Whereupon, the zealous Sovereign, taking as his assessors many Bishops and Abbots and Lay Religious, immediately instituted a close scrutiny among the Clergy of Orleans. Heribert and Lisoye did not dissemble, how much they differed from the established faith of Rome: and many came forward, expressing their adherence to the two heresiarchs, and declaring that nothing should separate them from their fellowship.

Sorely grieved, that an inculpation thus serious should attend upon men, who, with all probity of morals, had hitherto, in their appointed station, been pre-eminently useful; the King and the Prelates,

retiring apart, proceeded to a more secret examination of the accused: and, as we are assured by the examiners themselves, the result of this secret examination was a full confession of the maintenance and advocacy of the most impious doctrines.

We have, said the culprits, long since embraced the tenets of this sect, the existence of which you have only so recently discovered: but we are well assured, that, sooner or later, both you and all men will do the same. Whatever the Old and the New Testament may say respecting the existence of a Triune Deity, the whole is a system of mere delirious falsehood. For both the heaven and the earth have ever been exactly as they now appear, without having a Creator who gave them a beginning. To expect, therefore, any future eternal reward of a holy and christian life, is no better than a superfluous absurdity.

On making this confession, the choice of either recantation or cremation was freely and mercifully offered to them. To recant, however, the heretics altogether refused. Hence, an enormous fire having been kindled by the royal command not far from the city, they were forthwith led out to execution. But, to the number of thirteen, they were so far from being daunted, that they willingly offered themselves to the flames. Yet, when they experienced the pain of burning, they cried out, with what voice they were able to exert, that they had been deceived by the devil, and that they had entertained evil sentiments respecting the God and Lord of the universe. The by-standers, hearing this lamentable cry, immediately attempted to draw them from the fire but the flames were so furious, that all their efforts were fruitless. Wherever any of their followers could be found, they were subjected to the same punishment. [2]

2. Thus runs the narrative of Glaber: but the Actuary of the Synod of Orleans, who wrote in the same year 1017, differs essentially from him in many important particulars.

According to the statement of this functionary, when the Manichean Heresy showed itself at Orleans, an individual named Arefaste, one of the Knights of the Duke of Normandy, was eminently useful in detecting that pest, which, in all directions, was pullulating throughout the provinces of France. This military retainer supported, in his house, a clerk named Herbert: who, for the sake of prosecuting his studies, repaired to Orleans. There, while he was seeking after the teachers of truth, he blindly fell into the bottomless pit of heresy. For, at that time, there lived in the same city two clerks, Stephen and Lisoye: men, illustrious among all for their wisdom, redolent of sanctity, abundant in almsgiving. To their teaching, Herbert resorted: and, while he fondly deemed himself to have reached the very pinnacle of true knowledge, he was, by their means, really entangled in the snare of the devil. On his return home, loudly celebrating Orleans as the true light of wisdom and as the resplendent lamp of sanctity, he sought to make a convert of his knightly patron Arefaste. But his lord was not so easily deceived. Suspecting that all is not gold which glitters, he quickly reported the matter to Duke Richard: who, in his turn, communicated it to King Robert; adding, that his trusty soldier Arefaste desired nothing more than the royal permission to undertake the development of the alarming theological pestilence. Leave being easily obtained, the knight repaired to Orleans: and presented himself, before the two heresiarchs, in the garb of a humble scholar. Ere this spiritually dangerous step, however, was taken, he very prudently had the precaution to fortify himself with suppliant prayer against the machinations of Lucifer: and, furthermore, during the whole progress of his most adventurous enterprise, he effectually kept the foul fiend at arm's length, according to the wise sacerdotal advice which he had received, by a daily orthodox communion. For the deliberate purpose of betraying them, our mirror of knightly honor soon wormed himself into the confidence of the two unsuspecting clerics: and his report to his employers was, that, at length, they communicated the following summary of their religious system.

Christ was not born from the Virgin Mary: neither did he suffer death for mankind: neither was he truly buried: neither did he ever rise again from the dead. In Baptism, there is no washing away of sin: nor, through the consecration of a priest, is there any sacrament of the Body and blood of Christ. The invocation of Saints and Martyrs is mere idle folly.

In making this communication, they professed to open the gates of heaven for the triumphant entrance of the devout aspirant: and, feeding him the while with celestial food, they undertook, by the imposition of hands, to liberate him from all sin, and to replenish him with the gift of the Holy Spirit.

But, notwithstanding such lofty promises, nothing could be a greater abomination, than the horrible mode in which they prepared their celestial food. On certain nights, they congregated together in an appointed house, holding lamps in their hands. There, after the form of a litany, they chanted forth the names of demons: nor did they desist from their unhallowed orisons, until, in the shape of some small beast, they beheld the worshipped Evil One suddenly descend among their company. [3] As soon as the object of their adoration appeared, they forthwith extinguished their lamps: and, then, without any regard either to nearness of consanguinity or to the holiest vows of female chastity, they each seized upon the woman who happened to be nearest. When, from this infernal commerce, an infant was born, they preserved it until the eighth day: and then, like the Pagans of old, burning it in a fire, they prepared the celestial food from the nefarious ashes which remained.

The indefatigable Arefaste, having made these discoveries, perhaps indeed having himself witnesses the bestial avatar of Lucifer, communicated them incontinently to his pious employers: and, without loss of time, the accused, confronted by the daring knight who had thus magnanimously bearded the demon in his very penetralia, were subjected to an examination. This examination, however, took place, not in public, but before a private convention of the King and the Prelates which was held with closed doors in the basilica or cathedral. The charges were duly preferred by Arefaste: and, as we are assured by those who assisted at the process, were duly confessed by the prisoners. When variously examined on sundry doctrinal points, and particularly as to their sentiments respecting the Holy Scriptures, the final answer of the culprits is reported to have been the following:

The doctrine, which you hold, you may tell to those, who savor of earthly things, and who believe the figments of carnal men written upon animal parchment. But, to us, who bare the law written in the inner man by the Holy Ghost, and who relish nothing save what we have learned from God the Creator of all thing's, you vainly propound matters which are superfluous and altogether alien from sound divinity. [4] Put, therefore, an end to your words: and do with us what you list. We clearly behold our King reigning in heavenly places. With his own right hand, he is raising us to an immortal triumph: and he is, even now, about to bestow upon us the fullness of joy celestial.

From the first hour of the day to the ninth, all labored incessantly to recall them from the strangeness of their wicked error: but, harder than any iron, they obstinately refused to repent. Whereupon, by the assembled Prelates, they were degraded from Holy Orders, preparatory to their being consigned to the arm of the secular power: and, lest the hitherto excluded people should rush into the church to kill them prematurely, Queen Constance herself, by the special order of the King, kept guard at the folding doors of the cathedral. When the ceremony of degradation was completed, the Queen, nobly sinking the feelings of the woman in the zeal of the catholic, with a stick thrust out the eye of Stephen who had formerly been her confessor. The heretics were then conveyed without the walls of the city: and, a mighty fire being kindled in a certain hamlet, they were all, together with the nefarious dust which has

been mentioned as the material out of which the celestial food was prepared, consigned to the flames, save a single clerk and a single nun who recanted their impious doctrines. [5]

3. To the fact of the cremation of these martyrs, a not unimportant circumstance is added in the ancient Fragment of the History of Aquitaine edited by Pitheus.

Heribert and Lisoye were not the only members of the Clerical Order, who, on this occasion, suffered for their opinions: no fewer than ten Canons of the Holyrood in Orleans were consigned to the flames. Their heresy is confidently stated to have been Manicheism: and it is subjoined, that various individuals of the same persuasion were detected at Toulouse and were similarly punished; so that the Manicheans, who sprang up throughout various parts of the West, began to conceal themselves, though still deceiving whomsoever they could. [6]

4. Finally, John of Fleury, in his brief narrative of the same transaction, communicates yet another particular: which shows, that, along with the ten Canons, four of the Laity also, for the sake of their religion, must have encountered the horrid death of vivicremation.

He tells us, that the entire number of the sufferers at Orleans amounted to fourteen and he adds, that among them were found certain of the more noble Laity, as well as of the better Clergy. [7]

Now the clerical sufferers were ten. Consequently, the additional four were Laics.

II. I have here simply given the various accounts of this detestable popish barbarity which have come down to us: and I will venture to say, that any unprejudiced reader will rise from the perusal of them, perfectly satisfied, that these ten Clergymen, confessedly skilled in theology, and confessedly eminent for the holiness of their practice, together with the four Laymen their friends and proselytes and associates, were no Manicheans, but, on the contrary, resolute and heaven-supported martyrs to the pure and unadulterated faith of the Gospel.

It will be useful, however, to enter a little into the particulars, which, though with no small measure of incongruity, we have seen recorded.

1. Here I shall pass over the slighter points of discrepancy in the several accounts, though even these tend to throw a doubt upon their general fairness and accuracy: I shall confine myself to those broader points, which, when united with other matters, effectually take away from Bossuet and subsequent writers of his stamp, all the benefits which they would derive from the case turning it over, in the way of historical evidence, to their opponents.

According to Rodulphus Glaber, the accused were absolute atheists: who, thence, believing in no God, consistently denied both the creation of the world and a future state of retribution.

According to John of Fleury and the Fragment of the History of Aquitaine, they were Manicheans; who, as we all know, maintained the existence of two Gods: an evil God, the creator of the material world; and a good God, the creator of the spiritual world.

According to the Acts of the Synod of Orleans, they believed in one God the Creator of the universe: and, so far from denying a future state of retribution, they confidently, on the very eve of a dreadful death, looked forward to an immortal triumph and to joy celestial.

Here we have three jarring accounts. Which of them are we to receive? By writers of the popish persuasion, they are all propounded, as being all severally the exact truth: and, though Bossuet is as

silent as the grave respecting any discrepancy; yet, in the treatment of heretics, we all know the strictly honorable conduct of Romish Ecclesiastics.

But some one may perhaps urge the express declaration: that This atrocious heresy, in every particular, was fully confessed by the associated culprits themselves.

And what man of plain common sense, I simply ask in reply, would believe such a declaration, even independently of the circumstance of its being propounded by the folly of their enemies?

Bossuet, who had an object to serve, carefully avoids the exhibition of any symptoms of misgiving: but the searching incredulity of a Protestant will find it difficult to admit, that even the Albigenses could have pleaded guilty to a tissue of absolute and irreconcilable contradictions.

The entire case, I apprehend, may be briefly summed up, as follows: Through a space of eight hours the examination was prolonged. And the same men, we are assured, in the course of the same scrutiny, confessed: that They believed in one God, that They believed in two Gods, and yet that They believed in no God; that They asserted one God in heaven to be the Creator of all things, that They asserted the material worm and the spiritual world to have been severally created by two Gods, and yet that They asserted the entire world both material and spiritual to have never been created at all but to have existed without any Creator from all eternity: that They totally denied a future state of rewards and punishments, and yet that Their assured confidence in an everlasting state of future glory and joy celestial was such as to make them face without shrinking the most terrible of all deaths!

Such, then, being the case presented to us, we may perhaps, without incurring a very severe reprehension, be allowed, even on the premises themselves, to doubt, or possibly still more than doubt, whether the alleged heretics of Orleans ever really pleaded guilty either to Atheism or to Manicheism; for, out of their three recorded confessions, two, I suppose, must inevitably be apocryphal.

2. As yet, however, we have in no wise, traveled to the end of our record. It is clumsily asserted, we have seen, that the Heretics, while professing the faith in one Supreme Creator, made, nevertheless, a free confession both of Atheism and of Manicheism.

Now what evidence have we, that they confessed either the one or the other of these two hopelessly jarring monstrosities?

Truly, our sole evidence is the allegation of their stupidly blundering murderers.

Smitten, as it were, with judicial blindness, these wretched men seem not to have perceived, that, by issuing forth, as the result of their examination, a tissue of contradictory absurdities, they were shamefully blasting their own characters, and with a pen of infernal fire were writing their own historical condemnation.

The accused were examined, not fairly in open court, so that all, who chose to attend, might hear what they really said: but, as both Glaber and the Acts of the Synod agree, they were examined secretly, before none, save the bigot King, and his miserable spy Arefaste, and his Conclave of interested Prelates, and his Synagogue of heartless Monks; they were examined in a Church with carefully closed doors, from which, on the easily intelligible pretense of apprehended danger to the prisoners, from a sudden ebullition of popular fury, the multitude were sedulously excluded, Queen Constance herself condescending in person to guard the portal. [8] Hence, most plainly, we know nothing, either of the asserted fact of their confession, or of the specific nature of their confession, beyond what their

infuriated enemies have been pleased to tell us. And, in the very sottishness of their malice, so egregiously have those enemies blundered: that, while, by way of blackening to the uttermost the objects of their hatred, they have put into their mouths the two palpably irreconcilable confessions of Atheism and Manicheism; they have providentially been overruled to record yet a third confession, which is evidently the true one, and with which the antecedently mutual incongruity of the two pretended confessions can by no ingenuity be made to harmonize.

We have the law of God written in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, say these noble champions of the truth and we relish nothing, save what we have beard from God the Creator of all things. You vainly propound, for our acceptance, matters which are alien from sound theology. Put an end, therefore, to your words: and do with us what you list. With the eye of faith, we see our King reigning in heaven. By his own almighty hand, he will raise us up to an immortal triumph, and will speedily be, tow upon us joy celestial.

Were these men Atheists or Manicheans? Were these men incestuous and abandoned worshippers of Satan? Were these men deliberate murderers of children; that so, from the ashes of their victims, they might compound an infernal parody on the Eucharist? Can we seriously believe, that these men, firm unto death in the maintenance of their principles, were ever guilty of such unutterable, such monstrous, such wantonly gratuitous, such palpably objectless, abominations? Is it likely, that a diabolical faith and a hellish practice should train up men, confidently to look beyond this transitory world, and courageously to choose death in all its bitterness, rather than apostasy with all its temporal advantages? Nay, calling in mere common sense to our aid against the splendid absurdity of fabled impossibilities, who will, who can, believe, that Lucifer either did or could appear among them in the shape of some small beast: a cat, to wit, as the grotesque superstition of a barbarous age was most commonly inclined to determine? In the whole account, a Pelion upon an Ossa, absurdities are mercilessly piled upon gross self-contradictions: yet the Bishop of Meaux either is, or would affect to be, quite satisfied. At all events, he has taken especial care not to endanger the acquiescent faith of his easily-convinced admirer, by letting him into the secret of those damning incongruities, which may lie advantageously locked up in a dead language, or which may safely repose in massy tomes not to be found save in the popularly neglected libraries of special reference.

Perhaps, by determined prejudice it may be said: that, Out of the very midst of the flames, the martyrs were heard publicly to confess, that they had been deceived by the devil, and that they had entertained evil sentiments respecting the God and Lord of the Universe.

The allegation in question is certainly made by Rodulphus Glaber but the very minute Acts of the Synod of Orleans are altogether silent respecting this particular; and even Glaber himself, by the sort of trembling uncertainty which marks his phraseology, may well be deemed no secure witness to the pretended fact. They cried out, we are told by this writer, not with a loud and distinct voice, so that all the bystanders might easily hear their words; but only with what feeble measure of utterance they possessed. Whatever, then, they might say, in their agonies, they were indisputably heard very uncertainly and very indistinctly. Most probably they warned the bystanders of the snares of the devil: and, for their many sins against their Heavenly Father, confessing their own unworthiness, pleaded the alone merits of their Redeemer. Broken ejaculations to such effect would, by brutal or ignorant bigots, be readily construed into an acknowledgment, on the part of the sufferers, that they had been deceived by Satan, and that they had thought ill of the God and Lord of the Universe. [10]

When we recollect, that a woman is recorded as having been the instrument of converting Sergius to ancient Paulicianism, we shall be struck with the singular resemblance of the asserted mode wherein the Canons of Orleans were converted to Catharism. In the circumstance itself, I see nothing improbable, provided we allow, that these Clergymen were thus brought to the knowledge of the unadulterated Gospel: but I see everything improbable in it on the hypothesis, that they were quite easily induced to adopt the dreams of Manicheism by a vagrant female from Italy. If, in point of fact, the Canons were really converted by a woman from that country, I conclude, that she must have been a member of one of the Italian Churches of the Paulicians. [11]

CHAPTER 5

THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE HISTORY OF BERENGER.

WHETHER the famous Berenger of Tours, who flourished in the middle of the eleventh century, ought to be viewed as an actually associated member of the Paulician or Albigensic Community, may perhaps, not unreasonably, be doubted. Still, however, there are particulars both in his doctrine and in his system, which may tend to establish the circumstance of his intimacy with the members of that Community, and thence inductively to show that the Community in question could not have been tainted with Manicheism.

I. The Paulicians and the Albigenses always denied the occurrence of any material change in the consecrated eucharistic elements: and they were remarkable on account of the zeal with which they carried on their extensive missions, for the purpose of disseminating tenets, which they deemed to constitute the sincere Gospel, and from which they asserted the dominant Church both of the East and of the West to have foully apostatized.

Now, like them, Berenger strenuously denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Under the influence of fear, indeed, he was led more than once to recant: but, so far as conviction is concerned, he appears never to have given up his opinion. After every abjuration, as Bertold of Constance happily expresses it, he returned to the same heresy, even as a dog returns to his vomit. [1] Yet, such was his fame for austerity and good works and humility and almsgiving, that even without retractation, as we learn from William of Malmesbury, some accounted him a saint. [2] Holding, then, doctrinal views of this description, he employed, for the purpose of spreading his sentiments, poor scholars, whom he had himself converted, to act as missionaries in every direction: and so great was their success, that, as the popish writers lament, well nigh all the French and Italians and even English were infected with the poison of his heretical pravity.

But, if he and his disciples thus widely traveled, decrying the belief of any material change of the consecrated elements into the substantial body and blood of Christ, they must have attracted the notice and fallen into the company of the Albigensic Cathari, whether in France or in Italy, who, invariably and from the very first, held precisely the same sentiments. Whence it is obvious, that identity of opinion must have produced a deep feeling of interest, and must have led to much intimacy and converse and mutual confidence so that, whether the Berengarians and the Cathari were or were not strictly one Community, they would still, from a consciousness of doctrinal harmony associated with an identity of missionary purpose, be readily inclined to give each other, as brethren, the right hand of fellowship. [3]

II. Nor is this all. According, indeed, to the Bishop of Meaux, Berenger was heretical on the alone point of Transubstantiation: for, if we may credit that ingenious Prelate, leaving all the remaining fabric of Popery untouched and uninjured, he never advanced any other erroneous opinions. [4] But it may be doubted, whether this is quite so certain, as Bossuet would have us believe. Berenger, says Reginald, was condemned, because he embraced that Faith, which we of the Reformed Churches hold to be purely and perfectly evangelical: rejecting, on the one hand, the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and maintaining, on the other hand, the Roman Church to be a Church of Malignants, the Council of Vanity, and the etc. of Satan. [5]

To this statement of a modern writer, the Bishop might, with some show of reason, have demurred: but he could scarcely, with any measure of decorum, have slighted the intelligible hint of William of Malmesbury that a denial of Transubstantiation was not the sole heresy of Berenger, when that historian, speaking in the plural form, tells us, that, by the defense of some HERESIES, be had rendered the first heat of his youth infamous.[6] At any rate, whether Bossuet had or had not consulted the continuator of Bede, he says nothing of an intimation, which, without indeed descending to particulars, ascribes, nevertheless, to the perverse Archdeacon of Angers, the contumacious defense of more heresies than one. These heresies, I feel persuaded, were no other than the general Scheme of Doctrine professed by the Cathari: for they, too, always declared the Church of Rome to be a Church of Malignants; and they, too, always inculcated that same apostolical poverty, which, according to William of Malmesbury, was assumed by Berenger. [7]

III. I may add, that there is yet another testimony, respecting which the Bishop is equally silent: the undeniable testimony, to wit, of Berenger himself, as adduced and commented upon by his stout opponent Lanfranc. At least, if the words be not precisely the identical words of Berenger, the opinion, which they convey, is ascribed by Lanfranc to Berenger and his followers.

The Gospel, so runs the imputed heresy, was originally preached to all nations. Then the world believed: and the Church was founded. For a season, it increased and fructified: but, through the unskillfulness of men whose intelligence was evil, it afterward erred and perished. Such was the fate of the great body of the Church: and, henceforth, in us alone and in those who follow us, the Holy Church of Christ has remained upon earth. [8]

How such a sweeping denunciation as this can be construed to mean only, that Berenger left the whole fabric entire (as the Bishop speaks), save and except the dogma of Transubstantiation, I have not skill sufficient to explain. At all events, what may well show the close connection, of the Berengarians and the Cathari, the latter, on this point, held precisely the same opinion as the former. The Church of Rome, says Reinerius, they style a Harlot. Hence they oppose the Pope and all the Catholic Bishops and Priests and Clerks: declaring, that they themselves are the Church of God, and that the others are but the seducers of the world. [9]

IV. In point, then, of fact, the circumstance, that both Berenger and his numerous missionaries and still more numerous proselytes must have familiarly mingled and doctrinally conversed with the Cathari both of France and of Italy, is, from the very necessity of the case, plainly, I think, indisputable. Now the sentiments of Berenger were too well known, for his enemies to hazard against him any charge of Manicheism. Hence it is a reasonable presumption, that, mixing with the Cathari as he and his missionaries must inevitably have done, they found among them just as little of Manicheism as could be detected among themselves.

CHAPTER 6

THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE CASE OF PETER DE BRUIS AND HENRY

BUT, whatever direct connection may have subsisted between Berenger and the Cathari, there can be no rational doubt, that Peter de Bruis and his disciple Henry were two of the most eminent among their ministers. Under that aspect, accordingly, they are viewed by Bossuet: and thence, as a necessary part of his system, they are of course to be convicted of Manicheism. [1] Such being the case, an exculpation of these two individuals is an exculpation of the Cathari.

A more complete failure than the attempt of Bossuet, I have rarely encountered. Yet, save the malignity of the intention, it may well be excused. The Bishop, in truth, had little to work upon: and that little was, either nothing to the purpose, or directly adverse to his theory. So zealous were the Inquisitors in destroying the writings of Bruis and Henry, that we scarcely know any thing of their tenets save what we can learn from the Tractate or Epistle of an Abbot of Clugny, Peter the Venerable, addressed to the Archbishops of Arles and Embrun with other Prelates of Dauphiny and Provence. In point of quantity, this Work is, indeed, most abundantly verbose and prolix: but its quality and texture are such, that, to deduce from it any proof of the Manicheism of the alleged heretics, could only, I think, have been gravely attempted by an Ecclesiastic of the Romish persuasion.

I. In the first quarter of the twelfth century, Peter de Bruis labored, throughout Dauphiny and Provence and Languedoc and Gascony, during a term of nearly twenty years. [2] At length, he was seized by his watchful enemies: and, in the year 1126, was committed to the flames in the town of St. Giles. After his death, Henry ministered in the same tract of country: and, in the year 1147, he also was either burned alive at Toulouse, or (as some statements say) ended his days in prison. Now, from the Tractate of the Abbot of Clugny, Bossuet trusts, that he shall be able to establish the Manicheism of Bruis and Henry, and thence, by a necessary consequence, the Manicheism of the Albigenses. For the giving a correct account of the doctrinal system maintained by these two individuals, the admirable qualifications of Peter the Venerable are sufficiently clear from his own free acknowledgments. He wrote, as he himself distinctly tells us, from mere vulgar unauthenticated rumor.

Let us see, whether these heretics, who yield not to the authority of the great doctors of the Church, will at least acquiesce in the decision of either Christ or the Prophets or the Apostles. I say this, because common report has spread it abroad, that you do not totally believe either the Prophets or the Apostles or even Christ himself: and the same report, if it be true, indicates moreover, that you detract from the majesty both of the Old Testament and of the New Testament. But, because I ought not to give assent to the fallaciousness of mere rumors, more especially when some affirm that you have rejected the whole of the Sacred Canon, while others contend that you receive some portions of it, I am unwilling to censure you for matters uncertain. [3]

He had furthermore, as he likewise informs us, consulted a Work, which was said to have been dictated to an amanuensis by Henry, the disciple and successor of Bruis: but he himself, nevertheless, did not venture to adduce it as affording any safe warrant for a regular accusation. After the burning of Peter de Bruis at St. Giles; whereby, through the zeal of the faithful, he passed from temporal to eternal fire, Henry, the heir of his wickedness, with I know not what other persons, did not so much amend as alter his diabolical doctrine: for, as I lately saw in a volume which was said to have been written from his

dictation, he put forth, not merely five points, like his master, but many points. Nevertheless, because I have not as yet full confidence, that he either so thinks or so preaches, I defer my answer to him in particular, until I shall have indisputable certainty of the matters which are reported concerning him. [4]

The honesty, while he attacks the two heretics, evinced by Peter of Clugny, in duly telling us, that, save by hearsay, he really knows nothing about them, is doubtless laudable as far as it goes yet, assuredly, if acknowledged ignorance and uncertainty be valuable requisites in a trustworthy witness, we have them exhibited in the highest perfection by this specially Venerable Abbot.

After thus very handsomely confessing that he was entirely in the dark, as to whether the Petrobrusians did or did not receive either the whole or any part of the Canon of Scripture, he sets himself to demonstrate, that an admission of the New Testament inevitably involves and draws after it an admission of the Old Testament. [5]

And, in truth, very well he performs his task. But how this perfectly conclusive argument against one of the recognized tenets of Manicheism is to fix the charge of Manicheism itself upon persons whom Peter all the while confessedly knew not to hold any such tenet, certainly passes my comprehension. The reasoning is very good reasoning in its place but, so far as Bruis and his disciples are concerned, it is plainly, according to the Abbot's own statement of the matter, quite irrelevant.

II. Descending, however, to greater particularity, for the purpose of indisputably establishing his accusation, he sums up, in five points, the principal doctrines, which, during the space of well nigh twenty years, were said to have been preached by the indefatigable heresiarch.

> The first point denies: that children, who have not arrived at the age of intellect, can be saved by Christian Baptism; [6] or that the faith of another person can be profitable to those, who are physically unable to exert any faith of their own. For, according to them, it is not the faith of another, but an individual's own faith, which saves with Baptism inasmuch as the Lord says; He, that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; and he, that believeth not, shall be damned.
>
> The second point maintains that churches ought not to be built, and that those already built ought to be pulled down. For sacred places, set apart for prayer, are no way necessary to Christians: inasmuch as God, whether invoked in a tavern or in a church, in a market-place or in a temple, before an altar or before a manger, equally hears and answers those who are deserving. [7]
>
> The third point commands: that sacred crucifixes should be broken and burned. For the cross, on which Christ was so horribly tortured and so cruelly slain, is worthy neither of adoration nor of veneration nor of ally suppliant invocation: but rather, big way of avenging his torments and death, it ought to be treated with every dishonor, to be hacked with swords, to be burned with fire.
>
> The fourth point not only denies the truth of the body and blood of the Lord, through the sacrament daily and continually offered up in the Church: but it also declares, that that sacrament is nothing, and that it ought not to be offered up to God.

> The fifth point derides sacrifices, prayers, alms, and other good deeds, when made by the living faithful on behalf of the faithful defunct: affirming, that, not even in the smallest degree, can they help any one of the dead. [8]

Here, in due form, as preferred by Peter the Venerable against Bruis and his disciples, we have, with whatever distortion of statement, five specific articles of indictment. Now, even if we unreservedly take them as they stand, I should be glad to learn, from any modern follower of Bossuet, where it is that they exhibit the slightest shade of doctrinal Manicheism.

III. But, in vindication of Bruis and his disciples, merely negative evidence is by no means the whole that may be urged: we have also a sufficiency of positive evidence.

By the Manicheans, the outward administration of Baptism was altogether rejected: whence, in the writings of popish ecclesiastics, a renunciation of this sacrament is perpetually alleged against those pretended heretics, upon whom they would invidiously fix the charge of Manicheism. But, according to the Abbot, bitter and prejudiced as he was, the Petrobrusians were only a sort of Antipedobaptists, who rejected not Baptism itself, but who simply denied the utility of Infant-Baptism. Judging from the language which they are reported to have held on that topic, I am myself satisfied: that they did nothing more than deny the spiritual grace of Regeneration to follow, ex opere operato, the outward administration of the material sign in Baptism; and that this was misconstrued into an assertion, that infants ought not to be baptized, inasmuch as infants cannot, by any proper faith of their own, be worthy recipients. [9] But, however that may be, the question, Whether Infant-Baptism was really rejected by them, is, in truth, so far as any testimony to their fancied Manicheism is concerned, quite wide of the mark. Let them have rejected, or let them have retained, Infant-Baptism specifically, still they confessedly held the observance, and even insisted upon the necessity, of the sacrament of Baptism itself. Now this they could not have done, if they had been votaries of the Manichean Heresy.

So likewise the very mode, in which (according to the Abbot) the Petrobrusians showed their zeal for the destruction of crucifixes, and respecting which Bossuet is profoundly silent, yet again demonstrates the impossibility of their having been Manicheans. On a certain Good-Friday, they collected together as many crosses as they could: and, using them as the materials for a large fire which they kindled, they proceeded to roast a quantity of flesh meat, from which they afterward made a hearty meal, inviting the people to follow their example. [10] In such an action, they might perhaps have shown more of iconoclastic zeal than of sober discretion: but, at all events, the narrative effectually confutes the charge of Manicheism. For, among the various badges of the disciples of Manes, one, it is well known, was an abhorrence of animal food, on the ground that it was the special production of the Evil Principle: whereas Bruis and his followers, instead of being haunted by any such absurd scruples, showed their contempt both of purely mechanical fasting and of idolatrously worshipped crucifixes, by feeding strenuously upon flesh meat cooked on Good-Friday at a fire made of the timber of crosses. There is also another matter, which, even still more definitely, brings us to the same conclusion. The Manicheans, like the old Docetae, denied that Christ had any proper material body; the form, which was seen, having been purely phantasiastic: whence, they also consistently denied, that he endured upon the cross any real sufferings. Accordingly, a denegation of Christ's substantial body, is, by the romish ecclesiastics, perpetually charged upon those, whom they would convict of Manicheism. But the Petrobrusians, so far from denying that Christ had a material body, are actually said to have alleged, in their third point of doctrine, that it was the height of absurdity to adore the instrument on which the

Lord was so horribly tortured and so cruelly put to death. Hence, assuredly, according to the testimony of their very enemies, Bruis and his disciples could, by no possibility, have been Manicheans.

IV. Still, however, though with these three several facts before his eyes, the Bishop of Meaux does not altogether despair. Advancing, it seems, a step beyond Berenger, the Petrobrusians not only denied the truth of the body and blood of Christ, but likewise the sacrament itself with its species and figure – thus leaving the people without any sacrifice of the most high and true God. [11] Hence the Bishop rapidly pronounces them to be clearly convicted Manicheans, because, like the Manicheans, they absolutely rejected the Eucharist. [12]

It is really very difficult to believe, that Bossuet could have honestly penned such a charge on such grounds. Why, the very language of Peter the Venerable is so perfectly intelligible, that he, who runs, may read. What Bruis and his disciples rejected was, most evidently, not the due administration of the Eucharist, but its miserable perversion by the Church of Rome. They denied not broadly the truth of the body and blood of Christ; for they acknowledged, that he had a real substantial body which suffered upon the cross but they denied the truth of any material presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist; rationally and scripturally asserting, that the process, whereby the priests claimed to make the body and blood of Christ at the altar, was a piece of useless folly. And, in like manner, they denied not the sacrifice of Christ, which he once for all offered upon the cross but they rejected the worse than idle notion, that the Eucharist, in species and figure, is a sacrifice of the literal body and blood of Christ, offered up whensoever Mass is celebrated by a priest. [13] Whatever Peter may mean by asserting, in his loose declamatory style, that Bruis went beyond Berenger it is quite certain, from his own words, as quoted by Bossuet himself, that such, and nothing more, was the reputed heresy of the Petrobrusians in regard to the Eucharist; for he represents their doctrine, concerning the ministration of a popish priest at the altar, as one which left the people without any sacrifice of the most high and true God; that is to say (for thus the whole context imports), as one which left the people without any daily sacrifice of the Mass. In truth, the very phraseology which the blundering Abbot puts into their mouths, absurd and incongruous as it is, so utterly destroys the fancy of their being Manicheans, that Bossuet, more prudently than equitably, has not, any more than their fourth and fifth points of doctrine, ventured to adduce it.

According to Peter de Clugny, they were wont to say to the people Be not deceived by the priests, who would persuade you that they can make the body of Christ upon the altar; whereas the body of Christ was made once only, by Christ himself, at the last supper. [14]

What they really said, was; that The body of Christ was once for all offered up on the cross: whence they argued; that A priest could not make it upon the altar, in order that it might be repeatedly a sacrifice for sin. Their own language to the people, indeed, even as reported by the Abbot, is incompatible with the notion of their being Manicheans: for, in that very language, they are made professedly to acknowledge the true substantial existence of the human body of Christ.

V. That the entire matter may be still further cleared, I shall give the Abbot's own construction of the five doctrinal points ascribed to the Petrobrusians; together with a sixth point, in itself of secondary importance, and to the main question of no importance whatsoever.

> Ye say: that neither baptism without concomitant faith, nor faith without concomitant baptism, is of any avail; for neither can save without the other. [15]

> Ye preach: that churches are vainly built; since the Church of God consists, not in a mass of coherent stones, but in the unity of the congregated faithful.
>
> Ye say: that the cross of the Lord is not to be honored or adored; for the instrument of Christ's torment and death ought to be rejected, not venerated; ought to be burned, not (mere insensible matter as it is) to be innovated by silly prayers.
>
> Ye assert: that the Church possesses not the body of the Lord, in the sacrament of the altar; and that, whatsoever is there done by the priests, is idle and without true effect, since Christ gave his body, not to future Christians, but once alone to his then present disciples.
>
> Ye affirm: that it is in vain to pray or to do any good deed for the defunct; because the good deeds of the living cannot profit those, who, when they departed hence, took with them their whole stock of merit, to which nothing can be contributed by another.
>
> Ye add: that by ecclesiastical chants, God is only mocked; since he, who is delighted with holy affections alone can neither be propitiated by loud voices, nor soothed by the artificial modulations of scientific music. [16]

From this statement, we may easily gather: that the true reason, why the Petrobrusians objected to the miserably superstitious worship of the cross, was the palpable circumstance of its being a piece of mere insensible matter; and that the real ground of their objection, to the vain and impious mummeries of the Mass, was the scriptural verity of the one sacrifice of Christ, once offered on the cross for the sins of all mankind, not repeatedly offered under the aspect of a sacrifice both for quick and for dead as often as a priest celebrates the Eucharist.

On the whole, if we allow for some small misapprehension or misconstruction in the statement which readily corrects itself, I can here discern, nothing indeed of Manicheism, Out much of very sound Protestantism. Hence, with such evidence before him, I marvel not, however discrepant from Bossuet, at the very natural conclusion of the chronologist Genebrard: that The theological parents of the Calvinists, or the members of the French Reformed Churches, were the Petrobrusians and the Henricians and the Albigenses. [17] In truth, the Petrobrusians and the Henricians, as Bossuet himself well knows or rather insists, were but the Albigenses under different names. Consequently, when their doctrinal system is ascertained, that of the Albigenses is ascertained also. [18]

VI. At a later period, as I have already stated, the disciple Henry either died in confinement or encountered the same fate as his sainted master Bruis. Let us hope, that the former was the case. It has been said, however, that, after a painful life incessantly devoted to ministerial and missionary exertions, he was, in the year 1147, consigned to the flames at Toulouse, by the barbarity of the Papal Legate Alberic, and at the unchristian solicitation of Bernard of Clairvaux.

Be that as it may, this last individual, relentlessly, even after death, pursued the reformer with the foulest and yet most inconsistent calumnies: for, while he represents him as a very monster, he is compelled to acknowledge the wide success of his indefatigably conducted labors. Henry traveled, indeed, throughout the whole of Languedoc and Gascony, a convicted wolf in sheep's clothing: he apostatically threw off the habit of his Order, for he had originally been a monk; and, as a dog returns to his vomit, greedily returned to the world and the uncleanness of the flesh: he sold the word of God; and preached, what he called the Gospel, for a livelihood: he was a gamester, an habitual fornicator,

and, by way of variety, an occasional adulterer: wherever he journeyed, whether from Lausanne or from Poictou or from Bourdeaux, he left behind him the slimy traces of his filthiness: yea, the very land, wherein for a season he took up his abode, stank awfully with the stupendous fetidness of his evil odor. Yet, when he girt up his loins; and, knowing not whither he went, became a wanderer upon the face of God's earth: such, with a plainly besotted people, was his paradoxical success; that churches were left without congregations; congregations, without priests; priests, without reverence; and Christians, without Christ. The sanctuary of God was denied to be holy: churches were deemed no better than synagogues: sacraments were no longer sacred: festivals were deprived of their solemn festivities. By death, souls were hurried before the terrific tribunal of God: neither, alas, reconciled by penance, nor fortified by the viaticum of the Holy Communion. Children were shut out from the life of Christ, while the regenerative grace of Baptism was denied to be their property. [19]

Surely, concludes the zealous Bernard to his noble friend Count Ildefonso of St. Giles: Surely, this man cannot be of God, who says and does things so contrary to God. Nevertheless, alas, alas, he is heard by multitudes: and he has a people, who give implicit confidence to him. By some strange diabolical art, he has bewitched the silly vulgar: so that they believe not even their own eyesight. He has made them fancy: that all are in error; that the whole worm is in the high-road to ruin; and that all the riches of the mercy of God, and the entire grace which belongs to the whole human kind, appertain exclusively to those, whom he, by his artful predication, has fatally deceived. [20]

The climax of Bernard would have been complete, had he subjoined: that this unheard of monster of depravity, this manifest child of Satan, after painfully wandering from place to place, after enduring a life of labor and discomfort and self-denial, after devoting himself to the propagation of what at least he deemed the Gospel of Christ; braved death, either in the flames or in a dungeon, rather than renounce the principles, which, during a term of more than twenty years, he had cherished and acted upon.

CHAPTER 7

THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATIONI DEMONSTRATED FROM THE STATEMENT OF BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX

IF, however, in regard to the Manicheism of Bruis and his catharistic followers, Peter of Clugny be not quite so satisfactory a witness as Bossuet could have desired the celebrated Bernard of Clairvaux, a brother Abbot and contemporary, whose general vituperation of Henry we have already heard, may perhaps somewhat better supply the wished-for information.

Such are the sanguine hopes of the Bishop of Meaux. Peter the Venerable, he admits, may indeed speak with some hesitation, as to their receiving, like the Manicheans, no part of the Sacred Canon except the Gospel alone: but then Bernard, he remarks, who knew them well in Gascony, had, upon this conclusively damning point, no doubt at all. [1]

I. The truth of Scripture, says the Clairvaux, stands thus: IT IS THE GLORY OF KINGS TO CONCEAL A MATTER; BUT IT IS THE GLORY OF GOD TO REVEAL A DISCOURSE. Wilt thou not reveal? In that case, thou wilt not glorify God. But perhaps thou receivest not this portion of Scripture. Even so it is. They profess, that they, and they alone, are emulators of the Gospel alone. [2] Here we have the charge in mood and form. Bernard, we see, alleges, against the Petrobrusian Cathari of Gascony, a rejection of the Old Testament: and his proof lies; partly, in an intimation, that they received not a text which he had professed to cite against them from the Proverbs; and partly in an avowal made by themselves, that they alone were emulators of the Gospel alone to the exclusion (as he understood their language) of the Hebrew Scriptures.

1. That the Cathari, perhaps with some slight tinge of sarcasm, should have refused to admit the passage which Bernard professed to cite against them from the Book of Proverbs, will not excite much surprise in a Protestant Biblicist: while, at the same time, he will in no wise perceive the validity of the reasoning, which, from the rejection of the cited passage (for, verily, the Cathari did reject it), would demonstrate their universal rejection of the Old Testament also.

The truth is: neither in the Hebrew Original, nor yet in the Greek of the Seventy, nor yet again in the Latin Vulgate, does any such passage exist, as that which Bernard has unfortunately professed to cite (memoriter, no doubt) as a genuine portion of the Ancient Scriptures. We are taught, indeed, that It is the glory of GOD to conceal a matter, while it is the glory of KINGS to search it out. [3] But we no where read, that It is the glory of KINGS to conceal a matter, while it is the glory of GOD to reveal a discourse.

Now I submit, that the probably sarcastic rejection of a passage, which no where occurs in the Old Testament, is not a very logical proof, that the Old Testament itself was rejected by the Cathari. [4]

2. But these clearly convicted Manicheans professed also, that they alone were emulators of the Gospel alone: and, from such phraseology, Bernard was confirmed in his prepossession, that, confessedly emulating the Gospel alone, they must, by a plain implication, be understood, as also confessedly rejecting the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

When I consider the will-worship, wherewithal Popery has so mercilessly overlaid the sincere Gospel of Christ; and when I recollect, that, by Bernard's own account, the Cathari of Gascony claimed to be successors of the Apostles and distinguished themselves by the name of Apostolicals: I doubt not, that

they really made the profession ascribed to them, though Bernard, much too hasty and much too violent to be a patient investigator, has somewhat absurdly mistaken its obvious and indeed necessary import. What, then, was that profession, which is to establish the alleged fact of their rejection of the Old Testament?

They profess, says he, that they, and they alone, are emulators of the Gospel alone.

Such was their profession. And what is its obvious and necessary meaning; necessary, I say, because the words, they alone, or they to the exclusion of their adversaries, absolutely forbid any other interpretation. Bernard, though he himself, mingled with whatever superstition, repeatedly maintained the sound doctrine to which the Cathari of Gascony alluded; yet, impetuous and prepossessed, was easily led, by his prejudices, to misapprehend the purport of their profession, and thence to impose upon it a sense foreign alike to its plain meaning and to their evident intention. This I can readily comprehend. But, that the cool and penetrating and acute Bossuet really fell into the same mistake, albeit reluctant to judge uncharitably, I find it no easy matter to believe. Even a child in Theology, who knows the fundamental point of difference, between simulated Catholicism and genuine Catholicism, to be the vital doctrine of Justification through-Faith on account of the alone perfect Righteousness of Christ, and not on account of the Infused-Righteousness and alleged Meritorious Works of fallen man: even a child in Theology, I suppose, will readily understand the noble profession of these maligned and persecuted Petrobrusians, as it stands imperishably recorded by the hand of Bernard himself.

While the Romanists, as good Latimer quaintly expresses it, made an utterly unevangelical mingle-mangle of Christ's merit and Man's merit; a confused Scheme, which shortly afterward was reduced into regular phrase and form by the Schoolmen, and which ultimately was laid down as an Article of Faith by the shameless heretics who congregated together in the packed Conventicle of Trent: the Cathari, broadly in their day contrasting their own doctrine with that of their adversaries, professed; that They alone, in the wide world of antiscriptural error and ignorance, were emulous of preaching the Gospel alone; that They alone, as contradistinguished from the rife teachers of human merit, made it a principle to preach the Gospel, and nothing but the Gospel; that They alone, in the midst of the great predicted apostasy of the Man of Sin, refused to adulterate the Gospel by laying down terms of Justification and Salvation which the Gospel has not delivered and which the Gospel refuses to sanction.

On this ground, as the Abbot of Clairvaux testifies, they consistently censured the Papalists, for ascribing to Baptism the grace of Inward Regeneration, mechanically or ex opere operato; which he curiously mistook for a denial of the Sacrament of Baptism to Infants: and, on this same ground also, they, with great justice, ridiculed, both as utterly unwarranted, and as altogether contrary to the analogy of Evangelical Faith, the idle practice of praying for the dead and of supplicating the Saints for their suffrages.[5] Hence, moreover, as essentially subversive of the sincere Gospel which alone they were emulous to preach, inasmuch as it rests upon the unscriptural principle, that Man may either hereafter make satisfaction for himself by his own sufferings, or that Here he may make satisfaction for the dead by his reputed good works and by the sacerdotal offertory of the Mass: they rejected entirely the dangerous and unauthorized figment of a Purgatorial Fire; maintaining, that, as soon as the soul is separated from the body, it forthwith passes, either to a state of rest, or to a state of damnation. [6] And hence, finally, whatever names of reproach might be imposed upon them by their enemies, they themselves would acknowledge no appellation, save that of Apostolicals, equivalent to their old name

Paulicians: inasmuch as they claimed to be the uncorrupted successors and followers of St. Paul and the Apostles. [7]

II. Of this last peculiarity, Bernard was aware: and, accordingly, he notices it in a very remarkable passage, which, by placing these Apostolicals (though unable, he contends, to show any sign of their Apostolate) in direct contradistinction both to Manicheans and to Sabellians and to Arians and to Eunomians and to Nestorians, thence of necessity admits, that They symbolized not with any one of those various classes of acknowledged Heretics.

The passage in question, Bossuet has thought it expedient to suppress altogether. Not even Bernard's ingenious theory, that, Satan himself was the true heresiarch of the Nameless Insincerity, can tempt him to communicate a statement, which, with whatever grossness of misrepresentation, abundantly indicates, that the Cathari or Albigenses of Southern France were not Manicheans. I shall, therefore, in common justice, supply the learned historian's lack of service.

These heretics prohibit matrimony: and abstain from meats, which God hath created. But now, in order to see whether this ludification be not properly of demons and not of men, according to that which the Spirit had foretold, inquire of them the author of their sect: and they will assign none. What heresy is there, which, from among men, has not had its own heresiarch? The Manicheans had Manes, for their prince and preceptor, the Sabellians, Sabellius: the Arians, Arius: the Eunomians, Eunomius: the Nestorians, Nestorius. Thus all other pests of this stamp are known to have had, each a man, as their several founders whence they have at once derived both their origin and their name. But, by what appellation or by what title, will you enroll these heretics? Truly, by none. For their heresy is not derived from man; neither, through man, have they received it: though far be it from me to say, that they have received it through the revelation of Jesus Christ. Rather, and without all doubt, as the Holy Spirit hath foretold, they have received it, through the fraudulent injection of demons, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and forbidding to marry. [8]

The assertion, that the Petrobrusian Cathari prohibited matrimony, when yet, according to the testimony of Peter of Clugny, they absolutely compelled the Monks to marry, and when, according to the researches of Coccius, Bruis himself maintained that both Priests and Monks ought to marry; and the assertion, that They enjoined abstinence from meats on the known principles of Manicheism, when yet, still according to the testimony of the same Venerable Abbot, they publicly roasted and ate flesh-meat on Good-Friday: such assertions, on the part of Bernard, tend not to give us much confidence in the scrupulousness of his accuracy. [9] And certainly our confidence in the stated result of his inquiries will not be much increased, when we recollect, that, even agreeably to his own showing, this most perverse spawn of the father of lies invariably denied alike, both the charge of Manichean Heterodoxy and the imputation of Manichean Impurity.

CHAPTER 8

THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION DEMONSTRATED FROM THE STATEMENT OF WILLIAM OF NEWBURY

BUT still the indefatigable Bishop of Meaux is not without resource. Through the help afforded by William of Newbury, he thinks, that he has certainly detected the pest of Gascon Manicheism, in the very act of attempting the invasion of our hitherto unpolluted England. [1] Yet, with such strange diversity, does the same evidence operate upon different minds: that, had I wished to select a specially compact proof that the Albigenses were not Manicheans, while, at the same time, I might exhibit a vivid picture of their character and disposition; I should have incontinently laid my hand upon the precise narrative, to which Bossuet has appealed for a directly opposite purpose.

Whichever view be the most correct, the circumstances, that are detailed in the narrative of our ancient English historian, occurred during the reign of the second Henry: and Bossuet assigns them to the year 1160. Hence they took place much about the same time that Bernard, with more prejudice than caution, was pursuing his not always accurate investigation of the doctrines and habits of the Cathari of Gascony and Languedoc.

I. Let William of Newbury, however, tell his own story in his own words: and thus let him enable us, fairly and reasonably, to estimate its just amount.

In the same days, certain vagabonds came into England, of the race (it is believed) of those whom they commonly denominate Publicans.

These formerly emigrated from Gascony, deriving their origin from an uncertain author: and, into many regions, they infused the poison of their perfidy. For, in the broadest provinces of France and Spain and Italy and Germany, so many are said to have been infected with this pest, that according to the prophet, they seemed to be multiplied beyond the sand of the sea. When any remissness toward them is shown by the Prelates of Churches and by the Princes of Provinces then these very evil foxes creep out of their caves; and, seducing the simple under a pretended display of piety, demolish the, vineyard of the Lord of hosts the more grievously as the more freely. But, when with fire the zeal of God's Faithful is kindled against them: then they lie hid in their pits, and are less noxious; but still, by secretly scattering their poison, they cease not to be injurious. They are mere rustics and men of inferior condition, whence they are dull in the comprehension of argument. Yet, if they are once thoroughly tainted with that pest, they will rigidly hold out against all discipline. Hence, it very rarely happens, that any one of them, whenever they are betrayed and dragged out of their lurking-places, is ever converted to piety. From this and from every other similar pest of heresy, England was always exempted: though, in other parts of the world, so many diverse heresies were in a state of vigorous pullulation. It is true, indeed, that when the island was called Britain on account of the Britons its inhabitants, it sent forth Pelagius a future heresiarch in the East, and in process of time admitted his error within its borders. But, when, after expelling the Britons, the nation of the Angles occupied the island, so that it was now denominated no longer Britain but England; no poison of heretical pestilence ever boiled out from it, or even entered into it from other quarters for the purpose of propagation, until the times of King Henry the second: and, even then, God being propitious, the pest, which had crept in, was so promptly encountered, that henceforth all heresies feared to invade this highly privileged island.

At that time, however, somewhat more than thirty individuals, as well men as women, dissembling their error, entered here, as it were peacefully, for the sake of propagating their pestilence; a certain Gerard being their leader, to whom they all looked up as their prince and preceptor: for he alone among them had a smattering of learning; while the rest were altogether without letters, being mere rustics of the Teutonic Nation and Language. Making some stay in England, they were only able to enroll in their community a single miserable woman, whom they circumvented with their poisonous whispers, and whom moreover (as it was said.) they fascinated by the potency of diabolical incantations. But they could not long remain concealed: for, some persons, inasmuch as they were a foreign sect, inquiring more closely into their condition, they were apprehended and kept in the public prison.

The king, unwilling either to dismiss or to punish them without full discussion, ordered, that a Council of Bishops should be assembled at Oxford. Here, while they were solemnly convened respecting religion, the person, who seemed to have a tinge of letters, undertaking the cause of all and speaking for all, they answered: that They were Christians, and that They venerated the doctrine of the Apostles. Being questioned in succession concerning the articles of our holy faith, they answered rightly, indeed, so far as respects THE SUBSTANCE OF THE HEAVENLY PHYSICIAN: but, respecting his remedies by which he designs to heal human infirmity, that is to say, the divine sacraments, theft uttered perverse things; detesting holy Baptism and the Eucharist and Marriage, and presumptuously derogating from Catholic Unity which is imbued with these divine subsidiaries.

When they were urged with divine testimonies taken from Scripture, they replied: that They believed as they had been taught, but that They would not dispute concerning their faith. Being admonished to do penance and to unite themselves to the body of the Church, they entirely despised all such wholesome counsel. They also laughed to scorn the threats, which were uttered for the purpose of inducing them, through the agency of fear, to repentance: abusing that word of the Lord; Blessed are they who suffer persecution on account of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Then the Bishops, cautiously guarding lest the poison of heresy should creep more widely, after a public declaration of their being convicted heretics, delivered them up to the catholic Prince, in order that they might be subjected to corporal discipline. His sentence, accordingly, was: that A mark of heretical infamy should be branded on their foreheads; that, In the sight of the people, they should be whipped and driven out of the city; and that A strict prohibition should be published, forbidding all the lieges either to receive them into their houses or to cherish them with any consolation.

Judgment having been thus pronounced, they were led forth to their most just punishment, not with lingering steps, but actually rejoicing with much joy: while their master preceded them, and sang; Blessed are ye, when all men shall hate you. So greatly did the seducing spirit abuse their self-deceived understandings. As for the wretched woman whom they had seduced in England, she, departing from them through fear of punishment, confessed her error, and merited reconciliation.

Furthermore, that detestable company, with cauterized foreheads, was subjected to just severity: the individual, who acted as primate among them, bearing the disgrace of a double brand, to wit, both upon his forehead and round his chin, as a badge of his preceptorship. Thus, with garments cut short, as low as the girdle, being publicly flagellated, and with loudly sounding stripes being ejected from the city, through the intolerance of the cold (for the season was winter) no one showing to them even the slightest degree of mercy, they miserably perished.

The pious rigor of this severity did not, indeed, purge the realm of England from the pest which had already crept into it: but, through the salutary terror which it struck into heretics, it at least prevented it from creeping any further. [2]

II. Such, even in their mildest form, are the tender mercies of Popery! But can we seriously believe, even on a hasty survey of the matter, that these devoted individuals, thus meekly conducting themselves, thus triumphantly suffering, thus exhibiting afresh the wonders of the Primitive Church, were, after all, a synagogue of inveterate Manicheans, bad in doctrine, worse in practice? Both common sense itself, and the slightest knowledge of human nature, alike forbid the monstrous, the incredible supposition.

But, happily, we can appeal to somewhat yet more tangible, than the warm feelings of Christian experience: happily, we can appeal also to the very record of their examination.

Why does Bossuet garble one part of this record and then, in his discussion, slip over, without the slightest notice, another, and that too by far the most important part of it?

1. With respect to the first, the murdered Publicans, it seems, had a horror of Baptism and Marriage and the Eucharist – thus, according to Bossuet, exhibiting three visible characters of Manicheism. [3]

Now, on these specific points, what was the nature and quality of their horror?

Bossuet represents his author, as saying: that They spoke VERY ILL of the remedies which the celestial physician has left us holding in horror Baptism and the Eucharist and Marriage. [4]

But William of Newbury uses no such vaguely pliant language. On the contrary, he employs a strict definiteness of phraseology, which Bossuet, in his version, has altogether suppressed.

What the historian really says, is this: that They uttered PERVERSE THINGS respecting the remedies by which the heavenly physician deigns to heal human infirmity, that is to say, RESPECTING THE DIVINE SACRAMENTS; detesting Baptism and the Eucharist and Marriage.

The genuine words of the historian, we see, bear a very different aspect from those which Bossuet has put into his mouth: and they evidently convey a very different impression.

William of Newbury states: not, loosely and vaguely, as Bossuet represents him, that the Publicans spoke very ill of the remedies; but, distinctly and definitely, that they uttered perverse things respecting the sacraments; in other words, that they perverted what the Romanists held to be the true doctrine of the sacraments.

This is the statement: and perfectly intelligible it is to all, save those who do not choose to understand.

The assembled bishops, adducing from Scripture the testimonies alluded to by William, from a literal construction of our Lord's eucharistic words, enforced the doctrine of Transubstantiation with all its idolatrous results: and, when the prisoners, by the mouth of Gerard, objected to such a construction and expressed their detestation of the idolatry involved in the Mass; their judges would readily pronounce them, to utter perverse things respecting the sacrament, and, inasmuch as they detested the abominations of the Mass, to detest the Eucharist itself.

The assembled Bishops, still adducing scriptural testimony, from a misconstruction of our Lord's baptismal words, contended; that, mechanically and ex opere operato, Regeneration by the Spirit always accompanies Baptism by water if canonically administered: and, when the prisoners expressed

their dissent, making, I suppose, like the Primitive Church and the Church of England, the efficacy of a sacrament to depend, not upon its canonical administration merely, but upon its worthy reception; their judges would again describe them, as speaking perverse things respecting the sacrament, and as undervaluing, not to say rejecting, all Baptism by water.

The assembled Bishops, once more adducing scriptural testimony, from St. Paul's declaration that Marriage is a great mystery, maintained, on the ground of mystery and sacrament being theological synonyms, that Marriage is a sacrament: and, when the prisoners demurred to such a gloss, denying Marriage to be a sacrament in any such sense as the two only ordained by Christ himself; their judges, once more likewise, would charge them with speaking perverse things of a sacrament, and would exhibit them to the hatred of the people as despising and detesting Marriage, simply because they objected to the view taken of it by their episcopal inquisitors.

That what I have said has not been devised for the mere purpose of serving a turn, but that I am correct in my interpretation of the language employed by William of Newbury, is fully evinced by the old History of Treves preserved in the Spicilegium of Dacherius. From this Work, it distinctly appears: that the PERVERSE THINGS which the German Publicans uttered RESPECTING THE SACRAMENTS, as William speaks, were not A denial of the genuine Sacraments themselves, but only (as I have supposed) A denial of Transubstantiation and A denial that Baptism mechanically insures the salvation of children. [5]

Thus, when, instead of the garbled statement given by Bossuet, the real words of William of Newbury are attended to; and when those words are explained by the parallel narrative contained in the History of Treves: thus does the idle charge of Manicheism against the German Publicans melt rapidly into thin air.

2. The second and most decisive point, however, yet remains to be noticed.

In his translation, Bossuet certainly does not venture to omit this point that were a somewhat too hazardous experiment. But, so far as his Commentary is concerned, while he is copious and triumphant upon the garbled passage which I have already noticed; the garbling itself being very likely to escape observation he cautiously avoids directing the attention of his reader to the decisive point in question; and suffers it to sleep, as soundly as it may, in the deep silence of his rapidly-perused version. Yet, at the very time when he was busily engaged in transmuting the poor Publicans into palpable Manicheans, the learned Prelate must himself have well known, that the distinctly specified particular alluded to was utterly fatal to his very ingenious case of accusation.

At the present advanced stage of the discussion, I need scarcely to repeat that the real followers of Manes denied to our Lord, altogether, the possession of any substantial body; alleging, that, what appeared, was nothing solid and material, but simply an unsubstantial phantom which mocked the eye by a mere corporeal semblance.

Now, in direct opposition to this palmary doctrine of Manicheism, the prisoners, we are assured by William of Newbury, answered RIGHTLY, so far as regards the SUBSTANCE of the heavenly physician. In other words, they acknowledged the precise point, which the Manicheans, by their very theory that Matter is the production of the Evil Principle, stood pledged to deny.

Hence, instead of establishing the Manicheism of the Gascon Albigenses, the narrative of the English Historian absolutely and incontrovertibly demonstrates that, By no possibility, could those much calumniated religionists have been Manicheans. [6]

It may be useful to add, that, upon this head, there can be no mistake. The very terms of the narrative show; that the Publicans must have been closely questioned upon the precise doctrinal points of Christ's SUBSTANCE: the very nature of the questioning demonstrates; that its cause was a suspicion, the vulgar suspicion of the day to wit, that the prisoners must needs be followers of Manes: and the very statement, that They answered RIGHTLY so far as regards the SUBSTANCE of the heavenly physician, invincibly brings out the conclusion; that The suspicion was entirely groundless and unfounded.

CHAPTER 9

THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE CASE OF THE ALBIGENSES AT LOMBERS

WE have already seen more than one specimen of Bossuet's management in the garbling and packing of evidence: but all, that we have hitherto beheld, sinks into insignificance, when compared with his treatment of a witness, who, by faithfully giving us from their own lips their own Confession of Faith, practically and effectually acquits the Albigenses of any taint of Manicheism.

The witness in question is Roger Hoveden: and the Confession, recorded by him, was publicly delivered in open court and addressed at large to the multitude there assembled.

In the year 1176, a Council was held at the town of Lombers near Albi, for the purpose of examining certain reputed heretics. These sectaries, it appears, prevailed, in great numbers, throughout the region of Toulouse; where they were known by the appellation of Good Men: and, as the Bishop justly remarks, they were indisputably those, upon whom, subsequently to the Council of that year, has most usually been bestowed the local name of Albigenses.

Thus far, all is clear. But now comes the question, Whether, on the authority of Roger Hoveden, Bossuet was justified in asserting the Albigenses to have been Manicheans.

On this point, let us first hear the French Prelate's representation of his evidence, and afterward attend to the entire testimony of the writer upon whose statement he professes to depend.

I. Respecting the alleged Manicheism of the Albigenses at Lombers, Bossuet writes and quotes, as follows.

An historian of the time, Roger Hoveden, speaks of this Council at considerable length: and he gives a faithful abridgment of its Acts in a more ample form than they have ever since been recovered. Mark, how he begins his recital.

In the province of Toulouse, says he, there were certain heretics, who assumed the name of GOOD MEN, and who were supported by the Knights of Lombers. These said: that They received, neither the Law of Moses, nor the Prophets, nor the Psalms, nor the Old Testament, nor the Doctors of the New; save the Gospels, the Epistles of St. Paul, the seven Canonical Epistles, the Acts, and the Apocalypse.

Without speaking more of the remainder, this is quite sufficient to make our Protestants blush for the errors of their ancestors. [1]

Here, as if nothing of any importance followed, the Bishop suddenly stops short.

II. Now, even upon the face of his own meagre citation from Hoveden, we might well demur to the validity of this testimony. For, simply taking the matter as there exhibited, we might justly observe that the very statement, which was formally made the ground-work of the charge against the Albigenses, itself contains the most palpable internal marks of falsehood. These strange heretics are said to have made a profession-that They received none of the Books of the New Testament; save only the Gospels, and the Epistles of St. Paul, and the seven Canonical Epistles, and the Acts, and the Apocalypse. In other words, since ALL the Books of the New Testament are enumerated, they are actually charged

with an avowal: that They received NONE of the Books of the New Testament; save only EVERY Book which the New Testament comprehends!

But let this pass. In order to expose and put down a writer, whose disgraceful calumny is built upon a deliberate suppression of evidence, and who yet (as I may truly say) has the unaccountable impudence to aver, that, without speaking more of the remainder, the modicum, which he cites, is sufficient to make Protestants blush for the errors of their ancestors: I have little to do, beyond exhibiting Hoveden's own narrative; which Bossuet himself graces with the well-deserved name of faithful, and which Bossuet himself describes as giving an abridgement of the Acts of the Council in a more ample form than they have ever since been recovered. There were, in the province of Toulouse, certain heretics, who assumed the title of GOOD MEN, and whose cause the Knights of Lombers maintained. These persons taught the people contrary to the faith of Christ, propounding and saying: that They received, neither the Law of Moses, nor the Prophets, nor the Psalms, nor the Old Testament, nor the Doctors of the New Testament; save only the Gospels, and the Epistles of Paul, and the Seven Canonical Epistles, and the Acts of the Apostles, and the Apocalypse.

When interrogated, concerning their faith, and concerning the baptism of infants, and as to whether they were saved by baptism; also concerning the body and blood of the Lord, where or by whom it was consecrated, and who took it, and whether it was more or better consecrated by a good man than by a bad man; also concerning marriage, whether man and wife could be saved if they were carnally united: they answered, that, Concerning their own faith and the baptism of infants, they would not speak, nor were they obliged to speak. Concerning the body and blood of the Lord, they said: that He, who received it worthily, was saved; and he, who received it unworthily, gained to himself damnation. But, concerning marriage, they said: that Man and woman were joined together, in order, as St. Paul speaks, to avoid luxury and fornication.

They said also many things, without being interrogated: as, for instance, that Men ought not to swear at all with any oath; as John declared in the Gospel and James in his Epistle. They said, moreover, that Paul commanded Bishops and Presbyters to be ordained in the Church; and that, If such persons as he commanded were not ordained, they were not Bishops or Presbyters, but ravening wolves, hypocrites, and seducers, lovers of salutations in the market-place and of the highest seats of feasts, wishing contrary to the commandment of Christ to be called Rabbi, bearing white and splendid robes, having on their fingers rings of gold decorated with jewels, which things their Master commanded not. Wherefore, since such Bishops and Presbyters resembled the Presbyters who betrayed Jesus, men ought not to obey them, because they were bad men.

The allegations, therefore, being heard on both sides, before Gerard Bishop of Albi; and judges being elected and appointed by each party; and these judges consenting and acting as assessors to the said Gerard Bishop of Albi, namely Roger Abbot of Castres and Peter Abbot of Ardoural, and the Abbot of Candeil and Arnold of Narbonne; and this, furthermore, in the presence of good men, as well Prelates and Clerks as Laics, to wit, the Lord Peter Archbishop of Narbonne and other Bishops and Abbots and Archdeacons, as also Counts and Nobles of that Province to the number of twenty, and almost the whole population of Albi and Lombers: many authorities from the New Testament, against the propositions of the aforesaid heretics, were brought by the Archbishop Peter of Narbonne and by the Bishop of Nismes and boy Abbot Peter of Cendras and boy the Abbot of Fontfroide; for the heretics would receive no judgment save through the New Testament. [2]

Having thus given a summary of the accusations and the proceedings, Roger next details at great length, under seven different heads, the arguments of the Court against the asserted opinions of the Albigenses and the result was, that, on the several counts of the indictment, they were formally pronounced to be heretics. [3]

1. Now, before we admit the justice of this sentence, or, in other words, before we admit the Albigenses to have been convicted Manicheans, we must inquire Whether they themselves acknowledged, that they held the opinions ascribed to them; or Whether, on the contrary, they altogether disowned and rejected them.

The allegations against them may be conveniently arranged under two divisions and their several replies shall be duly given and fairly discussed.

> (1.) As affording a distinct proof of their Manicheism, it was alleged against the Albigenses that They rejected the Scriptures of the Ancient Dispensation. And, in point of form, the charge against them ran: that They received, neither the Law of Moses, nor the Prophets, nor the Psalms, NOR THE OLD TESTAMENT. [4]
>
> Their reply to this charge, according to the report of the Bishop who acted as spokesman, was an acknowledgment that They received Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms, only in those testimonies which are induced by Jesus and the Apostles, and not in any others; for the reception of one part of a written instrument does not pledge a man to receive every part, so that he must either believe the whole or reject the whole. [5]
>
> The phraseology of the report now before us is certainly not of a common description; and the report itself admits the Albigenses to have disclaimed at least an universal rejection of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms: but still, whether justly or unjustly, the sufficiently obvious design of the reporter was; to convey an idea, that The Albigenses professed to receive no part of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms, except the few sentences verbally cited from them by Christ and the Apostles; and thus, on their side, to produce the semblance of an acknowledgment of Manicheism.
>
> Yet the idea, so plainly intended to be conveyed by the episcopal reporter of their answer, is directly contradicted by the remarkably precise statement of one of their own ancient Symbols or Confessions. For, in that instrument, they expressly declared: that They received the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, as well as those of the New Testament. [6] Under these conflicting circumstances, the Confession saying one thing and the episcopally – reported answer saying quite another thing, what is the conclusion to be deduced from the existing evidence?
>
> Nothing, I think, is more clear, than that the actual answer of the Albigenses at Lombers has been garbled and managed by its popish reporter, in order that it might be made to speak a language altogether opposite to that which it really spoke: and, if I mistake not, the process of misrepresentation may, particularly when we are assisted by the specific statement of their ancient Confession, without much difficulty be detected.
>
> The charge ran: that They received, neither the Law of Moses, nor the Prophets, nor the Psalms, NOR THE OLD TESTAMENT.

But the reply, if we may credit the reporting Inquisitor, leaves the sweeping clause, NOR THE OLD TESTAMENT, altogether unnoticed, mentioning nothing more than Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms. Now it is not very likely, that the important clause in question would, in their reply, be omitted by the Albigenses themselves: but it is very easy to understand, why it should be omitted in a report of their reply, drawn up, for a special purpose, by an interested and unscrupulous Ecclesiastic. Under the comprehensive denomination of THE OLD TESTAMENT, the Romanists included, as well the Apocrypha, as the Canonical Books of the Inspired Hebrew Scriptures.

By the very terms, then, of the accusation, the Albigenses were charged with rejecting, not only Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms, or, agreeably to the well-known jewish division, The Tora and the Nebiim and the Chethubim, but likewise THE ENTIRE OLD TESTAMENT viewed as comprehending also the Apocrypha.

To such an accusation, their answer was, not the garbled statement reported by the episcopal Inquisitor, but a statement, which exactly corresponded with their ancient Confession as already adduced: a statement, in truth, which that very Confession itself enables us to disentangle from the palpable misrepresentation of their malicious and dishonest adversay.

Their ancient Confession ran: that They received the CANONICAL Books of the Old Testament, as well as those of the New Testament.

Their ungarbled answer at Lombers harmoniously ran: that They received Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms AND THE OLD TESTAMENT, only so far as the several Books of the entire Volume had been respectively attested by Jesus and the Apostles, no other attestation possessing any validity; for it did not follow, that, because they received some Books of the Volume which in the language of the day was collectively styled THE OLD TESTAMENT, they were therefore bound to receive them all.

And the obvious purport of such an answer was: that They received the CANONICAL Books of the Old Testament, because those Books had the attestation of Christ and the Apostles; but rejected the APOCRYPHA, though by the Papists deemed a part of the Old Testament, because it was not thus attested.

(2.) It was further alleged against the Albigenses: that They refused to confess, with the mouth, the faith which they cherished in the heart; that They denied Baptism to be a mean of salvation to children; that They asserted the consecration of the Eucharist to be invalid, if performed by an ungodly Priest; that They maintained man and woman, united in marriage, not to be in a state of salvation; and that They received none of the Doctors of the New Testament, save only the Gospels and the Epistles of Paul and the Seven Canonical Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse; in other words as I have already noted, that They received NONE of the Books of the New Testament, save only them ALL.

To these allegations, while they reasonably refused to plead before their iniquitous judges, they freely made a full reply before what they deemed the more impartial tribunal of the assembled multitude.

> Seeing themselves convicted and confounded, says the narrative of Hoveden, they turned themselves to the whole people, and said: Hear, good men, our faith which we confess; for we now confess it, through love of you and for your sakes. Then the above-mentioned Bishop answered: You speak, it seems, not for the love of God, but for the sake of the people. Whereupon, they confessed, as follows.
>
> We believe in one God, three and one: the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.
>
> Also we believe: that the Son of God took our flesh upon him; was baptized in Jordan; fasted in the wilderness; preached our salvation; suffered, and died, and was buried; descended into hell; rose again on the third day; ascended to heaven; sent, on the day of Pentecost, the Spirit the Paraclete; and will come again, in the day of judgment, to judge the quick and the dead, when all will rise again.
>
> We acknowledge likewise: that, what we believe with the heart, we must confess with the mouth.
>
> We believe: that he, who eateth not the body of Christ, is not in a state of salvation; and that the body of Christ is not duly consecrated save in the Church and by a Priest, whether that Priest be good or bad; and that the consecration is performed, not more effectually by a good Priest, than by an evil one. Also we believe that a person is not in a state of salvation, unless he has been baptized; and that infants, through baptism, are placed in a state of salvation.
>
> We believe likewise that man and woman are in a state of salvation, though they be carnally joined in marriage; and that every one ought to receive penitence, both in mouth and in heart, from a Priest; and that he ought to be baptized in the Church.
>
> If any thing more than these articles can be shown to us through the Gospels or the Epistles, we are prepared to believe and to confess it. [7]

In this most important document, we have, distinctly and honestly recorded, A FULL CONFESSION OF THE REAL FAITH OF THE ANCIENT ALBIGENSES. Positively, it propounds the genuine catholic doctrines of the Gospel: negatively, it rejects those various manichean peculiarities which were alleged against them by their accusers. In short, so far as I can perceive, it definitely settles for ever the question, as to the Doctrinal System really maintained by the Paulician Churches of Southern France and Italy.

2. Here, then, notwithstanding the previous juridical conviction of the accused (against the justice of which they formally protested [8]), we doubtless may well expect a speedy reversal of the finding: we doubtless may expect, that, with an acquittal in full of all tendency to Manicheism, the much maligned Albigenses will now be discharged.

So we might reasonably imagine: but a Popish Court of Ecclesiastical Judicature is not so easily satisfied. The episcopal prolocutor at Lombers seems to have studied the Works of Bernard with no less emolument than the Bishop of Meaux. The former Prelate, like the latter, had there read, I suppose: that, while, on the plea of conscience, the Manichean Heretics of Gascony refused to swear at all; they, nevertheless, had a mysterious arcane maxim, which enjoined them to swear and to forswear rather than betray the dread secret which the free-masonry of their sect required them to conceal. [9] On this principle, he very ingeniously proceeded to act and, knowing that they were privately bound both to

swear and to forswear, he, somewhat incomprehensibly on the premises, though doubtless very usefully for the object which he had in view, brought the truth of their Public Confession to the undeniable test of their refusing to take any oath whatsoever.

Then the aforesaid Bishop asked them: whether they would swear, that they really held and believed that faith: and whether there was any thing else, which they ought to confess inasmuch as they had previously both thought ill and preached ill. In reply, they said that they would not swear at all; because, if they swore, they would act contrary to the Gospel and the Epistles. [10]

The trap completely answered the warmest hope and expectation of the dextrous Prelate. These unaccountable religionists, whose arcane doctrine, it seems, was well known to be that They ought to boggle neither at an oath nor at perjury when the secret of their sect was in question, and whose fixed principle, nevertheless, was equally well known to be that They ought not to swear at all upon any occasion, REFUSED to swear precisely when their arcane dogma REQUIRED them to swear, And the result was that they were clearly convicted of being Manichean Heretics, because they would in no wise swear to the sincerity of their Public Confession, and thus effectually conceal the dread secret of their nefarious community. In arrest of this most righteous judgment, our manifest Heretics pleaded the bargain which Bishop Alberic had made with them that they should not be compelled to swear. [11]

The plea was overruled by the Bishop of Albi, who flatly denied the existence of any such bargain. [12]

Thus was defeated the provident caution of the precondemned Albigenses: who, shrewdly anticipating that they would be required to take an oath touching the truth or falsehood of whatever their enemies might please to profound, and having scruples on that point however unfounded, made it an express stipulation with their treacherous sacerdotal judges, that no confirmation by oath should be demanded.

Accordingly a final sentence of condemnation was pronounced and it was severally confirmed, both by the President Gerard of Albi, and by all his assessors whether Bishops or Abbots or Provosts or Priors or Archdeacons or Nobles; whose united wisdom was at once enlightened and confirmed by the strictly concurrent judgment of a noble female theologian, the Lady Constance, sister to the Majesty of France and wife to the Count of Toulouse. [13]

III. We have now seen the Solemn Confession of Faith, publicly delivered by the Albigenses at Lombers a Confession; which, on the one hand, correctly propounds the great leading doctrines of the orthodox Catholic Creed; and which, on the other hand distinctly renounces the incompatible peculiarities of Manicheism with the holding of which they were charged by their enemies.

THIS CONFESSION WITH ALL ITS CONCOMITANTS HAS BEEN DELIBERATELY SUPPRESSED BY THE BISHOP OF MEAUX.

A brief citation of what he must have known to be the mere hearsay charge of their enemies; for, almost at the commencement of Hoveden's narrative, it is explicitly said, that allegations were heard on both sides, that is, both on the part of the accusers, and on the part of the accused a brief citation of this description is all, that Bossuet gives, to his miserably duped readers and admirers, out of the present most important and (evidentially speaking) most DECISIVE, trial; and such a citation, he adds, with a mixture of true gallican flippancy and popish impertinence, is quite sufficient, without speaking more of the remainder, to make our Protestants blush for the errors of their ancestors. [14]

The Bishop was writing for the avowed purpose of saddling the charge of Manichi, ism upon the Albigenses. This charge he professes to establish on the authority of what he himself styles a faithful

abridgement. That abridgement unequivocally demonstrates, that THE ALBIGENSES WERE NOT MANICHEANS. But the part of it, which contains this demonstration, Bossuet DELIBERATELY SUPPRESSES.

CHAPTER 10

THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE CONFESSIONS OF THE ALBIGENSES.

FROM the great compactness of their Confession as delivered at Lombers, I incline to think, that the Albigenses must have had it by heart: inserting, however, extemporaneously, those evident vituperative allusions to Manicheism, which the tenor of their examination obviously required, and which might exculpate them from any supposed participation in the wild reveries of that ancient oriental heresy.

But the having it by heart implies that they also had it in writing: for such a Confession would be useful and indeed necessary, both for the instruction of their Catechumens, and likewise as a test and directory to their Clergy.

Accordingly, we have on record more than one reference to documents of this description: and, like the obvious conclusion which cannot but be drawn from the Confession preserved at full length by Roger Hoveden, the equally obvious conclusion, drawn by those who had actually read them, was this; that The Albigenses, so far from being Manicheans as Bossuet would maintain, held, in truth, the same general system of doctrine as that which is professed by the Reformed Churches of the sixteenth century.

I. To such documents, for instance, under such an aspect, the historian Popliniere, on the testimony of many eye-witnesses, will be found to advert.

That the religion of the Albigenses differed very little from that which is now professed by Protestants, appears: both from many fragments and monuments, which, in the ancient language of their country, have been written concerning the history of those times; and likewise from the public and solemn disputation, which was held between the Bishop of Pamiers and Arnold Hot one of their ministers. The Acts of this Disputation, written in a dialect approaching rather to the Catalonian than to the French, remain entire down to the present day. Indeed, many have assured me, that they had seen THE ARTICLES OF THEIR FAITH, engraved on certain ancient tablets which are at Albi: adding, that these Articles are every where conformable to the doctrine of the Protestants. [1]

II. To these written Articles of their Faith, doubtless in substance the very same as the Confession preserved by Roger Hoveden, another historian, Vignier, also adverts: and, with much laudable precision, he gives the authority on which he makes his statement.

A person from Gascony, worthy of confidence, affirmed to me: that he had read ONE OF THEIR CONFESSIONS, written in the ancient Basque language, and presented to the Chancellor de l'Hospital before the breaking out of the second troubles in France. This Confession entirely agreed with the doctrine of the Valdenses: and, in no part of it, could be detected even a trace of Manicheism. In it, they expressly declare: that they receive the Canonical Books of the Old, as well as of the New, Testament; and that they reject every doctrine, which either is not founded upon them, or which contains any thing contrary to them. Whence, upon this principle, they profess to repudiate and condemn all the ceremonies and traditions and ordinances of the Roman Church saying, that she is a den of thieves and the Harlot of the Apocalypse. [2]

III. Should it be said that Popliniere and Vignier are comparatively modern writers, we may turn once more to the ancient and unobjectionable testimony of Roger Hoveden.

In the year 1178, Raymond and Bernard Raymond and other Albigensic Heresiarchs were examined at Toulouse, under the assurance of a safe-conduct, before Cardinal Peter the Papal Legate assisted by a numerous body of Prelates and Ecclesiastics. On this occasion, they produced a paper, on which they had written THE ARTICLES OF THEIR FAITH. The suspicions of the judges led them to enter into a minute personal examination of the accused: but, when questioned concerning the Articles of the Christian Faith, they answered, upon all those Articles, just as soundly and as circumspectly, as if they had been the most sincere of Christians. Whereupon, by the Count of Toulouse and other witnesses, they were charged: with having asserted the existence of a good God and an evil God; with having declared, that man and wife cannot be saved in the state of matrimony; with having denied, that the body of Christ is made by an unworthy Priest; with having taught, that Baptism is unprofitable to infants; and with having uttered sundry other blasphemies against God and the Church. In return, the Heretics flatly contradicted all these charges: declaring, that their enemies had borne false witness against them. For, PUBLICLY, before the aforesaid Cardinal and Bishops and all present, they spoke, and confessed, and firmly asserted; that One only God the Most High had created all things both visible and invisible: entirely denying the existence of two independent Principles. The other charges likewise they specifically denied in a similar manner: but, when required to swear to the truth of their asseveration, they refused on the score of conscience. The result, therefore, was, as in the case which had shortly before occurred at Lombers: that they were duly excommunicated and condemned, together with their undoubted master and preceptor the Devil. [3]

CHAPTER 11

THE FALSEHOOD OF THE ALLEGATION, DEMONSTRATED FROM THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF HISTORY

WHEREVER they went, the Albigenses, with no light hand, denounced alike the unscriptural errors and the personal profligacy of the Popish Clergy: while the Roman Church itself they pertinaciously stigmatized, as the blood-thirsty Harlot of the Apocalypse, or as the Synagogue of Satanic Apostacy to which the Papal Man of Sin, Antichrist ruling over Antichristianism, enacted the part of a head and ringleader.

In return, the Priesthood liberally bestowed upon them the name of Manicheans; described them, as very monsters of secret wickedness; terrified the silly populace, with idle tales of their worshipping Lucifer under the specious form of a male cat; and, what was a far more serious matter than these nonsensical and malignant impertinences, wherever they could catch them, burned them alive without evincing the slightest measure of compassion or compunction.

All this huge overgrown mass of grotesque absurdities, Bossuet, with most imposing gravity, affects to believe: though a man of his talents and acuteness (would that I could likewise say, of his honesty and fairness) must have slyly laughed in his sleeve, at the solemn mockery of professing to establish a charge of Manicheism on the authority of the very extraordinary witnesses whom he has called into court.

To demonstrate the correctness of such a view of his management, nothing more, I suppose, can now be necessary, than to mention the names of Peter Siculus, and the Actuary of Orleans, and Bernard the Saint, and Peter the Venerable, and Reinerius the Apostate, and Radulph the Ardent, and Radulph the Smooth, and, though last not least, Alan the Great, yclept The Universal Doctor, that erudite etymologist of the crabbed word Catharus, and that immortal immortalizer of the Infernal Catus or the Luciferian Boar-Cat.

That Bossuet secretly laughed at his ragged regiment of witnesses, is, in truth, sufficiently clear from his deliberate suppression of really valuable evidence, when it came indeed immediately to his hand, but when unluckily it was fatal to the whole edifice of dirt and darkness which he was so industriously constructing. I say not, that an inferior artist of the Roman School might have been unprepared, through the profuse credulity of ready malice, to hold each strange tale devoutly true. But can any one believe, that the quick-sighted Prelate of Meaux, assuredly no ordinary man, after perusing the clear and valuable narrative of Roger Hoveden, could, actually and bona-fide, have been persuaded, that the Albigenses were cat-worshipping and devil-venerating Manicheans? [1]

In exact accordance with the opinion which I have avowed relative to the determined ascription of Manicheism to the Albigenses, speak two very honest old historians, with whose Works it is not my good fortune to be acquainted, but whose testimony has very judiciously been adduced by Archbishop Usher.

I. While the paradoxes of Bossuet are still sounding in our ears, we may profitably listen to William Paradin, the Annalist of Burgundy. I have seen certain Histories, in which both the Albigenses and their Princes stand excused of the allegations so frequently brought against them. The vices and errors of Manicheism, with which they were said to be stained, were purely fictitious. Through sheer malice,

such enormities were imputed to them by their enemies. They did none of the things, whereof they were falsely accused though they did indeed, somewhat too freely, reprehend the vices and corruptions of the Prelates. [2]

II. In a precisely similar strain, speaks Bernard Girard, the Historiographer of France.

The Counts of Toulouse and Cominges and Bigorre, and even the King of Aragon himself, espoused the party of the Albigenses.

These sectaries were tainted with bad opinions: but that circumstance did not so much stir up against them the hatred of the Pope and of the great Princes, as the freedom of speech with which they censured the vices and the dissolute manners of the said Princes and Ecclesiastics; for they were accustomed to reprehend the life and actions of the Pope himself. This was the chief matter, which stirred up an universal hatred against them and it moreover was the cause, that many nefarious opinions, from which they altogether dissented, were fictitiously ascribed to them. The Clergy of France, in short, falsely accused the Albigenses of all sorts of heresies, merely because they exposed and reprehended their vices. Hence also they stirred up the King Philip-Augustus against them insomuch that that Prince desired Pope Innocent III, to interpose his authority, and to reduce the Heretics to good order. [3]

In the mouth of a Romanist, though an honest Romanist, the bad opinions, with which the Albigenses are here said to have been really tainted, were evidently no other than the doctrines subsequently held by the Reformed Churches of the sixteenth century: while the many nefarious opinions, which through sacerdotal enmity were falsely ascribed to them, but from which they themselves altogether dissented, were, no less evidently, the various fantastic dogmata of the Manichean Heresy.

CHAPTER 12

THE ALBIGENSES DID NOT APPEAR IN FRANCE UNTIL AFTER THE CLOSE OF THE TENTH CENTURY.

PERHAPS it may be asked, why, in the preceding lengthened discussion, I have made no use of the Work of Dr. Allix on the Ancient Churches of the Albigenses.

The simple reason is: that, In his whole account of the state of religion in the South of France down to the end of the tenth century, I can find no traces whatever of any Albigensic Church or Churches being then and there in existence. [1]

I. Of course, it will not be supposed, that I am quibbling about a mere name. I know full well, that the precise name of Albigenses did not come into use until after the Synod of Albi or Lombers in the year 1176: and I likewise know full well, that, although the Albigenses themselves would recognize no other names than those of Good Men or Apostolicals; they were, by their enemies, before that time, variously called Petrobrusians and Henricians and Publicans and Paterines and Cathari and Bulgarians.

But, what I mean, is this. Let those religionists be distinguished by what appellation they may, I can discover no vestiges of them in the South of France until about the commencement of the eleventh century.

1. At that time, as Dr. Allix states on the authority of Ademar Cabannensis, certain Manicheans (for so he incautiously styles the descendants of the Asiatic Paulicians), being chased by the Emperor of Constantinople out of his dominions, made their first appearance in France; having, in their progress westward, previously shown themselves in the more eastern region of Lombardy. [2]

Now, long before the commencement of the eleventh century, quite back indeed to the semi-apostolical times of the second century, we may observe, throughout the Churches of Southern France, a strong adherence to a purer system of religion than what had become fashionable at Rome: and, with it, we may also observe a strong disposition to resist the papal encroachments and usurpations. From time to time, moreover, we may see many eminent individuals, inculcating the sincere truths of the Gospel, and protesting against the veneration of saints and images and relics. But, so far at least as the Work of Dr. Allix is concerned; which seems, however, to have exhausted the subject: we can perceive nothing, which at all resembles a detached and compact Church of avowed and uncompromising and systematic witnesses against the manifold corruptions and abominations of Popery.

2. Such was the state of things at the commencement of the eleventh century. But, as soon as the misnamed Manicheans, from Lombardy and the East, make their appearance upon the stage, a totally different scene rapidly develops itself.

The strangers, it is true, were a mere handful: but, then, they were a well-disciplined handful, accustomed to act together in concert and to move with a common object. They were so few, that they have not even communicated to the West any of the proper names of the East: but, then, they were a nucleus, round which serious and dissatisfied inquirers might perpetually and combinedly be gathered. [3] From Bulgaria to the Atlantic, their entire number, as appears from an estimate of the associated or proper Cathari made in the thirteenth century by Reinerius, scarcely amounted to four thousand: but, then, their compactness, and admirable fitness for missions, no less appear, from the concurring statement of the same writer; that, along that whole line of Country, planted here and planted there,

they had sixteen Churches, regularly organized under the government of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. [4]

3. Reinerius adds: that, although the proper or associated Cathari were, as we have seen, barely four thousand in number; their local proselytes, whom they styled Believers, were absolutely innumerable. [5]

Now, as to the growth of the main Church of the Albigenses in France, such a statement exhibits precisely my own view of the matter. When the emigrating Paulicians first appeared in that country, the people were already pre-disposed to resist the papal authority, and were already inclined to maintain what the Pontificials were pleased to call heresy. This whole district of Toulouse, says Peter of Vaux-Sernay in perfect accordance with the account given by Dr. Allix, was, from the very foundation of the city, notorious for its theological craftiness: insomuch that the town might well be called DOLOSA, rather than TOLOSA. Rarely or never, as report credibly asserts, has it been free from this pest: yea, rather, it has ever been notorious for the detestable prevalence of this heretical pravity. Generation after generation, from father to son, the venom of superstitious infidelity has been successively diffused. [6]

What Peter calls superstitious infidelity, or (in other words) overscrupulous unbelief, was, no doubt, a pertinacious unwillingness to receive new doctrines and new practices: an unwillingness, united with a troublesome demand for the production of scriptural authority, whenever the usurping Roman Church strove to force those doctrines and those practices upon the struggling consciences of the reluctant Gallicans.

4. Hence, under such circumstances, the minds of the people being thus prepared, we shall not wonder at the portentously rapid success of the Paulician Albigenses.

The baleful tyranny of Rome was daily increasing: and the necessity of a regular and complete separation from that incorrigible Church became daily more and more manifest. By the zealous disciples of St. Paul, a rallying point was offered: and now we begin to hear of a spread of religion, swift as lightning, and incapable of submitting to a confinement within the comparatively narrow boundaries of Southern France. The framework of the Church was the Church of the ancient Paulicians: but its acquired members were native French or Italians or Germans or Spaniards. [7] Its grand and most influential settlement, however, seems ultimately to have been in the southern provinces of France: though a correspondence and connection was long kept up with the Church in Bulgaria, from which the more western Bishops received their consecration, and which itself was viewed under the aspect of a spiritual Metropolis. [8] Here also, finally, in the same southern district, the prevailing name of Albigenses was bestowed upon its members: a local or geographical appellation, which itself indicates the mighty increase of the misnamed heretics throughout Languedoc and Provence and Gascony.

II. When it is considered, that we literally know nothing of the Paulicians and the Albigenses save what has come down to us through the medium of their enemies; and when it is recollected, that, by the malignant diligence of the popish inquisitors, the writings of the Albigenses themselves have been so effectually destroyed, as to prevent their now being independently heard in their own defense: we may well consider it to be specially providential, that, through the blunders or inconsistencies or admissions of their unrelenting persecutors, enough, and more than enough, should have come down to us for their complete exculpation.

They were charged with Manicheism. But, invariably, and (as Bernard speaks) according to their custom, they are admitted to have firmly denied the justice of the accusation.

They were publicly examined upon that precise charge. But their open confession in full court, as happily preserved by Roger Hoveden, was a perfectly sound and orthodox confession, directly opposed, in all its articles, to the Manichean System.

They were accused of the most profligate impurity, and were even charged with an actual adoration of the devil. But their lives are confessed to have been eminently holy: and they cheerfully preferred martyrdom to apostasy.

They were charged with turbulence and insubordination; verily, the wolf's arraignment of the lamb: they were said to have propagated their opinions by fire and sword: they were reported to have been public plunderers and stark marauders; who, at length, sorely against their will, forced the meek and unoffending Papists into a just war (the ruthless hypocrites!), undertaken for self-defense no less than for the extirpation of heresy. Yet Bernard describes them, as a timid race, of mere rustics and weavers; altogether unwarlike, and much more disposed to hide themselves in the dens and caves of the earth, than, in the spirit of the age, to court the chivalrous dangers of glorious battle: while, at a somewhat later period, their lawful feudal Sovereigns, the Count of Toulouse, the Count of Foix, the Count of Cominges, the Viscount of Bearn, and even the young Viscount of Beziers though himself a professed Romanist, against whom all these pretended deeds of violence, if committed at all, must indisputably have been committed, not only endured but protected them; and, when the Pope, through the agency of his military apostles, kindly undertook to free those princes from such troublesome subjects, actually made common cause with the lawless miscreants, and suffered in their defense every calamity which the unchristian zeal of the misnamed holy croisards could inflict. [9]

There is, however, a character with which the God of truth has branded every liar: and that is SELF-CONTRADICTION. It is impossible to escape it. No tale of falsehood can be so artfully framed, as not to contain within itself its own confutation. This is manifestly the case with the stories fabricated respecting the Albigenses. [10] Their credibility is destroyed by their inconsistency.

BOOK 3

THE VALLENSES

CHAPTER 1

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF THE TESTIMONY OF REINERIUS RESPECTING THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES, WITH REMARKS ON THEIR DIALECT AND THEIR OWN CONCURRING TRADITIONS.

BUT it is time, that I should leave the much persecuted and calumniated Albigenses, to introduce a pure and never-reformed Church still older than that of the Paulicians.

The Church, to which I allude, is that of the Vallenses of Piedmont: and, in order to my purpose of connecting the Churches of the Reformation with the Church of the Primitive Ages, the two points of its Remote Antiquity and of its Evangelical-Purity must be successively considered. Agreeably, then, to the present arrangement, the point of its Remote Antiquity will first come under discussion.

This topic requires the production of a continued line of witnesses through the whole period of what are usually called the Middle Ages. But, before I enter directly upon such a production, the decisive general testimony of Reinerius Sacco a well-informed Inquisitor who flourished during the earlier part of the thirteenth century, associated with the dialect and traditions of the Vallenses themselves, may, under the aspect of preliminary matter, be usefully and properly brought forward.

I. The following is the testimony of Reinerius. Concerning the sects of ancient heretics, observe, that there have been more than seventy: all of which, except the sects of the Manicheans and the Arians and the Runcarians and the Leonists which have infected Germany, have, through the favor of God, been destroyed. Among all these sects, which either still exist or which have formerly existed, there is not one more pernicious to the Church than that of the Leonists: and this, for three reasons. The first reason is; because It has been of longer continuance: for some say, that it has lasted from the time of Sylvester; others, from the time of the Apostles. The second reason is; because, It is more general: for there is scarcely any land, in which this sect exists not. The third reason is; because, While all other sects, through the immanity of their blasphemies against God, strike horror into the hearers, this of the Leonists has a great semblance of piety; inasmuch as they live justly before men, and believe, together with all the Articles contained in the Creed, every point well respecting the Deity: only they blaspheme the Roman Church and Clergy; to which the multitude of the Laity are ready enough to give credence. [1]

1. I have adduced this passage for the purpose of exhibiting Reinerius, as attesting the remote antiquity of the Vallenses of Piedmont. Yet, by name, he mentions not, in it, the Vallenses: he speaks only of a body of contemporary religionists, whom he denominates Leonists. These, in regard to the origin of the sect, he carries back to a very distant period: and, at the same time, he broadly distinguishes them from the Albigenses or Cathari, whom he here simply alludes to under the names of Manicheans and Runcarians, but whom he afterward fully describes under the systematic charge of being deeply tainted with the Manichean Heresy. Hence, to make his attestation at all available to my purpose, I have to

show: that the Leonists, whom he thus characterizes, were the Vallenses or Valdenses or Vaudois of Piedmont.

My proof, then, runs in manner following.

Reinerius, a writer of the thirteenth century, tells us: that, In the judgment of some inquirers, the Leonists had existed from the time of Pope Sylvester. Pilichdorf, another writer of the thirteenth century, tells us that The persons, who claimed to have thus existed from the time of Pope Sylvester, were the Valdenses. [2]

And Claude Scyssel, who was Archbishop of Turin at the latter end of the fifteenth and at the beginning of the sixteenth centuries, who lived in the immediate neighborhood of the Valdenses of Piedmont, and who in fact comprehended them within the geographical limits of his province, tells us that The Valdenses of Piedmont derived themselves from a person named Leo; who, in the time of the Emperor Constantine, execrating the avarice of Pope Sylvester and the immoderate endowment of the Roman Church, seceded from that communion, and drew after him all those who entertained right sentiments concerning the Christian Religion. [3]

Thus we have the Valdenses of Piedmont standing in direct connection, not only with the tradition respecting Sylvester, but likewise with an individual from whose name the title of Leonists has plainly and almost avowedly been deduced.

Such a combination of circumstances evidently brings out the result: that The Valdenses and the Leonists were the same.

Whence, of course, it follows: that, In ascribing a most remote antiquity to the Leonists, Reinerius, in fact, ascribes it to the Valdenses.

2. Since, then, the Valdenses were occasionally denominated Leonists from an individual named Leo, who must have lived in a far distant age because some traditions made him even a contemporary of Sylvester and Constantine: an inquiry, as to Who this Leo was, will at least afford a subject for a somewhat curious investigation.

On that subject, I purpose now to enter: and it will probably be found to bear not a little closely upon a matter of testimony which will be the topic of a future discussion.

That any Leo was the founder of the Vallensic Church, as Claude not quite accurately (I suspect) reports the tradition, cannot be allowed: for the tradition, thus reported, agrees not with the standing belief of the Vaudois, that their Communion descends in a direct unbroken line from the Apostles. But, that, at some remote period, they had among them an eminent teacher, who was distinguished by the appellation of Leo, and from whom they themselves were sometimes denominated Leonists, is a matter so highly probable, that I can see no reason why we should hastily reject such a supposition. At all events, we seem by chronology itself prohibited from deriving, as some have done, the name of Leonists from the town of Lyons on the Rhone: that is to say, if, for such derivation, we take the specific ground that Peter of Lyons, in the twelfth century, communicated, from the town, the name of Leonists to his own peculiar disciples. For, according to the plain and natural import of the language used by Reinerius, the very ancient Vallenses were already called Leonists long before the time of Peter of Lyons: inasmuch as he intimates, that Peter's disciples, the Poor Men of Lyons, were also, as well as the ancient sect of which they were a branch and respecting which he had treated in the immediately preceding section of his Work, denominated Leonists. [4] Yet, though I think it clear that the Valdenses

could not have been called Leonists from the Lyons of the opulent merchant Peter, that is to say, from the Lyons which is seated upon the Rhone: I am not without a strong suspicion, that, ultimately, and through an entirely different channel, the title may have been borrowed from another Lyons; from Lyons, to wit, in Aquitaine, upon the borders of the Pyrenees; from the Lugdunum Convenarum, I mean, which now bears the name of St. Bertrand, and which is situated in what (from Convenae) is styled the Pays de Cominges. [5]

My conjecture is: that the traditional Leo of the Valdenses, however his history may have been circumstantially distorted and chronologically misplaced, is no other than the famous Vigilantius; of whom, in immediate connection with the primitive Christians of the Valleys at the beginning of the fifth century, we shall presently hear again.

This holy man, as we fortunately learn from the very scurrility of Jerome, was actually born in the precise town of Lyons or Convenae in Aquitaine. [6] Whence, from the place of his nativity, he would obviously be called, among his hosts of the valleys, Vigilantius Leo or Vigilantius the Leonist. His proper local appellation he communicated, if I mistake not, to his congenial friends, the Vallenses of Piedmont; and his memory, as we see, was affectionately cherished by them, down even to the time of Claude Scyssel.

Thus ultimately, I apprehend, the name of Leonist was derived from Lyons: not, indeed, from the more celebrated Lyons on the Rhone; but from the Lyons of Aquitaine, or the Lugdunum Convenarum of the Pyrenees.

3. The importance of the testimony of Reinerius, to the apostolically remote antiquity of the Piedmontese Vallenses, is so great, that we shall not wonder at the circumstance of its being made the subject of a quibble on the part of the Jesuit Gretser.

He remarks that Reinerius, not on the authority of his own careful inquiries or pursuant to his own well-founded conviction, but purely on the hearsay statements of other persons, ascribes to the Leonists an antiquity, which reaches to the time of Sylvester or even to the time of the Apostles themselves. [7]

So far as it extends, this observation, no doubt is true. But Gretser took good care to stop short where he did, cautiously eschewing all notice of what Reinerius says in his own person; and thence plainly omitting the whole of what he says, as the result of his own inquiries and as the amount of his own conviction.

The direct and positive testimony, then, of Reinerius, speaking in his own person and not merely reciting the opinions of others, runs to the following effect.

He assures us: that The Leonists were, as a sect, older, than either the Manicheans or the Arians or the Runcarians or any one of the more than seventy sects of heretics that had once existed. And he assigns this, their undoubted high antiquity, as the first and foremost of the three special reasons why they were so injurious to the Church of Rome.

Now the Manicheans, even if we say nothing of the allied sects of the Gnostics and the Docetae and the Valentinians and the Marcionites, were certainly as early as the third century.

Therefore the Leonists, inasmuch as Reinerius pronounces them to be still older than the Manicheans, must, according to the result of his inquiries and the sum of his conviction, inevitably be viewed, as

running up to an antiquity not less than that of the third and second centuries: a circumstance, which at once places them in the times of the Primitive Church. [8]

II. Agreeably to this conclusion, the very necessity of their ancient dialect, corroborated as the evidence is by their own unvarying tradition, throws back their original retirement into the Valleys of Piedmont, exactly to the period marked out by the personal inquiries of Reinerius.

1. I should not have ventured to hazard such a remark on my own authority but I certainly may lay some considerable stress upon the decision of a scientific inquirer into the Monuments of the Roman Tongue, who had no object to serve beyond the general objects of perfectly independent literature.

The dialect of the Vaudois, as we are assured by Raynouard, is an intermediate idiom, between the decomposition of the tongue spoken by the Romans, and the establishment of a new grammatical system. It must, therefore, be philologically viewed, as a primitively derivative language-that is to say, it must be viewed, as a language, derived, without any intervention of an older derivative language, from the decomposed stock of its parent Latin.

On this principle, when speaking of the Noble Lesson which bears in its text the date of the year 1100 and which thence is more ancient than the greater part of the writings of the Troubadours, he says The language seems to me to be of an epoch already far separated from its original formation; inasmuch as we may remark the suppression of some final consonants a peculiarity, which announces, that the words of the long-spoken dialect had already lost some portion of their primitive terminations. [9]

Circumstances of this nature plainly refer the formation of the Vaude from the Latin to a period of most remote antiquity: and thus, by a necessary consequence, refer also the settlement of the Vaudois themselves to the same remote period; forbidding the supposition, that they might have retired to their Alpine Valleys, after what Raynouard calls the establishment of a new grammatical system, and after the origination of a language derived only at second hand from the Latin.

Hence, the primevally Latin Vaudois must have retired, from the lowlands of Italy to the valleys of Piedmont, in the very days of primitive Christianity and before the breaking up of the Roman Empire by the persevering incursions of the Teutonic Nations.

But it is scarcely probable, that men would leave their homes, the fair and warm and fertile country of Italy, for the wildness of desolate mountains and for the squalidity of neglected valleys; valleys, which would require all the severe labor of assiduous cultivation; and mountains, which no labor could make productive: unless some very paramount and overbearing cause had constrained them to undertake such an emigration.

Now a cause, precisely of this description, we have in the persecutions, which, during the second and third and fourth centuries, occurred under the Emperors Marcus Aurelius and Maximin and Decius and Valerian and Diocletian.

Therefore, both from the philological necessity of their language, and from the tenacity with which they have always maintained their primeval religion, we can scarcely doubt, that the Christians, who fled from persecution during those centuries, were the true ancestors of the Vaudois.

2. This opinion, accordingly, has ever prevailed among themselves, down, as we may say, even to the present time.

(1.) To such a purpose, for instance, speaks the celebrated Henry Arnold: who, in the emergency of the period, half clerk and half soldier, superintended the glorious re-entrance of the Vaudois into their native country during the year 1689.

That their religion is as primitive as their name is venerable, is attested even by their adversaries. Reinerius the Inquisitor, in a report made by him to the Pope on the subject of their faith, expresses himself in these words: that They have existed from time immemorial. It would not be difficult to prove, that this poor band of the faithful were in the Valleys of Piedmont more than four centuries before the appearance of those extraordinary personages, Luther and Calvin and the subsequent lights of the Reformation. Neither has their Church been ever reformed: whence arises its title of EVANGELIC. The Vaudois are, in fact, descended from those refugees from Italy who, after St. Paul had there preached the Gospel, abandoned their beautiful country; and fled, like the woman mentioned in the Apocalypse, to these wild mountains, where they have, to this day, handed down the Gospel, from father to son, in the same purity and simplicity as it was preached by St. Paul. [10]

(2.) To the same purpose, likewise, speaks their historian Boyer. O marvelous! God, through his wise providence, has preserved the purity of the Gospel in the Valleys of Piedmont, from the time of the Apostles down to our own time. [11]

(3.) To the same purpose, again, they themselves speak collectively in the Confession, which they presented to Francis I of France in the year 1544.

This Confession is that, which we have received from our ancestors, even from hand to hand, according as their predecessors, in all times and in every age, have taught and delivered. [12]

(4.) Still, moreover, to the same purpose, they speak in the year 1559, when they delivered their supplication to Emmanuel Philibert of Savoy.

Let your highness consider, that this religion, in which we live, is not merely our religion of the present day or a religion discovered for the first time only a few years ago, as our enemies falsely pretend: but it is the religion of our fathers and of our grandfathers, yea of our forefathers and of our predecessors still more remote. It is the religion of the Saints and of the Martyrs, of the Confessors and of the Apostles.

(5.) So again, when addressing themselves to the Reformers of the sixteenth century, they still harmoniously put forth the same traditional assertion of an apostolical antiquity: while, in point of knowledge and attainments, poor and secluded as they had long been, they modestly confess their own inferiority to the well-instructed teachers whose notice and assistance they solicit.

Our ancestors have often recounted to us, that we have existed from the time of the Apostles. In all matters, nevertheless, we agree with you: and, thinking as: you think, from the very days of the Apostles themselves we have ever been concordant respecting the faith. In this particular only, we may be said to offer from you; that, through our own fault, and the slowness of our genius, we do not understand the sacred writers with such strict correctness as yourselves.

(6.) Finally, it is remarked by Leger: that, when, to the Princes of the House of Savoy, they perpetually asserted the uniformity of their faith, from father to son, through time immemorial, even from the very age of the Apostles; those sovereigns always maintained a profound silence respecting such an allegation: a circumstance, which, as he reasonably enough observes, sufficiently indicates their internal consciousness of its accuracy. [13]

CHAPTER 2

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHEWN FROM THE TESTIMONY OF JEROME

THUS, during the persecutions of the second and third and fourth centuries, placed in the valleys of the Cottian Alps as in a citadel fashioned by the hand of nature herself, we find the Vallenses, in the self-same region, still holding the self-same primitive doctrine and practice at the beginning of the fifth century: while, by so doing, they characteristically bore witness against those growing superstitions, from which, by their secluded situation, they had been providentially exempted. The account of this matter, which I place at the head of the chain of testimony that runs through the whole period of the Middle Ages, is both deeply interesting and specially important, inasmuch as it furnishes the precise link which has long been wanted, in order, on the strength of evidence, synchronical with the particulars detailed, to connect the Vaudois with the Primitive Church: and it will not, I hope, argue an unreasonable degree of assumption, if I say, that, so far as my own knowledge and reading are concerned, I have been privileged to be the first discoverer of the evidence in question. [1]

I. Vigilantius, a native (as we have seen) of Lugdunum Convenarum or of the Pyrenean Lyons in Aquitaine, and a Presbyter of the Church of Barcelona in Spain, had charged Jerome with too great a leaning to the objectionable opinions of Origen. This circumstance called forth the rage of the irascible Father: and, in the year 397, he addressed to him a very violent epistle on the subject. [2]

Subsequently to the propounding of that epistle. Vigilantius returned into his native country of Aquitaine and there he published a most uncompromising and decisive Treatise against the miserable growing superstitions of the age; a Treatise, which is ascribed to the year 406. In this Treatise, he attacked the notion, that Celibacy is the duty of the Clergy: censured, as idolatrous, the excessive veneration of the Martyrs and the idle unscriptural figment that they are potent intercessors at the throne of grace: ridiculed the blind reverence, which was paid to their senseless and useless relics: exposed the gross folly of burning tapers, like the Pagans, before their shrines in broad day-light: detected the spurious miracles, which were said to be wrought by their inanimate remains: vilified the boasted sanctity of vainly gratuitous monachism: and pointed out the useless absurdity of pilgrimages, either to Jerusalem or to any other reputed sanctuary. [3]

Such was the drift of his Treatise and, ill the course of it, he naturally adverted to Jerome's former indecent attack upon him.

Matters being in this state, Jerome wrote a very intemperate and abusive epistle, addressed to Riparius: and, shortly afterward, receiving the Treatise itself, he composed an Answer to it; in which, it is hard to say, whether illogical absurdity or brutal scurrility is the most predominant. [4] From those documents, we fully learn the drift and object of the now lost Treatise of Vigilantius the Leonist: and the author, as will readily be concluded, has had the honor of being, by the Papal Church, duly enrolled in the list of heretics.

II. To the ecclesiastical student, the sentiments of Vigilantius are familiar: and their complete identity with those of the Vallenses, in all ages, cannot have escaped his notice. But, when this remarkable individual quitted Barcelona, from what part of the world did he publish the very seasonable Treatise, which called forth such vulgar and offensive vituperation from the superstitious and exasperated Jerome?

His antagonist tells us that He wrote from a region, situated between the waves of the Adriatic and the Alps of King Cottius; from a region, that is to say, which formed a part of what was once styled Cisalpine Gaul. [5] Now this district, on the eastern side of the Cottian Alps, is the precise country of the Vallenses. Hither their ancestors retired, during the persecutions of the second and third and fourth centuries here, providentially secluded from the world, they retained the precise doctrines and practices of the Primitive Church endeared to them by suffering and exile; while the wealthy inhabitants of cities and fertile plains, corrupted by a now opulent and gorgeous and powerful Clergy, were daily sinking deeper and deeper into that apostasy which has been so graphically foretold by the great Apostle: and, here, as we learn through the medium of an accidental statement of Jerome, Vigilantius took up his abode, at the beginning of the fifth century, among a people, who, Laics and Bishops alike, agreed with him in his religious sentiments, and joyfully received him as a brother. [6]

In his Epistle to Riparius, Jerome thinks it expedient to marvel: that the holy Bishop, within whose Alpine Diocese Vigilantius was then residing as a Presbyter, did not crush so useless a vessel with a well-aimed blow from the iron rod of Apostolicity. [7] But, alas, in his subsequent Tractate against the audacious heretic, the unwelcome truth comes out: and the reason of such forbearance stands forth, upon the historical canvass, most prominent and most abundantly manifest. The two superstitious bigots, indeed, Riparius and Desiderius, who seem to have dwelt upon the frontiers of the spiritual Goshen of the Valleys, complained heavily to Jerome, that their neighboring Parishes or Dioceses were polluted, forsooth, by such an unsavory vicinage: and it was charitably added, that, with Satan's own banner in his hand, Vigilantius, albeit, in the punning phraseology of the facetious Saint, a very Dormitantius, was making, from his aerial station, successful inroads upon the slumbering Churches of the Gauls.[8] But with respect to the Bishops, evidently the Bishops of the alpine district where the zealously active Leonist sojourned; they, however nefandous it might appear to Jerome and his correspondents, however it might elicit a piteous groan from the heaving bosom of the sorely distressed Father, however it might provoke a lamentable Proh nefas duly to be re-echoed by Desiderius and Riparius: they, the Bishops of the country between the Adriatic Sea and the Cottian Alps, perfectly agreed with the misnamed heretic; and, on one special point of difference between the controvertists, actually preferred the ordination of husbands to the ordination of bachelors; nay, if we rigidly interpret the inflated language of Jerome, absolutely made antecedent matrimony a sine quo non to the ordination even of a Deacon. [9]

But this is not all Rome herself, towering in her sacerdotal potency, was not to escape unscathed. In the Tractate of Jerome, we have a case, perhaps the earliest case upon record, of a Leonistic Presbyter, himself the long remembered and long venerated Leo of Vallensic tradition, supported by the Bishops of a whole people, and, in that support, standing directly opposed to the Roman Pontiff, and to all those other Bishops who were blindly following him in his now-rapidly developing predicted apostasy. Jerome, nurtured in the adulterate Christianity of opulent cities and fanatic monks and lordly prelates, is amazed, yea horrified, at the alpine audacity of Vigilantius. That stubborn son of the Pyrenean Lyons, who seems to have troubled his head very little about any doctrinal authority save that of Scripture, was unable thence to discover the vital importance of consecrating the Eucharist over the bones of Peter and of Paul, that rich and boasted treasure of Rome Ecclesiastical: whence, a fortiori, he could not be expected to entertain any very particular reverence for the less holy fragments of less important dead men and women. What, cries Jerome, scandalized to the last pitch of endurance, does the Roman Bishop, then, do ill, who offers sacrifices to the Lord over the bones of dead men; the bones, I trow, of Peter and of Paul: bones, in our estimation, venerable; bones, in thy estimation, a mere worthless portion of dust? Does the Bishop of Rome do ill, who deems their tombs the altars of Christ? Are the

Bishops, not merely of a single city, but of the whole world, all mistaken: because, despising the huckster Vigilantius, they reverently enter into the stately cathedrals of the dead. [10]

Truly, a rapid declaimer ought to be blessed with a good memory. Only two pages before, and in the course of the very same Tractate, Jerome had been groaning over Bishops, not indeed (as he remarks) to be called Bishops, who were the sworn allies and associates of the desperately wicked Vigilantius: and now he discovers, that all the Bishops of all the world, with the Pope of Rome at their head, are fiat against the heretic. But, though Jerome may forget the important fact which he has recorded, others will remember it. Those, who adhere to the catholic doctrines of the Primitive Church as they stand broadly opposed to unscriptural popish additaments, will recollect, that Vigilantius was not an insulated and unsupported witness to the sincerity of the Gospel. A whole people, with their Bishops and Clergy at their head, were his associates: and the recorded abode of this whole people was a mountainous district between the Adriatic Sea and the Cottian Alps.

CHAPTER 3

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHEWN FROM THE TESTIMONY RECORDED BY PILICHDORF

WITH fearful rapidity, the deluge of Teutonic Invasion was now rising to overwhelm the whole Western Roman Empire: and a period of well nigh two centuries elapsed, ere its tumultuous streams of many cognate peoples began to subside into a state of comparative tranquillity. But the Alpine Retreat of the Primitive Christians, more highly privileged than the submerged Ararat of old, reared its head above the flood, and preserved its sacred deposit amidst the mighty world of waters which rolled harmlessly at its feet.

Whenever the Gothic Nations precipitated themselves upon Italy, their line of march was invariably across either the Rhaetian Alps or the Julian Alps: nor have I been able to find, that the Cottian Alps ever came within the sphere of their operations. Under Providence, the peculiar locality of this mountain range procured its exemption: and thus, in the midst of the storm, the Vallenses were securely housed within its difficult and sequestered recesses.

At length, all the ten fated kingdoms were erected by the ten principal Gothic Tribes and, as the historian speaks, the victorious nations of Germany established a new system of manners and government in the western countries of Europe. [1] Then, the revolution being completed, we forthwith hear of the divinely preserved Church in the wilderness. The tenth and last Gothic Kingdom, that of the Lombards, was founded, upon the soil of Italy, in the year 567 and 568. and, about three centuries after Constantine or at the commencement of the seventh age, the Vallenses again demand our attention.

At this time, another celebrated and long remembered pastor, a worthy successor of the older Leonistic pastor Vigilantius, appeared among them. His name was Peter and, in the recorded appellation of the country where he sprang up, we first, so far as I know, meet with the geographically descriptive title of Valdenses or Vallenses or Men of the Valleys. [2]

For the preservation of this piece of Valdensic history, handed down among the Alpine mountaineers themselves, and from them communicated to the Valdenses of France, we are indebted to Peter Pilichdorf: who, in the thirteenth century, exhibited himself, as their bitter, though curiously inquisitive, enemy.

They say, reports that writer: that, in the time of Constantine, a companion of Pope Sylvester, disliking the excessive enrichment of the Church by the donations of the Emperor, and on that account separating himself from Sylvester, maintained the way of poverty: asserting, that the true Church was continued in the line of his own adherents, and that Sylvester with his adherents had fallen away from the true Church. Furthermore, they say: that, at the end of three hundred years from the time of Constantine, a certain person, named Peter, sprang up from a region called Valdis; who similarly taught the way of poverty. From these two, originated the sect of the Valdenses. [3]

From the identity of name, it may be thought, that this Peter of Valdis, thus ascribed to the beginning of the seventh century, is a mere fabulous duplicate of the later and more celebrated Peter Valdo of Lyons; who, in consequence of some extraordinary chronological blunder, has, in this tradition, been thrown back more than five hundred years.

Such, when first I read the passage which mentions Peter of Valdis as living three centuries after Constantine, was the idea which naturally presented itself to my own mind. But I doubt, whether such an idea be correct. If there be any error in the statement, that error must inevitably be laid to the account, either of Pilichdorf individually, or of the Valdenses his informants collectively.

I. Now, with respect to Pilichdorf individually, he well knew (as, indeed, he distinctly tells us), that Peter Valdo of Lyons began his ministry in the days of Pope Innocent II. or about the year 1160 and, of this individual, he gives, from his own knowledge, a very full account, which exactly corresponds with the parallel account given by Reinerius. [4]

Hence, I think it impossible, that Pilichdorf, thus fully informed, could ever have himself mistaken so widely, as to place Peter Valdo of Lyons in the seventh century under the appellation of Peter of Valdis. No confusion, therefore, can reasonably be ascribed to Pilichdorf himself individually.

II. And, as for the Valdenses collectively, it is plainly no less impossible, that, in the thirteenth century or in the age when Pilichdorf received his information from them, they should ever have fallen into so gross a chronological mistake.

Persons, who were actually living in the thirteenth century, and who thence must have familiarly known the character and history of the pious merchant of Lyons, could never have ignorantly ascribed Peter Valdo, who notoriously flourished during the latter half of the twelfth century, to so remote a period as the very beginning of the seventh century: or, if they had made such an extraordinary mistake, it is plain, that, to the malignant Pilichdorf, it would have afforded a topic of immeasurable exultation and triumph.

But no such misapprehension, and consequently no such triumph, appears. In his Work against the Valdenses, Pilichdorf gives us his account of Peter the rich merchant of Lyons: and, in the extant fragment of his other Work written against the Poor Men of Lyons, he notices, without any imputation of a confused blunder, the standing tradition of the Valdenses, that another Peter of much higher antiquity had previously risen up in the region named Valdis; a region, which, by its very name evidently identifies itself with the country of the Valdenses in Piedmont. Therefore, no confusion can reasonably be ascribed to the Valdenses collectively: and, therefore, we may safely conclude, that the Valdensic Peter of this tradition was not the Valdensic Peter of Lyons, but, as the tradition purports, an individual who flourished in the seventh century.

CHAPTER 4

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHEWN FROM THE HISTORY OF CLAUDE OF TURIN

DESCENDING with the stream of time, while corruption went on rapidly increasing through the provinces and in the rich towns of the now dislocated though partly restored Western Empire, we shall again, early in the ninth century, meet with the Piedmontese Vallenses in direct connection with their eminent Pastor, Claude, Bishop or Metropolitan of Turin.

I. Bossuet seems not quite to have made up his mind, as to whether Claude was an Arian or a Nestorian. One of the two, he confidently pronounces him to have been: and, so far as I can understand the ingenious Prelate, he rather in-dines to the charge of Arianism. His authority is Jonas, Bishop of Orleans: who, prudently waiting for the death of Claude, when he could offer no contradiction, brought the charge against him in the Preface to his work concerning the worship of images, addressed to Charles the Bald. [1]

The very vagueness of the allegation, which hovers between the asserted Nestorianism of his early friend Felix of Urgel and a pretended Arianism of which even his bitter enemy Dungal could discover no traces during his life, may well, even on the first blush, induce a full presumption that Claude was a favorer of neither heresy. [2]

Accordingly, in the Works of that remarkable man which have hitherto been brought to light, nothing whatever appears to inculpate him: while we find abundance, both to show his real sentiments, and also to explain why the Romish Priesthood have in his case diligently resorted to their old and familiar craft of abusive calumny.

A commentary on the epistle to the Galatians is the only one of his various writings, which has been published in full. But the Monks of St. Germain had in manuscript his Commentaries upon all the Epistles, which were found in the Abbey of Fleury near Orleans; as also those on Leviticus, which formerly belonged to the Library of St. Remi at Rheims. There exist likewise, both in England and elsewhere, several manuscript copies of his Commentary on St. Matthew. Papirius Masson, moreover, has published extracts from his Epistle to the Abbot Theutmir, which are prefixed to the violent attack of Dungal upon that Epistle, and which occur likewise in the Work of Jonas of Orleans written for the defense of images: and Mabillon has printed the dedication of his Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, addressed to the Emperor Louis the Pious.

Now, under such circumstances, could any real proof of heresy have been adduced from his writings, we should long since have heard of it: for, if Bossuet, from Claude's own compositions to which he had easy access, could have established the truth of his random accusation, he was not a man to have contented himself with a meagre reference to the posthumous gossip of Jonas of Orleans.

II. I have mentioned a Work by Claude, his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, as having been published in full. That Work is now before me and a brief account of its character and contents will fitly introduce those subsequent remarks, which I shall have occasion to offer. The Work itself is a composition of beautiful christian simplicity. From the superstitions of even the incomplete Popery of the ninth century, it is altogether free. And, throughout, with clearness and fidelity, it propounds the genuine doctrine of the Gospel.

So far as regards the claim of Rome, to the universal supremacy of Peter, and thence to the universal supremacy of his pretended successors the Latin Pontiffs, Claude maintains the equal authority of Peter and of Paul in their respective departments Peter being at the head of the mission to the Jews; and Paul, similarly and independently, being at the head of the mission to the Gentiles. [3]

The doctrine of man's justification in all ages, through faith alone in the merits of Christ, and not by the works of the law whether ceremonial or moral, be strenuously asserts with the utmost fullness and unreserve and precision. [4]

He virtually, without hesitation, sets aside the imaginary infallibility of the Church: for on the grand article of justification, he pronounces; that, as the Galatians had swerved from the true faith, so the same lamentable departure might also be then observed in the existing Churches at large. [5] With an evident reference to the state of religion in his own time, he declares; that, what constitutes heresy, is a departure from that interpretation of Scripture which the sense of the Holy Spirit demands: and he remarks, at the same time; that real heretics of this description may be found within, as well as without, the pale of the visible Church. [6] Finally, in respect to the posthumous charge of Arianism brought against him, he uses language, which touches the very point that divided that heresy from the true catholic doctrine: the point, to wit, that Christ, by nature, not merely by adoption, is the Son of the Father; or, in other words, the specially discriminating point, that the Father and the Son are consubstantial. [7]

III. When the never-changing genius of Popery is considered, it will be obvious, that the bold advocacy of primitive truth in such a declining age could not, in an ecclesiastic of Claude's high rank and influential character, pass without producing a considerable degree of annoyance to the pontifical faction: nor was he himself to be exempted from the calumnious imputation of being a presumptuous innovator, when, in reality, the proper innovators were the persons who assailed him simply because he was a steady adherent to the soundness of Apostolical antiquity.

You declare yourself to have been troubled, says he to the Abbot Theutmir, because a rumor respecting me has passed out of Italy through all the Gauls even to the very borders of Spain; as if I had been preaching up some new sect, contrary to the rule of the Catholic Faith: a matter, which is utterly and absolutely false. It is no marvel, however, that Satan's members should say these things of me, since he proclaimed our very Head himself to be a seducer and a demoniac. I, who hold the unity, and who preach the truth, am teaching no new sect. On the contrary, sects and schisms and superstitions and heretics, I have always, so far as in me lies, crushed and opposed: and, through God's help, will never cease to crush and oppose. But, certes, this trouble has come upon me, only because, when, sorely against my will, I undertook, at the command of Louis the Pious, the Burden of a Bishopric, and when, contrary to the order of truth, I found all the churches at Turin stuffed full of vile and accursed images, I alone began to destroy what all were sottishly worshipping. Therefore it was, that all opened their mouths to revile me: and, forsooth, had not the Lord helped me, they would have swallowed me up quick. [8]

IV. This universalizing language, however, must be viewed, as respecting one division only of the pious Bishop's people. The citizens of Turin and the inhabitants of the low country were vehemently against him; indignant like Micah of old, that he should have taken away their gods which they had made: but he had a flock among the Alpine mountains and in the Alpine Valleys, who had not forgotten the days of Vigilantius, and who both symbolized and sympathized with their admirable Prelate; themselves, in truth, being partakers both of his reproach and of his affliction.

These things says he, in an extract from his Commentary on Leviticus published by Mabillon: These things are the highest and strongest mysteries of our faith: they are the characters most deeply impressed upon our hearts. In standing up for the confirmation and defense of such truths, I am become a reproach to my neighbors insomuch that those, who see us, do not only scoff at us, but likewise, one to another, even point at us. God, however, the father of mercies and the author of all consolation, has comforted us in all our afflictions: that, in like manner, we might be able to comfort those, who are weighed down with sorrow and affliction. We rely upon the protection of him, who has armed and fortified us with the armor of righteousness and our faith; that tried shield for our eternal salvation. [9]

Here we perceive a direct reference to the twofold state of the diocese over which he painfully presided.

Some of his neighbors, it seems, were so irritated at the doctrines which he preached, that they not only scoffed, but even literally pointed the finger of scorn at him.

Yet he had to comfort others, who, in like manner with himself, were pressed down with sorrow and affliction.

The distinction is marked with singular precision: and its import, I think, can scarcely be misunderstood.

In the scoffers, we may note the Riparii and the Desiderii of the day those genuine successors of Jerome's correspondents, who deemed their lowland parishes or suffragan dioceses polluted by a too great vicinity to the mountains and valleys of the Cottian Alps.

In the partakers of holy Claude's affliction; the objects, like himself, of ribald scorn and the pointed finger of self-satisfied apostatic disdain; men, who needed the evangelical consolations which the troubles of their invaluable Bishop had so well qualified him experimentally to communicate: in these strongly-characterized members of his extensive Metropolitanship, we may note the Leonistic Vigilantii of the times; those genuine successors of the primitive Bishops and People, who were honored by Jerome's furious vituperation; kindred souls with the apostolic Claude; theologians, whose faith and practice stand out strongly reflected by the recorded sentiments of their superintending friend and pastor and adviser and comforter.

I am unwilling to call this obvious application of Claude's language by the name of a mere conjecture. From the Bishop's own statement to the Abbot Theutmir, we know, that Turin and its daughter cities were, as the Apostle speaks, wholly given to idolatry. And yet, from the evidence already adduced, we likewise know, that one large portion of his diocese, the valleys and mountains of the Cottian Alps, no less vehemently detested all modifications of the odious superstition in question; firmly, with their Bishop, holding to the doctrines and practices of the Gospel and the Primitive Church.

When these two matters are combined, I really see not what other satisfactory illustration the language of Claude is capable of admitting.

V. Accordingly, the illustration is fully borne out by his hostile contemporary Dungal, from whom we distinctly learn the precise fact which we wish to learn: the fact, namely, that the diocese of Claude was divided into two parts; the one part, comprehending those who adhered to the superstition of the day and who warmly opposed him; the other part, comprehending those who symbolized with him in doctrine and who are palpably the Vallenses of the Cottian Alps.

This book, I Dungal vowed to dedicate and compose, in honor of God and the Emperor, against the mad and blasphemous dirges of Claude Bishop of Turin: not that there lacked abundant reason for reclamation and complaint long before I came into this country, while I sighed to behold the Lord's harvest overrun with malignant weeds; but, lest I should seem only to beat the air, I long remained silent.

The people in this region are separated from each other, and are divided into two parts, concerning the observations of the Church: that is to say, concerning the images and holy picture of the Lord's passion. Hence, with murmurs and contentions, the Catholics say: that that picture is good and useful; and that, for instruction, it is almost as profitable, as Holy Scripture itself. But the heretic, on the contrary, and the part seduced by him, say that it is not so; for it is a seduction into error, and is indeed no other than idolatry. A similar contention prevails respecting the cross. For the Catholics say – that it is good and holy; that it is a triumphal banner; and that it is a sign of eternal salvation. But the adverse part, with their master, reply that it is not so; inasmuch as it only exhibits the opprobrium of the Lord's passion and the derisive ignominy of his death.

In like manner, concerning the commemoration of the Saints, there is a dispute, as to the approaching them for the sake of prayer, and as to the venerating of their relics. For some affirm: that it a good and religious custom to frequent the churches of the martyrs; where their sacred ashes and holy bodies, with the honor due to their merits, are deposited; and where, through their intervention, both corporal and spiritual sicknesses are, by the divine grace and operation, healed most copiously and most presently. But others resist, maintaining that the saints after their death, as being ignorant of what is passing upon earth, can aid no one by their intercession; and that, to their relics, not a whit more reverence is due, than to any ordinary bones of mere animals or to any portion of mere common earth. [10]

After this specification, he proceeds, in his rambling and declamatory fashion, to answer the Epistle of Claude addressed to the Abbot Theutmir: some portions of which, specially referred to by Dungal, Papirius Masson has published and prefixed to the Work of Dungal himself. [11]

VI. Here I need only to remark: that Claude and his faithful flock the Vallenses disclaimed all charge of innovation; while, with a force of argument to which Dungal's miserable and verbose reply affords a very curious contrast, they exposed the unscriptural vanity of image-worship and cross-worship and relic-worship and idle pilgrimages to Rome and formal penances and papal supremacy inherent in the chair of the Apostle. All these things, says Claude, are mighty ridiculous: truly, they are matters, rather to be lamented, than to be committed to the gravity of writing. But, against foolish men, we are constrained to propound foolish things. Return to the heart which you have left, ye wretched prevaricators: ye, who love vanity and are become vain; ye, who crucify afresh the Son of God and put hint to open shame; ye, who in this manner, even by whole troops, have made the souls of miserable men the companions of demons, alienating them from their Creator through the nefarious sacrilege of images, and thus casting them down into perpetual damnation. Return, ye blind, to the true light which lighteneth every one that cometh into the world the light which shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not; the light, which perceiving not, ye are therefore in darkness, and walk in darkness, and know not whither you go because darkness hath blinded your eyes. [12]

VII. I must not omit to remark: that, in an evidential point of view, Dungal's perpetual reference to Vigilantius is not a little striking and important.

He charges Claude and his Vallenses with teaching and maintaining the same doctrines, as those taught and maintained by the eminent individual in question: and his whole strain of uncomely vituperation serves only to show; that, after a lapse of four centuries, the memory and influence of the admirable Leonist still, in the Valleys of the Cottian Alps, remained fixed and unimpaired. [13] Accordingly, while he forgets not to mention the birth of Vigilantius at the Lugdunum Convenarum of the Pyrenees, he describes him, certainly with much correctness, as having been the neighbor of Claude: though it may be doubted, whether, with equal correctness, he asserts Vigilantius to have been the author of Claude's madness. [14] The madness in question, as holy Claude well knew, existed in Scripture and in the Primitive Church, long before any of the contending parties, either in the fifth century or in the ninth century, had made their appearance upon the face of this nether world. Hence we may perfectly understand the immeasurable wrath of Dungal, that Claude, to confound idolatry, should actually have dared to quote Scripture. [15]

Here, then, we have evidence, both for the continued existence and for the resolute unchangeableness of the Vallenses at the beginning of the ninth century. For, as it appears from a specific date in the Work of Dungal, Claude must have written his epistle to Theutmir shortly before the year 820: and Dungal must have answered him, either in, or shortly after, that same year. [16] The Vallenses, therefore, must have been in their native fastnesses, bearing their appointed testimony to scriptural truth and against paganizing idolatry, at the commencement of the ninth century.

VIII. Nor can it justly be said, as some have imagined, that they owed their origin to the faithful preaching of Claude of Turin. No doubt, he greatly encouraged and strengthened them: but, as we have had direct evidence to their long prior existence, so a diligent authoritative investigation, conducted by a bitter enemy, has been found to bring out the very same result.

Shortly before the year 1630, Marco Aurelio Rorenco, Prior of St. Roch at Turin, was employed to institute a strict inquiry into the opinions and connections and antiquity of the mountaineer Vallenses: and his researches led to the production of two Works; the one, published in the year 1632; and the other published in the year 1649.

Now in the first of these Works, entitled, A narrative of the introduction of Heresies into the Valleys, he states: that The Valdenses were so ancient, as to afford no absolute certainty in regard to the precise time of their origination; but, at all events, that, In the ninth and tenth centuries, they were even then not a new sect. [17]

And, in the second of them, entitled Historical Memorials of the Introduction of Heresies, he makes some very important additions to his former statement; for he there tells us: that, In the ninth century, so far from being a new sect, they were rather to be deemed a race of fomenters and encouragers of opinions which had preceded them; further remarking, that Claude of Turin was to be reckoned among these fomenters and encouragers, inasmuch as he was a person, who denied the reverence due to the holy cross, who rejected the veneration and invocation of saints, and who was a principal destroyer of images. [18]

CHAPTER 5

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHEWN FROM THE LANGUAGE OF ATTO OF VERCELLI

ABOUT a century after the time of Claude, we again find the Alpine Vallenses presented, with a sufficient measure of distinctness, to our observation.

Vercelli is a city of Piedmont, not very far distant from Turin to the eastward: and it constitutes the ecclesiastical metropolis of an immediately contiguous diocese or province. Of this district, in the year 945, Atto was Bishop or Archbishop. Hence, from the mere circumstance of locality, he must have been fully aware of what was passing, both in his own province, and in his own close vicinity.

I. Now two of his Epistles, by describing and censuring what he deemed the errors of certain neighboring religionists, who had penetrated into his diocese of Vercelli and who had there successfully labored to make proselytes, establish alike both the prolonged existence of the Vallenses and their steady adherence to the system of doctrine which had distinguished them in the time of Claude of Turin.

1. The former of these two Epistles is couched in terms following. Atto, by the grace of God, a humble Bishop, health and joy to all the faithful who reside in our diocese.

Lately, on the eve of the Octave of the Lord, we preached, God permitting, to those who were present a certain discourse, which we judge it necessary to direct to yourselves also.

In your parts, alas, there are many persons, who despise the divine services of the Church. These apply themselves to auguries or to signs of the heavens or to vain precantations, fearing not that which the Lord says concerning the Jews. A generation, incredulous and perverse, seeketh a sign. Paul likewise, the blessed Apostle, exclaims: Beware, lest any one seduce you through philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ. And elsewhere: Why turn ye again to weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? The Psalmist, moreover, says; Ye Sons of men bow long will you be heavy in heart, and love vanity, and seek after a lie?" And again: Blessed is the man, whose hope is in the name of the Lord, and who has not looked to vanities and insane falsehoods. Farewell in the Lord. [1]

2. The latter of the two Epistles speaks the same language, and plainly refers to the same subject.

Atto, through the mercy of Christ, a humble Bishop, to all the people of our diocese of the holy mother Church of Vercelli. Know ye, that, both through Christ himself and through the holy Apostles or Prophets and through the other holy Teachers, we have heard: that numerous false prophets will come, who, what is most grievous, will study to turn many aside from the way of truth, so as to lead them into destruction, inasmuch as they shall have given credit to their pretensions. Whence the heart is not so easily preserved in righteousness, but that ye may hasten to believe even some persons who utter only words of brute ignorance and simplicity: insomuch that (alas, most unhappy men!), being deceived by diabolical error, and forsaking your holy mother the Church or the Priests through whom ye ought to come to eternal salvation, you even distinguish those individuals by the name of Prophets.

Wherefore, when this letter shall have been seen or heard or known, if, by chance, any one of you (which God forbid!) shall hereafter perpetrate wickedness of such a description: let him learn, that be is altogether to be condemned, and that he has no license either to drink wine or to eat anything cooked

save bread alone, until he shall come to his holy mother the Church of Vercelli and into our presence, in order that he may be adjudged to make satisfaction and to exhibit the true humility of penitence. But, if any one, inflated by pride, shall attempt to act against this our behest, let him know: that he is to be driven from the threshold of the Church, an alien from the holy communion; and that he is to be abominated by all the faithful, until he shall have submitted to the correction of the Holy Church, as well himself, as all those who shall have associated with him after they have learned his character. If, moreover, any one of the Priests (which God avert!) shall peradventure have been polluted with such an abomination let him not dare usurpatively to administer any divine sacrament, until he shall have made satisfaction in our judgment worthy of God. [2]

II. Thus run two of the Epistles of Atto. and, in each of them, the Bishop is obviously speaking of one and the same body of individuals, whatever precise individuals may be intended.

The following are the several marked characteristics which he ascribes to them.

> They lived in his own immediate neighbor-hood: they despised the divine services of the dominant Church: they uttered, what Atto deemed, words of brute ignorance and simplicity: they deceived, by diabolical error, their proselytes: they induced them to forsake their holy mother the Church: they taught them to desert the Priests, through whom they ought to come to eternal salvation: and, from the nature of their ministrations, they were distinguished, among the people, by the name of Prophets or Religious Instructors; insomuch that the Bishop supposed them to be those numerous predicted false prophets, who should come and study to turn aside many from the way of truth.

Such is Atto's account of his troublesome neighbours: and, when the several points of vicinage and numbers and interference for the purpose of proselytism are considered, it is difficult to specify what persons can have been intended by the description, save the contiguous Vallenses of the Cottian Alps. But, if their identity with the Vallenses be admitted: then we have a full attestation to the still continued existence of the Vallenses, locally and theologically unchanged, in the middle of the tenth century. It will be said, that I have pretermited one, and that not the least extraordinary, of the characteristics which are ascribed by Atto to the individuals in question: he represents them as being sorcerers who dealt in the impious vanity of magical incantations.

To this it might be sufficient to reply: that falsehood is ever inconsistent with itself; and (agreeably to the axiom) that the very incongruity of the present charge demonstrates it to be nothing more than a malignant calumny fabricated by their inveterate and unscrupulous enemies the Romish Priesthood. Mere sorcerers, or mere pretenders to diabolical potency, would never, we may be quite sure, have troubled themselves with teaching their silly customers to despise the services of the ruling Church, or with injecting religious doubts into their minds as to the security of their immortal souls in the hands of the Romish Priesthood. Such are not the arts or habits of reputed or stimulated wizards and witches and votaries of Satan. They clearly appertain to persons of widely different principles and character.

But I may safely advance beyond this sufficiently-obvious argument. The charge, preferred against the neighbors of Atto, was that of sorcery. Now this identical charge was actually preferred against his alpine neighbors the Vallenses. Hence, the very fact of the charge having been preferred against the neighbors of Atto, serves only to confirm and establish the position, that the Vallenses were those neighboring proselytizers who made such provoking theological inroads into the diocese of Vercelli.

Through all the middle ages, the Vallenses of Piedmont were confidently reported to be an unclean race of impious magicians.

This prevalent notion of their sorcery was often of considerable use to them in their battles with their enemies. It was devoutly believed, that, through special favor of the devil, they were proof against musketry: and it was even asserted with an oath, that their Barbes or Clergy, after an action, gathered up the balls in their shirts by handfuls, without their having received the slightest scratch. The approved mode of shooting Satan's pupils with silver bullets was, I suppose, either then unknown, or on trial had been found to be too expensive. [3]

In a similar spirit of voracious credulity, a popish wiseacre, in the year 1488, gravely assured Duke Philip of Burgundy: that the children of the terrific Vaudois were invariably born, with hairy throats, with four rows of awfully black teeth in their heads, and (like the cyclopean brethren of old) with a single eye in the middle of their foreheads. [4]

Such sagacious individuals were indisputably of the same school as those writers, upon whose credit we have been more than once exhorted (for it were unfair to lay the whole burden of the kindly exhortation upon the single back of Bossuet) to believe all the Manichean Diaboliads ascribed to the old Paulicians and the later Albigenses. Yet, in regard to the concernments of the Vaudois with the Evil One, so firmly persuaded was each miserable dupe of the Romish Priesthood, that the very term Vaulderie came to denote Witchcraft.[5] Their faith rested upon the credible report of a shuddering Inquisitor: and who shall doubt an Inquisitor's veracity, when he is dealing with an obstinate Heretic? But let us hear the report, that naught may be extenuated and naught set down in malice.

When they wish to go to the said Vaulderie, they anoint themselves with an ointment which the devil has given them. They then rub it with a very small rod of wood: and, with palms in their hands, they place the rod between their legs. Thus prepared and equipped, they fly away wherever they please: and the devil carries them to the place, where they ought to hold the said assembly. In that place, they find tables ready set out, charged with wine and victuals: and a devil gives them the meeting, in the shape of a he-goat, with the tail of an ape, or in some form of a man. There, to the said devil, they offer oblation and homage: – and there they commit crimes so fetid and enormous, as well against God as against nature, that the said Inquisitor declared that he did not dare to name them. [6]

The result of the investigation will readily be anticipated but, as to the poor victims of popish intolerance themselves, when they were brought out to be burned, they declared, that they had never had any thing to do with Vaulderie, and that they did not even know what idea was annexed to the term. Nevertheless, the districts in France, through which these reputed sorcerers were scattered, acquired so evil an odor, that merchants scarcely dared to visit them, lest they should be branded with the hateful name of Vauldois. [7]

III. Among the people of Vercelli and its diocese, the great success of the Vallensic Missionaries may be readily gathered from the very lamentations of Atto: and his angry peradventure, in regard to the possibility of some even among his Clergy adopting their theological sentiments, shows not obscurely, that many of the Priesthood were already in that unsatisfactory predicament. These were, I suppose, the most exemplary, the most religiously disposed, and the best informed, of the Order: and it is highly probable, that the notorious profligacy and the gross ignorance of their brethren may have led them to seek pure faith and consistent practice among the despised and hated Vallenses.

Accordingly, on the one hand, a chapter of Atto's own Cupitulare strictly inhibits, under pain of an anathema, all his Suffragan Bishops and Priests and Deacons and Clerks of every description, from resorting to those whom he stigmatizes under the aspect of sorcerers and magicians: while, on the other hand, he addresses two admonitory Epistles to his Clergy on the fruitful subject of their scandalous concubinage, which led them rapaciously to rob the Church in order to decorate and enrich their spurious offspring and their acknowledged harlots. [8]

The reprehensions of the Bishop are just and praiseworthy: but what must have been the state of the Priesthood to require them? Atto admits: that, through the vices of the Clerical Order, the derision of the vulgar was excited and the name of the Lord was blasphemed; for these depraved men were actually not ashamed to play the part of judicial bullies on behalf of their strumpets and bastards. [9] Yet does he complain: that the Vallenses taught his flock to doubt, whether such pastors were the surest guides to eternal salvation!

CHAPTER 6

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHOWN FROM THE LANGUAGE OF PETER DAMIAN

AS the Romish Clergy, if we may believe their Bishop Atto of Vercelli, rejoiced in concubinage and a spurious progeny: so the Clergy of the Valdenses claimed and exercised their undoubted Christian right to enter into the holy estate of matrimony.

In the days of Jerome, as we have seen, the Bishops of the Cottian Alps even went so far as to refuse ordination save to already married candidates: and, in the middle of the eleventh century, or about a hundred years later than the time of Atto and his exemplary Priesthood, we find the Valdensic Clergy, in despite both of roman anger and of increasing superstition, still maintaining their liberty, and still preserving the wise custom of their forefathers. [1]

I. The account of them under this aspect is rendered doubly curious, by the amusing professional flattery offered upon the occasion to the Princess Adelaide; who appears, as Duchess of Savoy and as Marchioness of the Cottian Alps.

In the Epistle addressed to this great Lady by the blessed Peter Damian, Adelaide, under the hands of the courtly saint, is the Deborah of the day, while the less active Metropolitan of Turin performs the inferior part of the lagging Barak. The figurative Sisera, destined to be slain by the joint efforts of the united avengers, is Sacerdotal Matrimony: for this spiritual usurper domineers over certain of her Grace's Clergy, with no less unrelenting tyranny than the literal Sisera ever afflicted the unhappy children of Israel. But relief is at hand. Let the Bishops in the borders of Deborah's territories, where the enormities of Sisera are the most atrocious, with Barak at their head, come to the rescue: and, while the archiepiscopal warrior deals with the husbands; let the ducal prophetess show no mercy to the wives. Yet, forsooth, wives said I? Wives, I trow, they are not, as holy Peter acutely argues: but females of a most ancient, though non-descript, character. With Mary, God acknowledges virgins; with Anna, widows; with Susanna, wives; but who, I pray, are these? Since God owns them not, let them incontinently be turned out of the temple.[2] Here I shall prudently stop: for the blessed writer's happy illustration of Sisera's enormity which immediately follows the dismissal of the unrecognized females from church, albeit addressed to the princely Adelaide, will be more honored in its suppression than in its adduction.

II. The amount of the present evidence is this.

About the year 1050, there was, on the borders or marches of the Piedmontese Dominions, a pertinaciously married Clergy: and, neither the dilatory Barak of Turin nor his Suffragan Bishops on the borders seeming to have much inclination for the task, Adelaide, as Marchioness of the Cottian Alps or as Lady-Warden of the Vallensic Boundary-District, is exhorted by Peter Damian to coerce and to punish them.

CHAPTER 7

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE VALLENSES SHEWN FROM THE LANGUAGE OF RODOLPH OF ST. TRUDON

OUR next step must be over some seventy or eighty years: and then we shall once more hear of the same refractory people in the same mountainous region.

Rodolph, Abbot of St. Trudon, was engaged in writing his Chronicle, from the year 1108 to the year 1136. [1]

About the mean year 1124, he and some members of his Religious Fraternity were at Rome on the spiritual business of the Convent. When, at length, he purposed to return homeward, he heard – that the whole of a certain country, through which he had designed to travel, was polluted with an inveterate heresy concerning the body and blood of the Lord. This circumstance induced him to proceed by a different route: and, after encountering sundry hardships and difficulties, he and his companions at length reached Basle. From that place, Alexander, one of the monks, rode on horseback through Burgundy: but the way-worn Abbot himself, tired with his laborious journey through Switzerland, took shipping on the Rhine; and, after a perilous navigation described in words which imply shipwreck, he landed near Cologne. From this point, striking over the country, I suppose, he would reach his Monastery by a different course from that which Alexander pursued on horseback through Burgundy. {2] Such is the narrative: and it is not difficult to collect from it the region, which is described as being polluted by an inveterate heresy concerning the body and blood of the Lord.

The equestrian journey of Alexander distinctly teaches us: that the direct line of march, to be pursued by Rodolph and his company, lay through Burgundy. Now the course from Rome to Burgundy would lie straight through Turin and along the skirts of the land of the Vallensic District. But, to avoid the polluted country, the holy Abbot kept to the east: and thus, by a route which must have carried him near Milan and through. Switzerland, he reached Basle. To understand the justice of these remarks, nothing more is necessary than the simple consultation of a map.

I. Now the remarks in question bring out two very important results: the one, negative; the other, positive.

At the time when Rodolph composed his Chronicle, there were two countries in the north of Italy, where the heresy (as he calls it) concerning the body and blood of Christ was avowed and maintained: the district of the Cottian Alps, occupied by the Vallenses; and the region of Lombardy, irregularly colonized by the Publicans or Paulicians or Cathari or (as they were afterward called in France) Albigenses. Hence, on the first perusal of the passage in the Chronicle, we might doubt, as to which of these two provinces was the polluted country intended by Rodolph.

Both the narrative, however, and the march, of the weary pilgrim, distinctly show, that he could not have meant Lombardy: for, in order to avoid the polluted country, Lombardy itself was, in truth, the precise region through which he traveled in his way to Basle.

If, then, negatively, the province of Lombardy, sprinkled with Paulicians, could not have been the land described by Rodolph as the polluted country: it can only remain, positively, that the polluted country in question, which the Abbot avoided, was the Alpine District inhabited by the Vallenses.

II. These are the conclusions, to which we are brought by the very necessity of the language employed in the Chronicle: and, with them, will exactly agree the respective conditions of the two countries, one or the other of which must be the country intended by Rodolph.

The Abbot speaks, not merely of certain individuals scattered through a country, which in no wise generally symbolized with them in doctrine but he speaks, of a whole country, that is to say, of the entire inhabitants of a whole country, as being polluted to the very core with the alleged heresy. Accordingly, the large province of Lombardy, including the Milanese, could, with no propriety, be said to have been itself thus polluted' for, as we learn from Reinerius, even a century later than the time of Rodolph, the Paulicians had no more than six Churches throughout the whole of Italy; and the amount of the associated members in Lombardy scarcely reached two thousand five hundred. [3]

But the region of the Cottian Alps was altogether tenanted by the Vallenses: so that, with the strictest accuracy, it would be described by Rodolph, as a country so utterly polluted with an inveterate heresy, that, within its recesses, which were likewise in the evil odor of sorcery and witchcraft, he cared not to trust either his person or his orthodoxy.

III. Thus, both geographically and circumstantially, both negatively and positively, we are driven from Lombardy, and are constrained to plant our feet upon the land of the Vallenses.

Hence the testimony of Rodolph will run: that, during the early part of the twelfth century, the Vallenses still continued to occupy the Valleys of the Cottian Alps; and that they still persevered in maintaining their inveterate or ancient heresy concerning the body and blood of the Lord.

CHAPTER 8

THE RISE OF THE FRENCH VALDENSES IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY

IT cannot but have struck the cautious inquirer, that every notice respecting the Vallenses of Piedmont, down to the present point, relates exclusively to the Vallenses in their own Country or at most to the Vallenses occasionally penetrating into their own immediate Italian Neighborhood.

The circumstance is remarkable but, so far as I am aware, no allusion to the Vallenses out of their own Country or to the Vallenses out of their own immediate Neighborhood occurs, until we reach the days of Peter the rich Vallensic Merchant of Lyons. Then, for the first time, through the institution of that peculiar Class of the Leonists which was denominated The Fraternity of the Poor Men of Lyons, the Vallenses, who had hitherto testified against apostolic corruption only in or near their own Alpine Valleys, became missionaries upon a large scale and to a wonderfully great extent. [1]

I. Such being the case, there has hitherto been a marked and somewhat curious difference of character between the Albigenses and the Vallenses. Though, in doctrine, they mainly symbolized; whence, ultimately, without any mutual repulsion and without any serious difficulty, they coalesced together into one undistinguishable race of antipontificial religionists: yet, while the Vallenses long remained obscurely quiescent in the deep recesses of their native Valleys, the Albigenses were the very Pelasgi of evangelical reform. [2]

After these extraordinary individuals had emigrated, under the name of Paulicians, from Asia into Europe, we find them speedily branching out from one end to the other of that latter continent. Their ecclesiastical establishments, for Reinerius is unwilling to decorate those establishments with the name of Churches, sixteen in number, reached, in the twelfth and at the beginning of the thirteenth century, all the way, from Thrace and Bulgaria, to Gascony and the Pyrenees: [3] their theological schools, thronged with students, were so numerous, that Reinerius estimates forty and one in the diocese of Padua alone, attempting not to count those of Germany and Provence: [4] and, of themselves, we hear, at Orleans, at Arras, at Treves, and even (though their first effort to obtain a settlement there was unsuccessful) in England.

But, until the days of Peter Valdo, the mountaineers of the Cottian Alps seem never to have moved from their secluded Valleys, save peradventure to mingle, in domestic efforts at proselytism, with the lowlanders of Turin or Vercelli. Hence their name occurs not in France, nor (I believe) in any country beyond their own, until after the commencement of Peter's ministry about the year 1160. As far as hitherto has been discovered, it first, in French or rather in English story, appears in the year 1179: for Walter Mapes, the facetious Precentor of Lincoln and Archdeacon of Oxford, mentions, that, in that year, he conversed at Rome with certain Valdesians, so called from their Primate Valdes of Lyons; who, Frenchmen themselves in point of origin, and having recently been proselyted by that eminent Valdensian, wished, in the simplicity of their heart and the honesty of their purpose, to obtain, from Pope Alexander III, a license to act as missionary preachers of the Gospel. [5]

A new impulse, however, was now to be given to the exertions of the primitive Vallenses (those oldest of all heretics, in the judgment of the Inquisitor Reinerius) to promote the cause of pure and undefiled religion: and, through God's providence, the honored instrument was the individual noticed by Mapes, Peter the rich merchant of Lyons; himself denominated Valdes from the country and people whence his

family originated and where he had lived prior to his settlement, and himself communicating to his French converts the name which he had received from his own piedmontese descent and connection.

II. At present, in tracing downward, from the apostolic age, the Vallenses of Piedmont, I am concerned only with the ultimate Italian origin of the Valdenses of France: for let us not, in defiance of all evidence, imagine with the interested Bossuet, that the Valdenses or Vallenses or Leonists, in point of their final theological pedigree, sprang only from Peter of Lyons in the twelfth century. The native French Valdenses, no doubt, might justly acknowledge him as their local founder; and, under this aspect, Reinerius classes the Poor Men of Lyons (who were also, no less than a much more ancient sect, denominated Leonists) as a race of modern heretics: but, a Vaudois himself, he was nothing more than the planter of a new shoot, the parent stock of which is to be sought in the Cottian Alps of northern Italy.

On this point, the point, I mean, of the Italian theological origin of the Valdenses of France, Conrad of Lichtenau, Abbot of Ursperg at the commencement of the thirteenth century, is as full and decisive, as can reasonably be desired.

In the year 1212, he tells us, two new Religious Orders, that of the Minor Friars and that of the Preaching Friars, were instituted: and the object of their institution was, to meet two sects, which, having long since sprung up in Italy, still, when the Abbot wrote, continued to exist. These two sects, or rather these two branches of one and the same sect, were known by the names of The Humiliated and The Poor Men of Lyons: the former, I suppose, being the more stationary and domestic Vallenses of Piedmont; while the latter, professedly and decidedly a Body of Missionaries bent upon carrying the primitive doctrine of the Alpine Valleys to the very ends of the earth, were evidently no other than the French proselytes of Peter the Valdo, though described as being, through him their Vallensic Founder, of Italian origination. [6]

With the French Valdenses, however, we are not at present quite immediately concerned. Our object just now is simply to connect the disciples of Peter the Valdo with the Italian Valdenses; that is to say, the modern Leonists (as Reinerius speaks) with the ancient Leonists: and the testimony of the Abbot of Ursperg fully accomplishes that object. For the matter stands thus.

That the Poor Men of Lyons were the proselytes and disciples of Peter the Valdo, we all know.

Yet Conrad of Lichtenau, we see, distinctly tells us: that these Poor Men or Leonists or Valdenses, when viewed as a sect and when considered in reference to their ultimate theological origin, had already sprung up and had long existed in Italy, previous to their becoming celebrated in France under the auspices and tutelage of the piedmontese merchant Peter.

III. Thus, I am willing to hope, the Vallenses, in their present settlements through the valleys of the Cottian Alps, have been clearly traced, from the very times of the Primitive Church, down to an age when their existence can no longer be doubtful.

CHAPTER 9

THE THEOLOGY OF THE VALLENSES DURING THE PERIOD OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY

I NOW turn to the vitally important point of the Theology of the Vallenses.

In order, then, that we may have a full and distinct view of their Doctrinal System, it will be proper to exhibit it, as maintained at three several periods: the period of the twelfth century; the period of the thirteenth century; and the period either at or immediately after the Reformation. For, if we ascertain the Doctrinal System of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and if we find it the same as the Doctrinal System at the time of the Reformation, we may fairly infer the agreement of all the intermediate centuries.

Respecting the yet earlier period which preceded all the three periods thus marked out; a period, which may be viewed, as taking in the times of Jerome on the one hand and the times of Rodolph of St. Trudon on the other hand; a period, therefore, extending from the commencement of the fifth century down to the earlier part of the twelfth century: respecting this earlier period, nothing more needs here to be said; because every requisite statement has, in truth, been anticipated. During this lengthened term, there can be no reasonable doubt, that the opinions of Vigilantius and the opinions of Claude, as they stood at the beginning of the fifth century and at the beginning of the ninth century, were, universally and invariably, the doctrinal opinions of the Alpine Vallenses.

Such matters having thus been already dispatched, I proceed to inquire into the Doctrinal System of the Vallenses during the evolution of the period comprehended within the twelfth century.

To the very beginning of this age, or rather indeed to the last year of the preceding age, certainly one of the Valdensic Documents, which have come down to us, is to be referred: and, that another of them belongs to the latter half of the same twelfth age, there is at least very strong internal evidence.

Before this testimony is adduced, it may be necessary to make some preparatory observations.

In the year 1658, Sir Samuel Morland brought, from Piedmont to England, several manuscripts, which purported to be Works of the ancient Vaudois of the Cottian Alps. These he deposited in the University Library at Cambridge: whence, through whatever agency, most of them have since disappeared.

Among them may be specially noticed: A Confession of Faith; A Catechism; A Treatise upon Antichrist; and A Poem denominated the Noble Lesson.

Of these four Compositions, two only are given in the Work of Perrin, published in the year 1618: the Catechism, to wit; and the Treatise on Antichrist. [1]

With respect to the Confession of Faith, it strikes me, from its scholastic regularity and from its being systematically drawn up in fourteen several Articles, as affording decisive internal evidence, that it must have been composed subsequently to the Reformation. It was packed, with sundry other Documents of less moment, in one parcel; to the envelope of which the collector had affixed the general date of the year 1120: a circumstance, which itself shows, that all at least of the Documents, unless the doctrine of chances be a fable, could not have belonged to that precise year. I do not suppose, indeed, that there was any intentional imposition on the part of him who affixed the date but the action must, I think, be viewed, as purely arbitrary, and as altogether unauthoritative. [2]

On the Catechism, I do not venture to give an absolutely positive opinion but, as it is more refined and more speculative than the Catechism of the Church of England, I doubt its being the production of a simple people at a remote age; and, therefore, I shall not cite it in evidence to the doctrines of the Vallenses in the twelfth century. [3]

From certain internal marks, the Treatise on Antichrist, provided we keep strictly to the Treatise itself and dismiss its palpably spurious adjuncts, may be viewed as probably genuine. [4]

Of the authenticity of the Noble Lesson, the beautifully simple production of a confessedly simple people, there can, I think with the learned Raynouard, be no reasonable doubt entertained. [5]

Taking such a view of the four documents, I have no concern save with the two last that is to say, the Treatise on Antichrist and the Noble Lesson.

I. The Treatise on Antichrist was tied up in the same parcel with the Confession: and, as I have just observed, the whole packet was labeled with the date of the year 1120. [6]

1. Now such a mode of affixing a single specific date to a whole parcel of severally undated papers is plainly incapable of giving the least authority to the date itself. Had the collector of the documents, after a careful examination, affixed to the parcel the general, though indefinite, date of the twelfth century: some attention might have been paid to it. But the single and definite date of the year 1120, affixed conjointly to a mass of many papers, cannot in itself be viewed as carrying any weight or authoritativeness. Hence, if the Treatise on Antichrist be admitted as a really ancient composition, the admission, since it contains no date within itself, can only be made on the internal testimony, which the texture of the Work may be found to afford.

Adopting this mode of trial, then, we must immediately strike off the supplementary articles: I mean those, which treat of Purgatory and the Invocation of the Saints and the Sacraments. In these supplementary articles, a reference is made to what is known to have been a compilation of the thirteenth century, under the name of the Milleloquium of St. Austin. Therefore, as Bossuet justly remarks, let them have been written when they may, assuredly they cannot have been written in the twelfth century. [7]

2. The appendages having thus been struck off, the Treatise itself, specially on Antichrist, now remains alone: and, since it contains no date within itself, if it can safely be ascribed to any particular age, the only ground of such ascription must be the internal evidence afforded by the peculiarities of its own texture and the nature of its own allusions. Now that internal evidence brings out at least a very strong presumption, that the Treatise was written in the course of the twelfth age: and, from its leading dogma that the Roman Church is the Apocalyptic Harlot, I much incline to deem it the production of Peter the Valdo, and thence to place it shortly after the year 1160 which witnessed the spiritual conversion of that eminent reformer. [8]

Let us proceed, then, to examine the internal evidence presented to us. In a manner, perfectly unobtrusive and thence bearing no resemblance to the intentional management of a subsequent fabricator, the Treatise describes Antichrist, as having then attained to the full age of a perfect man: while yet it speaks, both of the mystical Babylon being divided, and likewise of many well-disposed persons devoting themselves to the preaching of the Gospel, through which, it is hoped, that the Lord will consume that Wicked One with the spirit of his mouth, notwithstanding the persecution which bad been set on foot against the members of Christ. [9]

These are the chronological marks, which occur quite incidentally in three several disconnected places of the Work: and perhaps it will not be easy to discover any period, to which they may all be referred, save the latter part of the twelfth century.

The notorious Pope Gregory VII well known by the name of Hildebrand, who had aimed at universal empire both in Church and in State, and who had raised the Papacy to a degree of power as yet unheard of, sat in the pontifical chair from the year 1073 to the year 1086.

Yet, though, in his person, Antichrist (as the Vallenses deemed the Pope) might well be said to have attained the full age of a perfect man: Rome, in the eleventh century, was so divided against itself, that, between the year 1010 and the year 1086, there were no fewer than five papal schisms; while the latter end of that century, and all the earlier part of the twelfth c entury down to the years 1122 and 1138, were distinguished by theviolent quarrels of Popes and Antipopes, of the Church and the Empire. Still those schisms and quarrels prevented not the characteristic popish business of zealous persecution. Martyrs were burned at Orleans, in the year 1017; were hanged in Germany, in the year 1052; and were executed at Treves, shortly after the year 1101: while, in the year 1126, after a laborious ministration of near twenty years, Peter de Bruis was brought to the stake at St. Giles in Languedoc; and, in the year 1147, his pupil and successor Henry, either perished in confinement, or (as some say), by the solicitation of Bernard and through the cruelty of the Papal Legate Alberic, was burned alive at Toulouse.

During all this time, the preaching of the Gospel by well-disposed persons as the Treatise expresses it, was going on: and, in the year 1160, by the spiritual conversion of Peter the Valdo and by his institution of those active missionaries the Poor Men of Lyons, a fresh impulse was given to that work, through which it was hoped that the Lord would speedily consume the Man of Sin by the breath of his mouth.

Such are the facts, respecting which a writer in the latter half of the twelfth century might truly say, that they had either already occurred or were still in a course of actual occurrence.

If, then, I be correct in referring the incidental allusions in the Treatise to this remarkable combination of circumstances, the result from the internal evidence will be: that the Treatise itself was written shortly after the year 1160, and that its probable author was no other than that devout merchant, whom Reinerius disparagingly owns to have been in some small measure learned, and whose zeal in communicating the New Testament in the vulgar tongue would be very likely to produce such a Work as the Treatise upon Antichrist. [10]

On this supposition, it will be easy to account for the appearance of the Work among the Vallenses of Piedmont. Either the intercourse of Peter the Valdo with his compatriots of Italy would readily and quickly secure its reception among them or the emigration of persecuted believers, whether Albigenses or Vallenses or a mixture of both, from France into the Valleys of the Alps, which occurred in the year 1165, may very possibly have first introduced it into the latter country. [11] At all events, there is small difficulty in conceiving the rapid transmission of a Treatise by Peter the Valdo into the border region of France and Italy.

3. Each person will judge of this internal evidence, as he pleases – but, having fairly stated it, I now feel myself at liberty to produce some extracts from the Work, as exhibiting the religious sentiments of the Vallenses during the twelfth century. Of course, agreeably to its title, the Treatise, with a reference to the Church of Rome, specially discusses the character of Antichrist: but such a discussion cannot be

conducted, without propounding the theological system which was maintained in avowed opposition to Popery.

Antichrist is the falsehood of eternal damnation, covered with the appearance of the truth and righteousness of Christ and his Spouse. – The iniquity of such a system is with all his ministers, great and small: and, inasmuch as they follow the law of an evil and blinded heart, such a Congregation, taken together, is called ANTICHRIST or BABYLON, or THE FOURTH BEAST, or THE HARLOT, or THE MAN OF SIN WHO IS THE SON OF PERDITION.

> His first work is: that, the service of Latria, properly due to God alone, he perverts unto Antichrist himself and to his doings; to the poor creature, rational or irrational, sensible or insensible; to man, for instance, male or female saints departed this life; and to their images, or carcasses, or relics. His doings are the sacraments, especially that of the Eucharist, which he worships equally with God and Christ, prohibiting the adoration of God alone. [12]
>
> His second work is: that he robs and deprives Christ of the merits of Christ, with the whole sufficiency of grace and justification and regeneration and remission of sins and sanctification and confirmation and spiritual nourishment; and imputes and attributes them, to his own authority, or to a form of words, or to his own performances, or to the saints and their intercession, or to the afire of Purgatory. Titus does he divide the people from Christ, and lead them away to the things already mentioned: that so they may not seek the things of Christ nor through Christ, but only the works of their own hands; and not through a living faith in God and Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, but through the will and the works of Antichrist, agreeably to his preaching that man's salvation depends upon his own deeds.
>
> His third work is: that he attributes the regeneration of the Holy Spirit to a dead outward faith; baptizing children in that faith; and teaching, that, by the mere work of the outward consecration of baptism, regeneration may be procured.
>
> His fourth work is: that he rests the whole religion of the people upon his Mass; for, leading them to hear it, he deprives them of spiritual and sacramental manducation.
>
> His fifth work is: that he does everything, to be seen, and to glut his insatiable avarice.
>
> His sixth work is: that he allows of manifest sins, without ecclesiastical censure.
>
> His seventh work is: that he defends his unity not by the Holy Spirit, but by the secular power.
>
> His eighth work is: that he hates, and persecutes, and searches after, and robs, and destroys, the members of Christ. –

These things and many others are the cloak and vestment of Antichrist, by which he covers his lying wickedness, lest he should be rejected as a pagan. – But there is no other cause of idolatry, than a false opinion of grace and truth and authority and invocation and intercession, which this Antichrist has taken away from God, and which he has ascribed to ceremonies and authorities and a man's own works and saints and purgatory. – As for Antichrist himself, he has already, by God's permission, long reigned in the Church. [13]

II. I now pass on to an examination of the Noble Lesson.

1. An ancient manuscript of this Work was one of the Vallensic Documents, which Morland deposited in the Library of the University of Cambridge, and which, as I have already stated, has, since his time, disappeared. Happily, however, another ancient manuscript of the same Work is preserved in the Library of the University of Geneva: and, as a transcript, moreover, of the Cambridge manuscript had fortunately been made by Morland, the loss of that manuscript is, after all, chiefly to be regretted in the way of antiquarian curiosity. For all effective purposes, we are still, virtually, in full possession of that important Document. Respecting the Noble Lesson itself, Mr. Raynouard, an indisputably competent judge, as he is styled by an able modern writer Mr. Hallam, has pronounced, purely on the strength of its dialect, that it must be a production of the period to which its own text refers; adding, after a strict examination, that the Genevan Manuscript has not been interpolated, though he thinks that the now lost Cambridge Manuscript had been made from a copy more ancient than the Genevan: and, in full accordance with him, Mr. Hallam observes, that Any doubts, as to the authenticity of the poem, are totally unreasonable. [14]

2. The Noble Lesson is remarkably distinguished by bearing a date, not attached to it conjecturally by another hand, but interwoven into the very texture of the verse by the author himself.

Well have a thousand and a hundred years been completed entirely, since it was written, Now we are in the Last Time. [15]

In this passage, the precise term of eleven complete centuries is specified but the phraseology is such, that a doubt may be raised, whether those eleven centuries ought to be reckoned from the day when the words Now we are in the Last Time were written by one or more of the inspired penmen, or whether they ought to be reckoned from the more familiar era of Christ's Nativity.

If we suppose, that they ought to be reckoned from the day when the words in question were written – then the date, thus brought out, will be either A.D. 1149 or A.D. 1164 or A.D. 1170 or A.D. 1180, according as the author of the poem is thought to allude to the language of St. Peter or the language of St. John, and according as the chronological arrangement of the respective first Epistles of those two Apostles by Michaelis or by Lardner is adopted. [16]

But, if we suppose, that they ought to be reckoned from the more familiar era of Christ's Navitity: then the date, thus brought out, will, of course, be A.D. 1100.

The strict letter of the passage would require the admission of the first supposition: but the mode, in which the eleven centuries are specified, would rather seem to demand the admission of the second.

Against the first supposition may be urged the improbability, that the author of the poem should have reckoned a precise term of exactly a thousand and a hundred years completed entirely (for so runs his own description of the term) from a point of time, respecting the definite chronological settlement of which he must, like even the much more critical moderns, have been altogether ignorant: for, in such a case, a known period of accurately defined length is reckoned, what looks very like a physical impossibility, from an unknown point of time; while, somewhat strangely, a date is framed, upon the unusual and indeed unprecedented era of the composition of an Epistle or Epistles, rather than upon the usual and perfectly familiar era of Christ's nativity. [17]

Against the second supposition may be urged the fact, that, however extraordinary and uncommon such language may be, the author himself declares his entirely completed eleven centuries to have been reckoned from the day, whatever that day was, when it was written Now we are in the Last Time.

3. Under these conflicting circumstances, our only resort can be to internal evidence, and this evidence, I think, requires the admission, that the complete eleven centuries were, in truth, reckoned by the author from the common era of Christ's Nativity, and consequently that the real date of the poem is A.D. 1100.

(1.) In the Noble Lesson, the remarkable peculiarity of the date is – that it stands forth, not so much under the aspect of a formal and merely business-like date alone, as under the aspect of a solemn warning connected immediately with what we know to have been the general impression of Christendom throughout the whole of the eleventh century.

From a chronological misinterpretation of the thousand years, mentioned in the Apocalypse as the period during which Satan should be bound; a misinterpretation, as old as the time of the commentator Arethas, and prevalent down even to the days of Usher who adopts it and of Bossuet who inclines to it: from this chronological misinterpretation, it was, in the year 1000 and for more than a century afterward, universally expected, that the world was drawing near to its termination. For St. John's thousand years were reckoned from the Christian era. Whence the result was; that Satan, having been bound during that millennium, was loosed in the year 1000: while, from that result, by the persons who lived through the eleventh century, it was additionally concluded; that, after Satan should have prevailed over the saints, during his short permitted period of freedom, through his special minister Antichrist, the worm would be destroyed. [18]

To this opinion, the context of the passage, together with another parallel passage toward the close of the poem, evidently relates: and, since the old Valdenses were not singular in pronouncing the Papacy to be the predicted Antichrist and the Babylonian Harlot, and since the author of the Noble Lesson perceived that a thousand years with an additional hundred years (as he remarkably expresses himself in the form of a double numeration) had fully elapsed or had then been entirely completed; he, very naturally, both mentions the thousand years with their then centenary addition, and, from the signs which he beheld, anticipates the speedy arrival of the end of the world and the approaching inauguration of the day of judgment.

Such, I think, is the true key to the rationale of his singularly expressed date. The specification of the apocalyptic thousand years, with an entirely completed century appended to them, was introduced by him, not so much for a formal date of his composition, as for a solemn practical warning to his brethren. It is, I apprehend, as if he had spoken in manner following.

The earlier times of Patriarchism and Legalism having passed away, we are now living in that last time of Christianity which was written of the Apostles Peter and John. But, as you all perceive the thousand years of the apocalyptic binding of Satan, have elapsed: and, after them, another century likewise has now been entirely completed. Satan, therefore, hath assuredly been loosed: and in strict correspondence with that event, Antichrist, the predicted murderer of the Saints, hath already appeared in his true character, seated monarchally in the seven-hilled city. But we have, by the voice of prophecy, been well fore-warned WHEN Antichrist shall come: namely, at the time when Satan, at the end of the thousand years, shall be loosed. [19] Therefore, as we now behold him enthroned in the mystic Babylon, we thence also see, that the world is near to its end. [20] Consequently, we ought to covet little: for the time is short; and but little now remains. [21]

This train of thought relative to the thousand years which commenced by anticipation in the tenth century, and which pervaded the whole of the eleventh century, I believe to have been greatly instrumental in leading both the Valdenses and the Albigenses so constantly to deem the Pope and his Clergy Antichrist; while, in the Roman Church, they beheld the Babylonian Harlot of the Apocalypse. No less than the Papists, they supposed, that Satan was loosed and that Antichrist was revealed when a thousand years, reckoned from the Christian era, had expired. But, with whatever reason, each party discovered the expected Antichrist, or at least the forerunner of the expected Antichrist, in the other party. With the Romanists, the rapid pullulation and increasing energy of the hated seceders, in the eleventh and afterward in the twelfth century, was a sure proof that Satan was loosed and that Antichrist was at hand. With their opponents, the monstrous portent, of a persecuting Priesthood whose labors commenced at Orleans almost immediately after the expiration of the fated thousand years, and of an apostate Church seated precisely upon the seven roman hills of prophecy, was a no less sure indication, that Antichrist and the Harlot had appeared. [22]

To the prevalence of such opinions, the Noble Lesson plainly refers: and thus, from internal evidence, establishes the supposition, that the entirely completed thousand years with the appended century are to be reckoned from the era of the Nativity; which will give, as the really intended date of the poem, the year 1100.

(2.) I may notice another matter; which, still on the principle of internal evidence, refers the Work to the same early period.

Then sprang up a people newly converted: Christians they were named, for they believed in Christ. But we, find here what the Scripture says: that the Jews and SARACENS persecuted them grievously. [23]

During the eleventh century, the renovated Visigoths were fiercely struggling with the Saracens in Spain; and, in the year 1099, Jerusalem was taken by Godfrey of Bouillon and his confederated crusaders. Thus thrown into active hostility with determined enemies of the Christian name, the illiterate nations of the West knew of no other Gentiles, who might be combined with the Jews in enmity to Christ and the primitive. Christians, than the Paynim Saracens: or, if some were better informed, they no more scrupled to adopt the current phraseology of the day, than we scruple to designate, either the islands of the American Archipelago by the catachrestical name of the West Indies, or the aboriginals of the New World by the similarly abusive name of Indians. Chronology and propriety were, indeed, alike set at defiance by such a nomenclature: for, during the middle ages and in the times of the crusades, those decided monotheists the Saracens were resolutely set down, by the nations of the West, as a race of idolaters, who were said to worship two false deities entitled Mahound and Termagant and who were viewed as largely dealing in the unhallowed arts of pagan sorcery. [24] But, in applying the name of Saracens to the Gentiles who concurrently with the Jews persecuted the Primitive Church, the writer of the Noble Lesson used only the familiar language of the eleventh and twelfth centuries: and the oriental exploits of Godfrey, at the latter end of the eleventh age, and in the very country where these imaginary Saracens had grievously afflicted Christ and the early Christians,

would naturally and readily suggest such phraseology to an author who wrote in the year 1100. [25]

(3.) On the whole, it may be generally remarked: that the entire poem itself, from beginning to end, affords, through the medium of its extreme simplicity, one continued mass of internal evidence to its remote antiquity; so that it is well nigh impossible to read it, without a growing conviction at every step, that it is the production of a distant age and of a simple people. [26]

4. To exhibit the force of this observation, and at the same time yet additionally to show the nature of the Vallensic Theology in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, I shall subjoin some extracts from that venerable monument of secluded piety, the Noble Lesson, which, unless I be altogether mistaken, its own date teaches us to ascribe to the year 1100. O brethren, hear a Noble Lesson.

We ought always to watch and pray: for we see, that the worm is near to its end. We ought to strive to do good works: since we see, that the world approaches to its termination.

Well have a thousand and a hundred years been entirely completed, since it was written that we are in the last times.

We ought to covet little: for we are at what remains. Daily we see the signs coming to their accomplishment, in the increase of evil and in the decrease of good. These are the perils, which the Scripture speaks of, which the Gospels have recounted, and which St. Paul mentions: that no man, who lives, can know the end. Therefore ought we the more to fear: since we are not certain, whether death will overtake us today or tomorrow. But, when the day of judgment shall come, every one shall receive his entire payment: both those who have done ill, and those who have done well. For the Scripture saith, and we ought to believe it: that all men shall pass two ways; the good, to glory; the wicked, to torment. But, if any one shall not believe this dipartition: let him attend to Scripture from the end to the commencement. [27] Since Adam was formed down even to the present time, there may he find, if he will give his attention to it, that few are the saved in comparison with those that remain.

Wherefore, whosoever wishes to do good works, he ought to begin with paying honor to God. He ought likewise to call upon his glorious Son, the dear Son of Holy Mary; as also upon the Holy Ghost, who gives unto us a good way. These three, the Holy Trinity, being one God, ought to be invocated: full of all power, and all wisdom, and all goodness.

This we ought often to pray for and request: that he would give us fortitude to encounter the enemies; and that we man conquer them before our end, to wit, the world, the devil, and the flesh; and that be would give us wisdom accompanied with goodness, so that we may know the way of truth, and keep pure the soul which God has given us, both the soul and the body in the way of charity.

As we love the Holy Trinity, so likewise ought we to love our neighbor; for God hath commanded it: not only those who do good to us, but likewise those who do us evil. We ought, moreover, to have a firm hope in the Celestial King, that, at the end, he will lodge us in his glorious hostelry.

Now he, who shall not do what is contained in this Lesson, shall not enter into the holy house: though the saying be hard to be received by the caitiff race; who love gold and silver, who depreciate the promises of God, who keep neither his laws nor his commandments, and who suffer not good people to keep them, but rather binder them according to their power.

How did this evil enter among mankind? Because Adam sinned from the beginning, by eating of the forbidden apple; and, to others, germinated the grain of the evil seed. He gained death to himself and to others who followed him. Well may we say, that this was an evil morsel. But Christ hath redeemed the good by his passion.

Now we find, in this Lesson, that Adam misbelieved God his Creator. And we may see likewise, that those now become still worse, who abandon God the Father Almighty, and who believe in idols to their own destruction.

The author then, for the information of his simple-minded and primitive scholars, proceeds to give a brief summary of the history of the Old Testament; until, following the stream of chronology, he reaches the times of the Gospel Dispensation.

Then God sent the angel to a noble virgin of the lineage of the King, sweetly saluting her, for she was separated unto the law.

Afterward, he went on to say unto her: Fear, not, Mary; for the Holy Ghost shall be in thy companionship, and thou shalt bear a son whom thou shalt call Jesus: he shall deliver his people from that wherein they have offended. Nine months the glorious Virgin bare him in her womb: but, that she might not be reprehended, she was espoused to Joseph. Pure was our lady, and Joseph also. But this we ought to believe, for the Gospel hath said it, that they put the child in the manger when he was born, and enveloped him in rags, and poorly lodged him. Here may repent the covetous and the avaricious, who will never cease to amass riches.

Many miracles were done, when the Lord was born: for God sent the angel to announce it to the shepherds: and, in the east, appeared a star to the three men; glory also was given unto God in heaven, and on earth peace unto the good.

Afterward, the little one suffered persecution: but the child grew in grace and in age and in divine wisdom wherein he was instructed. He called the twelve apostles; rightly are they so named: and he would change the law which he had before given. [28] Yet he changed it not, that it might be abandoned: but he renewed it, that it might be better kept. He received baptism to give salvation: and he said unto the Apostles, that they should baptize the nations; for they began the renovation. The ancient law well forbad fornication and adultery: but the new law forbids to look and to lust. The ancient law annulled matrimony, and permitted that a bill of divorce should be given: but the new law forbids to take her that is put away, and says that they should not be parted whom God hath joined. The ancient law cursed the womb which bears not fruit: the new law counsels to keep virginity. The ancient law forbad only perjury: the new law says, Swear not at all, and let thy speech be only yea and nay. The old law commanded to fight against enemies, and to render evil for evil: but the new law says, Avenge not thyself, but leave vengeance to the heavenly king, and let those live in peace who do unto thee injury, and thou shalt find pardon from the heavenly king. The old law said, Thou shalt love thy friends, and thou shalt hate thine enemies: but the new law says, Thou shalt do so no more, but love your enemies, and do good to them that injure you, and pray for them that persecute you and for them that seek an occasion against you, that you may be the children of your Father which is in heaven. The old law commanded to punish malefactors: but the new law sags, Pardon all mankind, and thou shalt find pardon from the Father Almighty; for if thou pardonest not, thou shalt not find salvation. None ought to kill or to hate any person: not ought we to scoff at the simple and the poor, nor to hold as vile the

stranger who comes from another country; for, in this world, we are all pilgrims. Thus ought all we, who are brethren, to serve God. This is the new law, which Jesus Christ has said that we ought to keep.

He then gives an account of the crucifixion and of the first preaching of the Apostles: and, from the persecution, of the primitive Christians, naturally adverts to those which their genuine successors the Vallenses were themselves then suffering from the pretended disciples of the Lord.

Occurring in and before the year 1100, when as yet the Vallenses had not become missionaries in foreign regions, they relate, I suppose, to some of those local or domestic vexations and insults and harryings, which, through every age down to the present, they have experienced from the wretched bigotry of their government and their neighbors.

The Apostles were so strong in the fear of the Lord, as also both the men and the women that were with them, that for these things they ceased not either their doings or their sayings: for many of them were determined to have Jesus Christ. Great were the torments according to what is written, only because they showed the way of Jesus Christ. But, as for those who persecuted them, it was not so much for them to hold to the bad; because they had not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ: like those, who now take occasion and who persecute so much; who ought to be Christians, but whose semblance is evil. Yet in this they ought to be reprehended, because they persecute and imprison the good: for in no lesson is it found, that the saints persecuted or imprisoned any one. Now, after the Apostles, were certain teachers: they showed the way of Jesus Christ our Savior. And these are found, even to the present time: but they are manifest to only few people. These greatly wish to show the way of Jesus Christ: but they are so persecuted, that they can do only little. So much are false Christians blinded with error; and, more than all the others, those who are their pastors. For they persecute and hate those, who are better than themselves: and they let those live quietly, who are false deceivers. But by this we may know, that they are not good pastors: because they love not the flock, save for their fleece. Yet the Scripture says, and we may see it: that, if a person loves those who are good, he will wish to love God and to fear Jesus Christ; and that he will neither curse, nor swear, nor lye, nor commit adultery, nor kill, nor defraud his neighbor, nor revenge himself upon his enemies. Nevertheless they say, that such a person is a VAUDES and is worthy of punishment: and they find occasion, through lies and deceit, to take from him that which he has gotten by his just labor. [29] But he, who is thus persecuted, strengthens himself greatly through the fear of the Lord: for the kingdom of heaven shall be given to him at the end of the world. Then shall he have great glory in the place of such dishonor. [30]

But, in this, is greatly manifested their malice: that those, who will curse and lye and swear and put out money to usury and kill and commit adultery and revenge themselves upon those who do evil to them, are said and reckoned to be good and loyal men. Yet let such a person take heed, that he be not deceived at the end, when his mortal malady comes, when death seizes upon him, and when he is scarcely able to speak. Then he calls for the priest, and wishes to confess himself: but, according to the Scripture, he has delayed too long; for it commands and says, that thou shouldest confess while in sound health, and not wait to the last. The priest demands, if he has any sin. Two or three words he answers: and he has soon finished. The priest tells him, that he cannot be forgiven, if he does not restore all that he has taken from another and well examine his sins. When he hears this he has great trouble: and he thinks within himself; If he shall restore it entirely, what will remain to his children, and what will the world say? Then he commands his children to examine their faults: and gives money to the priest, that he himself may receive absolution. Though he has extorted from another a hundred pounds or perhaps two. yet the priest will pardon him for a hundred pence, and sometimes for less

when he can get no more. And he tells him a long story, and promises him pardon for he will say Mass, both for him and for his forefathers. Thus grants he pardon to them, whether they be just or felonious: and he puts his hand upon their heads. But, when be leaves them, he occasions a grand festival: for he makes them to understand, that they have been very well absolved. Yet ill are they confessed, who are thus faulty; and they will certainly be deceived by such an absolution: and he, that makes them believe it, sins mortally. For I dare to say, and it will be found very true: that all the Popes from Sylvester down to the present one, and all the Cardinals, and all the Bishops, and all the Abbots, even all such put together, have no power to absolve or to pardon a single creature in regard to a single mortal sin; inasmuch as God alone pardons, and no other can do it. [31]

But those, who are pastors, ought to do this. They ought to preach to the people, and pray with them, and often feed them with divine doctrine, and chastise sinners giving unto them discipline. That is to say: they ought to admonish them to repentance; so that they should confess their sins without fail, that they should repent in this present life, that they should fast and give alms and pray fervently; for, by these things, the soul finds salvation.

Wherefore, we Christians, unworthy of the name of Christians, who have sinned, and who have abandoned the law of Jesus Christ (for we have neither fear nor faith nor charity), ought to confess our sins without delay: amending ourselves, with weeping and penitence, in respect to the offences which have been done through three mortal sins; namely, the last of the eyes, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life, through which we have done ill. This way we must keep. If we will love and follow Jesus Christ, we must have spiritual poverty of heart, and love chastity, and serve God humbly: so may we follow the way of Jesus Christ; and so may we overcome our enemies.

The author then enumerates and describes the three laws, which have been given from God to man: the unwritten patriarchal law; the written law of Moses; and the also written law of Christ. This being done, he brings his poem to its conclusion.

We have only to imitate Jesus Christ, and to do his pleasure, and to keep firmly that which he has commanded, and to be well advised when Antichrist shall come, that we may give no credence either to his doings or to his sayings. But, according to Scripture, there are many Antichrists: for all, who are contrary to Christ, are Antichrist.

Many signs and great wonders shall be, from this time forward, to the day of judgment. The heaven and the earth shall burn: and all the living shall die. [32] Then all shall rise again to life everlasting. Every building shall be laid prostrate: and then shall be the last judgment, when God shall separate his people according as it is written. Then shall he say to the wicked: Depart from me, ye accursed, into the infernal fire which shall have no end. There shall they be straitened by three grievous conditions: namely, by multitude of pains; and by sharp torment; and by an irreversible damnation.

From this may God deliver us, if it be his pleasure: and may he give us to hear that which he will say to his people without delay, when he shall say; Come unto me, ye blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world. In that place, you shall have delight and riches and honor.

May it please the Lord who formed the world, that we may be of the number of his Elect to stand in his courts? Thanks unto God. Amen.

CHAPTER 10

THE THEOLOGY OF THE VALLENSES DURING THE PERIOD OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

FROM the period of the twelfth century, we descend to the period of the thirteenth and, here, Pilichdorf, and the Author of the Index of Valdensic Errors, and Conrad of Magdenberg, will prove usefully concurrent witnesses.

I. According to the first of these, Pilichdorf, the Valdenses, who, through the unwearied missionary labors of Peter Valdo and his Gallican Proselytes, had now, in their various offshoots, been spread far beyond the limits of their native mountains, held the following opinions.

They contended that They and their associates were exclusively the few Elect; while their adversaries, the corrupt Romanists, were the many called. [1]

They maintained: that The Virgin and the Saints are so filled with heavenly joy, as to be unable to regard what is done upon earth; and that, Inasmuch as they cannot pray for us, they ought not to be invoked by us. [2]

In immediate connection with this dogma, they contended: that God alone ought to be praised and honored and invocated and served; that, Since he alone redeemed us, he alone can help us; that The merits of the Saints cannot be applied to us, because they belong only to themselves; that, Since God well knows what is necessary for us, be requires not to be moved by the prayers of the Saints; that, What he wills, all the Saints will; and, therefore, that We ought not to invoke the Saints, but God exclusively and alone. [3]

They asserted: that, After this life, there are no more than two ways to the departed; and, consequently, that There is no such place or condition as Purgatory. [4]

They taught that There is no greater benefit to be obtained by burial in a consecrated cemetery, than in any other place. [5]

Agreeably to this principle, they said: that A material Church, dedicated or consecrated by a Romish Bishop, was neither better nor holier nor worthier than any other house, since God both could be adored and ought to be adored everywhere. [6]

In like manner, they reprobated the consecration of sacerdotal and pontifical robes, water, salt, ashes, candles, food at the time of Easter, and all other things which are consecrated by bishops and priests: and they rejected also the consecration of bishops, priests, churches, altars, cemeteries, baptismal water, unctions of chrism and oil, palms, branches, and herbs; saying, that Things thus consecrated derived no particular sanctity from the words used, though the words themselves might be good. [7] They reprobated the indulgences of the prelates of the Church, together with pilgrimages to the thresholds of saints and the year of jubilee: and this they did, as we learn from the counter-reasoning of Pilichdorf, on the ground of rejecting the whole system of human meritoriousness, more especially as it appears in its worst form of supererogation. [8]

All images and the worship of them they utterly abominated: and, for this, as Pilichdorf admits, they seemed to have authorities from Scripture; though, ludicrously enough, he is quite satisfied, that he can dispose of them all and solve every apparent difficulty. [9]

To oaths of every description they objected. [10]

II. The Author of the Index of Valdensic Errors, subjoined by Gretzer to the Work of Pilichdorf, has contributed some important additional notices. In the beneficial potency of the sign of the cross, the Valdenses had no faith for they were wont to declare, that They would venerate, neither the very cross upon which Christ hung, nor the crown of thorns, nor the nails, nor the spear, nor the garment without seam, even if they could behold the really genuine articles themselves; inasmuch as the veneration of all such things is vain and useless, being merely contrived by the priests for the sake of filthy lucre. [11]

To the sayings of the Saints they paid no regard, except in so far as they might be confirmatory to their own sect: for they admitted only the authority of the New Testament; and this they observed to the very letter. [12]

General confession they made no account of. [13]

Miracles, performed in the Church of God through the merits of the saints, they utterly rejected. [14]

They said: that The Pope is the head of all heresiarchs. [15]

All Religious Orders of Monks and Sanctimonials they reprobated: saying, that They are vain and superfluous. [16]

They maintained: that All the words of the Mass, and all the preparations appertaining to the Mass, beyond the simple words of consecration, are of error. [17]

III. Various other matters of less moment have been omitted: and if there should be any doubt as to the import of the last specified particular, it is effectually solved by their own explanatory language as reported by Conrad of Magdenberg.

They blaspheme, says he, the Priesthood of Christ, styling the Presbyters in the Church of God, by way of mockery and derision, GOD-MAKERS. Nevertheless, the Priests themselves make not God: but only, through the words of consecration instituted by Christ, under the species of bread and wine mixed with water, they make our Lord Christ to be corporeally present who was not corporeally present before, the Holy Spirit operating the transubstantiation of this oblation so as to make God. [18]

Conrad is here speaking of the Beghards or Pighards or Picards. But this was the name, by which, from the circumstance of their abounding in the neighbor province of Picardy, the Valdenses were wont to be styled in Germany. [19] Consequently, there can be no doubt touching the specific religionists, to whom he alludes. As for his language, it is useful to let a Romanist himself exhibit the blasphemous heresy of the Transubstantialists in all its naked deformity.

CHAPTER 11

THE THEOLOGY OF THE VALLENSES AT AND IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE TIME OF THE REFORMATION.

FOR the ascertaining of the Doctrinal System, maintained by the Vallenses, at and immediately after the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century, I shall adduce two several authorities: the testimony, to wit, of Claude Scyssel Archbishop of Turin about the year 1500; and the confession, presented, in the year 1542, to Francis I. of France, through the medium of Cardinal Sadolet.

I. The testimony of Scyssel respects the Vallenses, who continued to occupy their ancient settlements in Piedmont, and who thence were geographically comprehended within the limits of the Archbishop's diocese.

Scyssel's Work, against what he calls the Errors and Sect of the Valdenses, is written, both with much bitterness, and with no small measure to boot of absurd inconsistency: for while he stoutly reviles the Heretics, as brute beasts quite unfit through their barbarous ignorance to enter into any argument; he nevertheless, in the same breath, tells us, that they were specially acute in the citation of Holy Scripture to establish their own opinions, exhibiting also some specimens of their reasoning which certainly show no defect either in knowledge or in dexterity. [1]

Their doctrines, he claims, of course, after the usual self-laudatory method of popish controversialists, to have refuted and exposed: and, for this purpose, he gives those doctrines, as professed by them at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

Now, upon examination, we shall find that their theological principles had, in no respect, varied from those, which they are attested to have maintained at an earlier period.

They acknowledged no authoritative rule of faith save the Bible: receiving only, what was expressly said by Christ or handed down by his Apostles, and rejecting the glosses of the popish doctors, they followed it, in its plain and obvious sense, according to the letter. [2]

Deeming the Church of Rome the Babylonian Harlot, and asserting their own Church to be the alone true Catholic Church of Christ, they paid no regard to the ecclesiastical censures of the Popish Prelates and Clergy. [3] The vital doctrine of Justification through the alone merits of Christ they firmly maintained: asserting, that men required not the suffrages of the Saints, Christ only being to all abundantly sufficient for all things. [4]

Purgatory they altogether rejected; affirming that departed spirits passed immediately to a state either of happiness or of misery: and they pronounced, that the payment of money, in reference to the expiation of the souls of the deceased by penal sufferings, is a foolish and destructive superstition; the whole fable having been invented by the Priests for their own sordid emolument. [5]

They maintained, that, with one or two exceptions at the utmost, the contraction of matrimony is freely open to all degrees of men: and, in every other ease, they denied to the Pontiffs the right of prohibition. [6]

The power of absolution by the Priests, and the necessity of confession to them, they entirely disallowed. [7]

All worship of the Virgin and the Saints they rejected, as idolatry: and thence they threw aside those prayers addressed to them, which had been composed even by the highest doctors of the Church. [8]

The tenet of Transubstantiation they denied and derided: and, though Scyssel describes them as mere babblers upon this point, he waives all argument with these dreadfully inconclusive reasoners, on the ground; that even the faithful themselves and the most skillful theologians, so far from being capable of understanding so deep a mystery, were unable even to deliver it to others. [9]

All benedictions of cemeteries and holy water and oratories and ecclesiastical ornaments they affirmed to be utterly useless. [10]

The adoration of images they strenuously opposed: and Scyssel himself admits, that, if they stated the practice of the Romanists fairly, their sentiments would be correct. [11]

Much abuse is poured upon them by the Archbishop, on the ground, that they made no scruple of contracting marriages, which the Romanists deemed incestuous: [12] but he is constrained to admit, that their conduct was exemplary. They commonly, says he, lead a purer life than other Christians. Except by compulsion, they swear not: and they rarely take the name of God in vain. They fulfil their promises with all good faith: and, living for the most part in poverty, they protest, that they alone preserve the apostolical life and doctrine. On this account, they assert, that the power of the Church resides with themselves, as being the innocent and true disciples of Christ: for whose faith and religion, to live in poverty, and to suffer persecution from us, they esteem honorable and glorious. [13]

II. Such were the Vallenses of Piedmont at the beginning of the sixteenth century' I shall now pass to the Confession, presented, in the year 1542, to the King of France.

To this document, as preserved by Crispin, there is a peculiarity attached, which renders it eminently valuable.

In the year 1342, a date brought out by the specification of two centuries before the year 1542, a colony of the Vallenses of Piedmont planted themselves at Merindol and Cabriere on the western side of the Cottian Alps' and there by dint of hard labor, brought an uninhabited desert into a state of such high cultivation, that they supplied all Provence with corn, wine, oil, honey, almonds, flocks, and herds. [14]

Such being the case, their Confession may justly be viewed, as connecting the latter part of the middle ages with the times of the Reformation-for it may be considered, as exhibiting the faith of the Vallenses, on either side of the Cottian Alps, through a period of two entire centuries; or from the year 1342 when the emigration took place, down to the year 1542 when the Confession was drawn up and delivered to the French King by Cardinal Sadolet.

> OF THIS CONFESSION, THE FOLLOWING, IN BRIEF, ARE THE ARTICLES.
>
> We all believe and confess: that the Holy Scripture, as contained in the Old and New Testament, was written by divine inspiration.
>
> From the teaching of the same Scripture, we confess and believe: that there is one God; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: distinct in three persons, and subsisting in one spiritual and eternal essence: who, by his mighty power and infinite goodness, originally created and still preserves all things.

We hold it for certain: that the Son of God came into this world, and voluntarily submitted to be clothed in human flesh; on which thing alone the mystery of the Christian Religion is constituted: for, in that name, our whole hope and faith rest upon Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Lord, the admirable God, the author of eternal life, the sole savior and justifier and sanctifier and interpreter and patron of mankind; and the sole sacrificer also, whence there is no need of a successor. Also we hold it for certain: that he is truly God and truly man.

We believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost without the intervention of a man, as the angel announced before his conception; in order that he, whose procreation ought to be free from all sin, might be born holy and upright.

We believe and confess: that Jesus Christ without any taint of original sin, was born in Bethlehem from the Virgin Mary; and that he assumed a body, like unto our bodies in all things, sin only excepted, to which he could not be obnoxious.

We believe and confess: that Jesus Christ suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, for our sins; and that he alone is the true Paschal Lamb, offered as a victim, that he might snatch us from the jaws of the devil.

We believe and confess: that he descended into hell.

We believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ rose again on the third day from the dead for our justification.

We believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, forty days after his resurrection, ascended to heaven, and withdrew his bodily presence from these lower regions.

We believe and confess: that he sits at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.

We believe: that Jesus Christ will come to judge the quick and the dead once, at the last day of judgment.

We believe and confess: that the Holy Ghost is the third person of the same essence with the Father and the Son, proceeding from the same Father and Son, and equal to each of them.

We believe and confess: that there is one Holy Catholic Church, which is the Congregation and Assembly of all true believers faithful and elect of God, who have been from the beginning of the world, and shall be to the end; of which Church Jesus Christ is the head.

We believe and confess: that there is a free remission of sins, proceeding from the mercy and mere goodness of our Lord Christ; who died once for our sins, the just for the unjust; who took away our sins in his own body upon the cross: – who is our advocate with God, the price of our reconciliation; – whose blood cleanses our consciences from dead works, that we should serve the living God; – who alone made satisfaction for the faithful, so that their sins are not imputed to them, as to the unbelieving and the reprobate. [15]

We believe: that there is a resurrection of the flesh of the blessed of God, to possess the kingdom of heaven for ever; as also a resurrection of the cursed of God, to perpetual fire and torment.

We believe also: that souls are immortal; but that the souls of the faithful, as soon as they migrate from this body, pass immediately to the glory of heaven; – and that the souls of the unbelieving and the reprobate, as soon as they depart from their bodies, pass to the torments of bell until the day of judgment and the resurrection of the, flesh, that so, both body and soul, they may be eternally tormented in the gehenna of inextinguishable fire.

We believe: that eternal life is offered to us by the grace of God through Christ, who is truly our life, and who endured death that the faithful might become heirs of eternal life.

We believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, having abolished Circumcision, instituted Baptism, through which we are received into the Church of the people of God. – This outward Baptism exhibits to us another inward Baptism; namely, the Grace of God which cannot be seen with the eyes. The Apostles and other ministers of the Church baptize, using the word of God in order to a sacrament; and give only the visible sign: but the Lord Jesus Christ, the chief shepherd, alone gives the increase, and causes that we may receive the things signified. – They greatly err, who deny Baptism to the children of Christians.

We believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ afterward ordained the sacrament of the Supper, which is the giving of thanks and the remembrance of the death and passion of Jesus Christ, rightly celebrated in the Assembly of God's People. There the bread and wine are distributed and taken, as visible signs and representations of holy things: that is to say, of the body and blood of Jesus Christ offered upon the cross for the remission of our sins and for the reconciliation of mankind with God.

> Whosoever believeth, that Jesus Christ delivered his body and shed his blood for the remission of sins: he eats the flesh and drinks the blood of the Lord, and becomes a partaker of both: considering the agreement, of those things which are subjected to the eyes, and of the food by which the body is sustained, with those things which are not seen and with spiritual food. For, as the body, in this life, is strengthened with bread; and as wine recreates the heart of man: so, likewise, the body of Jesus Christ delivered unto death, and his blood shed for us, nourish and confirm and refresh the sad and affected soul. But let not any one imagine, that the visible sign is so conjoined or conglutinated with the invisible thing signified, as to be incapable of separation; insomuch that the one cannot be received without the other: for Judas, indeed, received the sign; but the thing signified he did not receive, nor was be ever made a partaker of the body and blood of Christ. – The opinion of some, therefore, is not to be received, who believe, that the true and natural body of Christ, his flesh and his bones, exist and lie hid in that bread of the Supper, or that any transmutation of the one into the other is effected. For this opinion is repugnant to the word of God and contrary to the articles of our faith, in which it is clearly set forth: that Christ ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; whence, also, he will come, to judge the quick and the dead. But the Lord Jesus Christ is present in the sacrament of the Supper; by the power and virtue and presence of his Spirit in the hearts of his elect and faithful. – They also, who affirm that in the Supper the body of Christ is eaten corporally, do

err: for the flesh, when eaten, profiteth nothing; it is the Spirit, which quickeneth. Therefore, the truly faithful of Jesus Christ eat his flesh and drink his blood spiritually in their hearts. [16]

We believe and confess: that the sincere worship of God consists, in obedience to his will, and in the use of all our diligence to attain to it. – The end of the commandment is, to obey God in true charity, from a pure and upright heart and a good conscience and faith without dissimulation.

We confess: that the knowledge of sin comes from an understanding of the Law, which points out to us our own imbecility, so that no mortal can perfectly fulfil it; for all men are sinners.

We confess: that good works which God has prepared that we should walk in them, and which God has propounded in his word, ought to be done and studiously accomplished: not, indeed, through hope of meriting any thing at God's hand, or through fear of eternal perdition, but for that duty and love which we ought to bear to our common Father.

We believe and confess: that, agreeably to the divine commandments, we must, in all things, preserve sobriety and continence; also that fasting is enjoined to us in Scripture, which consists in the affliction and humiliation of the body, though not for the mere purpose of afflicting the flesh, but for the purpose of making us more lively and more fit for prayer.

We confess: that, in the Old Testament, certain foods are prohibited; but that, through Christ, the free use of them is granted to Christians.

We confess: that Kings, Princes, and Magistrates, are persons constituted of God; in order to bear the sword, for the defense of the good, and for the punishment of the bad. Obedience, therefore, is due to them, not only for wrath's sake, but also for conscience sake.

We confess: that Ministers and Pastors of the Church ought to be an example to the flock and to the faithful, in discourse, conversation, charity, faith, and chastity; being preeminent in preaching the word of God and in persevering in sincere doctrine. But covetous Pastors; who, for the sake of base gain, under pretext of God's worship, introduce false doctrine; – who profane the temple of God, making it a den of thieves; who, profess themselves able, for money, to redeem souls out of purgatory, as they speak; who, for a price, promise pardon and remission of sins; who sell bad works these impostors, sacrilegers, and idolaters, ought, by the authority of Kings and Magistrates, to be removed from their degree; and, in their place, others ought to be substituted. [17]

These were the doctrines of the Vallenses at the time of the Reformation: doctrines, handed down and preserved among them, through a long line of ancestors, from the very days of the Primitive Church Catholic.

Previous to their delivering their Confession to Cardinal Sadolet, through the Court of the Province and the Bishop of Carillon, they professed themselves willing to abjure any point, which, from God's word, could be proved heretical. [18] And, after it had been delivered in and duly recited preparatory to its being read before the King, an honest Doctor in Theology, employed by the Bishop of Carillon to

examine it, fairly confessed; that he had never been so much astonished as he was, when he had duly weighed the articles of their faith, and had diligently compared them with the testimonies of Holy Writ which were adduced for the confirmation of their Confession: freely acknowledging, that, in his whole life, he had not made such a proficiency in the divine Writings, as he had done in the course of the eight days, during which he had been compelled to examine the passages of Scripture cited in those articles. [19]

III. Harassed and persecuted as the Vallenses had long been, and reduced perpetually as they were to poverty and thence to that comparative ignorance which attends upon the want of a regular education, they obtained, I doubt not, a considerable degree of improvement, in the accurate and scholastic statement of their doctrines, from the more logical and better instituted reformers of the sixteenth century. Thus far, we may readily concede to Bossuet, in the precise case of the Vallenses of Merindol. [20] Accordingly, as Crispin tells us, we find them, with much humility and with a beautifully ready acknowledgment of their incompetence, sparing no pains to acquire religious information and instruction. [21] But, that they borrowed little beyond precision of language and goodness of arrangement, is, I think, plain, from the consistent and never-varying evidence which has already been produced. Accordingly, as the same Crispin distinctly informs us, they steadily claimed, without any infection of heresy, to have ALWAYS taught and maintained the pure doctrine of the Gospel. [22]

With this view of the matter, their own language perfectly corresponds. Ever prophesying in sackcloth, and driven by brutal persecution to take refuge in dens and caves of the earth, the confession of their deputation to Ecolampadius, in the year 1530, bespeaks, I think, on the part of the Vallenses, rather a want of regular education, than any theological or biblical ignorance in the strict and proper sense of the expression.

We are, said they, the teachers, such teachers as we are, of a certain unworthy and poor little people. – Yet, in all things, we agree with you: and, from the very time of the Apostles, our sentiments respecting the faith have been the same as your own. In this matter alone we differ: that through our own fault and through the slowness of our genius, we do not understand the inspired writers so accurately as yourselves. [23] There is something wonderfully touching, and singularly savoring of primitive evangelical humility, in this language on the part of a most remotely ancient Church; which refused the title of a Reformed Church, on the honorable ground that it had never needed reformation. [24] Bossuet, indeed, pleads strenuously for Vallensic ignorance: but they, who are aware that an intimate and deeply practical knowledge of the grand essentials of the Gospel may subsist without the possession of a regular scholastic education, will be apt to think; that those, whose ancestors are recorded by an enemy to have had the whole of the New Testament by heart with considerable portions of the Old Testament also, undervalued themselves through modesty; and that, merely because they did not adopt the overweening style of self-satisfied conceit, their words are not to be taken with all the severity of a strictly literal interpretation. [25]

CHAPTER 12

RESPECTING THE POOR MEN OF LYONS OR THE MISSIONARY VALDENSES OF FRANCE

IN establishing the Antiquity of the Vallenses of Piedmont, I brought down their history, until, in the twelfth century, they stand connected with the Vallenses of France. [1] Resuming the subject, I shall now give some account of these modern Leonists, as they are styled by the Inquisitor Reinerius Sacco.

Perhaps, through the whole range of ecclesiastical story, there can scarcely be mentioned an individual, who in the hand of God has been more eminently an instrument for good, than the rich and holy merchant Peter of Lyons.

This illustrious reformer began his labors about the year 1160: and he is commonly thought to have died about the year 1179. He was the founder of the comparatively modern Society of the Poor Men of Lyons; and to them he imparted the name of Valdenses, derived from his own agnomen of Valdo or Valdes or Valdensis or Valdensius or Valdius; for, in all these slightly varied forms, does the agnomen occur. [2]

I. Thus far, the matter is perfectly clear: but, although Peter communicated to his new Society the title of Valdenses, the question still remains, whence he himself derived his own agnomen.

With respect to this question, the very form of that agnomen shows, with sufficient clearness, that it cannot be viewed as the proper family name of the wealthy merchant; that is to say, as his family name after the manner in which family names are now borne. It is evidently a title imposed, either from some town, or from some people, or from some country, or from some circumstance connected with Peter's own religious sentiments.

Accordingly, we are told: that he received the name from a town or district named Valdis or Vaudra or Valden, which is indifferently said to have been situated in the march of France or in the borders of France: for, in the middle ages, the term march was applied to all border countries; whence the Count or Warden of the Marches received the title of Margrave or Marquis.

On this point, simply, there is an universal agreement: but, if we descend to particulars, there is a slight apparent variation. I say apparent: because, in reality, when one account, that given by the Centuriators of Magdeburg, represents his family, as having originated from that place or district; and when another account, that given by John Masson, speaks of him, as having been himself born there; and when yet a third account, that given by Pilichdorf, describes him, as having once been a citizen of Valden: there is nothing at all incongruous or irreconcilable in these several statements. [3] Rather, indeed, I apprehend, that they each convey a portion of the truth: so that, from them all combined, we learn; that Peter was born in Valdis or Valden of a family belonging to that country, and that he himself had lived there in his youth before he settled as a merchant at Lyons.

Now, if these concurring statements are to be viewed as intimating nothing more, than that Peter received his agnomen from some place called Valdis or Valden or Vaudra vaguely described as situated somewhere near the extensive frontier of France: they will not explain his very peculiar conduct, when his mind first became deeply and vitally impressed with the importance of religion.

Luther, trained a Papist from his childhood, and having at the age of about twenty years finished his course of philosophy at Erfurt, happened one day to walk in the fields with an intimate friend and associate. A violent thunderstorm came on: and his companion, by a stroke of lightning, was killed at his side. This awful occurrence produced a mighty effect upon the mind of the future reformer: but, in what outward demonstration, did that effect show itself? Precisely in such a demonstration, as might have been anticipated from the School of Theology in which he had been nurtured. He determined to withdraw himself from the world and to enter into a monastery at Erfurt. His father strongly remonstrated: but the son was inflexible, as to what he deemed a manifest vocation from heaven; and the result was his taking upon himself the vows of monasticism.

Now, by Reinerius, we are informed, that a very similar occurrence befell the opulent merchant of Lyons, whose name indeed he does not mention, but whom he sufficiently identifies, by describing him as the founder of the sect of the Poor Men, and by afterward specifying a sect under the precise name of Valdenses. When, on some public occasion, the more wealthy or the more dignified citizens were assembled together, it happened, that one of the number suddenly dropped down dead. By this event the mind of Peter was as much impressed, as that of Luther was by the instantaneous removal of his friend: and, since the same causes usually produce pretty much the same effects, we may safely infer; that, if the previous sentiments of Peter had been identical with the previous sentiments of Luther, in that case, just as the poor student Luther, under the influence of those sentiments became a monk, so, under the influence of the same sentiments, the rich merchant Peter would have devoted his wealth to the erection of an Abbey, and would himself have become (what the Papists call) one of the Religious in his own munificent foundation. [4] So, from such premises, we may fairly infer but, in truth, this was not the case. Instead of acting, proportionally to the difference of his rank in life, like Luther Peter distributed his substance among the poor; devoted himself altogether to the profession of the Gospel; caused the Scriptures to be translated into the vulgar tongue; began eagerly to make proselytes to what (so far as mere speculation is concerned) must plainly have been his already adopted sentiments; and sent them forth throughout the whole world, to denounce the Roman Church as the Babylon of the Apocalypse, and to warn all men against partaking of her abominations. [5]

Here we have a case totally different from that of Luther. Peter had speculatively held sentiments the very opposite to those which Luther entertained when he threw himself into a monastery: and, as soon as his mere speculation began to be practically operative, the result was that which has been stated. On evangelical principles, he declared war against the Roman Church: and, thus acting, we find him distinguished by the agnomen of Valdes or Valdensis or Valdius or (as the word would be expressed, in French) Le Vaudois.

With these matters before us, we shall, I think, view the preceding statements, as intimating something much more definite and particular than some uncertain place, either of Peter's family origination, or of his own personal nativity, or of his early residence in the way of his mercantile business.

1. The place, or district, it seems, was called Valdis or Valden or (in a gallican form) Vaudra; and it was situated in the marches or upon the borders of France.

What, then, was this place and where are we to seek it definitely and precisely?

Truly, both the very name of the place, and its descriptive geographical situation, alike refer us to the Valleys or the Valden of Piedmont and Dauphiny: for the ancient or proper Vallerises, those primeval

Leonists whom Reinerius notes to be the oldest of all known sects, occupied the Valleys on either side of the Cottian Alps.

Originally, on the breaking up of the Western Empire, Dauphiny was within the limits of the kingdom of Arles, itself a member of the kingdom of the Burgundians: and, thence, it became a fief of the restored empire under Charlemagne. But, in the middle of the fourteenth century, it was annexed to France. Still, however, in either case, the Valleys of the Cottian Alps were always a march country: for, situated as they were on the borders of France and Savoy, they constituted the marches, as the phrase ran, of both those neighboring Sovereignties. Hence, in the eleventh century, we find Peter Damian addressing the Dutchess Adelaide of Savoy, as the Marchioness or the March-Countess or the Lady March-Warden of the Cottian Alps. [6]

Here, then, was that march or border country of France – whence, either from birth, or from family origin, or from early inhabitation, Peter received his agnomen of Valdo or Valdes or Valdensis or Le Vaudois. The march-land region, called Valdis or Valden or Vaudra, was plainly no other, than the border Valley district of the ancient Vallenses or Leonists. [7]

Such, in whatever precise mode, being the connection of Peter with the Vallenses of Dauphiny and Piedmont, we shall now have no difficulty in accounting for the form which his sudden religious impression assumed a form, so essentially different from any that could have been produced by the papally superstitious spirit of the age in which he lived. Either by birth, or by origin, or by early inhabitation, the wealthy merchant was a Valdensis or Vaudes or Vaudois. With the pure and primitive doctrine of the pious Dalesman, he had long, most probably from his very childhood, been acquainted: but the full occupation of successful traffic, and the consequent increase of worldly opulence and worldly respectability, had choked the word, so that it became unfruitful in a thorny soil of mere speculative knowledge. But the Lord had a purpose of mercy for the individual: and, through him, had a purpose also of great and abiding, and extensive good to his sincere Church. An awful dispensation, witnessed by the merchant, while seated among his brother burgesses of Lyons in all the pride of place municipal, proved effectual and decisive. It spoke to his sleeping conscience, with a voice of thunder. And the result was precisely in accordance with the previous speculative illumination of his understanding.

2. In point of connection, here it is, that Peter and his new French Society join themselves to the ancient Vallenses of Italy: and thus, agreeably to the explicit testimony of Conrad of Ursperg, that The Valdenses, in both their divisions, originated, at a remote period, in Italy, they appear as a gallican branch springing out of the parent stock which had long flourished in the Valdis or Valden or Vaudra of the bordering Cottian Alps. [8]

This circumstance fully accounts for the peculiar language of Reinerius in his Treatise concerning Heretics language, which, with some modern writers, has led, most unfortunately, to blunders and misapprehensions of no ordinary magnitude.

The Leonists, he tells us, are to be ranked among the sects of ANCIENT Heretics; for they are older than either the Arians or the Manicheans or any other of the seventy sects which had once existed, but which had then become extinct. while the poor men of Lyons, who are also, as well as the members of the older sect from which they had branched out, denominated Leonists, are a sect of a MODERN Heretics; having been founded, as late as the twelfth century, by an opulent merchant of that city. [9]

Though, on the first survey, these two statements are apparently discordant; they will, on examination, be found perfectly to agree with each other.

The proselyted French Valdenses, considered as a congregation gathered out of those who were previously members of the Roman Church, were no older than Peter the Valdo: but, in point of ultimate theological pedigree, when considered as a branch or continuation of the ancient Vallenses of Dauphiny and Piedmont, they were, agreeably to their own true and perpetual allegation, as old as the times of the Apostles themselves.

Hence, in France, the name of Valdenses occurs not until after the commencement of Peter's ministry: for the first writer who mentions the name as sectarially connected with that country, is Walter Mapes in the year 1179. [10]

Thus we see, how utterly repugnant to historical testimony is the assertion of Bossuet: that The Valdenses so owed their origin to Peter Valdo, as to have had no existence in any part of the world previous to his time. [11]

Thus also, on the specific ground taken up by himself, we may perceive the absolute childishness of his objection to the antiquity of the Vallensic Treatise on Antichrist.

Some unknown collector, he states, ascribes the Treatise to an early part of the twelfth century. But the very founder of the Valdenses did not commence his ministry until after the year 1160. Therefore the antiquity of the Treatise must be purely fictitious. [12]

Now, whether in itself that Treatise be or be not a genuine relic of antiquity, at all events, this objection, which is insecurely based, partly upon the mere guess of an unknown collector, and partly upon the false assertion that the Valdenses corporately are not older than the time of Peter of Lyons, furnishes no proof that it is a modern fabrication. The Treatise, I admit, is not so ancient as the beginning of the twelfth century. But what then? The mere random circumstance of a collector's having erroneously ascribed it to an early part of the twelfth century, even if, on Bossuet's theory, Peter of Lyons were really the founder of the entire Church of the Valdenses, would afford no very satisfactory evidence that it must have been the production of a modern writer; a writer, for instance, who flourished subsequently to the age of the Reformation.

II. During many centuries, as I have already observed, the old Vallenses seem rarely to have departed from their native Valleys. Their testimony was, indeed, faithfully borne against their immediate papalising neighbors: and there, as we have seen, their existence was well known to the governing powers and to the influential members of the Roman Church. But, a simple and primitive race, strongly attached to their mountain fastnesses, we hear not of them out of their own direct vicinage for, as Bossuet justly remarks, it was an error of Gretser (and, I may add, of Mariana also, and of other Jesuits), in a much later age, unskillfully and vaguely to apply the name of Valdenses to those who were really Albigenses. [13]

With Peter the Vaudois, however, a new succession of ages commences: and, what his alpine brethren (his brethren, apparently, after the flesh, as well as; after the spirit) had hitherto wanted, the Christian zeal of the enlightened and liberal merchant amply supplied. Under the name of the Poor Men of Lyons, he instituted a special order of Preachers or Missionaries: who, instead of quietly vegetating at home from generation to generation, should go forth, like the wandering Albigenses, into the world at large, and should thus carry the Gospel to every quarter of Europe. [14]

1. Of this peculiarity in the new local sect of MODERN Heretics, as Reinerius styles and describes them, we have abundant historical testimony. [15]

(1.) Reinerius himself, in his Treatise edited by Marten, gives us some very valuable information respecting the present particular.

The Sect of the Leonists is composed of members of two different descriptions.

Some of them are distinguished by the name of The Perfect: but, of these, the strictly proper designation is, The Poor Valdenses of Lyons. [16] Into this form, all are not admitted indiscriminately: but the candidates are first trained in a long course of education, that so they may know how to teach others.

These say, that they possess nothing as individual property, neither houses nor lands nor certain mansions: and their wives, if they previously have any, they leave. They call themselves the successors of the Apostles: and, of the others, they are the Masters and the Confessors. Hence they circuit the country, visiting their disciples and confirming them in their error. To these, their disciples minister things necessary. Into whatever place they come, their Laity contrive mutually to insinuate among each other the knowledge of their arrival. Then many, for the purpose of secretly hearing and seeing them, congregate to them in some place of safety: and there they send to them the best meat and drink. Here they appoint to the disciples collections of money, to be made for the support of the said Poor Men and their Masters and their students, who are unable to supply their own expenses; or indeed, likewise, in order to allure some whom the desire of money draws to their sect. [17]

(2.) Walter Mapes similarly exhibits the Poor Men of Lyons or the Perfect Brethren under the aspect of Preachers or Missionaries, when, in the year 1179, he first mentions their name of Valdesians or Valdenses.

We saw, in the Council of Rome celebrated under Pope Alexander III certain illiterate individuals, called from their Primate Valdes who bad been a citizen of Lyons upon the Rhone, VALDESIANS. These persons presented, to the Lord Pope, a book written in the French Tongue; wherein were contained the text and gloss of the Psalter and likewise of very many books of both the two Laws: and, with much urgency, they petitioned, that the authority of preaching might be confirmed to them; for though they had lived mere sciolists, they seemed to themselves to be skillful and well-instructed clerks, the least of the many thousands who bad been called, derided them; because, in the matter of their petition, there might be doubt or discussion: and, being invited by a certain great Prelate to whom that supreme Pope had enjoined the charge of confessions, I shot an arrow at the mark. For, many prudent men and well skilled in the law being called in, two Valdesians, who seemed the chief of their sect, were brought to me, that they might dispute with me concerning the faith: not, however, from any love of inquiring after truth; but purely that I might be confuted, and that my mouth might be stopped as if I spoke absurdities.

Now I sat, I must own, with a considerable feeling of timidity, lest, for my sins, the grace of speech should be denied to me in so great a Council. But the Prelate commanded me to set myself in force against them: and they prepared to answer me.

First, then, I propounded the most trifling questions; such as no person ought to be ignorant of: as knowing, that, when an ass is munching thistles, he is eating the lettuce which best befits him. Believe ye in God the Father? They answered: We believe. And in God the Son? They answered: We believe. And in the Holy Ghost? Still they answered: We believe. I then reiterated: And in the mother of Christ? Again they gave the same answer: We believe. Upon this, with a manifold clamor, they were derided by all: and they retired in confusion. And well, indeed, they might do so: for they were ruled by none; and yet, like Phaethon who did not so much as know the names of his horses, they wished to be rulers themselves.

These men have no where any fixed domiciles; but they travel about two and two, naked as to their feet, clad in coarse woollen garments, having nothing, holding all things in common like the Apostles, following naked a naked Christ. They begin, at present, with the utmost humility; because they cannot get in a single foot: but, if once we admit them, we shall soon be ourselves expelled. [18]

(3.) The rude treatment experienced by these good men at the Papal Court in the year 1179, which Walter Mapes seems most unaccountably to have mistaken for wit, did not deter their successors from making a second application in the year 1212. A description of it is given by Conrad of Lichtenau, Abbot of Ursperg: and it is marked by the same characteristics of the disciples of Peter, as those which were associated with the former application. The statement of Conrad is yet further important: because, as I have already observed, it distinctly intimates the ultimate Italian or Vallensic origin of the French Community founded by Peter Valdo.

Formerly, two sects sprang up in Italy, which still continue to exist. One of these bears the name of the Humiliated: the other, that of the Poor Men of Lyons. Pope Lucius once enrolled them among Heretics: because certain superstitious opinions and practices were found among them. In their secret preachings, moreover, which they commonly made in lurking places, they derogated from the Church of God and the Priesthood.

At that time, in the year 1212 to wit, we saw some of the number of those, who were called Poor Men of Lyons, at the Apostolic See, with a certain master of theirs, as I think, Bernard by name: and these petitioned, that the Apostolic See would confirm and privilege their sect.

The account, truly, which they gave of themselves, was: that they led the life of the Apostles; and that, wishing neither to possess any thing nor to have any certain place of residence, they went in a circuit through the villages and to the castles. But the Lord Pope objected to them certain superstitious matters in their conversation: as, for instance, that they preached in shoes which covered only the upper part of the foot, walking as it were with their feet naked; and, moreover, that, while they wore certain caps as if belonging to some Religious Order, they polled the hair of their heads only in the same fashion as the Laity. This also seemed opprobrious in their case: that men and women walked together in the way, and commonly remained together in the same house; so that it was said of them, that they sometimes slept together in the same bed. All which things nevertheless, they asserted to have descended to them from the Apostles. [19]

> The women, no doubt, who shocked the concubinarian purity of the Romish Priesthood by thus travelling with men that seemed to belong to a sort of Religious Order, were the wives of the missionaries: though, from the inconvenience attendant upon such a practice, they had, shortly afterward (we have seen) when the Inquisitor Reinerius wrote, discontinued it. Yet, as it was justly alleged, the practice itself was apostolical. Conrad, indeed, who most probably was a very inferior scripturist to the well read Valdenses, might, as appears from the turn of his phraseology, be ignorant of the biblically-recorded circumstance. [20] But the Poor Men of Lyons had read the question propounded by St. Paul: and thence felt themselves authorized in asserting, that the practice of travelling with their lawful wives had descended to them from the Apostles. [21]

2. Papal disapprobation was rapidly followed by papal persecution: but, as Archbishop Usher well observes, persecution produced no other effect, than that, which, of old, resulted from the murder of the protomartyr Stephen; a matter, fully attested by the Inquisitor Eymeric in the fourteenth century.

When the Poor men could not rest at Lyons, fearing the Archbishop and the Church, they fled from that city: and, being dispersed through the parts of France and Italy, they had very many accomplices; and, down even to the present day, they have in various districts abundantly sown their errors. [22]

3. Thus, on amply sufficient evidence, the historian Thuanus was induced to write in manner following.

Peter Valdo, the ringleader of the Valdenses, leaving his own country, went into Belgium: and, in Picardy, as they now call the province, obtained many followers. Passing thence into Germany, he long sojourned among the Vandalic States, and finally settled in Bohemia: where those, who, at the present day, embrace his doctrine, are, on that account called Picards. [23]

III. Such being the origin of the Poor Men of Lyons, we shall probably be not a little surprised at the grave statement put forth by Bossuet. When they first separated themselves from the Church, they had only very few dogmas contrary to our own: perhaps, indeed, none totally. – Their system was, in truth, a species of Donatism. [24]

Certainly, if such were the case with the rich Valdensic merchant and his proselytes, at least to the extent specified by the Bishop of Meaux, we cannot view them, at the time when their labors commenced, as continuing the perpetuity of the faithful Church, however justly we may claim the Vallenses of Piedmont. The allegation, however, is so remarkable, that it well deserves to be carefully examined.

So far as I can find, the evidence for the allegation, as adduced by Bossuet, resolves itself into three points: the application, on the part of the Poor Men, to the Pope, for his license to act as preachers; and the asserted circumstance, that they held the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and the allegation, that their tenets scarcely differed from those of Rome. [25]

1. The first of these, Bossuet does not state so strongly as he might have done. For he mentions only their application to Pope Innocent III. in the year 1212, as recorded by the Abbot of Ursperg – whereas, he might have considerably strengthened his point, by intimating, that this was in truth the second application; a former one having been made in the year 1179 to Pope Alexander III, as recorded by Walter Mapes.

Of course, the double fact, the particulars of which I have fully stated above, is readily admitted' but we have to inquire, how far it can be made available for the purpose of the learned Prelate.

The individuals, who applied in the year 1179, were not native Piedmontise Subalpines, who had inherited their tenets from the most remote antiquity, and who thence felt no more scruples upon their minds respecting the self-entitled Catholic Church and its Pontifical Head than we Catholics in communion with the English Church feel at present: but they were French Proselytes from Popery, who thence, as we may well suppose, could not, even ill the course of several years, shake off the hereditary sense of dutiful subjection in which they had been educated. This was precisely the case with Luther; who long wished to draw a line, between the imagined abstract holiness of an Ecclesiastical System, and the gross doctrinal corruptions of its managers and adherents. [26] Whence, if that wonderfully strong-minded man, in the far greater light of the sixteenth century, found such a conscientious difficulty in shaking off early impressions: it is surely small wonder, that the French Proselytes of Lyons should honestly labor under a similar delusion, and should wish, (if it were not absolutely impossible) to act under the sanction of the Pope rather than in direct and avowed opposition to his authority.

In the year 1212, when the second application was made, we may well suppose, that the feeling of hereditary prescriptive veneration would be greatly abated, or, in old converts, perhaps altogether extinguished: but there is small difficulty in conceiving, that pious and sober-minded men would think it proper to make yet another experiment (perhaps too in deference to the less matured convictions of younger converts), before they finally separated themselves from Rome, as utterly apostatic, and, in system as well as in mere individuals, obstinately incorrigible.

Under this impression (an impression, which, we know, long influenced the mighty mind of the Saxon Reformer), the second application, I suppose, was made; and, when the petition was absolutely refused, and when moreover two Orders of Friars were instituted with the direct object of counteraction; the pious and scrupulous French Valdenses would then feel, that, for the preservation of peace and unity, they had done all that they could do conscientiously.(Matthew 10:11; Acts 18:6.)

In such a view of the matter, I am the more confirmed, because we find not, that any step of this description was taken in the life-time of Peter himself. The first application was made in the very year of his death: and, after an interval of thirty-three years, it was followed by a second. Thus, in each instance, the applicants were the disciples of the good merchant, when he himself had been called to his reward.

Now this is precisely what we might expect. Peter, born and educated a Vaudois, though long possessed of knowledge merely speculative, had no hereditary scruples to master: he, therefore, went to work, without the least stay or hesitation; and, while he lived, he had sufficient influence with his converts to prevent any act of submission to Rome. But, as soon as he died, the honest fears and doubts of those who were only proselytes very naturally prevailed: and, to satisfy weak consciences, an attempt was made to procure the papal sanction. Nor was it, until after the failure of yet a second attempt, that the French Valdenses became fully satisfied, that there can be no religious concord, between light and darkness, between Christ and Belial.

Thus valueless is the first effort of Bossuet to show: that the French Valdenses differed little or nothing from the Romanists at the time of their original separation.

2. Nor is his second effort much more cogent and powerful than his first. The Poor Men of Lyons, he contends, on the authority of Reinerius, so far from denying the doctrine of Transubstantiation, actually maintained it. I have great doubts, whether Reinerius says really any such thing, as the Bishop puts into

his mouth: for, after a mode not altogether uncommon with the French Prelate, a very important part of his testimony is entirely suppressed. [27]

According to Reinerius, in his Treatise concerning heretics, the Poor Men of Lyons said, indeed as the Bishop correctly states: that Transubstantiation does not take place in the hand of him who consecrates unworthily, but in the mouth of him who receives worthily. [28] But then, what the Bishop forgets to state, these same Poor Men, according to the same Reinerius in the same place of the same Treatise, also said: that the Mass is nothing because the Apostles had it not, and because it is celebrated for the sake of lucre; and that, beyond the precise words of Christ himself in the vulgar tongue, they could not receive the canon of the Mass; and that the oblation, made by Priests in the Mass, is nothing and profits nothing. [29]

This I apprehend, looks somewhat suspicious: and when we recollect that the term Transubstantiation was not brought into authorized ecclesiastical use until the year 1215, while the proselytism of the Poor Men was in active progress from the year 1160 to the year 1179, we are strongly tempted to conjecture, that Reinerius reported them rather in the phraseology of his adopted Church, than in their own proper phraseology; we are strongly tempted to conjecture, that what they really said was, that a beneficial reception of Christ's body and blood depended, not upon the consecrating Priest, but upon the worthiness of the devout recipient.

It will be said, that this is conjecture. Be it so. Yet Bossuet, since he cites Reinerius as edited by the Jesuit Gretser, might as well, while his hand was in, have also cited Reinerius as edited by Marten: for there is, I believe, no doubt, that the Treatise, published by Marten as the Work of an anonymous author, and placed by him in his Thesaurus immediately after the Summa of Reinerius, is, in truth, the production of Reinerius himself. Now, according to Reinerius, as speaking in this Work, the Poor Men of Lyons viewed the Eucharist in the same manner as all the Reformed Churches except the consubstantializing Church of the Lutherans. They believe not, says he, that the body and blood of Christ are truly present, but only blessed bread; which, in a certain figure, is called The Body of Christ: as it is said, That rock was Christ, and the like. [30]

3. We shall now, perhaps hear no more of the French Valdenses being stout Transubstantialists: but still, if we may believe the Bishop of Meaux, when they first separated themselves, they maintained very few dogmas, perhaps indeed not a single one, contrary to those of Rome. He builds, I suppose, upon the statement Reinerius, as edited by Marten: a supposition, which, if correct, involves the point, that he knew Reinerius to have mentioned the rejection of Transubstantiation by the Poor Men of Lyons, though he has thought it expedient to suppress such knowledge. Be this, however, as it may, Reinerius says only, that The contempt of ecclesiastical power was their first heresy, which, under the influence of Satan, precipitated them into innumerable errors: and those errors, or pretended errors, he afterward gives at full length. [31] But, in neither of his Treatises, nor yet in his Summa, does he give the slightest hint: that, at their first separation under the teaching of Peter Valdo, they differed little, if at all, from the Church of Rome; and that their sentiments, as stated by him, were of a much later growth. [32]

Let us, then, inquire, what dogmas these asserted papalising Valdenses are recorded to have held: and, that the inquiry may be quite unexceptionable, I shall resort to the Reinerius of Gretser.

> The Valdenses say: that the Roman Church is not the Church of Jesus Christ: but that it is a Church of Malignants, and that it fell away under Sylvester when the venom of temporal possessions was infused into the Church. [33]

They say: that they themselves are the Church of Christ, because they observe the doctrine of Christ, agreeably to the words and examples of the Gospel and the Apostles. [34]

They erroneously contend: that all vices and sins are in the Church; and that they themselves alone live justly. [35]

They falsely say: that, except themselves, almost no one preserves evangelical doctrine in the Church. [36]

They say: that they are the truly poor in spirit; and that, on account of righteousness and faith, they suffer persecution. [37]

They say: that they are the Church of Jesus Christ. [38]

They say: that the Roman Church, on account of her superfluous ornaments, is the Harlot in the Apocalyse. [39]

They say: that they despise all the statutes of the Church, because they are burdensome and too numerous. [40]

They say: that the Pope is the head of all errors. [41]

They say: that the Prelates are the Scribes; and the Religious Orders, the Pharisees. [42]

They say: that the Pope and all the Bishops are homicides on account of the wars which they stir up. [43]

They say: that we are not to obey the Prelates, but God alone. [44]

They condemn all the sacraments of the Church. [45]

They say: that the Church has erred in forbidding the Clergy to marry. [46]

If any thing be preached which cannot be proved by the text of the Bible, they deem it a mere fable and they say, that Holy Scripture in the vulgar tongue has quite as beneficial an effect, as it has in the Latin language; whence they consecrate and give the sacraments in the vulgar tongue. [47]

They can repeat by heart, in the vulgar tongue, the whole text of the New Testament and great part of the Old: and, adhering to the text alone, they reject decretals and decrees with the sayings and expositions of the Saints. [48]

They despise excommunication: and they disregard absolution. [49]

They reject the indulgences of the Church: and deride dispensations: and believe not, that a breach of Monastic Rule is sinful. [50]

They esteem none to be Saints, except the Apostles alone. [51]

They invocate no Saint: but pray to God exclusively. [52]

They despise canonisations, translations, and vigils, of the Saints. [53]

They laugh at the superstition of the Laity, in choosing tutelar Saints by lot at the altar. [54]

They never read the Litany: and they disbelieve the legends of the Saints. [55]

As for the miracles of the Saints, they make a mock at them: and their relics they despise. [56]

The holy cross they deem no better than a log of common wood. [57]

They abhor the sign of the cross on account of Christ's punishment: nor do they ever sign themselves with it. [58]

They say: that the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles, without the statutes of the Church, is quite sufficient for salvation; and that the tradition of the Church is the tradition of the Pharisees. [59]

They despise all ecclesiastical customs, which are not read in the Gospel: such as Candlemas, Palm-Sunday, the Reconcilement of Penitents, the adoration of the Cross on Good-Friday, the Feast of Easter, and the Festivals of Christmas and the Saints. [60]

They despise, likewise, all dedications and benedictions and consecrations of candles, flesh, palms, chrism, fire, wax, and the like. [61]

Holy water they reckon no better than simple water. [62]

Images and pictures they pronounce to be idolatrous. [63]

Processions, whether festive or mournful, they reject. [64]

They despise the sepulchre of the Lord and the sepulchres of the Saints. [65]

They say: that services for the dead, masses for the defunct, oblations at funerals, visitations of tombs, and suffrages for the departed, are no way profitable to souls. [66]

All these errors they hold, because they deny Purgatory, saying, that there are only two ways; one, of the elect to heaven; another, of the damned, to hell. [67]

They say: that one Pater Noster is worth more, than the jingling of ten bells and the Oblation of one Mass. [68]

These are the dutiful and conforming sons of the Church, with whom Bossuet is so delighted, that I must needs, in conclusion, repeat his well-merited eulogium.

When the Poor men of Lyons, says the Bishop of Meaux, separated themselves from the Church, they had only very few dogmas contrary to our own: perhaps, indeed, none totally. Their system was, in truth, a species of Donatism.

Certainly, a contented mind is one of the greatest of earthly blessings.

BOOK 4

SUPPLEMENTAL MATTER

CHAPTER 1

RESPECTING THE ANCIENT INTERCOURSE AND FINAL GEOGRAPHICALLY ECCLESIASTICAL JUNCTION OF THE ALBIGENSES AND THE VALLENSES

SINCE on all hands it is admitted, that the Vallenses were not Manicheans, whatever might have been the case with the Albigenses: it is, I think, palpably clear, that, if the latter had really been Manicheans (as the Papists delight to represent them), they never could have had any religious intercourse with the former, and still less could ever have finally been absorbed into their Society. Yet both these matters rest upon historical testimony. Hence we are again brought to our old conclusion: that the Albigenses could not have been Manicheans.

I. We have more than one notice, that the Albigenses and the Vallenses mingled with each other, in the way of brotherly fellowship, prior to their final ecclesiastical union in the same country.

1. About five hundred years before the year 1655, or (to specify the precise time) in the year 1165, a large body of Frenchmen, driven from their own country by persecution, emigrated and planted themselves in the Valleys of Piedmont, chiefly in that of Pignerol: where they were kindly received as brethren, and where they settled among the ancient Vallerises without any objection being raised and without any impediment being contrived. [1]

Now who could these gallican sufferers from persecution have been? Certainly, they could not have been the French Proselytes of Peter Valdo. For he himself only exchanged a barren hereditary speculation for a spiritual personal faith in the year 1160: and it is highly improbable, that his converts in the course of five years, even if he made any in the lapse of that period, should either be so numerous or attract such attention, as to emigrate in a large body on account of a furious persecution. Accordingly, the historian Thuanus distinctly tells us, that the sect of the French Valdenses or the Poor Men of Lyons, as instituted by Peter the Valdo, did not commence until the year 1170. [2] This is precisely what we should expect. In the first instance, I suppose, the pious merchant's converts were neither very abundant in number nor very complete in organization. They were a small and feeble flock: and, if they drew any notice, they would probably be deemed nothing more than the germ of one of those Religious Orders which the Roman Church has ever sagaciously patronized as the safety-valves of fanaticism. But, in the year 1170, they had become regularly embodied as a Society of Missionaries. Whence that year was not unnaturally pitched upon, as affording a satisfactory date for the commencement of the French Valdenses under the aspect of an organized sect of new heretics. Such a chronological view of the matter precludes the possibility, that the gallican emigrants to Piedmont in the year 1165 could have been proselyted disciples of Peter Valdo. It may be added too, that a permanent settlement of this description was directly contrary to the very plan of the institution of the Poor Men of Lyons. They were strictly a body of wandering Missionaries, not a body of settled colonists: and, as such, they remained in one place no longer, than, like the Apostles of old whom they

professed to imitate, the Lord might have a work for them to perform. Agreeably to this studied arrangement, when persecution was at length stirred up against them at Lyons, instead of settling corporately in some one less disturbed district, they were dispersed, as Nicolas Eymeric the Inquisitor assures us, through the various regions of France and Italy, where they made numerous converts, and where, in this province and in that province, they disseminated what that pontifical agent denominates their errors. [3]

But, if the gallican emigrants to Piedmont in the year 1165 were not French Valdenses, they could only have been French Cathari or Albigenses, who fled from the persecution stirred up, during the first half of the twelfth century, against the Petrobrusians and the Henricians. Here, then, we have a distinct case, of the ready amalgamation of the Vallenses of Piedmont and the Albigenses of France: an amalgamation, which, I suppose, could never have occurred, had the latter, as their enemies would misrepresent them, been Manicheans.

2. A few years still earlier than the emigration of the year 1165, we find Peter of Clugny giving a very intelligible hint, that the barbarous theology (as he terms it) of the Cottian Alps was substantially the same as that of the Petrobrusians or Albigenses.

The impious heresy, taught by Peter de Bruis, says he, addressing himself to the Archbishops of Arles and Embrun, through the grace of God exciting and assisting your desires, has somewhat removed itself from your parts of the country. Yet, as I have heard, it has migrated only, into places sufficiently near to you: for, being driven out of your Languedoc and Dauphiny, it has prepared secret dens, whither it may retreat, in the province of Gascony and the adjacent regions. – This report stirs me up the more to my present undertaking: the report, to wit; that the slippery snake, having escaped, or rather through your prosecution having been expelled, from your districts, bas betaken itself to the province of Narbonne; and that its mere timid sibilations among you, in deserts and in petty villages, have been changed into daring predications in large assemblies and in populous cities. I once thought: that the cold Alps, and their rocks covered with perpetual snows, had introduced among your people this barbarism; and that a land, unlike all other lands, had created a race unlike all other races: whence, through the clownish and untaught manners of the individuals, a foreign dogma might the more easily have crept in. But this my opinion stands confuted, by the furthest banks of the rapid Rhone, and by the circumjacent plain of Toulouse, and by the city itself more populous than its neighbors: a city, which ought to be the more cautious against false theology, in proportion as, by the assiduity of persons who frequent it, and by its trial of manifold doctrines, it may be the better informed. [4]

So far as I can judge, language such as this imports: both that the existence of a barbarous theology (as the refined Abbot of Clugny speaks), in the Cottian Alps bordering upon the diocese of Embrun, was well known to Peter the Venerable; and likewise that this theology so closely resembled that of the Petrobrusians or Albigenses, as to produce, at the first blush, an impression of the Albigenses themselves having borrowed their religious system from the Subalpines or Vallenses.

3. As for the Poor Men of Lyons or the French Valdenses, they, from the very first, so intermingled themselves with the Albigenses, and became so identified with them both in community of teachers and in identity of doctrine, that, on one memorable occasion, we find also an interchange of nomenclature.

In the years 1205 and 1207, at Verfeuil and Pamiers and Montreal and other places in the South of France, a prolonged public disputation, or a succession of public disputations, according as we may view the matter, was held with the dissident religionists, who swarmed throughout Dauphiny and

Languedoc and Guienne and Gascony, and who were protected by the then powerful houses of Toulouse and Foix and Comminges.

(1.) Now who were these dissident religionists?

That they were Albigenses, there cannot be a doubt: for the fact is demonstrated, both by their geographical locality, and by the circumstance of the disputations immediately preceding the horrid popish war of plunder and extermination, conducted, under the auspices of Innocent III and his successors, by that blood-stained disgrace to humanity, Simon de Montfort. Accordingly, Nicolas Vignier, who gives a full account of the disputation held at Montreal in the year 1207, distinctly tells us that the speakers on the and-papal side were the Pastors of the Albigenses.[5] Yet William of Puy-Laurens, who also gives an account of the previous disputation at Pamiers in the year 1205, tells us, no less distinctly, that it was held by the Romanists against the Valdenses specially: while he adds, without any absolute distinction of the parties concerned, that the disputation at Verfeuil, in the same year, was maintained against the pontifical faction of his own friends by heresiarchs generally, who openly (to the great scandal of mild and tolerant Popery) assembled under the evident protection of their lords, and whom he boasts to have been confounded by the admirable reasoning of their opponents, though he is constrained to admit that they were not converted. [6]

It may perhaps be said: that this is nothing more than the confusion, into which the Jesuits Gretser and Mariana fell in a later age, and which led them erroneously to apply the name of Valdenses to those who were really Albigenses.

So, peradventure, at the first sight, it might appear. But the language of William of Puy-Laurens forbids such a supposition: for he tells us, as we have seen, that the disputation at Pamiers was held against the Valdenses specially. His words, therefore, plainly imply; that, as, in the general series of disputations which were prolonged at different places through two years, the Valdenses and other heresiarchs acted as mutual friends and allies; so, in the particular disputation at Pamiers, it was agreed, that the business of the day should be conducted by the Valdenses or the Missionary Poor Men of Lyons exclusively. Nor is this all. While, on some occasions, the Valdenses acted separately; and, on other occasions, the Albigenses acted separately likewise on one memorable occasion, that of the dispute at Montreal in the year 1207, they joined their forces; their Pastors appearing, as the joint Pastors and Representatives of both Churches. [7]

(2.) This last matter deserves a somewhat more full elucidation. Upon the two parallel narratives of Popliniere and Vignier, evidence of a very peculiar kind is attendant' for it goes to prove, that one of the leading Pastors at the disputation, though certainly a Pastor of the Albigenses because he was the Pastor fixed at Lombers one of the chief albigensic settlements, was himself, nevertheless, individually, a Valdensis of the missionary stock of the Poor Men of Lyons. Whence it would obviously follow both that the French Valdenses were mingled with the French Albigenses; and likewise that the doctrine of the latter, so far from being a form of Manicheism (as the popish writers, and their followers even among Protestants, absurdly pretend), was, in truth, substantially the same as the doctrine of the former.

The Pastor, in question, was Arnold Hot or Arnold Ottho or Arnoldtot, as his agnomen, in connection with his name Arnold, is variously expressed by Vignier and Ribeira and Popliniere: the last of whom gives us the information, that he was the Minister of Lombers; where, as we have seen from Roger Hoveden, the remarkable examination of the Albigenses took place in the year 1177, and where their memorable and orthodox profession of faith was publicly recited. [8]

Now, who was this Arnold?

As yet, we know only: that, in the disputations of the years 1205 and 1207, he was a leading Pastor among the Albigenses; and that, while his wider sphere of ministration was the province of Languedoc and its vicinity, his settled and peculiar charge was the Albigensic Congregation at Lombers.

But, in addition to these positively-known particulars, we may say, unless I greatly mistake, that he was also the friend and proselyte and fellow-missionary of the venerable Peter Valdo himself. At least, both in name, and in character, and in ministerial locality, and in the vital point of chronology likewise, the Arnold of Valdo perfectly agrees with the Arnold who was the Pastor of Lombers and who disputed at Montreal. Peter Valdo, the ringleader of the Valdenses, says Thuanus, leaving' his own country went into Belgium: and, in Picardy, as they now call the province, obtained many followers. Passing thence into Germany, he long sojourned among the Vandalic States, and finally settled in Bohemia: where those, who, at the present day, embrace his doctrine, are, on that account, called Picards. Valdo, for his associate, had also had Arnold. This person, journeying in a different direction, descended into Languedoc; and fixed himself at Albi: from which place the Albigenses derived their name, who, in a short time, pervaded the whole of Toulouse and Roussillon and Cahors and Agens. [9]

The identity of name and character and geographical sphere of ministration, in the case of Arnold the Valdensis of Lyons and Arnold the Pastor of the Albigenses at Lombers which was close to Albi, will, of course, be immediately obvious. No remark, therefore, is necessary, save a single one upon the vital point of chronology, in order to bring out the quadruple presumption, that the two Arnolds, were one and the same individual.

Peter of Lyons became a spiritual instead of a merely speculative, Christian, in the year 1160: his Poor Men began to attract notice, as a sect, in the year 1170: and he himself is supposed to have finished his labors, and to have been called to his rest, in the year 1179.

Hence, in order to allow due time both for the formation of his band of missionaries at Lyons and for his subsequent journeys which terminated in Bohemia, we may fairly assume the mean year 1174 to have been about that in which he and his friend Arnold set out on their respective pilgrimages, himself choosing Picardy and Belgium and Germany, while Arnold bent his steps southward to Languedoc and Albi and Lombers. In the year 1174, then, we may reasonably say, that Arnold would be about thirty years of age. On such a supposition, he would have been sixty three years old in the year 1207, when the disputation was held at Montreal: an age, which fully agrees with the circumstances at that time attendant upon Arnold the Pastor of the Albigenses at Lombers; for we may be sure,

that, to manage an important disputation, men of full age and ripened experience and extensive knowledge in theology would be carefully chosen.

4. The large intermixture of the Albigenses with the Poor Men of Lyons or the French Valdenses is yet further evident, not from the error of Gretser and Mariana who in a later age pronounced the Valdenses and Albigenses to be absolutely identical, but from authoritative documents of the very period respecting which we are now treating.

These documents mix up together, as heretics closely associated in the same country, and as holding with some small differences the same faith, both the Cathari or Paterines or Arnoldists on the one hand, and the Insabbattati or Humiliati or Poor Men of Lyons or Valdenses on the other hand; the Arnoldists being evidently so called from the zealous Valdensic Pastor of the Albigenses in Lombers, who made so conspicuous a figure in the disputation at Montreal.

(1.) To this effect speaks the decree of Pope Lucius III. in the year 1184, when he met the Emperor Frederick I. at Verona. In order to abolish the pravity of diverse heresies, which, throughout many parts of the world, have, in modern times, begun to pullulate, ecclesiastical rigor ought to be excited: by which, with the powerful aid of imperial fortitude, both the protervity of heretics in the very efforts of their falsehood may be dashed to pieces, and the catholic simplicity of truth, resplendent in the Holy Church, may show it to be every where expiated from all execration of false doctrines. We, therefore, supported alike by the presence and rigor of our most dear son Frederic always Augustus the illustrious Emperor of the Romans, agreeably to the common counsel of our brethren, with other Patriarchs and Archbishops and many Princes who have come together from diverse parts of the Empire; rise up, according to the general sanction of the present decree, against the heretics themselves; upon whom a profession of diverse falsehoods has conferred a diversity of appellations; and, by our apostolic authority, through the series of this constitution, condemn every heresy under whatever name it may be enrolled. In the first place, we decree: that the Cathari, and Paterines, and those who falsely call themselves the Humiliated or the Poor Men of Lyons, and the Passagines, and the Josephines, and the Arnoldists, are subjected to a perpetual anathema. And, because some, under the semblance of piety, denying (as the Apostle says) the power thereof, claim to themselves the authority of preaching (though the same Apostle asks, How shall they preach, unless they be sent?): therefore we bind, by the knot of a perpetual anathema, all, who, either prohibited or not sent, shall either publicly or privately presume to preach, without authority received either from the Apostolic See or from the Bishop of the place; and likewise all, who, concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, or concerning baptism, or concerning the confession of sins, or concerning matrimony, or concerning the other ecclesiastical sacraments, shall not fear to think or to teach otherwise, than the holy Roman Church preaches and observes; and moreover, in general, whomsoever the same Roman Church, or the several Bishops through their respective dioceses with the advice of their Clergy, or the Clergy themselves during the vacancy of the See with the advice (if necessary) of the neighboring Bishops, shall judge and pronounce to be heretics. Furthermore, we decree that their harborers, and defenders, and all equally who shall afford any patronage or favor to the aforesaid heretics for the purpose of cherishing in them the pravity of heresy; whether such heretics be called the Consoled or the Perfect, or whether

they be distinguished by any other superstitious names; shall be subjected to the same sentence. [10]

(2.) To a similar effect speaks the decree of Alphonso of Aragon, in the year 1194.

Alphonso, by the grace of God, King of Aragon, Count of Barcelona, Marquis of Provence; to all Archbishops, Bishops, and other Ecclesiastical Prelates of the Kingdom; to Counts, Viscounts, Knights; and to all the Commonalty of his Kingdom and Sovereignty; health and a sound observance of the Christian Religion.

Since God has willed that we should preside over his people, it is right and just; that, for the salvation and defense of the same people, we should, according to our power, feel a continual solicitude. Wherefore, in imitation of our predecessors, and in due obedience to the canons; since they have judged that heretics, who are cast out from the sight of God and of all Catholics, ought every where to be condemned and persecuted: therefore, as enemies of Christ and the Christian Religion, and as public foes both of ourselves and of our Kingdom, we command forthwith to depart and banish themselves, those who are called Valdenses or Insabbatati or Poor Men of Lyons, and all other heretics without number who have been anathematized by the Holy Church; so that they should evacuate the whole of our Kingdom and Lordship. [11]

(3.) To the same effect again, still more precisely, speaks the Decretal Epistle of Pope Innocent III addressed, in the year 1199, to the Prelates of Aix, Narbonne, Vienne, Arles, Embrun, Tarascon, and Lyons, with their several suffragans.

We have heard: that in your province, certain persons who are called Valdenses and Cathari and Paterines, or who are distinguished by any other names whatsoever, have pullulated to so vast an extent, as to entangle in the snares of their error, and to corrupt by the ferment of their falsehood, an innumerable multitude of people. Since, therefore, to catch these small foxes which demolish the vineyard of the Lord of hosts, having a diversity indeed of semblance, but having their tails bound to each other, because concerning vanity they are agreed, we have thought it right to send into the countries themselves, that the rod of Moses may devour the phantasms of the magicians, our beloved son Friar Reinerius, a man of approved life and honest conversation, through the divine gift powerful in deed and in word, and with him our beloved son Friar Guy, a man fearing God and studying the works of charity: we commit them, through the apostolic writings, to your fraternity, and strictly charge you, that, receiving and treating them with benignant affection, you do so assist them against the heretics, that by their means they may be recalled to the Lord from the error of their way; or if, by chance, any cannot be converted, that they be excluded from your borders, lest the sincere part of the flock be drawn away after them. [12]

II. These early interminglings and associations prepared the way for the final geographical and ecclesiastical amalgamation, of the joint French Valdenses and Albigenses of Languedoc, with the primeval Vallenses of Piedmont and Dauphiny on either side of the Cottian Alps.

1. A large body of the French Valdenses, harassed by incessant persecution, emigrated about the middle of the fourteenth century: and took up their abode with their brethren, the Vallenses of the Cottian Alps, in the Valleys of Piedmont and Dauphiny, which, eastward and westward, stretch into the dioceses of Turin and Embrun.

Here the great body of them settled: but, still preserving their missionary character as the Poor Men of Lyons, they shot forth, as the Inquisitor expresses it, their sad branches into Liguria and Italy and beyond them into Apulia. [13]

It is worthy of note: that the language of this Inquisitor exhibits, what might seem at first a contradiction, but what is readily explained from the general and extended view of the old Vallenses which we have now obtained.

In the instrument, which was drawn up shortly after the year 1489, he mentions, on the evidence of the examined themselves: that they had been settled in the Valleys, for at least a century, and likewise through a succession of ages so long as to be beyond the memory of man. [14]

These two depositions seem, at first, to be scarcely compatible: yet they are easily reconciled.

The century of inhabitation respects the French Valdenses or the Poor Men of Lyons: who, at the beginning of the instrument, are said to have been driven from France into the Valleys by stress of persecution. The time beyond the memory of man respects the native aboriginal Vallenses: who had been settled in the range of the Cottian Alps from the very days of primitive Christianity.

After this, the instrument goes on to state their doctrinal system. That system, I need only add, is precisely the same, as the system which was ever held by the Vallenses. [15]

Hence it serves to corroborate the evidence already adduced, in regard to the nature of their religious tenets at and shortly after the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

2. With respect to the much enduring Albigenses, it is no part of my plan to write their history. For my own object, it will be sufficient to state the regions whither the poor remnant of them fled from the exterminating sword of the detestable Simon de Montfort and from the racks and fires of the still more detestable Popish Inquisitors in the course of the thirteenth century. [16]

For this purpose, I shall avail myself of the testimony afforded by the historian Thuanus.

When exquisite punishments were of no avail against them; when the evil seemed to be only embittered boy the remedy, which had been unseasonably applied; and when their number daily increased: regular armies were at length enrolled; and a war of no less magnitude, than that which had previously been carried on in opposition to the Saracens, was decreed against them. Its end was: that they were slaughtered, routed, everywhere despoiled of their property and their dignities, and scattered in this direction and in that direction, rather than convinced of their error and brought to repentance. Those, therefore, who at, first bad defended themselves with arms, being finally conquered by arms, fled into Provence and the neighboring Alps of the French territory: where they found secure concealment, both for life and for doctrine. Part migrated into Calabria: and there they remained, down even to the Pontificate of Pius IV. Part retired into Germany: and fixed their seats in Bohemia and in Poland and in Livonia. Others, directing their course westward, found a refuge in Britain. [17]

From this time, so far as I am aware, we hear no more of the Albigenses separately and collectively. Their name was lost: and they themselves were gradually absorbed into the sister Church of the Vallenses.

Upon the fact of their absorption, a considerable degree of light is thrown by the testimony of Vincent Ferrier. In the year 1405, that person traveled out of Dauphiny into the Valleys of Piedmont, for the purpose of preaching Popery to the inhabitants: and from him we learn, that the two Churches of the

Vallenses and the Albigenses, amicably (since the crusade of Simon de Montfort) subsisting together in the same mountainous district, had, down to that time, continued distinct; for he found there, not only the Valdenses, but likewise a numerous body of the Cathari or Albigenses. Yet, subsequently to the year 1405, the absorption has at length, become complete: and no organic separation, under the discriminating names of Albigenses and Vallenses, I believe, now subsists among the uniform religionists of the Valleys.

The whole of this is precisely what we should expect. Each sister Church would, very naturally for a season be attached to its own familiar, though theologically indifferent, peculiarities: but the mingled operation of time and local intercourse and painfully endearing fellowship in perpetual persecution would gradually form, into a single united Communion, the members of the two substantially symbolizing Societies. Accordingly, we are told: that, during the space of three centuries anterior to the visit of Ferrier in the year 1405, the French Valdenses, who began to emigrate into Piedmont in the twelfth century, encountered no disturbance. And, in perfect congruity with such a circumstance, we are also told: that, down to that year, the Albigensic Refugees had continued to possess the character of distinctiveness. But, when a series of tormenting persecutions commenced, the character of distinctiveness was soon lost: and the two harmless and equally suffering Churches of the Piedmontese Valleys, like two drops of rain, were soon drawn and blended together by a perfectly intelligible power of attraction. [18]

Henceforth, then, secure in the recesses of the Cottian Alps, that part of the Albigenses, which, from its greater compactness, became the only just representative of their Church, formed an inseparable union, both doctrinal and geographical, with the primitive Church of the Vallenses: so that, from this time forward, the true title of the Church seated in the Valleys of Piedmont and Dauphiny became, if I mistake not, THE CHURCH OF THE UNITED VALLENSES AND ALBIGENSES.

CHAPTER 2

RESPECTING THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE SCRIPTURAL PROMISES OF PERPETUITY TO A SINCERE CHURCH, IN THE CASE OF THE TWO ANCIENT CHURCHES OF THE VALLENSES AND THE ALBIGENSES.

AT an early stage of the present inquiry, it was stated: that Christ has made two distinct promises to his Church.

The one promise respects its perpetuity: under the aspect of a Church, immovably built upon the rock of Peter's doctrinal confession.

The other promise similarly respects its perpetuity: but under the additional aspect of a Church, always (so far as respects the grand essentials) pure both in doctrine and independent practice, and always thus exemplifying the spiritual presence of the Lord even unto the end of the world.

Hence it was inferred: that the entireness of the complex promise could only receive its accomplishment in some particular Branch or Branches of the Visible Church Catholic; inasmuch as FACTS have shown, by the common consent of all men, that the whole original Church Catholic, in every Branch, has not corresponded with the full terms of the complex promise in question.

Furthermore, in corroboration of this inference, it was remarked that the concurrent voice of Prophecy completely and definitely establishes its propriety; inasmuch as Prophecy describes a state of things, in which the Sincere Church should he reduced within narrow limits, while the great Body of the Visible Church, lapsing into an apostasy of a very marked character, should be brought under the dominion of a person or a succession of persons emphatically denominated The Man of Sin and The Son of Perdition. [1]

I. At the point where we have now arrived, the last remark, which at the beginning of the present discussion, was thrown out as a mere illustrative hint, assumes a high degree of applicatory importance and interest.

1. By the prophet of the Apocalypse, our Lord's promise of a spiritual as well as of a doctrinal perpetuity to his Sincere Church is explained after a manner which bears so peculiarly upon the subject of our late inquiries that the coincidence cannot be overlooked.

During a long and dark period of 1260 prophetic days or 1260 natural years; a period, to be reckoned, as we are concurrently taught by Daniel and St. John, from a delivering of the saints, into the hand of a most remarkable Ecclesiastical Power, by the concurrence of ten Kingdoms, among which the Western Roman Empire was doomed to be partitioned: during this long and dark period, the visible Church General is described as being a Harlot under the government of a False Prophet; and the nature of her harlotry is exhibited under the perfectly intelligible imagery of a relapse into the superstition of the Gentiles, characterized by a worship of demons or canonized dead men, and by an insane veneration of idols of gold and silver and brass and stone and wood which can neither see nor hear nor walk.

While this dreary period evolves, where is Christ's promise of his perpetual spiritual presence to his sincere Church built immovably upon the rock of Peter's doctrinal confession?

Truly, the promise is neither forgotten nor unaccomplished.

The new race of Gentiles, indeed, tread the holy city under foot during the cognate term of forty and two prophetic months: but the temple and the altar and they that worship at it are carefully measured; while the outer court, like the wide extent of the city itself, remains unmeasured.

Who, then, are the worshippers within the measured precincts, that stand so broadly distinguished from the idolatrous Gentiles of the unmeasured outer court and holy city?

Clearly, they are the persons, in whom alone we can deem Christ's promises to have been accomplished.

But these promises respect, not mere insulated individuals, but a visible Branch or visible Branches of the entire visible Church Catholic. Assuredly they do: and accordingly, the inspired seer intimates; that, during the evolution of the 1260 years, the Lord would give power to his two witnesses, who should courageously, though in sackcloth, prophesy, or propound, in harmony with the predictions of the ancient prophets, the great essential truths of the Gospel.

Who or what, then, are these two Witnesses, thus remarkably characterized?

The oracle tells us, that they are two Candlesticks standing before the God of the earth: and, at the same time, leaves us in no doubt as to the intended meaning of the symbol, by distinctly teaching us, that a Candlestick represents a Church. [2]

Such being the ease, the two Witnesses, who are defined to be two Candlesticks, are thence, of plain necessity, defined also to be two Churches.

Consequently, the Revelation of Jesus Christ, or the Revelation communicated by Jesus Christ to his servant John, distinctly and unequivocally explains to us, HOW the promises of the Lord to his Church were destined to receive their accomplishment.

The perpetuity of his sincere Church, as alike sound in the great fundamental doctrine of Peter's confession, and as privileged with the unceasing spiritual presence of the Divine Head, is described, as being effected in the channel of two visible Churches: which, abhorring the apostasy of the gentilizing tenants of the outer court and the degraded holy city, firmly and faithfully proclaim the true Gospel in chronological concurrence with a state of things widely marked by the worship of dead men and their images.

This is the explanation of Christ's own pro-raises, as afforded in Christ's own Revelation. [3]

2. Now many centuries have elapsed, since ten gothic nations erected ten several kingdoms on the platform of the divided Western Empire; and certainly, from that time, it is a mere naked historical fact, that the doctrines and practices of the visible Church General, whether in the Western or in the Eastern Patriarchate, have but too faithfully reflected the announcements of descriptive prophecy.

But was the whole Church General, in all its Branches, thus apostolic, thus grievously degenerate?

If it were so, the promises of Christ would have failed of their accomplishment. But not one word or one tittle of his declarations can come to nought. While both the East and the West were playing the harlot after a new race of tutelary Baalim or Demon-Gods, exactly two Churches were found to protest, even unto the death of the protesting individuals, against the antichristian abominations with which they were surrounded. One of them, itself a Church built upon the very principle of reformation, and by an extraordinary providence of God collecting many of its members from among those who had once

professed a paganizing heresy of the worst description, sprang up in the East during the course of the seventh century: but, expelled by incessant persecution brought on by its firm testimony against the rapidly-increasing corruption of the times, it migrated into Europe; and there also, in the midst both of unfounded calumny and of suffering carried at length to the verge of extermination, it showed itself a faithful witness for the truth in opposition to the still more gross demonolatry of the Western Patriarchate.

The other of them, justly claiming and honestly glorying in the title of an Unreformed Church, was always a denizen of Europe: and, while the two conjointly, during all the middle ages, acted the part of resolute witnesses on behalf of the Gospel; this Occidental Society, under the precise aspect of a Church Unreformed, because it never required reformation, forms the chain, which, in an unbroken series, connects the Reformed Churches of the sixteenth century with the Apostolic Primitive Church, and thus exemplifies the accurate accomplishment of our Lord's two-fold or complex promise.

3. With these facts under our eyes while the roll of prophecy lies unfolded before us, it is, I think, well nigh impossible not to conclude: that the two Churches of the Albigenses and the Vallenses are the two symbolical Candlesticks or the two Witnessing Churches of that Apocalypse, which at once predicts the future fortunes of the entire Church Catholic and authoritatively explains the mode in which Christ's promises of perpetuity and purity would be fulfilled.

In truth, if these two Churches be not the two apocalyptic Churches, I see not where, between the decuple partition of the Western Empire and the times in which we are now living, the two latter Churches can be found in History: and thence, since the apocalyptic prophecy is evidently a virtual comment upon our Lord's promises, I see not, how those promises can be said to have ever been accomplished.

Their pretended fulfillment, in a Church so notoriously corrupt and apostatic and secularized and blood-stained and unscriptural as the Roman, is, both to the Bible and to common sense, too monstrous an insult to be for a moment tolerated and almost as little can we endure the supposition of their accomplishment in the Greek Church or in any one of its dependent Asiatic or African Churches. [4]

But prophecy teaches us: that the promised perpetuity and purity were to be carried on and transmitted through the instrumentality of two Churches; characterized, in a manner which instantaneously excludes the gorgeous and temporally prosperous Roman Church, by a long-continued prophesying in sackcloth, or, in unfigured language, by a long-continued predication of the true Gospel in a depressed and afflicted and despised condition.

And history responsively teaches us: that exactly two Churches, precisely so characterized both circumstantially and locally and chronologically, have actually appeared upon earth; and have actually subsisted through all the middle ages.

The conclusion from such premises is obvious: and, as I perceive not how it can be avoided, so likewise I perceive not how it can be rejected without a consequential admission, at least on the part of the Reformed Churches, that the promises of Christ have failed in their accomplishment. For, if they were not accomplished through the medium of the Vallensic and Albigensic Churches: let any Protestant, if he be able in consistency with his own principles, point out, how they were accomplished, during the period which elapsed, between the days of the uncorrupted Primitive Church, and the times of the sixteenth century.

II. But, in the prophetic account of the two Witnessing Churches, there is a very remarkable circumstance announced, which will throw yet further light upon the present subject.

They are exhibited under the two-fold aspect of two not precisely identical conditions: for they are exhibited under the aspect, of prophesying in sackcloth, or of preaching the Gospel in a depressed and afflicted condition; and they are also exhibited under the aspect, of bearing their martyria, or of attesting the truth even to martyrdom itself.

Now we are told: that, when they should have finished, not the former of these, but the latter, they should be slain in their ecclesiastical capacity, or should be dissolved as Churches, for in no other mode can a Church be slain; that their dead bodies, or the constituent members of the dissolved Communities, should lie unburied, or should not be consigned to invisibility and oblivion, during the time of three prophetic days and a half or three natural years and a half, upon the platform of that great city, which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, and which mystically bears the name of Babylon; that, at the end of three years and a half, the breath of life from God should enter into them, so that they should stand again upon their feet, or that they should be restored to their condition of visible corporate Churches; and that, finally, they should ascend to heaven in a cloud before the face of their enemies, or should obtain a legalized establishment, though still under the cloud of affliction, inasmuch as they had still to accomplish the remainder of the appointed term during which they should prophesy in sackcloth.

These are all very peculiar and very distinctly marked circumstances: nor is it easy to conceive, how they could ever occur in strict simultaneity, unless the two Churches had previously, in point of geographical location, been so amalgamated, as to form one mingled Church of both the Albigenses and the Vallenses. But exactly such an amalgamation took place about the middle of the thirteenth century, in consequence of the bloody popish crusade conducted by Simon de Montfort. Hence, if the two Churches of History be the two Churches of Prophecy, we may expect a congruity, in regard to the above-mentioned circumstances, at some indefinite time after the middle of the thirteenth century. [5]

It is obvious, from the very terms of the prediction that the absolute martyrdom, or the testification even unto death on the part of the two Witnesses or the two Churches, is brought to a close, when the announced circumstances occur; so that, notwithstanding, even after their legal establishment, they still continue to prophesy in sackcloth, they are no longer exposed, to the horrors of a direct brutal butchery instigated by the Romish Priesthood and perpetrated by the Romish Laity. Hence, if we find indications that such direct butchery has ceased, we may conclude: that the circumstances in question, on the supposition of the two historical Churches being the two prophetical Churches, must have already occurred.

1. In order to satisfy ourselves on this point, we must, in the first instance, recur to the annals of direct sanguinary persecution.

The exterminating crusade, waged against the Albigenses in the thirteenth century, with its remarkable effects, has already been noticed. At this point, we must advert to the persecutions, carried on jointly against both them and the Valdenses, with whom they had now become inseparably amalgamated.

A recent historian of the Vallenses has given a very useful list of the successive persecutions to which his people have been exposed: and, as this list merely details a succession of facts, I may resort to it with the strictest propriety.

In brief, the various bloody assaults, to which the united Vallensic and Albigensic Church of the Cottian Alps was exposed, from an early part of the thirteenth century down to the latter part of the seventeenth century, comprising a term of nearly five hundred years, amount in number to about twenty-six, and consequently average about five in each century, or about one in every twenty years. [6]

But here, through divine mercy, they are brought to a close: and nothing, save vexation and bigoted annoyance, has occurred subsequently to the year 1690.

It is true, indeed, that an edict was passed in the year 1698, which proscribed a portion of the Vallenses, who had advanced, I suppose, beyond their strictly limited boundaries' it is true, moreover, that, in the year 1730, Victor Amadeus banished from his dominions all save the native Vallenses. But, as Dr. Muston styles this the last persecution which they had to undergo; a persecution, however, not amounting to martyrdom so Mr. Acland, speaking of persecutions stained with the blood of the martyrs, justly remarks, that that, which commenced with the year 1686, was the LAST and most oppressive persecution of the Vaudois; and he subsequently adds, that, from the time when the edict was passed which banished those who were not natives, the only distinguishable features in Vaudois history are resignation to an oppressive government and adherence to their faith and the practices inculcated by it. [7]

Thus, from naked facts, it seems clear: that the blood-stained testimony or martyrdom of the two Churches ceased at the latter end of the seventeenth century. Hence, the circumstances, of their violent ecclesiastical extinction, and of their complete ecclesiastical revival at the end of three years and a half, and their legal though afflictive establishment subsequent to their revival, must apparently, if the two Churches of History be the two Churches of Prophecy, have occurred, when the seventeenth century was drawing near to its conclusion.

2. The question, therefore, now is; a question, be it observed, of naked matter of fact: the question now is; Whether, at that time, any such circumstances occurred?

This question must, of course, be answered by a simple appeal to the record of History.

On the 31st day of January, then, in the year 1686, the Duke of Savoy, at the instigation of the French King, issued an edict: by which, on pain of death, he forbid to the Vaudois the exercise of their religion, banished all their pastors, and commanded their places of worship to be destroyed. The effect, produced by a decree of such a barbarous description, may easily be anticipated. France and Savoy let loose their blood-hounds upon an innocent and unoffending people: murders and rapes and every abomination followed: and, the Valleys in a very short space of time having been wholly depopulated by the expulsion of their former inhabitants, the place of the fugitives was supplied by the colonizing adherents of the dominant superstition.

Thus were the two ancient united Churches completely suppressed and dissolved: a calamity, which at no former period had ever befallen them: yet, scattered far and wide, their fragments, though disunited as a body corporate, still retained their separate existence. In the course of God's providence, they were not suffered to vanish utterly from off the face of the earth: they were not suffered to be lost and absorbed in the several Communions of those Reformed States, within whose territorial dominions they had taken refuge. On the contrary, though the two Churches were politically dissolved, their members were individually preserved from complete annihilation.

In this state they continued, during the space of three years and a half. But, at the end of that period, the spirit of life entered into them: and they began once more to act corporately and simultaneously. Under the conduct of a very extraordinary man, Henry Arnold one of their Pastors, eight hundred of the most intrepid among them, having assembled in the Swiss Territory, secretly, on the night of the 16th of August in the year 1689, crossed the lake of Geneva: and entering Savoy with their swords in their hands, and thence advancing to the mountains of Piedmont, drove from their native Valleys the intrusive Romanists, and recovered by main force their ancient avital possessions. In this wonderful enterprise so complete was their success, that ere the month of April in the year 1690 had commenced, after a series of victories over the disciplined troops of France and Savoy, they had firmly established themselves in the seats of their ancestors.

Nor did their triumph terminate here. In the course of God's providence, events were so ordered that the Duke of Savoy was led to desert the French Interest: and, in consequence of this new political arrangement, by an edict dated the 4th of June in the year 1690, he recalled and reestablished the remainder of the now mixed Vallenses and Albigenses; granting to them henceforth, though with many vexatious restrictions, the exercise of the religion of their forefathers.

Thus were these two ancient united Churches built up anew, and solemnly established by an act of the civil power, in those identical valleys of the Cottian Alps, where the Albigensic Church, when driven out of the South of France by the crusade of the thirteenth century, had finally joined itself to the sister Church of the Vallenses. [8]

Yet, though legally established, or, in the figured language of prophecy, called up to the allegorical heaven; and though exempt from any longer bearing the testimony of a blood-stained martyrdom to the truths of the everlasting Gospel: they still, agreeably to the divine oracle, continue to prophesy in sackcloth or to perform their functions in a depressed and afflicted condition, and thus practically indicate that the grand period of 1260 years has not yet expired.

Under the letter of this legal establishment, such as it is, the united Churches at present subsist: but instead of merely excluding them from political power, it exposes them to a perpetual succession of very serious injuries, short indeed of persecution to death, but utterly destructive of social comfort and civil prosperity.

The Vallenses are forbidden to reside or to purchase land beyond the limits of certain specified boundaries: nor can a minister visit a sick person who happens to be beyond those limits unless he be accompanied by a Romish layman; and, even then, his stay must not exceed twenty-four hours. All correspondence with foreign ministers is prohibited: and, in order that no books should be introduced among them, immense duties are imposed, particularly on Bibles and works treating of Religion.

Any physician, surgeon, apothecary, advocate, or notary, brought up to their religion, cannot exercise his profession beyond the limits of the Valleys. [9]

They are forbidden to inclose their burial grounds with walls.

If a Papist steal the child of a Vaudois for the purpose of proselytism, or if he insult him in the public streets by calling him dog or heretic, the Vaudois has no redress.

They are compelled to abstain from work on all popish festivals, though they themselves have never been followers of the Pope's religion and a refusal to uncover the head to a wooden doll, representing

some saint real or reputed, when ridiculously carried in procession by its silly worshippers, subjects them to a fine or imprisonment. [10]

These are the tender mercies of dominant Popery in its mildest form: and, as we all know, the well-grounded boast of Romanism is, that it never changes. The tiger, as in France, may be coerced, by the civil power: but, in nature and disposition, the tiger is the tiger still.

III. The series of facts, here detailed by the voice of History, requires but little comment.

So far as simple coincidence, between the facts and the prophecy, is concerned, a denial of such simple coincidence is plainly impossible: and, when we recollect, that, as the prediction announces the existence of precisely two Witnessing Churches, so History records the actual existence of two such Churches; we can scarcely, I think, deem this concurrence of coincidences purely accidental or undesigned.

But, if we admit that the two Churches of History are the two Churches of Prophecy, we shall then, by a necessary consequence have the plain attestation of Scripture to the important position: that Christ's promises of Perpetuity and Purity to his faithful Church were accomplished, in the long unbroken line of the Vallenses, and (on the principle of ecclesiastical agglomeration) in the shorter line of the Paulicians or Albigenses; and that, through their intermediation and more especially through the intermediation of the never reformed Vallenses, the Reformed Churches of the sixteenth century stand directly connected with the holy Primitive Church Catholic.

CHAPTER 3

RESPECTING THE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY OF THE VALLENSES AND THE ALBIGENSES.

AS I thus pronounce the two Communions of the Vallenses and the Albigenses to be the two Witnessing Churches of the Apocalypse; and as I further contend, against Bossuet, that the Vallenses, in a more especial manner, constitute that Visible Church which connects the Churches of the Reformation with the Primitive Church: it may be expected, that I should say something, as to their right to be considered Churches at all, in regard to their possessing or their not possessing the apostolical succession. I readily confess, that I am not able to demonstrate the circumstance of their possessing an apostolical succession, either as regularly transmitted by episcopal ordination, or as less regularly handed down by the simple imposition of the hands of the Presbytery. [1]

Yet, though a strictly legal demonstration of this matter, in the case of two Churches subjected to incessant persecution or driven into the obscurity and poverty of an alpine wilderness, may well have been thus rendered impracticable, and thence in common fairness, cannot be rigidly demanded: we may nevertheless, come so near to the point, that, in concurrence with the scriptural declaration of the assured existence of precisely two Witnessing Churches during all the middle ages, we may deem it sufficiently established for all legitimate ecclesiastical purposes.

I. Let us begin with considering the case of the Vallenses.

With respect to these long-enduring tenants of a region geographically marked out as situated between the Cottian Alps and the Adriatic Sea, we have the express testimony of Jerome: that, at the beginning of the fifth century, they were regularly organized under Bishops, and thence, of course, under a body of inferior Clergy also; though he laments, that those Bishops should have opposed themselves, to what he esteemed the orthodoxy of the age, and to what they esteemed its unscriptural and corrupt innovation.

At a later period, in the ninth century, they constituted a part of the provincial flock of the holy Claude, Archbishop or Metropolitan of Turin. Whence, from the known ordinary constitution of the Church, we may be morally sure, that, in point of immediate government, they were ruled by inferior Bishops, the suffragans of the Archbishop of the entire Province. [2] Accordingly, when they became completely separated from the Roman Church and entered upon their predicted function of one of the two Apocalyptic Witnesses, they still retained that primitive form of Ecclesiastical Polity, which ordains the authoritative government of the Church to be vested in Presbyters, employing Deacons as their subordinated assistants, while they themselves acknowledge the superintendence of a Bishop or General Overseer.

Of this, a remarkable instance occurred about the year 1450. Commenius, a Bohemian Bishop, who wrote in the year 1644, has stated: that The Bohemian Separatists, in their anxiety to have their Pastors ordained by Prelates in regular succession from the Apostles, sent three of their Preachers to a certain Stephen, Bishop of the Vauldois; and this Stephen, with others officiating, conferred the vocation and ordination, upon the three Pastors, by the imposition of hands. [3]

A century afterward, there were still Bishops in the Valdensian Church: for, in a Confession of Faith, presented in the year 1544 to Francis I. King of France, we find the following Article. This point is held

among us as firmly determined, that the Bishops and the Pastors ought to be irreprehensible in their doctrine and in their morals. [4]

Agreeably with these historical notices, the venerable Peyrani, when asked by Dr. Gilly in the year 1823, whether, in the Vaudois Church, there had not formerly been Bishops properly so called, readily answered: Yes: and should now be styled Bishop, for my office is virtually episcopal; but it would be absurd to retain the empty title, when we are too poor to support the dignity, and have little jurisdiction save that which is voluntarily submitted to among ourselves: the term Moderator is, therefore, now in use with us, as being more consistent with our humiliation. [5]

II. The case of the Albigenses or Paulicians, which I next proceed to consider, is somewhat more difficult than that of the Vallenses: it shall, however, be fairly and distinctly exhibited.

While in Armenia, the Church of the Paulicians, as described by Peter Siculus, was evidently, so far as form is concerned, episcopal. Constantine acted as the first Bishop: Simeon was the second: and, after him, are enumerated many others in regular succession, among whom is specially mentioned the famous Sergius or Tychicus. [6]

When the Paulicians in a body, or at least a considerable part of the Paulicians, migrated from Asia into Europe, we still find them subsisting under an Episcopal Polity. In Bulgaria, they had an Archbishop or Patriarch: and, when they passed into Lombardy, we read of their Bishop named Mark, who first received his ordination from Bulgaria, but who is said to have afterward received a new ecclesiastical mission from Nicetas the Paulician Patriarch of Drugaria. [7]

Descending to the time of Reinerius, who during several years of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was one of their members, we find their form of Ecclesiastical Polity marked out very distinctly by that writer. Their Clergy consisted of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons: but the Order of Presbyters they divided into two classes, that of the seniors, and that of the juniors. [8]

All these are simple historical facts: but, when we come to the point of apostolical succession, we rest purely upon conjecture.

It is recorded, that the Church of the Paulicians originated with Constantine, a native of Armenia and an inhabitant of Mananalis. This is all that we positively know, as to the ecclesiastical character of Constantine, the first Bishop of the Paulicians, and in their separate line the head or commencement of their succession. He may have been a Bishop, or he may have been a Presbyter, or he may simply have been a Layman. On the point of his ecclesiastical character, Peter Siculus is silent. Hence we can resort to nothing more than probabilities deduced from the facts which have been recorded.

The facts, then, and the probabilities, are the following.

> Constantine, while residing at Mananalis, hospitably entertained a Deacon, who was returning home from his captivity in Syria: and, in consequence of his receiving from this Deacon the four Gospels and the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, with which, though a Christian (such was the lamentable darkness of the age and country), he was previously unacquainted, he forthwith collected a Church out of his neighbors, many of whom had hitherto been Manicheans.
>
> Now, so far as probability is concerned, I should gather from these facts, that Constantine was either the Bishop or the Presbyter of Mananalis: where, pursuant to the fashion of the

times, he had preached, what (according to Peter Siculus) afterward became a special abomination to the Paulicians, the superstitious worship of the Virgin and the Saints and the Cross.

Agreeably to the habits of that period, a Deacon, when returning from captivity, and when travelling homeward, would obviously, in his progress, resort to the houses, not so much of the Laity, as of the Bishops and Presbyters, bringing with him his letters of commendation or introduction. [9] Hence the natural presumption is, that Constantine was a Cleric and not a Laic.

With this presumption, both his subsequent conduct, and the ready acceptance of him by his numerous proselytes in the capacity of their Bishop or Ecclesiastical Governor, perfectly correspond. In the seventh century, lay-teaching, I should suppose, would be a thing unheard-of and unknown. The early heresies, commonly, perhaps universally, originated with speculative Clergymen: and, in this manner also, I apprehend, originated the so-called heresy of the Paulicians. Constantine himself, by his very language, seems to intimate as much. Showing to his people the sacred volume which he had received from the Deacon, he exclaimed: Ye are Macedonians; I am Sylvanus, sent to you by Paul. In these words, we may suppose him, at once to open his commission, and to answer objections, You ask me, how I come to preach so differently from mat clerical brethren: you demand my authority for so doing. The reason is this. You are just as ignorant of the Gospel, as the Macedonians of old could be, before the saving knowledge of Christianity was carried to them by the ministration of Paul and Sylvanus. Now I have received light from the word of God himself; from the four Gospels and from the Epistles of St. Paul, which I have unexpectedly obtained, and which I have diligently studied. Therefore, I no longer preach to: you, as I have hitherto done, the superstitious veneration of the Saints and the Cross and the Virgin. But, a new Sylvanus, sent to you a new race of Macedonians, by Paul himself, whose Epistles I hold in my hand; I now call upon you to turn from all such vanities to the pure worship of the living God through Christ the only Savior and Mediator. Ye, brethren, have been blind, as well as myself: but, henceforth, the glorious light of the Gospel shall shine upon you. I am quite ready to allow, that this is conjecture, save only the recorded address of Constantine: Ye are Macedonians; I am Sylvanus, sent to you by Paul. But it is a conjecture, which falls in with the history more naturally than any other supposition as to the anterior character sustained by Constantine.

III. After all, should what has been said be unsatisfactory, I hesitate not, so far as the Vallenses and Albigenses are concerned, to refer the matter, under all existing circumstances, to the plain will and over-ruling providence of God.

Man, in all ordinary cases, is bound: God, in the course of his overpowering moral dispensations, no less than in his more palpable interpositions through the agency of miracles, is free. [10]

We know, that God himself bestowed the name of Candlesticks or Churches upon two Communions, which are described as prophesying in sackcloth against the paganizing corruptions of the dominant Church throughout all the middle ages: we know, that the two Communions of the Vallenses and the Albigenses discharged this precise function during this precise period: and we further know, that it is vain to seek out any other two visible Communions, which, during that precise period, discharged that precise function.

Such being the ease, I cannot but think, that we have the very highest moral evidence as to the identity of those two Communions with the two Witnessing Churches of the Apocalypse. And, if this be admitted, who shall dare to refuse the name and character of Churches to two Communions, which God himself has declared to be Churches, however they originated, and however they were politied?

CHAPTER 4

RESPECTING THE OCCASIONAL DISCREPANCE OF THE CHURCHES OF THE VALLENSES AND THE ALBIGENSES FROM THE CHURCHES OF THE REFORMATION

NO person I suppose, will imagine: that, in compliance with the captious and unreasonable demand of Bossuet, I should attempt to exhibit the Vallenses and the Albigenses, either as agreeing in all points great and small with the various Churches of the Reformation, or as holding opinions with which universally I can be expected to symbolize.

That some of these opinions are untenable, I readily admit: but, that they affect those primary essentials either of faith or of practice, which are indispensably necessary to the due accomplishment of our Lord's promises, I strenuously deny. The opinions, in question, involve no departure from the Gospel in any of its grand requisites: and they so naturally sprang up under the peculiar circumstances wherein the two persecuted Churches were placed, that they very readily may be excused and pardoned.

My meaning will be better understood by an adduction of instances.

I. The enormous corruption and determined profligacy of the Romish Priesthood, fully acknowledged and duly censured (as we have seen) by Atto of Vercelli, caused the Dissidents to feel: that it was a moral impossibility for them to receive any spiritual benefit from such instructors, with whom they too clearly saw that Christ was not spiritually present.

But they erred in carrying this feeling to the extent of maintaining, if indeed they ever really did maintain, the opinion: that The efficacy of the Sacraments depends upon the personal holiness of the administrator.

On the present point, it will be observed, I speak with considerable hesitation: for I can, in no wise, adopt the positive language of Bossuet respecting it. [1] That the Romanists make the efficacy of the Sacraments to depend upon the intention of the ministering Priest, I assuredly know: because the doctors of the Tridentine Council anathematize all who assert; that in the administration of the Sacraments, the intention of the Priest, to do what the Church does, is not requisite.[2] But I do not feel equally certain, on the legitimate principle of adequate historical testimony, that the Vallenses, and their fraternal conreligionists the Albigenses, made the personal holiness of the administrator essential to the efficacy of the Sacraments administered.

Some speculation of this sort is, indeed, apparently laid to their charge by Reinerius and Pilichdorf; but their language is so loose, and misapprehension in regard to those who spared not the vices of the Romish Clergy was so easy, that I do not feel myself justified in adopting the confident assertion of Bossuet. [3]

In my doubts, moreover, I am greatly strengthened, when I recollect the positive disavowal of any such opinion on the part of the Dissidents, who, in the year 1176, were publicly examined at Lombers. This open disavowal is faithfully recorded by Roger Hoveden: and, though the Bishop of Meaux very prudently pretermits it, we may justly say that it is far too unambiguous to be rapidly set aside.

We believe: that he, who eats not the body of Christ, is not in a state of salvation; and that the body of Christ is not consecrated, save in the Church, and that it is not consecrated save by a Priest, whether good or bad; and that it is not more effectually consecrated by a good priest, than by a bad one. [4]

In the way of evidence, such an open confession is the more valuable and important, because it manifestly refers to this very allegation which they knew to be so frequently and so perniciously brought against them. As we receive the allegation, upon which Bossuet builds with so much confidence, purely from the determined and exasperated enemies of the Vallenses: so it may be useful yet additionally to remark, that not a vestige of the opinion attributed to them appears either in the Noble Lesson, or in the Treatise on Antichrist, or in the ancient Catechism, or in any one of the Confessions which have come under my own observation; though, what probably gave rise to such an attribution, we find, perhaps in all those Works, a warm reprobation of the vices and superstitions of the Popish Priests, and likewise a direct protestation against the favorite Romish Doctrine that the efficacy of the Sacraments depends upon their right sacerdotal administration ex opere operato as the notion is technically expressed.

The true Doctrine is that of the Church of England, which makes the spiritual efficacy of the Sacraments to depend upon the fitness or worthiness of the recipient. [5] And, as we may not obscurely gather, even from the blundering statement of Reinerius, that such also was the real Doctrine of the old Valdenses: so, in the long Confession of the Bohemian Brethren (who, according to Eneas Sylvius, adopted the Faith of the Valdenses, though they rejected the name), presented to King Ladislaus in the year 1508, we find that: Doctrine distinctly stated and explicitly maintained. [6]

If, however, any of the Vallenses, at any time actually adopted the opinion, that The beneficial efficacy of the Sacraments depends upon the personal holiness of the administrator: I can only say, that they labored under an error. At the same time, I would add: that such an error, (a venial one, after all, I trust) was an error, which, among the less educated of them, might easily spring up under the peculiar and very trying circumstances in which they were placed. As the inspired Preacher truly said: Surely oppression maketh a wise man mad.

II. The overgrown endowments of the Church, they perceived, had transmuted the Roman Pontiff and many of his Bishops into sovereign temporal Princes: while, throughout the whole Order, they had introduced, among an unmarried Clergy, the most offensive luxury, the most undisguised debauchery, the most palpable secularity, and the most jealous and persecuting tyranny.

All this was reprehensible. But the Valdenses erred, in carrying their objection so far, as to deny the legality of any endowment of the Church: a notion, at once, absurd in itself, pregnant with the worst species of mischief, and involving a national profession of infidelity.

Its absurdity is evinced: both by its direct opposition, in the abstract, to God's own temporal arrangement of the Levitical Church, which never could have been instituted, had ecclesiastical endowments, in themselves, been an abomination; by its effective contrariety to the prophecy, that Kings should be the nursing fathers of the Christian Church, and Queens its nursing mothers; by its virtual denial, that they, who minister at the altar, should live by the altar; and by the moral impossibility (for an endowed Church is eminently the poor man's Church), that, in a quietly settled country, any unendowed Church could supply the spiritual wants of poverty-stricken and thinly-peopled rural districts, however it might be precariously and insultingly supported by the grudged and

penurious and reluctant voluntary contributions (if I may combine together terms, contradictory in speech, but not contradictory in practice) of opulent and thickly-inhabited cities.

Its direct tendency to mischief of the worst kind is evinced: both by its general certainty of producing an ignorant and ill-educated Clergy, studiously selected from among the least intellectual members of a family, confined altogether to the inferior ranks of society, and by their habits unfitted to exercise any wholesome and legitimate influence over their flocks, who would be more likely to be blind leaders of the blind, than skillful dividers of the word and able defenders of the faith when attacked by heretics or infidels; and also by its totally depriving God's ministers of that fearless independence, by which with all freedom they may rebuke as well as exhort, and by which they may faithfully preach the Gospel, without, as respects poor weak humanity, the strong temptation to please the perverted humor of their dictatorial people, by handling the word of the Lord deceitfully, lest some governing children of Diotrephes should either tyrannically cashier them, or meanly starve both themselves and their families.

Its involution of a national profession of infidelity is evinced: by its actual basement upon the unhallowed principle, that nations, as such, ought to uphold no religion nationally, but that they ought impartially to view all modes of faith with philosophic indifference, deeming them alike equally false or equally true or equally unimportant; a principle, in the working of which, the individual members of a nation may indeed peradventure be Christians, but the nation itself is assuredly of no religion, and thence neither recognizes the authority nor looks for the support and blessing of the Deity.

1. Perhaps it may be asked: If the system of Non-Endowment be condemned as practically inefficacious, how, then, did Christianity do, previous to its establishment as the religion of the Empire? Under the aspect of a pervadence of the worm both universal and complete, the true point now under consideration, I readily answer: that It did very ill.

Its pervadence, agreeably to the eloquent declamation of Tertullian, was, no doubt, in some sort, universal: but, in the way of leavening the whole mass, it was not complete; nor, under such circumstances, without a standing miracle, either could it or can it be thus complete. During the first ages, the chief spread of Christianity was in populous cities, or in commercial districts, or in regions where men were numerously congregated together. It might, indeed, as Pliny states, partially penetrate into the villages and fields of Asia Minor: [7] but, in the rural tracts, from the very necessity of things as they then stood, it made small progress. Accordingly, though Tertullian, in one place of his Apology, describes the jealous Pagans as lamenting that Christians should be in the fields as well as in the castles and the islands: [8] yet he himself, even in his declamatory boast of universality, is totally and remarkably silent ill regard to their spread among the rustic population of the Empire.

We sprang up but yesterday, says he: and we have filled every place that belongs to you: cities, islands, castles, boroughs, places of general assembling, the very camp itself, tribes, decuries, the palace, the senate, the forum. [9]

Why does not the orator include the country in his enumeration? Clearly, because the country formed no part, or at least no considerable part, of his every place.

In fact, that the inhabitants of rural districts long remained idolaters after Christianity had penetrated into perhaps every town of the Empire, is abundantly clear from the very name of Pagans in its acquired or ecclesiastical sense. The word Pagani itself simply means Villagers or Countrymen or Peasants: and it acquired its now familiar superinduced sense of Gentile Idolaters, purely from the

notorious circumstance, that the Pagans or Rustics held to their ancient idolatry long after the Gospel had, as Tertullian speaks, widely and generally pervaded the camp and the forum and the small trading islands and the crowded boroughs and the densely populated cities.

Now, as God, in his moral administration, usually works by second causes alone, it requires not the gift of prophecy to foretell: that the universal introduction of what now is called The Voluntary System, by turning the whole predication of the Gospel into a matter of individual buying and selling through the agency of which the poor must either personally pay the expense of a stated minister or go without him, would rapidly transmute the people of rural districts into a new race of Pagani; or, at least, that that fate could only be avoided by the introduction of a spurious Christianity, wherein, through the ghostly terrors of delusive superstition, an artful Priesthood might extract, from the wretched Peasantry, the hard-earned product of their labor. Where the machinery of superstition or fanaticism is not employed, still the most honest and the most zealous Divine cannot (save when he possesses an independent private fortune, which is rarely the case with the Clergy) subsist without an extrinsic provision of food and raiment: and, though the promise of perpetuity, made by Christ to his Church, can never fail; yet, if deprived of a regular standing ministry, which, by reason of an endowment, can offer the Gospel to the poor without: money and without price, and which at the same time is ever ready to superintend their wants and to aid their distresses and to manage their little matters of business, Christianity, in rural districts, would rapidly become either totally extinct or altogether degenerate.

I mean not to say, that such would absolutely be the case in every rural district: because, occasionally, a truly devout proprietor might stand in the gap, and stay the moral pestilence. But such, or something similar, would, in the very way of cause and effect, be most generally the case.

As for the Vallenses, who fled to the alpine mountains to escape persecution, they will form no exception which can be universally reduced to a practical account. They were animated with all the vehement spirit of a small body under actual suffering: but no such spirit would pervade rural districts in general, if, without any individual persecution, a regular stated ministry were suddenly withdrawn; and the result would be a speedy declension into something, which, to say the very least, would not be genuine Christianity.

2. It has sometimes been said: that, if ecclesiastical endowments were abolished, we should be blessed with a much more spiritual Clergy; because no one then would enter into the ministry, as a mere profession, or from consciously mercenary motives.

But this is a great delusion. It does not follow, that, what would cease to be a temptation to some, would cease to be a temptation to all. The Clergy might be lowered ill rank by such an expedient: but it: is not equally clear, that they would be raised in spirituality. To men of an inferior class, who had no prospect of legitimately elevating themselves in any other manner, an unendowed and unestablished Church would the more become a matter of artful and interested speculation simply because it was unendowed and unestablished. In that case, the cheap talent of a depraved and noisy oratory would, in the way of barter, be regularly brought to the oppidan market, mere grimace usurping the seat of genuine scriptural piety: and, while the prospect of turning the penny, by collecting large audiences in chapels let out for regular rents (which, of course, the slighted poor would be unable to pay), would be duly calculated by the ill-taught trader in his own lungs; the thinly-peopled country, which, in the way of an income, would furnish nothing worth the speculatist's attention, would be turned over to the cheerless prospect of a resuscitated Paganism.

Meanwhile, in towns, which might penuriously purchase the services of those who might wish to sell them, what would be the inevitable operation of such a system? The fancied more spiritual ministers, who had confidently pushed themselves forward into publicity, while modest worth sensitively shrank into the background, must please the humor of their wayward and tyrannical congregations, or must lose their bread: the legitimate evangelical places of the teachers and the taught would be exactly inverted: the diotrephic lovers of preeminence, like their recorded predecessors when the infant and persecuted Church was compelled to depend upon voluntary contributions, would readily, when their slightest whim was thwarted, treat the successors of St. John, as their spiritual forefathers treated the holy Apostle himself: [10] and thus a temptation of faithlessly adulterating the Gospel, as the Gospel has evidentially been delivered down from the times of Primitive Christianity, to suit the ever-varying taste of the day, would be constantly present; a temptation, which might indeed be resisted at the expense of starvation or of insolent dismissal; but yet a temptation, which ought not deliberately and systematically to be imposed upon any who undertake the awful function of Ministers of Christ.

Nor is this all. On yet another account, nothing can be more idle than to say: that spiritual pastors, and none save spiritual pastors, would enter into the Priesthood of an unendowed Church. The taking of such a step does not altogether depend upon a young person's own choice, however both zealous and disinterested he may be. A parent's consent must be previously asked and obtained: and, with no prospect before him save that of eleemosounary dependence (for, of course, under a voluntary system, there can be no such being as an independent Divine, unless indeed he be a man of sufficient private fortune, and thence not relying for his bread upon the meagerness of lay liberality), a prudent father would be very apt, to withhold his consent, and to refuse to his son the expensiveness of an education necessary to qualify him for becoming a competent religious instructor of others; unless, indeed, the voluntary system contemplates the existence of a Clergy, who may either dispense entirely with all theological attainments, or who, somewhat incomprehensibly, are theologians by instinct, and thence require not any preparatory education. Yet, if Tertullian could say, that Men are made Christians, not born Christians: we may perhaps say, with equal truth, that Men are made Theologians, not born Theologians. [11]

3. But sometimes another ground also is taken by the modern admirer of the voluntary scheme: and then it is urged; that, in all trades, wants create their own level; and that the demand will always produce the requisite supply.

Now he, who thus coarsely argues, must needs be ignorant of that very condition of man, upon which the Gospel is specially founded. Fallen man acutely perceives, when his bodily frame is disordered, or when the security of his property is endangered: hence the demand for physicians and for lawyers will always ensure a full supply of those very necessary and important individuals. But the precise spiritual disorder of fallen man, the precise actual insecurity of his alienated condition, is an insensibility to his true state and a thorough hatred of the divine remedy prescribed: hence, the greater the necessity of religious amelioration and religious security, the less will be the demand for it; and, consequently, where it is most of all required, as either by literal Pagans or virtual Pagans, there will be no demand for it whatsoever. In our lapsed state, in short, religion must be brought home even to our doors: for an indifference to, or a dislike of, the true remedy, is inherent in the very nature of our disease; or rather, we may well say, constitutes the very disease itself.

Nay, such is the absurdity of the present speculation, I may add: that, on the voluntary principle, various cases may easily be supposed to occur, where there might really be an honest demand

associated with the moral impossibility of such demand producing any adequate supply. A rural district, seeing the benefit of oppidan Christianity even as degraded by the whims and humors of tyrannical democratic intervention, sincerely wish for a Cleric whose business it shall be to go in and out among them as one that devotes himself to the care of their souls. On the voluntary scheme, how is the demand here to produce the supply? The Clergy, no more than the Laity, can subsist upon air: neither, like the Israelites in the wilderness, do they enjoy the miraculous privilege, that, through forty long years of ministerial labor, their clothes should not wax old upon them, nor their shoes wax old upon their feet. Hence, the demand may be made: but poverty, on both sides, forbids the supply. Of the poor man, more especially of the poor man in the country, the peculiar proprietary Church is, specially and solely, the regularly endowed and parochially established Church. Let such a Church be swept away by the simulated friends of the poor: and, in the very way of cause and effect, those friends show their friendship, by tearing remorselessly from them the bread of life, and by dashing unrelentingly from their lips the cup of salvation. Justly may we say, that like the Jews of old, they please not God, and are contrary to all men.(1 Thessalonians 2:15.)

III. There is yet another error of the old Vallenses and Albigenses, which, before the subject be dismissed, may very briefly be noted. Profane swearing of the most offensive description, such as detestable colloquial oaths by God's teeth or by God's blood or by God's wounds or by the sacramental Pix and Ousel, prevailed, they well knew, to an awful extent, among the adherents of the Papacy' while yet no person, on that account, thought the worse of these daring blasphemers. Those, who will curse and lye and swear, says the ancient author of the Noble Lesson, are said and reckoned to be good and loyal men.

This the Valdenses and Albigenses justly abhorred. But, when, by a misinterpretation of our Lord's precept, they deemed all oaths, even though taken in the fear of God and for the promotion of truth before the lawful authorities, to be utterly prohibited; and when they thence proceeded to the conclusion, that every oath of every description was to be utterly rejected by a Christian man; then, however innocently, they erred.

Yet, surely, these errors, much as we may wonder that, with honest and good men of such generally sound judgment, they should have prevailed (if, indeed, they all did prevail), affect not the: grand essentials of either faith or practice: for even the worst of them, that, which, by asserting what is now called the Voluntary Principle, at once undermines religion and unchristianizes every nation (as a nation) which adopts it, might be held without, on the part of those who held it, any consideration or perception of its true character and consequences; and I need scarcely say, that the error, as maintained in simplicity of heart, differs widely from the same error, as entertained to serve the purposes of faction, or as inculcated in the spirit of envy and hatred and malice and all uncharitableness, the very spirit, in short, of the opposing Antichrist.

On the whole, therefore, we may safely and reasonably view the old Vallenses and Albigenses, notwithstanding such minor errors, as the appointed channel in which Christ's promises to his sincere Church were destined to be fulfilled.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

THE preceding Discussion is, I trust, fully sufficient to extract its sting from the very plausible though very sophistical, argument of the Bishop of Meaux.

I. Agreeably to the promises of our Savior Christ, which it has been my object to explain through the medium of an historical verification, there has never been wanting, from the very first promulgation of the Gospel, a spiritual visible Church of faithful worshippers.

Through all the worst and darkest periods, even through that century which Baronius himself calls the iron and leaden and obscure age, such a Church has incessantly existed, though often, to all appearance, on the very brink of destruction. [1]

There was a time, when, in the boasted immutable communion of the Latins, religious knowledge was at so low an ebb, that the Cardinal, during the evolution of his leaden age, is fain to pronounce Christ himself asleep, while the mystic ship of the Church Catholic was overwhelmed by the waves: and, what he thinks even yet worse than the alleged somnolency of the omniscient Redeemer, the ecclesiastical mariners snored so soundly, that the disciples, who might rouse their sleeping Lord, were no where to be found. [2]

He, however, that keepeth Israel, neither slumbered nor slept. Profound as might be the drowsiness of the whole Latin Church, respecting which Baronius so justly and so honestly complains; widely extended as might be the great apostasy from the faith, which St. Paul has so characteristically foretold' Christ, nevertheless, was not without mariners, both fully awake, and zealously active at their post. What the Cardinal was unable to find throughout the Vast Obscure of the Papal Dominions, and the want of which might: well nigh seem to have frustrated the promises of the Savior himself, still continued to exist in the secluded and despised Valleys of Dauphiny and Piedmont.

Though incessantly harassed and persecuted by the tools of the Papacy, yet, through all those middle ages which preceded the Reformation of the sixteenth century, the Vallenses were never, either exterminated by the sword of violence, or enslaved to the unhallowed superstition of the Latin Church. According to the remarkable confession of an Archbishop of Turin in the earlier part of the sixteenth age though perpetually attacked by an enemy of surpassing power, still, ill mockery of all expectation, the Vallensic Heretic of the Alps came off victorious: or, at least, if not absolutely victorious, he showed himself unconquered and unconquerable. [3]

II. With the Reformed Catholics of the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, the visible united Church of the Vallenses and the Albigenses, now actually existing in the Valleys of the Cottian Alps, agrees, both in all essential points of Scriptural Doctrine, and in a steady opposition to the unscriptural corruptions of the Church of Rome.

Through the medium of the Vallensic Church, which, at the very beginning of the fifth century, not to speak of even a yet earlier period, subsisted where it still subsists, in the region geographically defined by the angry Jerome as lying between the waters of the Adriatic Sea and the Alps of King Cottius, we stand connected with the purity of the Primitive Church. In despite of the lawless innovations of the papacy, innovations which are condemned by the testimony of the earliest ecclesiastical writers, the promises of Christ have been faithfully accomplished.

III. A very subtle problem has been proposed by the Bishop of Meaux. That problem, I am willing to hope, has now been solved. In the Valleys of the Alps, by a pure visible Church, the Ancient Faith of Christianity has been preserved, through all the middle ages of innovating superstition, sound and uncontaminated.

Behold, the bush burned with fire: and the bush was not consumed. The Angel of the Lord was in it: and the arm of the mighty God of Jacob was its protection. Therefore the son of wickedness could not destroy it and the enemy was unable to wear it out by violence.

FOOTNOTES:

PREFACE

[1] La doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique consiste en quatre points, dont l'enchainement est inviolable. L'un: que L'Eglise est visible.

L'autre: qu'Elle est toujours.

Le troisieme: que La verite de l'Evangile y est toujours professee par toute la Societe.

Le quatrieme: qu'Il n'est pas permis de s'eloigner de sa doctrine; ce qui vaut dire, en autres termes, qu'Elle est infaillible.

Le premier point est fonde sur un fait constant; c'est, que Le terme d'EGLISE signifie toujours, dans l'Ecriture, et ensuite dans le langage commun des fideles, UN SOCIETE VISIBLE. –
Le second point, que L'Eglise est toujours, n'est pas moins constant: puisqu'il est fonde sur les Romesses de Jesus-Christ, dont on convient dans tous les partis.

De la on infere tres-clairement le troisieme point; que La Verite est toujours professee par la Societe de l'Eglise car, l'Eglise n'etant visible que par la profession de la verite, il s'ensuit, que, si elle est toujours, et qu'elle soit toujours visible; il ne se peut, qu'elle n'enseigne et ne professe toujours la verite de l'Evangile.

D'ou suit aussi clairement le quatrieme point, qu'Il n'est pas permis de dire que L'Eglise soit dans l'erreur, ni de s'ecarter de sa doctrine. Et tout cela est fonde sur la Romesse, qui est avouee dans tous les partis: puisqu'enfin la meme Romesse, qui fait que L'Eglise est toujours, fait qu'Elle est toujours dans l'etat qu'emporte le terme d'EGLISE: par consequent, toujours visible, et toujours enseignant la verite. Il n'y a rien de plus simple, ni de plus clair, ni de plus suivi, que cette doctrine.

Cette doctrine est si clair, que les Protestans ne l'ont pu nier: elle emporte si clairement leur condamnation, qu'ils n'ont pu aussi la reconnoitre.

C'est pourquoi ils n'ont songe, qu'a l'embrouiller. Hist. des Variat. livr. 15:3, 4.

[2] Matthew 28:19, 20. In other parts of his Work, he specially adduces these two texts. Whence I conclude, that I am not mistaken in supposing them to be here tacitly referred to.

[3] Bossuet, we may observe, like the rest of his fraternity, claims for the Church the prerogative of Infallibility: and, since he limits the Catholic Church to the Church of Rome and the subordinate Churches which acknowledge her as their mother and mistress, he of course claims the prerogative of Infallibility for what we may call the Romish Church as contradistinguished from the diocesan Roman Church.
May I be allowed to ask, on what authoritative decision of what Ecumenical Council do Bossuet and Trevern and other Popish Ecclesiastics claim for their Church this same prerogative of Infallibility? If there be any such decision, it would run I suppose, in some such terms as the following.

The Catholic Church is infallible. Therefore, if any one shall assert, that the Catholic Church either has erred or can err in defining the faith: let him be anathema.

Now where does any such canon of an Ecumenical Council exist?

In the eleventh century, during which no Ecumenical Council was sitting, the famous Hildebrand, who played the part of Pope by the style and title of Gregory VII, decided, indeed, that the Roman Church has never erred and never will err: but this can only serve the turn of those, who hold the individual Infallibility of the Pope; nor will it serve even their turn, unless they can produce the infallible decision which infallibly assigns to the Pope the privilege of individual Infallibility.

Nothing can be more distinct and precise than the dictate of Pope Gregory himself. Romana Ecclesia nunquam erravit: nec in perpetuum, testante Scriptura, errabit. Dictat. Pap. Gregor.

VII. in Epist. lib. 2. epist. 55. Labb. Concil. vol. 10. p. 110, 111.

But, still, does the constant Romish claim of Infallibility rest solely upon the individual dictate of Gregory? Or does it claim to repose upon some other authoritative document?

Romanists often object, to members of the Reformed Churches: that The faith of those, who reject the authority of the Latin Communion rests only upon moral evidence; while the better faith of themselves rests upon the sure foundation of absolute Infallibility.

Where does there exist the canon of an Ecumenical Council, in which the possession of Infallibility is decreed to the Church of Rome?

[4] I do not object to the mode, in which Bossuet puts this point.

Nommer quelques docteurs, par-ci par-la, et temps en temps, que vous pretendiez avoir enseigne votre doctrine; quand le fait seroit avoue, ce ne seroit rien: car c'etoit un corps d'Eglise qu'il falloit montrer, un corps ou l'on prechat la verite, et ou l'on administrat les sacremens; par consequent un corps compose de pasteurs et de peuples; un corps a cet egard toujours visible. Voila ce qu'il faut montrer, et montrer par consequent dans ce corps visible une manifeste succession et de la doctrine et du ministere. – La difficulte restoit toujours de nous montrer une Eglise et une Societe de pasteurs et de peuple ou l'on trouvat la saine doctrine toujours conservee jusqu'au temps de Luther. Hist. des Variat. livr. 15. Section 6, 11.

But the Bishop is not content with thus putting the point. He advances a step beyond it: and, with a considerable measure of triumph, propounds, to the French Protestants, a question which he evidently deems altogether unanswerable.

Mes freres, donnez gloire a Dieu. Quand on a commence votre Reforme, y avoit-il, je ne dis pas quelque Eglise (car il est deja bien certain qu'il n'y avoit aucune), mais du moins y avoit-il un seul homme, qui en se joignant a Luther, a Zuingle, a Calvin, a qui vous voudrez, lui ait dit en s'y joignant: J'ai toujours cru comme vous; je n'ai jamais cru ni a la messe, ni au Pape, ni aux dogmes que vous reprenez dans l'Eglise Romaine? Mes chers freres, pensez-y bien, vous a-t-on jamais nomme un seul homme qui se soit joint de cette sorte a votre Reforme? En trouverez-vous quelqu'un dans vos annales, ou l'on a ramasse autant qu'on a pu tout ce qui pouvoit vous justifier contre le reproche de la nouveaute, qui etoit le plus pressant et le plus sensible? Donnez gloire a Dieu encore un coup: et, en avouant que jamais vous n'avez rien oui dire de semblable, confessez, que vous etes dans la meme cause que les

Sociniens, et que tout ce qu'il y a jamais eu d'heretiques. Troisieme Avertiss. sur les Lettres de M. Jurieu. Section 30.

An answer to this question is promptly afforded by the address of the Vallensic Clergy to the leading Reformers in the year 1530.

Sumus qualescunque doctores cujusdam plebis indignae et pusillae. – In omnibus tamen vosbiscum convenimus: et, a tempore Apostolorum, semper de fide, sicut vos, sentientes, concordavimus: in hoc solo differentes; quod, culpa nostra, ingeniique nostri pigritia, scriptores, tam recte quam vos, neutiquam intelligimus. Scultet. Annal. Evangel. Renovat. in A.D. 1530. p. 161, 163.

[5] Pastorini's Gen. Hist. of the Christ. Church. p. 325, 326. This severe trial of the Church occurs, according to Pastorini, during the reign of the expected Antichrist.

The whole account of that terrific personage, agreeably to the received notions of the Romanists, as given at considerable length by Roger Hoveden, is extremely curious: and, in many points, purely by a following out of the declarations of prophecy, he is exhibited as bearing a most ominous resemblance to the Sovereign Pontiff in the plenitude of his power.

Antichrist, we are told, will be born from a father and mother, like other men: not, as some fancy, from a virgin. Yet the Devil will descend into the womb of his mother: so that the child, born from her by the joint cooperation of the man and the fiend, shall be altogether evil; whence he is fitly styled The Son of Perdition. When arrived at full age, he will send his nuncios and his preaching through the whole world: and his preaching and his power shall be eminently catholic, reaching from north to south and from east to west. Many wonderful miracles he will perform, so as, if possible, to seduce the very elect into error. Against real Christians, he will stir up an universal persecution: and he will labor to corrupt the faithful by the three modes of terror and bribery and miracles. Riches, in abundance, he will give to those who believe in him: and those, whom he cannot seduce either by bribery or by terror or by miracles, he will cruelly, in the sight of all, put to various deaths of marvelous torture. Then every faithful Christian, if he shall refuse to deny his God, will perish, either by the fire of the furnace, or by the sword, or by some other mode of torment. This dreadful persecution will continue, through the world, during the space of three years and a half. Antichrist, moreover, will sit in the temple of God, that is to say, in the Holy Church itself, inflicting martyrdom upon all sound Christians: and he will become very great; because in him shall be the Devil, the head of all evil. But, lest he should come without warning, and thus deceive and ruin the entire human race, two prophets, Enoch and Elijah, will be sent into the world, who, through the same term of three years and a half, will strengthen and prepare the faithful servants of God.

Nascetur ex patris et matris copulatione, sicut et alii homines; non, ut quidam dicunt, de sola virgine. Sed tamen in peccatis totus concipietur, in peccato generabitur, et in peccato nascetur. In ipso suae conceptionis initio, Diabolus simul introibit in uterum matris: et, ex virtute Diaboli, confovebitur et contuebitur in ventre matris: et virtus Diaboli erit semper cum illa. Et, sicut in matrem Domini nostri Spiritus Sanctus supervenit, et eam sua virtute obumbravit, et divinitate replevit; ut de Spiritu Sancto conciperet, et quod nasceretur divinum esset et sanctum: ita quoque Diabolus in matrem Anti-Christi descendet, totamque eam replebit, totam circumdabit, totam tenebit, totam interius et exterius possidebit; ut, Diabolo per hominem cooperante, concipiat, et quod natum fuerit totum sit nocivum, totum malum, totum perditum. Unde et ille homo Filius Perditionis appellatur: quia, in quantum poterit, genus humanum perdet, et ipse in novissimo perdetur. – Per universum mundum mittet nuncios et

praedicatores suos. Praedicatio autem ejus et potestas tenebit a mari usque ad mare, ab oriente usque ad occidentem, ab aquilone usque ad septentrionem. Faciet ergo signa multa, miracula magna et inaudita: ita ut in errorem inducantur, si fieri potest, etiam electi. – Excitabit enim persecutionem sub omni coelo supra Christianos et omnes electos. Eriget itaque se contra fideles tribus modis: id est, terrore, et muneribus, et miraculis. Dabit, in se credentibus, auri et argenti copias. Quos enim muneribus corrumpere non poterit, terrore superabit: quos autem terrore non poterit, signis et miraculis seducere tentabit: quos nec signis nec miraculis, in conspectu omnium, mirabili morte cruciatos crudeliter necabit. – Tunc omnis, fidelis Christianus qui inventus fuerit, aut Deum negabit; aut, per ferrum, sive per ignem fornacis, seu per serpentes, sive per bestias, sive per aliud quodlibet tormenti genus interibit, si in fide permanserit. Haec autem tam terribilis et timenda tribulatio, tribus annis et dimidio, in toto mundo manebit. – Sed etiam in templo Dei sedebit Antichristus, id est, in sancta Ecclesia, omnes Christianos faciens martyres: et elevabitur, et magnificabitur; quia in ipso erit omnium malorum caput Diabolus, qui est rex super omnes filios superbiae. Sed, ne subito et improvise Antichristus veniat, et totum simul humanum genus suo errore decipiat et perdat, ante ejus ortum duo magni prophetae mittentur in mundum, Enoc et Elias, qui contra impetum Antichristi fideles Dei divinis armis praemunient, et instruent eos, et comfortabunt, et praeparabunt electos ad bellum, docentes et praedicantes tribus annis et dimidio. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. par. poster, in A. D. 1190. fol. 389. This is followed by a strange document purporting to be a direct communication from our Lord to St. John, and duly fabricated upon genuine popish principles.

[6] Surgent quaedam gentes iniquae, quae dicuntur Gog et Magog; et destruent Ecclesiam Dei; et subvertent gentem Christianam: et tunc erit dies judicii. Sed, in tempore hujus Antichristi, multi Christianorum in cavernis terrae et in solitudinibus petrarum morantes, Fidem Christianam in timore Domini servabunt, usque ad consummationem Antichristi. Et hoc est, quod dicit: Mulier fugit in solitudinem Aegypti, ubi habet locum paratum a Deo, ut ibi pascant earn diebus mille et ducentis et sexaginta, Joachim. Curacens. apud Roger. Hoveden. Annal. par. poster, in A. D. 1190. fol. 388. It is remarkable, that Joachim undesignedly describes, as with the hand of a painter, both the very seats and the very location of the Vallenses. Their seats were the wild rocky solitudes of the alpine wilderness: their location was in the desert bordering upon the spiritual Egypt. In fact, they were almost irresistibly led to apply the prophecy to themselves. The Vaudois, says Henri Arnaud, are descended from those refugees from Italy, who, after St. Paul had there preached the Gospel, abandoned their beautiful country, and fled, like the woman mentioned in the Apocalypse, to these wild mountains, where they have to this day handed down the Gospel, from father to son, in the same purity and simplicity as it was preached by St. Paul. Preface to the Glorious Recovery, p. 14.

[7] Dicunt, quod Romana Ecclesia non sit Ecclesia Jesu Christi, sed sit Ecclesia Malignantium: – et dicunt, quod Ipsi sint Ecclesia Christi; quia Christi doctrinam, Evangelii et Apostolorum verbis et exemplis, observent. – Tertius error est: quod Doctrinam evangelicam paene nullus servet in Ecclesia, praeter eos. – Quintus: quod Ipsi sint Ecclesia Jesu Christi. Sextus: quod Romana Ecclesia sit meretrix in Apocalypsi. Reiner. Opusc. de Haeret. c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 300.

Valdensis haeretice, – per vocatos et multos, intelligis Catholicos: et, per paucos electos, intelligis complices tuos. Pilich. cont. Valdens. c. 14. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 315.

Dicunt: Papam esse caput omnium haeresiarcharum. – Item, vocant nos Christianos vulgariter alienos, et se notos: quasi Deus non nos, sed tantum ipsos, noscat, quoad comprobationem. – Item dicunt: quod

Illa secta sit vera et unica fides catholica, extra quam nullus possit salvari. Refut. Error. Valdens. ad calc. Pilich. cont. Valdens. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 340, 341.

[8] Hist. des Variat. livr. 11. Section 7-10.

[9] Hist des Variat. livr. 11. Section 2, 72, 73, 86.

[10] Reiner. de Haeret. c. 6. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 304.

[11] Dr. M'Crie has fallen into the same error: and, as his Work on the Reformation in Italy relates to a comparatively modern period, most probably his mistake has originated from the same cause. In the twelfth century, says he, those Christians, known in History, under the SEVERAL names of Vaudois, Waldenses, and Albigenses, as the hereditary witnesses for the truth against the corruptions of Rome, penetrated through the Alps into Italy. Hist. of the Reformat. in Italy, chap. 1. p. 4.

If I rightly understand Dr. M'Crie, this passage involves yet another mistake.

His language would imply; that the Vaudois OR Albigenses sprang up in France, and thence migrated into Italy. Accordingly, he adds, in immediate consecution; As early as the year 1180, they had established themselves in Lombardy and Puglia, where they received frequent visits from their brethren in other countries.

Whereas, in regard to the Albigenses (as they came finally to be denominated in France from the town of Albi), the course of their migration was precisely the reverse: and they had appeared in Italy at least as early as the very beginning of the eleventh century; for an emissary of theirs from Lombardy had made numerous and important converts at Orleans, both laic and clerical, in the year 1017. While, in regard to the entirely distinct Vaudois or Valdenses, the disciples of Peter the Valdo did indeed spring up in France and were themselves native Frenchmen: but the proper Vaudois or Valdenses, one of whom was the Lyonese Peter, were always, from the most remote antiquity, Italians of Piedmont; though some of them, from the circumstance of their dwelling also in the Valleys on the western side of the Cottian Alps, might be deemed inhabitants of France.

In consequence of this error (which, however, so far as the Vaudois are concerned, he afterward corrects, or apparently corrects, by stating that they had for centuries fixed their residence in Piedmont), he has fallen, I apprehend, into yet another error.

He ascribes the rapid spread of the Reformation of the sixteenth century throughout the Milanese, among other causes, to the circumstance of its bordering upon Piedmont, the ancient land of the Vaudois. Ibid. chap. in. p. 128, 129.

The real cause was: that the Milanese had been prepared for the doctrines of the Gospel by the numerous Churches of the Paterines or Albigenses, which in the middle ages had been planted through the whole of Lombardy, and which (to the amount of sixteen, as Reinerius testifies) formed a chain that extended from Bulgaria to the Atlantic. I may add, that Dr. M'Crie similarly confounds the Valdenses and the Albigenses in his later Work oil the Reformation in Spain, chap. 1:p. 28.

BOOK 1

CHAPTER 1

[1] Kai< galuyin, ejpi>gnonta aujtomwna pro>teron kalou>menon, ejpwno>mase Pe>tron. Kai< UiJommenon aujtomasi tw~n ajposto>lwn aujtou e]contev, kai< UiJogontev, nenoh>kamen o]nta kai< pro< pa>ntwn poihma>twn, ajpo< tou~ Patromei aujtou~ kai boulh~| proe>lqonta. Justin Martyr. Dial. Cum Tryph. A. D. 137. Oper. p. 255.

[2] See my Apostolicity of Trinitarianism, book 2 append. 2. numb. 10.

[3] Poetis fere omnibus id saepenumero usu venit, ut, vel occasione inducti, vel necessitate prope coacti, in eum locum incidant, in quo, multo cum ornatu et amplificatione, utpote in re gravi magnaque, describendi sunt Inferi, sive Vita Functorum Status: hoc est, id clare explicandum, quod quale sit, nemini mortalium concessum est omnino mente percipere aut conjectura consequi. – Quid vero vates Hebraei? – Nimirum idem hoc in loco fecisse videntur, quod in caeteris omnibus: nam, quae palam et in aperto essent, vulgoque constarent, de mortuis, hoc est, de mortuorum cadaveribus, ex iis generalem quandam imaginem confecerunt, quam, in describendo vita functorum statu, unice et constanter usurpant; quatoque, si modo fas sit, appellare possumus Hebraeorum Infernum Poeticum. Sheol ipsi vocant; Graeci, Haden; Latini, lnferum sive etiam Sepulchrum: neque sane aliunde sumpta est Hebraeis tota haec imago, quam de more rituque sepulturae apud ipsos recepto; qui ejusmodi erat, ut materiam praeberet ornatui poetico satis accommodatam. Hebraeorum enim sepulchra, saltem honestiora, quaeque familiis principibus patria erant ac gentilitia, speluncae erant amplae, sub terrain, ex nativa rupe, arte manuque excavatae; laqueare testudinato; quaedam tam spatiosae, ut columnis suffulcirentur. Ad latera, circumquaque, excidebantur cellae recipiendis sarcophagis. Ii, sculptili opere, apte ornati erant: singulique, singulis cellis, condebantur. Nullam omnino lucem admittebat specus: quippe, angusto aditu, quique advoluto saxo obstruebatur. Malta hujusmodi conditoria etiamnum in Judaea visuntur: duo prae caeteris magnifica, quae regum habentur sepulchra; alterum in ipsis Hierosolymis, cellas habens viginti quatuor; alterum, bis totidem continens, in urbis pomoerio. Quod si eos locos omnes excutimus, quibus sacri vates Inferos ornatu poetico describunt, liquido, nisi valde fallor, apparebit, eos mentem in hujusmodi sepulchrorum imagine per omnia intentam et defixam habuisse. – Cum viderent corpora vita functa in terram cadere, eoque modo, quo dictum est, sepulchro condi; percrebuit apud Hebraeos, ut apud caeteros, etiam, opinio quaedam popularis, agi sub terra vitam mortuorum deinceps consequentem: quam ut adsciscerent vates sacri etiam necesse erat, si modo de hac re omnino loqui et intelligi vellent. Lowth. de Sacra Poesi Hebraeor. praelect, 7. p.86-90. Our Lord's promise, I believe, is very commonly understood to intimate, that Satan, with all the banded powers of hell, should not be able to prevail against the Church.

Certainly, this is a great and important and consolatory truth: but, in point of ideality, it is not precisely the truth here announced by Christ. The promise is, that the Church should never die and be buried, so as to become invisible: as the dead became invisible, when consigned to those gloomy sepulchral caverns which were deemed the images of Sheol or Hades. Accordingly, our Savior no doubt said, in his native tongue, that the gates of Sheol should never prevail against his Church: and, thence, St. Matthew has justly and accurately expressed the Hebrew Sheol by the Greek Hades. The same ideal language is employed in the Apocalypse respecting the two witnessing Churches. Their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city: – and they of the people – SHALL SEE, their dead bodies three days and a half; and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put into A SEPULCHRAE. Revelation 11:8,

9. That is to say: the two Churches may be corporately dissolved as Churches; but they shall not pass into a state of defunct invisibility, as a body passes when consigned to one of the sepulchral caverns of the East.

[4] Even Bossuet himself makes the very important admission: that, The perpetuity of the Christian Religion depends not upon the preservation of any particular locality or of any particular race of mankind. Dans la Religion Cretienne, il n'y aucun lieu ni aucune race qu'on soit oblige de conserver a peine de laisser perir la Religion et l'Alliance. Avertiss. 5. sur les Lettres de M. Jurieu. 25.

Bossuet says this, to extricate himself from Jurieu's theological vindication of the House of Orange. But he perceives not, that, while he is avoiding Charybdis, he is running foul of Scylla. For, if the fact be as he states: then, by a plain consequence, the preservation of Rome in her asserted character of The Mother and Mistress of all Churches and in her alleged function of The Centre of Ecclesiastical Unity, is quite unnecessary to the preservation of Christianity. Should the mere superfluous adjunct be destroyed, Christianity, according to the Bishop of Meaux, would still continue to flourish, in unabated strength, in immortal rigor, and in heaven-born vivaciousness. With an expression of such sentiments it seems scarcely consistent to maintain, that the promises of Christ must needs be accomplished in the Roman Church and in no other: and the inconsistency is heightened, when the remarkable phraseology of Scripture itself is considered.

In the figured language of prophecy, a Church is symbolically represented by a Golden Candlestick, bearing an ignited candle, and thus communicating light throughout the whole extent of its action. See Revelation 1:12, 20.

Now a Candlestick is not a fixture: on the contrary, both it and the light which it bears are capable of removal from one place to another place. Accordingly, in strict adherence to this ideality, the Savior actually threatens such a removal, in the event of flagrant and hardened unfaithfulness. Revelation 2:5.

Such being the case, unless Rome can show scriptural cause for pleading an exemption from the common possible lot of all other Churches, nothing can be more idle than for her to claim a special and indefeasible right to promises, which were made generally to the Church Catholic in some one or other of its branches, and not to any one branch as contradistinguished from all other branches. I may here remark, by the way: that the argument, through which Bossuet would fain overwhelm all the sound Protestant Churches of the Reformation, most effectually and most tremendously tells against the arbitrary fantasy of Socinianism or (as its adherents delight to term it) Unitarianism.
If this utterly unsupported speculation be indeed the mind of the Gospel and the doctrine of the Apostles: then, agreeably to the tenor of Christ's promises, it must have been faithfully held, during all the middle ages of corrupt apostasy to the dogma of the Trinity (as Dr. Priestly speaks), by some one or more Visible Church or Churches; for, otherwise, the requisite ecclesiastically-doctrinal connection, between the asserted Socinianism of the Primitive Church and the real Socinianism of these latter days, can by no possibility be established. But no such Visible Church or Churches can be shown, from history, to have existed, throughout the long period of the middle ages. Therefore, if Socinianism be the true sense of Scripture: then Christ's promises of the perpetual preservation of a doctrinally pure Visible Church must inevitably have failed. And, conversely, if Christ's promises relative to the perpetual preservation of such a Church have not failed: then Socinianism cannot be the true sense of Scripture. The dilemma, in short, is this.

We must either reject Socinianism: or we must confess, that Christ's promises have not been accomplished.

[5] Walmesley's General History of the Christ. Church, under the name of Pastorini. p. 326.

[6] I beg it to be here understood: that, in strict accordance with what the nature of my subject requires, I speak of Churches collectively, not of Church-members individually. Corruptions, which shut out the very idea of Christ's approving spiritual presence with an apostatic Church collectively, and which (it is to be feared) operate as deadly poison upon the great bulk of the erring members of such a Church, may, nevertheless, through the mysterious agency of god's grace, prove innocuous to particulars, who, in the midst of superstitions sincerely though mistakenly received, have been sanctified by the blessed spirit, and who thence are animated by a living principle of interior religion. With these holy persons individually, Christ is spiritually present: though, from their Church collectively, his spiritual presence has been withdrawn.

If, in this view of the matter, I be inconsistent, as some may think: I must even be content to symbolize with the inconsistency of our judicious hooker. See disc. of Justificat. Section 9-20.

The true rational of the remarkable fact before us (for I venture to style it a fact) I take to be this. Christ declares, that he will build His Church upon the Rock of Peter's confession. He declares, therefore, that he will build it upon the Doctrine of the united Divinity and Humanity of the Messiah. Such being the case, a departure from evangelical truth in subordinate particulars constitutes nothing more than a corruption more or less intense: but a departure from the Rock of Peter's confession is an absolute digging up of the very foundation of the Church. Hence, wherever the foundation is held, grievous as may be the apostatic declension of the collective Communion which holds it; still, in such Communion, God, through his own mighty working and in harmony with the very principle of a foundation, has never ceased to have a people individually.

They are not all faithless, says the wisely discriminating hooker, that are weak in assenting to the truth or stiff in maintaining things opposite to the truth of Christian doctrine. But, as many as hold the FOUNDATION which is precious, though they hold it but weakly and as it were with slender thread, although they frame many base and unsuitable things upon it, things that cannot abide the trial of the fire: yet shall they pass the fiery trial and be saved, which indeed have builded themselves upon the ROCK which is the FOUNDATION of the Church. – If the name of FOUNDATION do note the principal thing which is believed, then is that the FOUNDATION of our faith, which St. Paul hath to Timothy; God manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit: that of Nathanael; thou art the Son of the living God, thou art the King of Israel: that of the inhabitants of Samaria; this is Christ, the savior of the world. He, that directly denieth this, doth utterly raze THE VERY FOUNDATION OF OUR FAITH. – Forasmuch, therefore, as it may be said of the Church of Rome; she hath yet a little strength, she doth not directly deny the FOUNDATION of Christianity: I may, I trust, without offense, persuade myself; that thousands of our fathers in former times, living and dying within her walls, have found mercy at the hands of God. Disc. of Justificat. Section 14, 16, 17.

This view of the matter will, I apprehend, teach us the true principle and full import of the language, which St. John has employed respecting Antichrist and the Spirit of Antichrist.

The precise and accurately distinctive characteristic of Antichrist and the spirit of Antichrist is a DENIAL OF THE FOUNDATION: whether such denial be heightened, it may be, into absolute atheism; or whether it be variously modified, in different ages and societies, by a formal rejection,

sometimes of the humanity, and sometimes of the Divinity, of Christ. This, then, is explicitly stated and defined to be the badge or characteristic of Antichrist.

Now the very name of Antichrist imports a direct and formal opposition to Christ: and, accordingly, the Apostle carefully limits that opposition to A DENIAL OF THE FOUNDATION. He is Antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father. – every spirit, that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have beard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world. – Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God. In we know, that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This person (Gr. Ou=tov) is the true God and eternal life. 1 John 2:22, 23; 4:2, 3, 15; 5:20.

No Communion, therefore, which holds the FOUNDATION, can be legitimately deemed a branch of Antichrist, as the character of Antichrist is defined by St. John. And, thence, in a Communion which does hold the FOUNDATION, grossly corrupt in doctrine as such a Communion may be collectively, there is no moral impossibility, that god should have, individually, a holy and salvable people. Here, we are encountered by no contradiction. But to say, that A member of the Foundation-denying Antichrist can also be, at the same time, a member of the Foundation-laying Christ, strikes upon my own apprehension, as something very like a contradiction in terms.

[7] Hist. des Variat. livr. 15:3.

CHAPTER 2

[1] Chrysost. Serm. de Pentecost. Oper. vol. 6. p. 233. Hilar. de Trin. lib. 6. Oper. p. 903. Athan. Unum esse Christ. Orat. Oper. vol. 1. p. 519, 520. Hieron. Comment. in Matthew 16:18. lib. 3. Oper. vol. 6. p. 33. August. Expos. in Evan. Johan, Tract. 124. Oper. vol. 9. p. 206.

[2] Cyprian. de Unit. Eccles. Oper. vol. 1. p. 106-108. Tertuil. de Pudic. Oper. p. 767, 768. Chrysost. Homil. 69. in Petr. Apost. et Eliam Prophet. Oper. vol. 1. p. 856.

[3] De tua nunc sententia, quaetro, unde hoc jus Ecclesiae usurpes? Si, quia dixerit Petro Dominus; Super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, tibi dedi claves regni coelestis; vel Quecunque alligaveritis vel solveritis in terra, erunt alligata vel soluta in coelis: idcirco praesumis, et ad to derivasse solvendi et alligandi potestatem, id est, ad omnem Ecclesiam Petri propinquam: qualis es, evertens atque commutans manifestam Domini intentionem PERSONALITER hoc Petro conferentem? Super TE, inquit, aedificabo Ecclesiam meam. Tertull. de Pudic. Oper. p. 767, 768.

On this very important passage I may remark, that, to make out a decent case of identifying the Rock even personally with Peter, Tertullian, when he repeats his citation of the famous text, in Matthew 16:18, gives the words of our Lord inaccurately. Christ NO WHERE says: Super TE aedificabo Ecclesiam mean. The inserted TE may, indeed, express Tertullian's view of the text: but he ought not to have introduced it with an inquit; when, all the while Christ says no such thing.

My quotation, however, from this ancient Father, is amply sufficient for the purpose, on account of which it has been made. It distinctly shows: both that The Primitive Church knew nothing of the modern Romish interpretation of the text; and also that, As soon as ever that interpretation was started

by an ambitious Prelate of Rome, it was promptly rejected as a groundless and unheard of and unscriptural novelty.

With the primitive exposition before him, the reader will perhaps be amused to see the exordium of an Epistle, written in the year 1178 by Pope Alexander III., To the celebrated individual of the middle ages familiarly denominated Prester John: such Epistle, with the delicate charge of discovering the local habitation of the said Christian monarch of India, being entrusted to the Pope's own friend and physician Prudent Master Philip; who had heard, that John wished to have a Church and altar at Jerusalem for the better apostolical institution of his subjects who might piously resort thither. Alexander Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, charissimo in Christo filio, illustri et magnifico Indorum regi, sacerdotum sanctissimo, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Apostolica Sedes, cui licet immeriti praesidemus, omnium in Christo credentium caput est et magistra: Domino attestante, qui ait beato Petro, cui licet indigni successimus, Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam. Hanc siquidem petram Christus esse voluit in Ecclesiae fundamentum, quam praeconat nullis ventorum turbinibus nullisque tempestatibus quatiendam. Et ideo non immerito beatus Petrus, super quem fundavit Ecclesiam, ligandi atque solvendi specialiter et praecipue inter Apostolos alios meruit accipere potestatem. Cui dictum est a Domino: Tibi dabo claves regni coelorum, et portae inferi non pravalebunt adversus eam; et Quodcunque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in coelis; et, quodcunque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in coelis. Audiveramus utique jampridem, referentibus multis, et in fama communi, quomodo, cum sis Christianum nomen professus, piis vel operibus indesinenter intendere, et circa ea tuum animum geras quae Deo grata sunt et aceepta. Epist. Alex. Papae ad Johannem Regem Indor. in Roger. Hoveden. Annal. par. post. in A. D. 1178. fol. 331, 332.
Whether Master Philip succeeded in discovering Prester John and in duly executing his commission, does not appear.

[4] Hist. des Variat. livr. 15:3. The whole of Bossuet's inviolable chain depends upon that Petitio Principii, in which the Romanists have always specially rejoiced.

[5] See my Difficult. of Roman. 2d edit.

[6] On this point let us hear the sound decision of the apostolic Ireneus in the second century. Ubi Ecclesia, ibi et Spiritus: et, ubi Spiritus Dei, illic Ecclesia et omnis gratia. Spiritus autem veritas. Iren. adv. haer. lib. 3. c. 40. p. 226. Ireneus, we see, in strict accordance with the purport of our Lord's second promise, lays it down, as a ruled case, that the presence of God's Spirit, or the spiritual presence of Christ, is essential to the character of the true Church, and thence, of course, essential to that legitimate ecclesiastical perpetuity which is expressed in the words, Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. The conclusion is inevitable. What sane person can believe, that Christ never ceased to be spiritually and approvingly present with a Church, of which he spoke by his Spirit, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins and that ye receive not of her plagues, and which he described by the voice of his angel, as the habitation of demons and the hold of every foul spirit and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird?

It is not unimportant to remark, that the language of Ireneus is that of a strict correlativeness. He not only says, Where the Church is, there is the Spirit: but he also says, Where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace. He acts, therefore, as a guide to us, under a two-fold aspect. We learn from him, both where we are not to seek the true Catholic Church, and where we are to seek it.

[7] See Bossuet's Hist. des Variat. livr. 11. Section 1-148.

BOOK 2

CHAPTER 1

[1] Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11:7-70. Mosh. Eceles. Hist. cent. 9: par. 2. chap. 5. 6. Of the Manicheism of the Albigenses Bossuet is so sure, that he defies all the Protestants in the world to produce a sect in Europe, anterior to Peter Valdo, which were not a branch of the old Manicheans. Hist. des Var. livr. 11:91.

[2] Fuit, imperante Constantino (seu Constante) Heraclii nepote, non procul a Samosatis, Armeniae indigena quidam, Constantinus nomine, vicum incolens Mananalim, quem ad hunc usque diem habitant Manichaei. Hic diaconum quendam captivum, qui e Syria in patriam revertebatur et Mananalim forte praeteribat, tecto excepit, aluitque dies aliquot domi suae. Diaconus ergo, ut hanc quasi gratiam hospiti suo rependeret, codices duos, quos e Syria secum tulerat, Evangelium scilicet, Paulique Epistolas, dono dedit Constantino. Petri Siculi Hist. de vana et stolid. Manichaeor. haer. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 9. par. post. p. 36.

[3] At ille, qui jam pridem nefariam atque impuram haeresim suam propter impia dicta foedaque flagitia, quae Manichaeorum scriptis continentur, omnibus odio atque horrori esse animadverterat, uti pietatem, magnopere pestem illam renovare iterum ac latius diffundere, in animum induxit; daemone, ut par est, instigante, librum deinceps, praeter Evangelii et Apostoli codices, nullum attingere: hoc spectans nimirum, ut mali labem universam, eorum ope, obtegeret; quemadmodum, qui noxia pocula propinant, eadem melle obliniunt atque obducunt. Et quidem ille, cum Manichaeorum libris omnes jam cujusque impietatis artes percepisset, tantum mox Satanae ope assecutus est, ut, Evangelii Apostolique sensus perperam interpretando, facile omnes in rem suam, quo vellet et pro libidine, detorqueret. – Sylvanum se illum jactabat, cujus mentio in Pauli Epistolis, quique, tanquam fidus discipulus, a Paulo missus est in Macedoniam: ostendensque discipulis suis Apostoli codicem quem a diacono accepterat: Vos, aiebat, Macedones estis; ego, Sylvanus, ad vos a Paulo missus. Atque id ille, post sexcentos annos quam a Paulo haec scripta sunt, dicere non dubitabat. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 36. Ut a nobis in prolixlore opere commemoratum, cum de Paulo et Joanne Samosatenis, Callinices filiis, ageremus: de illo, inquam, Paulo, a quo Paulliani pro Manichais, mutato nomine, appellari coeperunt. Ibid. p. 37. This Paul was an ancient Manichean of Samosata, long prior to Constantine-Sylvanus: and, as the proselytes of Constantine rejected for a purer faith the Manicheism of their forefathers; so, consistently, they declared, that Constantine, not Paul the Manichean, was the teacher from whom they derived their doctrinal system.

Ou=toi, meta< cro>nouv polloulou, e[teron e]scon dida>skalon Kwnstanti~non kalou>menon, tonta Silouanon. Tou~ton e]cousin ajrchgo Since they disowned this Paul as their teacher, and since they formally renounced (as even their enemy Peter Siculus confesses) the Manichean scheme, they could not have called themselves Paulicians from him, but must have assumed the name from that Apostle whose writings they peculiarly esteemed and whose disciples they eminently professed themselves to be. Their adversaries, however, regardless of the palpable inconsistency, and bent upon pronouncing them to be Manicheans, asserted, that they were called Paulicians from the Manichean Paul the son of Callinice, whom yet, as Cedrenus assures us, they disowned as their theological instructor. Peter Siculus goes still further: for he states, that they not only disowned, but even directly condemned, the very Paul, from whom he nevertheless asserts them to have borrowed their appellation. A curious effect

is produced, by placing in immediate juxtaposition the two singularly incongruous statements of Peter Siculus.

Promptissime etiam damnant Paulum Samosatenum. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 31.

Cum de Paulo et Joanne Somasatenis, Callinices filiis, ageremus: de illo, inquam, Paulo, a quo Paulliani pro Manichais, mutato nomine, appellari coeperunt. Ibid. p. 37.

They derived their name, it seems, from a person whom they condemned and whose Manicheism they abjured! Certainly calumniators ought to have good memories.

I suppose I need scarcely say, that this Paul of Samosata was an entirely different person from the more famous Paul of Samosata, who was Bishop of Antioch in the third century, and who speculated heretically on the doctrine of the Trinity.

[4] As a somewhat curious specimen of the style in which Peter Siculus delights to expatiate, I subjoin his own precise words.

Sergius, ille diaboli maximus propugnator: Sergius, qui multos ex ovibus lupos fecit, et per eos Christi ovilia dissipavit: Sergius, acer ipsc sub ovina pelle lupus, virtutum fraudulentus simulator, quippe hac arte multis fucum faciebat: Sergius, inimicus crueis Christi; os impietatis; in Christi Matrem Sanctosque contumeliosus: Sergius, Christi Apostolorum adversarius, qui et Prophetas odio habuit, et, a divinis literis versus, ad fabulas et mendacia se convertit: Sergius, Christi osor, Ecclesiae perdueills, qui Dei Filium conculcavit, et sanguinem Testamenti pollutum duxit, et Spiritui gratiae contumeliam fecit. Petr. Sicul. Hist. p. 38.

The Sergius, thus energetically vilipended, was a most laborious successor of Constantine and a diligent teacher of the doctrine which was derived from the confessedly unadulterated New Testament itself. Iisdem, quibus apud nos sunt, verbis, is the acknowledgment of Peter himself respecting the several books of the New Testament used by the Paulicians. Ibid. p. 33.

[5] Omnia quippe omnes Evangelii et Apostoli testimonia praedicant: sed illi soli capiunt et intelligunt fraudem haereticorum, qui din multumque in sacrae literaturae disciplina sunt versati. Illi enim impuri, quando primum cum aliquo in disputationis certamen descendunt, quandam prae se ferentes morum sanctimoniam, omnia Catholicorum dogmata per astum comprobant pronunciantque. Et aiunt, se sanctissimam Trinitatem Deum profiteri: cum impie prorsus imperiteque omnia, per allegorias, apud se taciti interpretentur; quando, sancram Trinitatem inficiantes, etiam detestantur. Incarnationem Domini Dei nostri in Virgine, quanquam alio et impio sensu,, fatentur; sequiusque sentientes damnant: omnia tamen Incarnationis mysteria, aliter ore, aliter corde, Manetem et asseclas illius imitati, exponunt. Promptissime etiam damnant Paulum Samosatenum. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 31.

Manichaeorum itaque scripta idciro protinus abjecit: et, hanc etiam maxime ob causam, quod multos videbat eo nomine gladio caedi. Ibid. p. 36.

Egregius autem Manetis discipulus Constantinus, quo facilius auditores suos in fraudem ac periculum induceret, et probabiliora redderet quae docebat, Valentini primum blasphemias ac portentosa de triginta aeonibus diisque dogmata, totam item Curbicii fabulam de pluvia quam ex formosi adolescentis virginem insectantis sudoribus manare affirmabat, et alia id genus non pauca, tanquam absurda nimis atque incredibilia, rejicienda sibi atque explodenda putavit: minime id quidem, ut tantam impietatem profligaret, sed quo plures ad se doctrinamque suam pertraheret. Ibid. p. 36.

It seems rather odd, that the most effectual mode of gaining the Manicheans of the old school should be an open rejection of their creed as absurd and incredible. We may pardon the historian, however, both for his gross inconsistencies, and for his uncharitably gratuitous ascription of motives, since he has recorded the vital facts: that Constantine disowned, both the books of the Manicheans, and the system of Manicheism itself; and that the Paulicians, his followers, held the doctrines of the Trinity and of Christ's incarnation and godhead.

[6] Iidem vero sunt, nec quiequam divertunt a Manichaeis Pauliciani, qui hasce recens a se procusas haereses prioribus adsuerunt, et ex sempiterno exitii barathro effoderunt. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 31.

Adeo ut, quotquot nunc sunt Manichaei, technam istam et artificium ignorantes, Scythianum ac Buddam et Manetem ipsum, qui totius sectae principes fuerunt, promptis animis respuant et detestentur: Constantinum vero hunc, qui Sylvani quo-que nomen assumpsit, aliosque qui post eum exorti, in Christi Apostolorum numero habeant, et Paulo pares in honore ducant. Ibid. p. 36.

Simeon autem, ne quid regii mandati praeteriret, Constantini discipulos, quo ad saniorem mentem revocarentur, Ecclesiis commendat. Sed illi haud quaquam conversi sunt: malueruntque in errore suo impie mori, quam Deum sibi poenitentia placare salutetoque consequi sempiternam. Ibid. p. 37. Itaque, extructo ad acervum ingenti rogo, incensi et cremati omnes fuerunt. Ibid. p. 37.

[7] Basilidis vero infanda flagitia et impuritates, caeterorumque omnium tetrum ac graveolens coenum, amplectens, novus repente perniciosae pestis ductor exiliit. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 36.

Hic igitur (Sergius), cum juvenis adhuc esset, in foeminam quandam casu incidit, moribus infamem, secta Manichaeam. Ila vero Diaboli sectatrix, ut callida erat ac subdola, sic juvenem est allocuta. Audio, domine Sergi, te literarum scientia et eruditione praestantem esse, ac bonum praeterea virum usquequaque. Dic ergo mihi: cur non legis sacra evangelia? Quibus ille verbis allectus, nec occultum potius intuens nequitiae venenum quod latebat, ita respondit. Nobis profanis ista legere non licet, sed sacerdotibus duntaxat. At illa, non ita est, inquit, ut putas: nec enim personarum acceptio est apud Deum; omnes siquidem homines vult salvos fieri Dominus, et ad agnitionem veritatis venire. At sacerdotes vestri, quoniam Dei verbum adulterant et mysteria occulunt quae in Evangeliis eontinentur, idcirco vobis audientibus omnia non legunt quae scripta sunt; sed quaedam legunt, quaedam omittunt: ne possitis pervenire ad aginitionem veritatis. – Eodemque filo singula percurrens Evangelii verba, et cujusque vocis sensum, prout capere illum videbat, mirifice depravans, brevi aptum reddidit diaboli instrumentum. Ibid. p. 38.

The person, thus converted to unacknowledged Manicheism by reading the New Testament, became afterward one of the most eminent successors of Constantine. His books were held in high veneration by the Paulicians. Ibid. p. 33, 39.

[8] Qui tametsi a Manichaeorum impuritatibus se alienos dictitant, sunt tamen dogmatum ipsorum vigilantissimi custodes et propugnatores. Petr. Sic. Hist. P. 31.

Quandam prae se ferentes morum sanctimoniam. Ibid. p. 31.

Hic vero, rejectis omnibus illorum flagitiis ac libidinibus (de Sergio Manichaeisque pristinis loquitur), blasphemias, veluti salubria dogmata, complexus, virtutes nonnullas callide simulabat. Ibid. p. 38.

[9] Ego Tibricae novem menses versatus, ea, quae supra nobis commemorata sunt, accurate perscrutatus, jussisque sanctissimis piorum et orthodoxorum principum, quamvis indignus et ultimus, multa cum cura obsecutus, omnibus palam facere enixe contendi. Petr. Sic. Hist. P. 40.

[10] Pietatis specie, velut ovina pelle, lupum tegens, pietatis autem abnegans virtutem, iis, qui ipsum norant, certissimus salutis ductor videbetur. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 38.

[11] Hoc siquidem, ad caetera sua egregia facinora, divini atque orthodoxi Imperatores addiderunt, ut Manichaeos Montanosque capitali puniri sententia juberent; eorumque libros, quocumque in loco inventi essent, flammis tradi: quod, si quis uspiam eosdem occultasse deprehenderetur, hunc eundem mortis poenae addici, ejusque bona in fiscum inferri. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 36.

[12] Cum eo loci annos septem et viginti versatus esset (Constantinus Sylvanus) multosque ex incolis in errorem impulisset, dignum magisterio et doctrina sua vitae finem sortitus est. Nam Imperator, postquam de hominis insolentia, nescio qua ratione, certior factus est, palatinum quendam Simeonem protinus ablegavit cum mandatis, quibus ipsum, ut improbitatis artificem, lapidare jubebatur, ejus vero discipulos, quos nempe induxerat ignorantia, per Dei Ecclesiam erudiendos convertendosque dispergere, quanquam illi corrigi prorsus noluerunt. Nec mora jussis intercessit. Advolans enim Simeon, simul ac destinatum locum attigit, comprehendi omnes, et in australem Coloniensis Castri pattem duci, jussit. Quo loco, miserum illum ejusque discipulos ex adverso destituens, signum dat illico, ut unum omnes lapidibus incessant. Verum hi, magistro suo, ut qui a Deo ad ipsos missus esset, parcentes, lapidibus arreptis, manus quidem ad balteos suos per speciem adducebant, clam autem lapides in terga vibrabant. Adoptarat ante plures annos Sylvanus Justum quendam, eumque Manichaei haeresi cum primis imbuerat; tunc vero, educationis doctrinaeque suae congruentem, ab illo mercedem tulit: palatini enim jussis obsequens, sumpto in manu saxo, Sylvanum, quasi alterum Goliath, vi magna percussit et occidit. In quem apte cecidit vox illa Davidica: Lacum aperuit, et effodit eum; et incidit in foveam, quam fecit. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 36, 37.

[13] Quos quidem dum temere nimis excutit et auscultat Simeon, ut qui divinae institutionis expers erat ac plane rudis atque (ut verius dicam) levis ac praeceps animo, pestiferam haeresim hausit, et cum ea rediit Constantinopolim ad Imperatorem. Triennio deinde domi suae privatim acto, cum plene jam irretitus possideretur a diabolo, relictis omnibus, clam excessit, Cibossam petens. Ubi, convocatis collectisque hinc inde Constantini discipulis, ejusdem impietatis successor effectus est: et ut nomini suo famam, eadem qua predecessores arte conciliaret, Titum se appellavit. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 37.

[14] Gliscente igitur inter Justum et Simeonem contentione, proficiscitur Justus ad Episcopum Coloniae: atque, ut de Apostoli sensu quod cupiebat audiret, omnia mox de se sociisque, et quam inter se disciplinam tenerent, liquido exposuit. Re comperta, Episcopus, nihil in his sibi cunctandum ratus, de singulis e vestigio refert ad Justinianum Augustum, qui post Heraclium Imperii sceptra gubernavit. Qui quidem ut audiit, omnes statim in unum cogi Manichaeos seorsimque interrogari jussit, atque flammis tradi quotquot essent in errore pertinaces. Itaque, extructo ad acervum ingenti rogo, incensi et cremati omnes fuerunt. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 37.

[15] Incensi et cremati omnes fuerunt, praeter Paulum quendam, genere Arabem, cui duo filii erant, Genesius et Theodorus, quibuscum fuga se proripuit pater, et Epispalim abiit jam dudum. – Producit ergo alter hic Paulus, ad impietatis scholam, filium Genesium, cui Timothei nomen imposuit. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 37.

[16] Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 37, 38.

[17] The violent declamation of Peter Siculus against this individual, as well as the account of his conversion through the agency of a woman whom the rabid historian pronounces to have been a morally infamous Manichean, have been given in the preceding notes. That he was a proselyte from among the Catholics, I gather from his expressed notion, so well combated by his female instructor, that the Gospel was too sacred a book to be read by profane Laics, and that it was reserved for the exclusive perusal of the Clergy. Pert. Sic. Hist. p. 38.

[18] Edoctus ergo ab exitiosa foemina, diaboli propugnator Sergius, cum haeresim altius imbibisset, crederetque omnes homines, qui sinceram et illibatam Christianorum fidem nostram ac pietatem colunt, in pernicie versari: zelo satanico insurgit, et novus praeco fit erroris; cognomentumque assumens Tychici, cujus nomen est celebre in Epistolis Pauli, Pauli discipulum se vulgo jactavit, et ab eo missum ad praedicandum, non Dei verbum, sed haeresim perniciosam. Itaque civitates singulas regionesque, in quibus Apostolus veritatis verbum ante octingentos annos promulgarat, impigre circumcursans, multos ab orthodoxa fide avertit, et diabolo adjunxit. Quod ipsemet, in quadem epistola, gloriatur, his verbis: Ab Oriente, inquit, usque ad Occasum, a Borea ad Austrum, cucurri, nuncians Evangelium Christi, et genibus meis laborans. Triginta enim et quatuor annorum spatio, ab Irenae Augustae imperio usque ad Theophilum Imperatorem persistens, conflavit illam, quae etiamnum obtinet, defectionem, quam Paulus Apostolus Thessalonicensibus praedixerat, quaque iste magnam Ecclesiae partem graviter afflixit. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 39.

Habent porro Sergii magistri sui, invisas superis, omnisque superbiae et impietatis plenas, epistolas. Ibid. p. 33.

[19] Justo tandem Dei judicio, securi dissectus, ut qui Ecclesiam Dei dissecuerat, in ignem missus est sempiternum. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 40.

[20] Petr. Sic. Hist. p.40.

[21] Sacra quatuor evangelia, et Sancti Pauli Apostoli denas quaternas Epistolas, recipiunt: Jacobi item Catholicam, ternas Joannis, Catholicam Judae, cum Actis Apostolorum, iisdem, quibus apud nos, verbis. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 33.

Cedrenus, the copyist of Peter Siculus at a considerably later period, similarly admits, that the New Testament of the Paulicians, which they probably at that time had completed by the addition of the apocalypse and the two epistles of St. Peter, was precisely the same as the New Testament of the entire Catholic Church: but he states, that they interpreted it perversely.

Wv gaphtai, th~| grafh~| kai< toi~v lo>goiv, ou[twv ejisillakta, tamata diastre>fousi. Cedren. Hist. Compend. vol. 1. p. 343.

In the days of Cedrenus who flourished during the twelfth century, any interpretation of the New Testament, which ran counter to the prevailing superstition, would be deemed a perversion. His testimony is important: inasmuch as it thence appears, that, in the course of the three hundred years which elapsed between Peter Siculus and himself, no corruption of the New Testament, to serve the purposes of the Manichean heresy, bad ever been attempted by the Paulicians. Yet, to extract Manicheism out of the genuine and unadulterated New Testament, is, I conceive, a moral impossibility.

[22] Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 33.

[23] In the midst of much violent declamation and of assumptions alike uncharitable and gratuitous, every one of the subsequently specified particulars will be found in the History of the Paulicians written by Peter Siculus.

[24] I have not had an opportunity of reading the work of Photius against the Manicheans: but, as I learn from Mosheim, he also, like Peter Siculus, admits, that the Paulicians expressed the utmost abhorrence both of manes and of his doctrine. Phot. cont. Manich. lib. 1. p. 17, 56, 65. See Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. cent. 9. par. 2 chap. 5 Section 5 vol. 2 p. 367. The historical work of Peter Siculus, who in the year 870 spent nine months among the Paulicians to the great jeopardy of his orthodox Catholicism, seems to be the original fountain, whence our knowledge of them is derived. Photius died sixteen years after the visit of Peter Siculus.

[25] See Tertull. adv. Marcion. lib. 4. Oper. p. 222-225. Marcion substantially held the same doctrines as the Manicheans. Hence, in order to make it serve his purpose, he found it necessary so to corrupt and mangle and mutilate and interpolate the genuine Gospel as to produce a code which might well be termed a new Gospel.

[26] I subjoin the six articles, under which Peter Siculus arranges the pretended Manicheism of the Paulicians. The prudent reader of course will exercise his own discretion in judging how far they truly set forth the doctrine of the acknowledged rejecters of Manes and his whole system.

Primum illorum axioma est: duo rerum esse principia; Deum malum, et Deum bonum: aliumque hujus mundi conditorem ac principem; et alium, futuri aevi.

Secundum: quod Deiparam semperque Virginem, atque infinitis laudibus concelebrandam, per odium abjiciant, nulloque inter bonorum hominum coetum numero vel loco dignentur; neque Christum ex illa natum, ut qui corpus e coelo secum detulerit; Josephumque ex illa, post Domini partum, plures liberos suscepisse dicant.

Tertium: quod, e sacris mysteriis, divinam ac tremendam corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi conversionem negent, aliaque de hoc mysterio doceant; a Domino nempe non panem et vinum in coena discipulis propinatum, sed figurate symbola tantum et verba, tanquam panem et vinum, data. Quartum: quod formam atque vim venerandae et vivificae crucis non solum non agnoscant, sed infinitis etiam contumeliis onerent.

Quintum: quod Veteris Instrumenti tabulas non admittant, prophetasque planos et latrones appellent: aut sola duntaxat sacra quatuor Evangelia, et S. Pauli Apostoli denas quaternas Epistolas, recipiant, Jacobi item Catholicam, ternas Joannis, Catholicam Judae, cum Actis Apostolorum, iisdem, quibus apud nos, verbis.

Sextum: quod arceant ab Ecclesiae administratione presbyteros et seniores: aiunt enim, quod seniores adversus Dominum congregati sint. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 33.

In the third of these articles, their doctrine of the Eucharist has evidently been perverted and misrepresented: whence we may judge of the bigoted historian's accuracy in other matters. According to Peter Siculus, they maintained: that Our Lord did not, in the institution of the Holy Supper, set before his disciples bread and wine; but that symbols only and words, as if they were bread and wine, were ,figuratively given. This palpable perversion, he, that runs, may read. What they really taught, as in truth appears from the very necessity of the entire third article itself, was this: that, The eucharistic bread and wine are not literally transmuted into the body and blood of Christ; but that, in the words of

consecration, they are given, figuratively as symbols or representations of the thing signified. The vein, indeed, of determined misrepresentation, which runs through the whole document, is so manifest, that it can scarcely escape even the most careless observation.

[27] Monachos complures, et moniales quae virginitatem suam Christo devoverant, per discipulos suos corrupit: et, a monastica vita revocans, a Deo simul alienavit. Multos denique sacerdotes et levitas ab orthodoxa religione avellens, et ex ovibus lupos faciens, hominivoros esse docuit. Petr. Sic. Hist. p. 39.

Like their theological descendants in Europe, they deemed, I suppose, monastic vows absurd and unscriptural and tending only to concealed impurity.

The most singular humor of Peter Siculus, in his dealing with the luckless Sergius (the special object of his vituperation in the preceding passage), is: that he not only heaps upon his devoted head a profusion of the most palpable and ridiculous calumnies, but that he actually charges him with all the consequences of his apostleship, in the shape of persecutions and troubles and captivity and the like; strangely describing him as being the person, who sold his disciples into bondage, and who put them to death. It seems, that the suffering Paulicians sometimes retaliated upon their persecutors. Of this, also, Sergius was destined to bear the blame, though he had expressed his decided disapprobation of such proceedings, and had admonished his followers to practice forbearance. If he could not restrain his suffering flock from occasional retaliation; if he could not always make them obey his exhortations to meekness and submission: he ought not, argues the candid historian, to have erected himself into their teacher. By that single action, he makes himself responsible for all the misdemeanors of his people. Ibid. p. 39.

CHAPTER 2

[1] Tibricae igitur, legationis obeundae caussa, apud Paullicianos diu moratus, saepe disputando cum illis sum congressus, illorumque arcana omnia per Catholicos etiam ibi degentes curiose investigavi: atque ab ipsismet impiis et delirantibus cognovi; quod, e suo conciliabulo, missuri essent, qui in Bulgaria quoscunque possent a Catholica Religione ad suam exsecratam et nefariam sectam averterent. A sacris enim literis facto praeonii sui initio, praesidentes opinantur facile se posse purae sinceraeque sementi infelix lolium haereseos permiscere. Amant enim hoc impii saepenumero factitare, ut omnem moveant funem, nullumque recusent periculum, quo damnatarum opinationum suarum pestem quibuscumque possint, infundant. Petr. Hist. Archepisc. Bulgar. nuncupat, p. 31.

The reader will not fail to observe, in this passage, two important admissions on the part of Peter Siculus: the one, that he picked up some of his tales respecting the Paulicians from the neighboring Catholics, as prejudiced bigots, no doubt, as himself; the other, that these hated religionists made the Sacred Scriptures the basis of all their attempts at proselytism.

It will be recollected, that the Sacred Scriptures, thus systematically made the basis of their zealous preaching, are those very Scriptures, which Peter Siculus himself, as well as Cedrenus three centuries later, admitted them to have possessed and used uncorrupted and unmutilated, so as precisely to correspond with the accredited copies used by the great Body of Christians in the Church at large. Thus perpetually does falsehood defeat its own ends by its own inconsistency: and thus wisely is it ordered by the righteous moral Governor of the Universe, that, to fabricate a lie, which shall so compactly hang together in all its parts as to laugh at detection, is perhaps nothing less than an impossibility.

[2] The progress of the Paulicians westward is very well given by usher: but, without any sufficient grounds, so far as I can judge, he adopts the familiar calumny, that they and their successors in Europe were Manicheans. See Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8 Section 17-22. Those successors I have, throughout this work, styled Albigenses: a name, sufficiently definite, and certainly of all others the most familiar to modern ears. As to the time when it was first imposed, different opinions have been entertained. The Benedictine, who wrote the General History of Languedoc, contends, that it is not older than the year 1208, having been given to the religionists of Southern France at the commencement of the crusade against them. He supposes, that they were thus denominated from the circumstance of their having been condemned as heretics in the Council held in the year 1176 at Lombers in the diocese of Albi. Hist. Gener. de Langued. livr. 19:4. vol. 3. p. 4. It is a point of no great moment, save to the antiquary. I may add, that Ricchini, the editor of Moneta, has given a very good summary of the diffusion of the Paulicians through well nigh the whole of western and middle Europe. Ricchin. Dissert. de Cathar. c. 1, 2. Like the rest of his fraternity, relying on the somewhat insecure authority of Bossuet, he rapidly decides, that the Albigenses were incontrovertibly Manicheans. Ibid. c. 1 Section 1. c. 2:5.

[3] In partibus Tolosae damnanda haeresis dudum emersit, quae paulatim more cancri ad vicina loca se diffundens, per Guasconiam et alias provincias, quamplurimos jam infecit. Concil. Turon. can. 4. Labb. Concil. vol. 10. p. 1419. sive in Gul. Neubrig. Rer. Anglican. lib. 2. c. 15.

Inter quos, in provincia vestra, quosdam, qui Valdenses, Cathari, et Paterini, dicuntur, et alios quoslibet quibuscunque nominibus appellatos, in tantum jam accepimus pullulasse, ut innumeros populos sui erroris laqueis irretierint, et fermento corruperint falsitatis. Innoc. III. Epist. Decretal. lib. 1. p. 56, 57.

Cum enim in partibus istis pestis haeretica, antiquitus seminata, nostris partibus usque adeo succrevisset, quod cultus divinus ibidem haberetur omnino in opprobrium et derisum: – factum est, ut, – in parte maxima destructis adversitatibus et erroribus universis, terra, dudum a cultoribus horum dogmatum conculcata, demum divino cultui assuescat. Archiepis. Narbon. Epist. in Labb. Concil. vol. 11. par. 1. p. 86.

Quia haeretici longo tempore virus suum in vestris partibus effuderunt Ecclesiam matrem nostram multipliciter maculantes; ad ipsorum extirpationem statuimus, quod haeretici, qui a fide catholica deviant, quocunque nomine censeantur, postquam fuerint de haeresi per episcopum loci, vel per aliam ecclesiasticam personam quae potestatem habeat, condemnati, indilate animadversione debita puniantur. Ludov. IX. Epist. in Labb. Concil. vol. 11. par. 1. p. 423.

[4] Sunt autem sedecim omnes Ecclesiae Catharorum. – In toto mundo non sunt Cathari utriusque sexus quatuor millia, sed Credentes innumeri. Reiner. Opusc. de haeret, c. 6 in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 13. p. 304. The actual Cathari were probably the physical descendants of the Paulician Emigrants, while the Believers were the native proselytes whom they made in Europe. I may observe, that, in this citation, I have given the work of Reinerius its real title as prefixed by himself. He calls it generally and accurately Opusculum de Hereticis. The Jesuit Gretser, by way of implicating the Valdenses in the charge of Manicheism brought against the Cathari, has thought fit to style it Liber contra Valdenses Haereticos.

[5] Tales dicuntur Catharri, id est, diffluentes per vitia; a Catha, quod est fluxus: vel Cathari, quasi Casti; quia se justos et castos faciunt: vel Catari dicuntur a Cato; quia osculantur posteriora cati, in

cujus specie, ut dicunt, appareret eis Lucifer. Alan. cont. haeret. lib. 1. c. 63. apud Usser. de Eccles. Succ. c. 8 Section 16.

This Alanus, in the fashion of the day, was styled Magnus and Doctor Universalis. He is one of Bossuet's witnesses, upon whose credit we are invited to believe, that the Albigenses were abandoned Manicheans. Another of his witnesses hereafter to be produced, is Lucas of Tuy. This remarkable Prelate, for he was in truth a Bishop, introduces the cat under a totally different aspect from that of an avatar of Lucifer. In his plastic hands, the creature appears in the extraordinary and somewhat unexpected capacity, of a strenuous advocate for the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and of a stout assailant of an Albigensic heretic who presumptuously denied the truth of that doctrine. See Luc. Tudens. adv. Albig. lib. 3. c. 14. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 13. p. 283.

The same veracious author assures us, in verbo Episcopi, that, in the province of Burgundy, the body of a burned heretic was preternaturally transmuted into a huge toad of the species Crapaldus. Ibid. lib. 3. c. 15. p. 283.

These were the arguments, wherewithal the Romish Clergy did battle against the hated Albigenses: cats and calumnies, crapauds and cremations.

It is really sickening to see such miserable specimens, either of rank dishonesty or of besotted credulity, gravely brought forward as good and sufficient evidence to convict the Albigenses of Manicheism.

[6] Nam nefanda et obscoena dicuntur agere in secreto, siquidem et vulpium posteriora foetent. Bernard. super Cant. serm. 65. Oper. p. 760.

In operimentum turpitudinis, continentiae se insigniere voto. Ibid. serm. 66. p. 762. Cum foemina semper esse, et non cognoscere foeminam, nonne plus est quam mortuum suscitare? Quod minus est, non potes: et, quod majus est, vis credam tibi? Quotidie latus tuum, ad latus juvenculae, est in mensa; lectus tuus, ad lectum ejus in camera; oculi tui, ad illius oculos in colloquio; manus tuae, ad manus ipsius in opere: et continens vis putari? Esto, ut sis: sed ego suspicione non careo. Ibid. serm. 65. p. 760.

[7] Ex sanguine infantis et farina conficiunt panem; qui infans, si moritur, martyr habetur; si vivit, sanctus dicitur. Adamitae, ab Adam, nudi conveniunt ad orandum, viri et foeminae. Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 307.

[8] Multi Credentes, tam viri quam mulieres, non timent magis ad sororem suam, et filium sive filiam, fratrem, neptem, consanguineam et cognatam, accedere, quam ad uxorem et virum proprium. Reiner. de haeret. c. 6. p. 303.

[9] Communis opinio omnium Catharorum est, quod matrimonium carnale semper fuerit mortale peccatum, et quod non puniatur aliquis gravius in futuro propter adulterium et incestum quam propter legitimum conjugium. Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. p. 302.

[10] Probatur etiam manifeste, quod non dolent de peccatis suis, quae ante professionem suae haeresis commiserunt, pro eo, quod nulli restituunt usuram, furtum, vel rapinam: imo reservant ea, vel potius relinquunt filiis et nepotibus in saeculo remanentibus; quia dicunt, usuram nullum esse peccatum. Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. 303.

[11] Haeretici cognoseuntur per mores et verba. Sunt enim in moribus compositi et modesti. Superbiam in vestibus non habent: quia, nec preciosis, nec multum abjectis, utuntur. Negotiationes non habent,

propter mendacia et juramenta et fraudes vitandas: sed tantum vivunt de labore, ut opifices. Doctores etiam ipsorum sunt sutores. Divitias non multiplicant, sed necessariis sunt contenti. Casti etiam sunt: maxime, Leonistae. Temperati etiam sunt in cibo et potu. Ad tabernas non eunt, nec ad choreas, nec ad alias vanitates. Ab ira se cohibent. Semper operantur, discunt, vel docent: et ideo parum orant. Item ad ecclesiam ficte vadunt: offerunt, et confitentur, et communicant, et intersunt praedicationibus, sed ut praedicantem capiant in sermone. Cognoscuntur etiam in verbis praecisis et modestis. Cavent etiam a scurrilitate, et detractione, et verborum levitate, et mendacio, et juramento. Reiner. de haeret. c. 7. p. 307.

[12] Vile nempe hoc genus, et rusticanum, ac sine literis, et prorsus imbelle. Bernard. super Cantic. serm. 65. Oper. p. 762.

[13] Lat. Infernum. I have translated the word into Hell: but Reinerius may perhaps mean only Purgatory, described as a Lower Region.

[14] Reiner. de haeret, c. 8. p. 307, 308.

[15] Si fidem interroges, nihil christianius: si conversationem, nihil irreprehensibilius; et, quae loquitur, factis probat. – Jam, quod ad vitam moresque spectat, neminem concutit, neminem circumvenit, neminem supergreditur. Pallent insuper ore jejuniis: panem non comedit otiosus; operatur manibus, unde vitam sustentat. Ubi jam vulpes? – Mulieres relictis viris, et item viri dimissis uxoribus, ad istos se conferunt. Clerici et sacerdotes, populis ecclesiisque relictis, intonsi et barbati; apud eos, inter textores et textrices, plerumque inventi sunt. Bernard. super Cantic. serm. 65. Oper. p. 761.

Bernard, blinded by prejudice, and led away by the idle cock-on-a-bell stories of the age, never seems to have considered the utter improbability, that numerous priests, who possessed whatever knowledge was then possessed, should forsake their all to join a body of absurdly unscriptural and despised and proscribed Manicheans: for such, if we may credit Bossuet's extraordinary band of witnesses, were the old Cathari or Albigenses.

I have used the expressive proverbial phrase cock-on-a-bell, familiarly corrupted into cock-and-a-bull, in its true and genuine application to the fabulous narratives of popery. There is some measure of antiquarian curiosity attendant upon it, which may rival the singular metamorphosis of the Pix and Ousel into the familiar sign of the Pig and Whistle. During the middle ages, as we learn incidentally from Reinerius, Gallus-supercampanam was the ecclesiastical hieroglyphic of a Romish Priest: and, as the gentlemen of that fraternity dealt somewhat copiously in legends rather marvelous than absolutely true, the contempt of our English Protestantism soon learned proverbially to distinguish any idle figment, such, for instance as the tales respecting Albigensic Manicheism, by the burlesque name of a cock-on- a-bell-story, or, as we now say, a cock-and-a-bull-story.

[16] Minucius Felix, in his Octavius, gives a very full account of the calumnies, which, by the Pagans, were excogitated and propounded against the Primitive Christians: promiscuous incest in the darkness of their private assemblies; an indecent worship paid to the presiding priest; an adoration of the head of an ass; and the murder of a young child, for the purpose of drinking his blood and devouring his mangled flesh. See Minuc. Fel. Octav. p. 70-90.

These senseless slanders have been duly plagiarized by the popish priests: and, with some trifling variations, as if the servile herd of imitators were, in their profitable trade of mendaciousness, unwilling to relinquish all claim to originality of invention, have, for the benefit and edification of the credulous,

been transferred to the Paulician Albigenses. The reader will perhaps be amused with a few specimens of such romish figments: for which he still is indebted to the several workshops, of Conrad von Magdenberg; of an Inquisitor, who seems to have had grace sufficient to conceal his name; and of Lucas of Tuy, who has recorded the two surprising cases, of a catus, or male-cat, which at the point of his claws zealously advocated the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and of the metamorphosis of a dead Albigensic heretic into the toad denominated Crapaldus. Doubtless he will be prepared to receive, with all due implicitness of confidence, the testimony of such credible witnesses.
Quia vero illorum deus venter est, qui Veneris ingloriem speciali quadam celebritate colere nituntur: itaque nonnulli ex eis, commessationibus, ebrietatibus, et hujusmodi carnis illecebris, inhiantes, in libidines spumant, ut cum reverentia loquar, spurcissimas; adeo etiam ut, contra naturam, exercitia pessima committere crebris ausibus sint reperti. Conrad. de Mont. Puellar. cont. Beghard. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 13. p. 343.

Tenent quosdam diabolicos articulos: quorum paucos subscribam. Primo, adorant Luciferum: et credunt eum esse Dei fratrem, injurios de coelo detrusum, et se cum eo regnaturos. Pueros eorum ei immolant: ipsumque pro divitiis rogant. – Ad loca subterranea conveniunt: promiscuas concupiscentias et abominabiles luxurias exercent. Ind. Error. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 341.

Dicunt eis haeretici: Omnia, quae in hoc mundo visibilia sunt, a diabolo facta sunt. Unde non refert, in lucro pecuniarum, utrum bene acquirentur vel male: quia nec bona adquisitio illarum salvat, nec mala damnat. Nihil prodest alicui bona facere, nec obest agere mala: quia omnis homo pari poena damnatur, si extra nostrum ordinem moritur. Haec dicentibus haereticis, vani homines tribuunt miserabiliter fidem: et se, fraudibus, homicidiis, latrociniis, et usuris, committunt. Efferuntur effraenes per varia desideria carnis: et nulla est nociva delectatio, quam non pertranseat eorum luxuria. Abutitur filius matrem: frater, fratrem: et pater in filia turpitudinem operatur. – Tales, per ministros suos haereticos, diabolus edocet: quos, in praesenti, diversis immundicitiis et foetore infamiae polluit; et, in futuro, aeternae damnationis flammis comburit. Haec ab illis accepimus, qui fuerunt quondam coeno faecis haereticae obvoluti; et per gratiam Dei ad gremium sanctae matris Ecclesiae redierunt. Luc. Tudens. adv. Albig. lib. 3. c. 5. in Bibl. Petr. vol. 13. p. 279.

It were easy to multiply specimens of similar fabrications, all relentlessly pilfered from the original manufactory of paganism: but these, at least for the present, may suffice.

[17] Taceo, quae negarent. Bernard. super Cantic. serm. 65. Oper. p. 760.

Plerumque fideles, injectis manibus, aliquos ex eis ad medium traxerunt. Quaesiti fidem, cum, de quibus suspecti videbantur, omnia prorsus suo more negarent, examinati judicio aquae, mendaces inventi sunt. Cumque jam negare non possent, quippe deprehensi, aqua eos non recipiente, arrepto, ut dicitur, freno dentibus, tam misere quam libere, impietatem non confessi, sed professi, sunt, palam pietatem astruentes, et pro ea mortem subire parati, nec minus parati inferre qui astabant. Ibid. serm. 66. p. 766.

From the very mode in which Bernard tells his story, I think it evident, that, what they rather professed than confessed, was not the truth of the allegations brought against them in regard to faith and practice, but the system which he indeed called impiety, but which they knew to be the Gospel.

[18] Saint Bernard fait voir, que leur piete n'etoit que dissimulation. Boss. Hist. des. Variat. livr. 11:35. Saint Bernard leur fait voir, que leur vertu n'etoit qu'une vaine ostentation. – Ne croyez jamais rien de bon de ceux qui outrent la vertu. Ibid. Section 60.

C'est d'eux, que Saint Bernard a dit: Leurs moeurs sont irreproachables; ils n'oppriment personne; ils ne font de tort d personne; leurs visages sont mortifies et abattus par le jeune; ils ne mangent point leur pain comme des paresseux; et ils travaillent pour gagner leur vie. Qu'y a-t-il de plus specieux que ces heretiques de Saint Bernard? Mais, apres tout, c'etoit des Manicheans, et leur piete n'etoit que feinte. Regardez le fond: c'est l'orgueil; c'est la haine contre le clergy; c'est l'aigreur contre l'Eglise; c'est par-la qu'ils ont avale tout le venin d'une abominable heresie. Ibid. Section 143.

[19] Avouant et jurant tout ce qu'on vouloit, pour se sauver du supplice. Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11 Section 41.

[20] I subjoin the originals, that full justice may be done to this curious and perhaps unique specimen of Latin ratiocination.

S' il (le diable) avoit bien pu porter Judas a se donner la mort a lui-meme, il pouvoit bien porter ces heretiques a la souffrir de la main des autres. Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11 Section 147.

Mirabantur aliqui, quod, non modo patienter, sed et laeti, ut videbatur, ducerentur ad mortem: sed qui minus advertunt, quanta sit potestas diaboli, non modo in corpora hominum, sed etiam in corda, quae semel permissus possederit. Nonne plus est sibimet hominem injicere manus, quam id libenter ab alio sustinere? Hoc autem in multis potuisse diabolum, frequenter experti sumus, qui seipsos aut submerserunt aut suspenderunt. Denique Judas suspendit seipsum, diabolo sine dubio immittente. Ego tamen magis existimo, magisque admiror, quod potuit immisisse in cor ejus ut traderet Dominum, quam ut semetipsum suspenderet. Nihil ergo simile habent, constantia martyrum, et pertinacia horum: quia mortis contemptum in illis pietas, in istis cordis duritia, operatur. Bernard. sup. Cantic. serm. 66. Oper. p. 766, 767.

Quorundam haereticorum mentes in tantum invasit diabolus, ut, dum, propter haeresim capti ducuntur ad mortem, nullatenus tristari, sed gaudere potius, videantur. – Qui autem non patitur pro justitia sed pro haeresi, in hoc, quod dicit se corporis non sentire dolorem, ostendit se ad Christi corpus minime pertinere, qui pro nobis cum dolore sustinuit passionem. – Est ergo a diabolo ejus insensibilitas, cum coecus mente dat se praecipitem morti: quod, in pluribus impiis, non solum legimus, verum etiam vidimus, praecessisse. – Saul et armiger ejus gladiis ceciderunt: et Achitophel suspensus occubuit, quia nutu Dei dissipatum est consilium ejus. Judas etiam Iscariotes laqueo se suspendit: et multi alii, seducti a diabolo, sponte se mortis praecipitio tradiderunt. De hac autem materia pulchrius beatus Bernardus fideles instruit. Luc. Tudens. adv. Albig. lib. 3. c. 21. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. pp. 285, 286.

Much in the same manner argued the Pagans respecting the martyrdoms of the primitive Christians. They were actuated by no philosophical love of truth, like the noble-minded stoics: but they were driven along to death by the mere vain glory of an ostentatious madness. That he of the cat and the crapaud should eagerly catch up the wisdom of St. Bernard, retailing it with some judicious improvements of his own, is small wonder. Verily, Lucas of Tuy would have forfeited his charter, had he acted otherwise.

[21] Humanum corpus factum a diabolo mentiuntur. Luc. Tudens. Praefat. adv. Albig. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 324.

Alia plura, ut oppugnent veritatem, proferunt haeretici, qui philosophorum seu naturalium nomine gloriantur. Quorum finis est Manichaeorum inducere sectam, et duos fateri Deos: quorum malignus, ut procaciter mentiuntur, creavit omnia visibilia. Ibid. lib. 3. c. 1. p. 277.

Dicunt eis haeretici: Omnia, quae in hoc mundo visibilia sunt, a diabolo facta sunt. Unde non refert, in lucro pecuniarum, utrum bene adquirantur vel male. Ibid. lib. 3. c. 5. p. 279.

Asserentes, Praelatos Ecclesiae, Christi animabus mortuorum fidelium, remissionum indulgentiis, non posse ullatenus subvenire; nullius sancti animam, ante diem judicii, coelum ascendere; atque nusquam pati poenas animas, nisi tantummodo in inferno; neque habere notitiam etiam eorum, quos, dum viverent, in saeculo dilexerunt. Praefat. in Ibid. p. 234.

[22] Tales sunt hodie haeretici Manichaei, qui sua haeresi patriam Agennensem maculaverunt: qui mentiuntur se vitam tenere Apostolorum; dicentes, se non mentiri, nec omnino jurare; sub praetextu abstinentiae et continentiae, escas carnium et nuptias damnantes. Dicunt, enim, tantum flagitium esse accedere ad uxorem, quantum ad matrem vel filiam. Damnant etiam Vetus Testamentum: de Novo, vero, quaedam accipiunt, quaydam non. Et, quod gravius est, duos praedicant rerum auctores: Deum invisibilium, Diabolum visibilium, auctorem credentes. Unde et occulte adorant Diabolum, quem sui corporis credunt creatorem. Sacramentum vero altaris purum panem esse dicunt. Baptismum negant. Neminem posse salvari, nisi per suas manus, praedicant. Resurrectionem etiam corporum negant. Radulph. Ard. Serm. in Dominic. post Trinit. 8. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8 Section 22.

[23] E vestigio exorti sunt per Aquitaniam Manichaei, seducentes promiscuum populum a veritate ad errorem. Suadebant negare Baptismum, signum Sanctae Crucis, Ecclesiam, et ipsum Redemptorem saeculi, honorem Sanctorum Dei, conjugia legitima, esum carnium: unde et multos simplices averterunt a fide. Fragment. Hist. Aquit. in Baron. Annal. vol. 11. A. D. 1017. col. 63.

[24] Haeresis illorum, quos Publicanos vel Catharos vel Paterinos vocant, quae Christi abnegat sacramenta, clam quidem pluribus in 1ocis irrepserat, sed palam in Guasconia maxime populos occuparat. Illic, namque, a catholica communione praecisi, castra habent quam plurima adversus Catholicos communita: catholico ritu posthabito, suis adinventionibus inservienites; earumque virulentia, quos potuerint, toxicantes. Quocirca, ad eorum retundendam vesaniam, missus ab Alexandro Papa vir linguae disertae, Henricus ex Abbate Claraevallis Episcopus Albanensis: quae, praedicationis verbo, militum peditumque copias undecunque contraxit, praefatosque haereticos expugnavit. Verum id frustra: nam, ut sui compotes facti sunt, se in erroris pristini volutabro revolverunt. Robert. Altiss. Chronolog. in A. D. 1181. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8 Section 37.

The same readily understood charge of denying the sacraments is brought against them by Nicolas Trivett in his Chronicle. Haeretici, quos Albigenses vocant, et alii multi, conveniunt circa Tolosam, male sentientes de sacramento altaris, de matrimonio, et aliis sacramentis: ad quorum confutationem Petrus Romanus, et multae aliae personae religiosae, cum praedictis regibus, licet parum profecerint, convenerunt. Nicol. Trivett. Chronic. in A. D. 1178. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 8. p. 478.

[25] Innoc. III. Epist. Decretal. lib. 1. p. 56, 57, 58. As I have stated in the text, it is commonly said, that Reiuerius wrote about the year 1254: but his work, I think, affords a strong internal presumption, that he really wrote it in the year 1230. From a date which occurs in the Work itself, his Inquisitorship must have continued at least down to the latter mentioned year: and the wording of the passage, which contains the date, seems to indicate, that, in that same year, the Work was composed. Prima pars tenet opiniones antiquiores, quas omnes Cathari antiquiores habebant in annis Domini CURRENTIBUS mille ducentis triginta. Reiner. Opusc. de haeret. c. 6. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 304. Somewhat awkwardly, the date is given in cardinal, rather than in ordinal, numbers: but it is hard to say, what the term CURRENT can import, unless it be used for the purpose of intimating, that the year

1230 was then actually current, when Reinerius was engaged in the composition of his Treatise. If, then, Reinerius was seventy years old in the year 1230 when I suppose his Work to have been written, he would have been thirty-nine years old in the year 1199, when a certain Friar Reinerius was employed by Innocent III. As his Inquisitor in the South of France and in the North of Spain, now the Reinerius of Pope Innocent, and the Reinerius sirnamed Sacco, correspond, both in name, and in office, and in the country where that office was exercised. But, if these two Reinerii be one and the same individual: then, from the calculated age of thirty-nine, we must deduct seventeen years, for the seventeen years during which Reinerius Sacco was one of the Cathad. This process will leave twenty-two years, for the time before Reinerius became a Catharus, and for the time after he ceased to be one up to the year 1199. Let us suppose, that he joined the Cathari at the age of eighteen. In that case, he must have left them at the age of thirty-five. Hence in the year 1199, when, by the hypothesis, he would be thirty-nine years old, he might well be an Inquisitor sent forth by Pope Innocent: for I need scarcely remark, that it was the barbarous though sagacious policy of the Roman Church to employ recent converts from reputed heresy in the task of hunting out and persecuting their former associates. But, even if we retain the year 1254 as the date of the work, the identity of the two Reinerii will still chronologically be quite possible. For, let Reinerius Sacco have been eighty-five years old in the year 1254, and let him have joined the Cathari at the age of twelve: and, according to such an hypothesis, he might easily have been acting as an Inquisitor in the year 1199.

[26] Communes opiniones omnium Catharorum sunt, videlicet: Quod diabolus fecerit hunc mundum, et omnia quae in eo sunt. Item, quod omnia sacramenta Ecclesiae, scilicet sacramentum Baptismi aquae materialis et caetera sacramenta, nihil prosint ad salutem; et quod non sint vera sacramenta Christi et ejus Ecclesiae, sed deceptoria et diabolica et Ecclesiae malignantium. Item, communis opinio omnium Catharorum est: quod matrimonium carnale semper fuerit mortale peccatum; et quod non puniatur aliquis gravius in futuro propter adulterium et incestum, quam proper legitimum conjugium. Item, omnes Cathari negant carnis resurrectionem futuram. Item credunt, quod comedere carnes, ova, vel caseum, etiam in urgente necessitate, sit mortale peccatum. Item, quod potestates seculares peccent, mortaliter puniendo malefactores vel haereticos. Item, quod nemo possit salvus fieri, nisi per ipsos. Item, quod omnes parvuli etiam, non baptizati, non levius aeternaliter puniantur, quam homicidae et latrones. Item, quod omnes negant Purgatorium. Reiner. Opusc. de haeret. c. 6. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 302.

[27] Opiniones istorum, praeter communes supra scriptas, sunt istae. Quod duo sunt Principia a Deo: videlicet, boni et mali. Item, quod Trinitas, scilicet Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, non est unus Deus: sed quod Pater major est Filio et Spiritu Sancto. Item, quod utrumque Principium, sive uterque Deus, creavit angelos suos et suum mundum: et quod iste mundus est creatus, factus, et formatus, a malo Deo; et omnia, quae sunt in eo. Item, quod diabolus cum suis angelis ascendit in coelum: et, facto ibidem praelio cum Michaele archangelo, angelus boni Dei extraxit inde et partem creaturarum Dei; et infundit eas quotidie in humanis corporibus et brutis et etiam de uno corpore in aliud, donec dictae creaturae reducantur in coelum. Item, quod Filius Dei non assumpsit humanam naturam in veritate, sed ejus similem, ex beata Virgine, quam dicunt fuisse angelum: et quod non vere comedit et bibit, nec vere passus est, nec mortuus, nec sepultus; nec ejus resurrectio vera fuit: sed quod haec fuerunt putativa: similiter, de omnibus miraculis, quae Christus fecit. Item, quod Abraham, Isaac, et Jacob, Moyses, et caeteri plures patres antiqui, et beatus Joannes Baptista, fuerunt inimici Dei et ministri diaboli. Item, quod diabolus fuerit auctor totius Veteris Testamenti, exceptis his libris: scilicet, Job, Psalterio, libris Salomonis, Sapientiae filii Sirach, Isaiae, Hieremia, Ezeckiel, Daniel, et duodecem Prophetarum. Item, quod mundus iste nunquam habebit finem. Item, quod judicium futurum jam factum est, nec amplius

fiet. Item, quod infernus et ignis teternus, sive poenae aeternae, sunt in isto mundo, et non alibi. Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 13. pp. 304, 305.

[28] Ego autem, frater Reinerius, olim haeresiarcha, nunc Dei gratia, sacerdos in ordine Fratrum Praedicatorum, licet indignus, dico indubitanter, et testificor coram Deo, quia non mentior, quod illorum trium non est aliquod inter Catharos, sive in poenitentia eorum. Reiner. de haeret. c. 6. p. 303. The man, who wrote this, was suspected of being a liar; and was conscious to himself, that the suspicion was well founded. Had he known himself to be a faithful witness to real facts, he would never have thought of saying, Non mentior. His whole phraseology and manner clearly import, that his injured brethren had charged him with gross falsehood and determined misrepresentation. Like Peter when he denied his lord, he rebuts the charge with oaths and violent asseverations: but, unlike Peter, the unhappy man repented not of his enormous and aggravated wickedness. He lied: and he knew that he lied.

[29] Quia, heu, jam multi sunt haeretici, idcirco, ad laudem Dei et cautelam fidelium, ego frater Reinerius, olim haeresi – archa, nunc, Dei gratia, sacerdos in ordine Fratrum Praedicatorum, licet indignus, praesens Opusculum de haereticis compilavi. Reiner. de haeret. Praefat. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 298.

Praeterea dico, quod, in septemdecim annis, quibus, heu, conversatus sum cum eis, non vidi aliquem ex eis orare secreto seorsim ab aliis, aut ostendere se tristem de peccatis suis, seu lachrymari, vel percutere pectus suum. Ibid. c. 6. p. 303.

The third instance of uneasy reference to his apostasy is given above.

[30] Apud nos; says one of the Cathari, as his words are given uncontradictedly by Reinerius himself: Apud nos, rarus est vir vel femina, qui textum non sciat vulgariter recitare. Reiner. de haeret. c. 8. p. 307.

[31] The mischievous Paulicians seem to have amused themselves, perhaps not very wisely, with playing upon the voracious credulity of Peter Siculus in regard to their most absurdly pretended manichean belief in two independent Principles!

We are Christians, said they to Peter: you are Romans. You believe in the creator of the world: we believe in him concerning whom our Lord speaks in the Gospel; Ye have neither heard his voice, nor seen his shape. John 5:37.

Peter greedily interpreted their confessedly bantering language in his own way: and forthwith set them down as acknowledging their difference from the Romans to be; that they believed one God to be the Creator of the world, and another God to be the heavenly Father excluded from the administration of the world and ruling in eternity alone. Yet their bantering words, which he luckily gives us as well as his own comment upon them, really import nothing more, than that he, whom the Romans worshipped as the creator of the world, was venerated by the Paulicians as that heavenly Father whose voice is not heard and whose shape is not discerned.

Hoc saepe licet in illis observare, quando, urbanitatis causa, cum aliquo liberiores facti, produnt libere, quisnam sit, qui cum illis sermocinetur. Age, dic, inquit, quid nos a Romanis secernit? – Vos creditis in mundi opificem: nos vero in illum, de quo in Evangeliis Dominus loquitur; Quoniam vocem ejus non audistis, neque speciem ejus vidistis.

These expressions of the bantering Paulicians Peter gravely interprets as an admission, that they held the manichean doctrine of two independent Principles!

Asserunt autem, sejunctionem suam a nobis in hoc consistere: quod ipsi quidem alium aiunt esse Deum, mundi conditorem; et alium, quem Patrem Coelestem vocitant, exclusum a mundi administratione, solaque in aeternitate dominantem. Pet. Sic. Hist. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 9. par. post. p. 33.
From what part of the words of the Paulician does Peter deduce his Asserunt?

[32] Quaesiti fidem, cum, de quibus suspecti videbantur, omnia prorsus SUO MORE negarent, examinati judicio aquae mendaces inventi sunt. Bernard. super Cant. serm. 66. Oper. p. 766.

[33] Mais la marque la plus certaine pour connoitre ces heretiques etoit le soin qu'ils avoient de se cacher, non-seulement en recevant les sacremens avec nous, mais encore en repondant comme nous, 1orsqu'on les pressoit sur la foi. Cetoit l'esprit de la secte des son commencement; et nous l'avons remarque des le temps de saint Augustin et de saint Leon. Pierre de Sicile, et apres lui Cedrenus, nous font voir le meme caractere dans les Pauliciens. Non-seulement ils nioient en general qu'ils fussent Manicheens; mais encore, interrogas en particulier de chaque dogme de la foi, ils paroissoient Catholiques en trahissant leurs sentimens par des mensonges manifestes, ou du moins en les deguisant par des equivoques pires que le mensonge, parce qu'elles etoient plus artificieuses et plus pleines d'hypocrisie. Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11:31.

CHAPTER 3

[1] According to the plan adopted by the Inquisitors of Languedoc, it was morally impossible for any of the accused Albigenses to escape. By the twenty-second canon of the Council of Narbonne, which sat in the year 1244 for the purpose of aiding and abetting the recently-established Holy Office of Holy Dominic in its project of exterminating the reputed heretics of Southern France, inquisitors (much, no doubt to their satisfaction) were forbidden to reveal the names of witnesses: by the twenty-fourth canon, it was enacted; that the testimony of infamous persons, of criminals, and of those who confessed themselves to have been accomplices, should be received in the process of the inquisition against the Albigenses: and, by the twenty-sixth canon, to make all sure, it was decreed; that he, who shall have been convicted by witnesses, or through any other proofs, shall henceforth be always reputed a heretic, even though he should deny the truth of the allegation. Hist. Gener. de Langued. par un Benedictin. livr. 25 Section 81. vol. 3. p. 445.

Deeply steeped in infamy as is the pontifical church, we can scarcely theorise a lower depth than this glaring and scandalous prostitution of justice. One benefit, however, may be said to result from it: for good occasionally springs even out of evil. No rational being can, by any conceivable possibility, believe a syllable of the tales of Manicheism related of the Albigenses, when those tales rest upon such a foundation as that which has been laid by the Council of Narbonne. For, in sooth, how stands the case? A man of infamous character charges an unoffending individual with Manicheism: the name of the wretch, who lays the accusation, is concealed: the accused, however, flatly denies the truth of the charge, avowing his firm belief in all the articles of the Christian faith: but still the charge, though in matters secular the word of the accuser would not be taken for a single farthing, is held to have been

fully established; and the accused shall be dealt with as a clearly convicted heretic. Such is the evidential basis, on which rests the pretended Manicheism of the Albigenses!

It must in all fairness be admitted: that, through their supreme contempt for the doubtless very miserable superstitions of popery, the Albigenses were, at times, sufficiently provoking to the romish clergy. Of this we have a whimsical instance given us, with most amusing simplicity, by that zealous heretic-hater, good Bishop Lucas of Tuy. The story, in brief, runs to the following effect: Through some ingenuity of management on the part of agents employed by the mischievous Albigenses, a fountain was found to work most surprising miracles, healing alike the blind and the halt, and ejecting demons from the persons of the possessed. Such a display must needs result from an adequate theological cause: and, through a continuation of the same management, it was soon discovered, that the bones of a sacred martyr and of a holy abbot rested, in the odor of sanctity, close to the wonder-working fountain. The whole country, sacerdotal as well as laic, was in a state of triumphant agitation: but the secret was far too good a secret to remain a secret. The laughter-loving Albigenses had contrived to deposit the remains of a condemned heretic and of an executed murderer, in the somewhat novel character of a catholic martyr and of a beatified abbot, near to the sacred fountain: and the bones of those two respectable individuals were found to be quite as efficacious in the performance of miracles, as the bones of the most approved saint in the pontifical calendar. From such premises, the logic of the Albigenses drew a most heterodox conclusion. They dared to hint, that popish miracles, as performed by the Hohenlohes of the day, were not a whit better than those which they themselves had got up. Quid plura? Says honest Lucas. Quod callide fecerant quibusdam detegentes, haeretici deridebant Fidem Catholicam: et, simili artijficio fieri miracula in Ecclesia coram Sanctorum corporibus, affirmabant. Unluckily, this albigensic argumentum ad hominem was not unsuccessful; for Lucas goes on to say; Non defuerunt aliqui, qui crederent illis, quibus profana consilia revelaverant, et in haeresin laberentur. But the progress of the malady was soon stopped by a judicious application of the regular popish medicine, for such eases had and provided. After an appeal to heaven somewhat on the plan of that of Elijah and the Baalites, which, Lucas assures us, was eminently successful, in despite of the blast of a trumpet credibly said to have been sounded by Lucifer himself: a simple deacon, fervent in the faith, effectually settled the entire controversy, in the good old way of persecution. The moral of the whole, as summed up by the Prelate of Tuy, runs thus: Haec idcirco scripsi, ut ab astuta calliditate haereticorum fideles caveant: quia multae sunt eoram insidiae, quibus intendunt, pervertere fidem Christi. Luc. Tudens. adv. Albig. lib. 3. c. 9, 10. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 280, 281.

[2] Rarus est doctor inter eos, says one of these heretics, qui tria capitula continuata Novi Testamenti literaliter sciat corde. Apud nos vero rarus est, vel vir vel femina, qui textum non sciat vulgariter recitare: et, quia veram fidem Christi habemus, et sanctam vitam et doctrinam docemus omnes nos; ideo Scribae et Pharisaei gratis persequuntur nos ad mortem, ut Christum. Reiner. de haeret, c. 8. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 307.

[3] Indueunt illud, quod dicitur Matthew 15:13: Omnis plantatio, quam non plantavit Pater meus coelestis, eradicabitur. Ergo aliqua plantatio est, quam Pater Jesu Christi non plantavit: et ita Diabolus plantavit illam: et ita Diabolus est creator vel factor creaturarum. Monet. adv. Cathar. et Valdens. lib. 1. c. 1. Section 2. p. 11.

Ad idem inducunt illud, quod legitur Joan. 1:12. Quotquot autem receperunt eum, dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri: qui, non sanguinibus, neque in voluntate carnis, neque ex voluntate viri, sed ex Deo, nati sunt. Illi ergo tantum sunt filii Dei, qui non sunt nati ex sanguinibus. Sed homo exterior ex duobus

sanguinibus natus est. Ergo homo exterior non est ex Deo natus; et, ita, a Diabolo. Ergo Diabolus est creator vel factor carnis. Ibid. p. 12.

Ad idem inducunt illud, quod legitur Joan. 8. 44. Vos ex patre Diabolo estis, et desideria patris vestri vultis facere. Diabolus erat pater illorum. Ergo creavit eos: et ita iterum ut prius. Ibid. p. 13. Ad idem objiciunt illud Joan. 14. 30. Venit Princeps mundi hujus: et in me non habet quidquam. Si Princeps, ergo creator vel factor creaturarum. Ibid. p. 14, 15.

Ad idem objiciunt illud Joan. 18. 36. Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo. Ergo mundus iste non est a Deo creatus vel factus. Ibid. p. 15. Ad idem illud Romans 8:8. Qui autem in carne sunt, Deo placere non possunt. Ex quo innuitur, quod caro sit mala: et, ita, creator vel factor malus. Ibid. p. 17.

In this way, throughout his large work, does Moneta represent the Albigenses themselves as arguing: and then does he gravely confute the arguments, which he puts into their mouths, and which he never could have heard them advance because (by the standing attestation of their very enemies) they constantly denied that they were Manicheans, and constantly rejected the tenets of Manicheism.

[4] Quidam Cathari credunt eam coelestem; et ipsum Christum, indutum illa carne, intrasse in Mariam, et cum ipsa de ea exivisse. Illud autem volunt habere ex illo verbo Joan. 6:51, ubi Christus ait: Ego sum panis vivus, qui de coelo descendi. Monet. adv. Cathar. et Vald. lib. 3. c. 3 Section 4. p. 246.

Est et alia aliorum Catharorum: – qui dicunt, quod Christus in ea, non de ea materialiter, carnem assumpsit hujus massae carnalis, quia eam credunt a Diabolo fabricatam. Dicunt enim quod non habuit vere corpus humanum, sed phantasticum; id est, quod apparebat nostrae naturae: et ex hoc oportet eos dicere, quod non fuit vere homo; id est, ejusdem speciei nobiscum. Dicunt ergo, quod corpus spirituale accepit operatione Spiritus Sancti, ex alia materia fabricatum: quo corpore mediante, Filius Dei Jesus Christus videbatur a conversantibus cum eo. – Quandoque autem, se spirituale corpus habere ostendebat, cum ambulabat super mare, ut habetur Matthew 14:25. Et, Luc. 4:29, 30. Et surrexerunt: ipse autem, transiens per medium illorum, ibat; qui eum inde praecipitare volebant, sed eum comprehendere non poterant. Ibid. p. 247, 248.

[5] Ad idem inducunt illud Act. 1:5. Joannes quidem baptizavit aqua; vos autem baptizabimini Spiritu Sancto, non post multos hos dies. Ecce, quod, in baptismo aquae, non dabatur Spiritus Sanctus. Monet. adv. Cathar, et Vald. lib. 4. c. 1 Section 11. p. 282.

Ad idem inducunt illud testimonium Marc. 16:16. Qui credideret, et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit: qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur. Parvulus ergo non credit. Ergo condemnabitur. Ibid. 4. Section p. 283. Negant etiam omnia sacramenta Ecclesiae Romanae, – Matrimonium. Ibid. lib. 1. c. 1. p. 5.

Ad probandum autem matrimonium esse illicitum inducunt illud Matthew 5:27, 28. Audistis quod dictum est antiquis, non maechaberis. Ego autem dico vobis, quia omnis, qui viderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam, jam maechatus est eam in corde suo. Sed ille, qui habet uxorem, videt mulierem ad concupiscendum eam. Ergo ipse moechatus est. Ibid. lib. 4. c. 7 Section 1. p. 315. Item. Luc. 20:34, 35, habetur. Filii hujus saeculi nubunt et traduntur ad nuptias. Illi vero, qui digni habebuntur saeculo illo et resurrectione ex mortuis, neque nubunt, neque ducunt uxores. Dicit haereticus: vide, quod ista verba, nubunt et ducunt uxores, praesentis temporis sunt: ille ergo, qui volunt esse digni futura gloria, in praesenti non debent nubere. Ibid. p. 319.

[6] Est autem opinio eorum detestanda: dicunt enim, quod panis non transubstantiatur in corpus Christi, nec vinum in sanguinem ipsius. Cujus opinionis causa prima est: quia istum materialem panem et

vinum mala esse dicunt, asserunt enim quidam eorum a Diabolo creata esse. Alii vero, facta esse a terra, unde hujusmodi cibaria oriuntur. Monet. adv. Cathar. et Valdens. lib. 4. c. 3 Section 1. p. 295. Alii autem aliter intelligunt illa verba Domini: Hoc est corpus meum. Id est, significat: sicut habetur 1 Corinthians 10:4, Petra autem erat Christus; id est, significabat Christum. Ibid. p. 296. Nemo ex eis credit, quod ex illo pane conficiatur Christi corpus. Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. p. 303.

[7] Impugnant imagines Ecclesiae et crucis adorationem. Monet. adv. Cath. et Vald. lib. 1. c. 1. p. 5. Nunquam etiam implorant patrocinium Angelorum, vel Sanctorum, seu Beatae Virginis: neque se muniunt, signo crucis. Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. p. 303.

[8] Credunt etiam, quod Satan, a Michaele dejectus de coelo, animas praedictas corporibus istis veluti carceribus inclusit et quotidie includit. Monet. adv. Cathar. et Vald. lib. 1. c. 1. p. 4. See also Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. p. 304. The passage is cited above, book 2. chap. 2. 3 Section 1. (5.)

[9] Omnes Cathari negant carnis resurrectionem futuram. Reiner, de haeret. c. 6. p. 302. Isti negant horum omnium corporum resurrectionem, ponentes resurrectionem esse corporum coelestium, de quibus jam locuti sumus. Monet. adv. Cathar. et Vald. lib. 1. c. 1. p. 5.

Thus speaks Moneta in his exordium. In a subsequent part of his Work, he notices the texts by which they demonstrated, that We are buried a carnal body, and rise again a spiritual body: and then, from such their demonstration, he clearly, at great length, shows them to have been truculent Manicheans. Ibid. lib. 4. c. 7 Section 1. p. 346-353.

[10] Isti negant liberum arbitrium. Monet. adv. Cathar. et Vald. lib. 1. c. 1. p.5.

Ad idem inducunt illam auctoritatem quae habetur Romans 7:15. Non enim quod volo BONUM, hoc ago: sed, quod odi MALUM, illud facio. Facit ergo homo, qui de bona creatione est, malum invitus. Ergo non habet liberum arbitrium ad malum. Ibid. lib. 1. c. 5 Section 1. p. 65.,br> I have thus largely used the Work of Moneta, because I never met with a book which more completely illustrates the principle adopted throughout the present chapter. Like his commentator and editor Richini after him, he seems, first, to have diligently raked up, from the old heresiographers, all the peculiarities of ancient Manicheism; next, to have saddled them upon the Cathari, with a reference to the alleged arguments of the heretics from particular texts of Scripture; and, then, to have triumphantly refuted those arguments, under the aspect of their being genuine specimens of catharistic reasoning. Meanwhile, the Cathari themselves, like their predecessors the Paulicians, instead of arguing in favor of Manicheism, constantly, by the very admission of their enemies, denied that they were Manicheans, and professed their steady adherence to the Symbols or Creeds of the Catholic Church. Moneta flourished about the year 1230. Hence he was a contemporary of Reinerius.

[11] Regem adoravit; non lignum utique, quia hic gentilis est error et vanitas impiorum: sed adoravit illum, qui pependit in ligno. Ambros. de obit. Theodos. Imperat. Oper. Col. 498.

To a popish bigot such language as this would have afforded quite sufficient proof, that the Albigenses were Manicheans who trampled upon the Cross and who renounced the Savior.
[12] Bossuet, as if internally distrusting his uncomely array of witnesses, would attempt to mend their credit by alleging: that, while they regularly bring a charge of Manicheism against the Albigenses, they never bring any such charge against the Valdenses for whom they cannot be supposed to have entertained much greater affection. Whence it must be inferred, that a charge, so strictly discriminating, could not but have rested on a solid foundation. Hist. des Variat. Livr. 11:51.

To this argument of the ingenious and acute Prelate, whose sagacity never overlooks even an apparent advantage, the preceding statement of the GROUNDS of the charge of Manicheism against the A1bigenses affords, I trust, a full and sufficient reply.

The enemies of the Albigenses had it in their power to make out a plausible case against that body of religionists: because they were known to be the theological descendants of the Paulicians, whose ancestors had, in a great measure, been Manicheans, though, in truth, they themselves were converts from Mauicheism to the pure truths of their confessedly unadulterated copies of the New Testament. But the equal enemies of the Valdenses could make out no such case against them: for they had no connection with the Paulicians; and they had never migrated westward out of Armenia and Bulgaria. Consequently, had their enemies attempted any such calumny, the very notoriousness of the falsehood would have forthwith defeated its own purpose. The Romish Priests, verily, were not such bunglers in their calling as to charge the Valdenses with Manicheism. Thus the Monk of Vaux-Sernay, after triumphantly relating the most absurd and incredible tales respecting the Albigenses, immediately alters his tone when he comes to speak of the French Valdenses; who, nevertheless, were mingled with the Albigenses throughout Languedoc; and who, as evidently appears from the records of the day (particularly, I may remark, from the account of the famous conference at Montreal), were in strict amity and communion with them.

There were many other heretics besides the Albigenses, says this veracious writer, who were called Valdenses from a certain Lyonese named Valdensfis. These were bad: but, in comparison of the others, they were far less perverse; for, on several points, they agreed with us. Petr. Vallisarnens. Hist. Albig. c. 3.

CHAPTER 4

[1] I subjoin Bossuet's statement of the matter: because, as we proceed, a reference to it may be found not altogether useless. Its scantiness of correct information affords to the Bishop ample room for a redundancy of illustration.

Il est constant, que l'heresie manicheenne jeta de profondes racines dans la Bulgarie: et c'est de la, qu'elle se repandit bientot apres dans le reste de l'Europe; qui fit donner, comme nous verrons, le nom de Bulgares aux sectateurs de cette heresie.

Mille ans s'etoient ecoules depuis la naissance de Jesus-Christ: et le prodigieux relachement de la discipline menacoit l'Eglise d'Occident de quelque malheur extraordinaire. C'etoit peut-etre aussi le temps de ce terrible dechainement de Satan, marque dans l'Apocalypse, apres mille ans; ce qui peut signifier d'extremes desordres: mille ans apres que le fort arme, c'est-a-dire le demon victorieux, fut lie par Jesus-Christ venant au monde. Quoi qu'il en soit, dans ce temps et en 1017, sous le roi Robert, on decouvrit a Orleans des heretiques d'une doctrine qu'on ne connoissoit plus il y avoit long-temps parmi les Latins.

Une femme italienne avoit apporte, en France cette damnable heresie. Deux chanoines d'Orleans, l'un nomme Etienne ou Heribert, et l'autre nomme Lisoius, qui etoient en reputation, furent les premiers seduits. On eut beaucoup de peine a decouvrir leur secret. Mais enfin un Arifaste, qui soupconna ce que cetoit, s'etant introduit dans leur familiarite, ces heretiques et leurs sectateurs confesserent avec beaucoup de peine qu'ils nioient la chair humaine en Jesus-Christ; qu'ils ne croyoyent pas que la

remissione des peches fut donnee dans le Bapteme, ni que le pain et le vin pussent etre changes au corps et au sang de Jesus-Christ. On decouvrit, qu'ils avoient une Eucharistie particuliere, qu'ils appeloient la viande ce1este. Elle etoit cruelle et abominable, et tout-a-fait du genie des Manicheens quoiqu'on ne la trouve pas dans les anciens. Mais outre ce qu'on en vit a Orleans, Gui de Nogent la remarque encore en d'autres pays. Il ne faut pas s'etonner, qu'on trouve de nouveaux prodiges dans un secte si cachee, soit qu'elle les invente, ou qu'on les y decouvre de nouveau.

Voila de vrais caracteres de Manicheisme. On a vu, que ces heretiques rejetoient l'Incarnation. Pour le Bapteme, saint Augustin dit expressement, que les Manicheens ne le donnoient pas, et le croyoient inutile. Pierre de Sicile, et apres lui Cedrenus, nous apprennent la meme chose des Pauliciens: tous ensemble nous font voir que, les Manicheens avoient une autre Eucharistie que la notre. Ce que disoient les heretiques d'Orleans, qu'il ne fallait pas implorer le secours des saints, etait encore de meme caractere, et venoit, comme on a vu, de l'ancienne source de cette secte.

Ils ne dirent rien ouvertement des deux principes: mais ils parlerent avec mepris de la creation et des livres ou elle etoit ecrite. Cela regardoit l'Aucient Testament: et ils confesserent dans le supplice, qu'ils avoient eu de mauvais sentimens sur le Seigneur de l'Univers. Le lecteur se souvient bien, que c'est celui que les Manicheens croyoient mauvais. Ils allerent au feu avec joie, dans l'esperance d'en etre miraculeusement delivres: taut l'esprit de seduction agissoit en eux. Au reste, c'est ici le premier exemple d'une semblable condamnation. On sait, que les lois romaines condemnoient a mort les Manicheens: le saint roi Robert les jugea dignes du feu. Bossuet. Hist. des V ariat, livr. 11 Section 16-20.

Such is the history which Bossuet gives of the Canons of Orleans: and, in his margin, he barely refers to the Acts of the Council of Orleans and to the History of Rodulphus Ginbet. But, while he thus treats his unsuspecting readers with nothing beyond a meagre reference for the authority on which he gives his narrative, he cautiously abstains from saying a syilable, as to the essential discrepances in the two accounts to which he refers. On the contrary, he makes up a very plausible and very respectable tale of his own out of the two, suppressing every incredible circumstance and every palpable absurdity which might shake its credit, preserving a profound silence as to the recorded language of the prisoners themselves which is totally incompatible with the idle figment of their Manicheism, and omitting the important fact that the examination was made with closed doors, and that we know nothing of the pretended confession of the accused, save what we have received from their interested enemies. That Bossuet himself had read the two jarring accounts to which he refers, and therefore that he could not have sinned from ignorance, is evident: because, in his garbled amalgamated statement, he says; that one of the Canons was called Stephen OR Heribert. The fact is: that one account gives this person the one name; and the other account, the other name.

[2] Tertio de vicesimo, infra jam dictum millesimum, anno, reperta est, apud praefatam Aurelianensem urbem, cruda nimium atque insolens haeresis: quae, scilicet, diutius occulte germinata, in perditionis segetem male pullulans, plures in suae coecitatis praecipitavit laqueum. Fertur namque, a muliere quadam ex Italia procedente, haec insanissima haeresis in Galliis habuisse exordium: quae, ut erat diabolo plena, seducebat quoscumque volebat non solum idiotas et simplices, verum etiam plerosque qui videbantur doctiores in clericorum ordine. Quae, scilicet, veniens in civitatem Aurelianensem, dum moraretur per aliquot spatium temporis, veneno suae nequitiae plures infecit. – Fuerunt nempe hujus perversi dogmatis haeresiarchae duo (heu proh dolor), qui in civitate putabantur genere ac scientia valentiores in Clero: quorum unus Heribertus, alter Lisoius, dicebatur. – Qui, non solum in praedicta

urbe, sed, etiam in vicinis urbibus, malignum dogma spargere tentabant: dum quendam sanae mentis in Rothomagorum civitate presbyterum cupientes suae consortem facere vesaniae, missis legatis, qui et omne secretum hujus perversi dogmatis explanantes docerent. Dicebant nempe, fore in proximum, in illorum scilicet dogma populum cadere universum.

Quibus compertis, presbyter sollicite perrexit ad christianissireurn Comitem ejus civitatis Richardum: exposuit ei omnem rei, ut compererat, ordinem. Qui, videlicet, Comes protinus misit celeriter ad Regem, palam ei faciens clandestinam in regno proprio Christi ovium pestem. Ut autem cognovit Rex, scilicet Robertus, – moerens nimium effectus est. – Idcirco, quantocyus Aurelianos properans, convocatis plurimis episcopis et abbatibus ac religiosis quibusque laicis, acerrime coepit perscrutari, qui essent auctores hujus perversi dogmatis. Facta igitur perscrutatione inter Clericos, quomodo unusquisque sentiret et crederet ea, quae Fides Catholica per doctrinam apostolicam incommutabiliter servat et praedicat: iili duo, videlicet Lisoius et Heribertus, statim se aliter sentire non negantes, quales diu latuerunt, manifestarunt. Deinde vero plures post illos se parti istorum profitebantur haerere, nec ulla ratione se posse affirmabant ab illorum segregare consortio.

Quibus compertis, tam Rex quam Pontifices, tristiores effecti, interrogaverunt illos secretius, utpote viros hactenus in omni morum probitate perutilissimos; quorum unus Lisoius, – alter Heribertus. – Qui dum interrogati fuissent, a quo, vel unde, eis ista praesumptio accidisset, hujusmodi dederunt responsum: Hoc enim diu est, quod sectam, quam vos jam tarde agnoscitis, amplectimur; sed tam vos, quam caeteros, cujuscunque legis vel ordinis, in eam cadere expectavimus: quod etiam adhuc fore credimus.

His dictis, continuo, palam exposuerunt omnium antiquarum stultissimam ac miserrimam nempe sui deceptricem haeresim. Dicebant ergo, deliramenta esse, quicquid, in Veteri ac Novo Canone, – de trina unaque Deitate, beata confirmat auctoritas. Coelum pariter ac terram, ut conspiciuntur, absque auctore initii, semper extitisse, asserebant. – Omne Christianorum opus, pietatis duntaxat et justitiae, quod aestimatur pretium remunerationis aeternoc, laborem superfluum judicabant esse. - Dictum est eis, quoniam, nisi celerius ad sanam fidei mentem redeant, Regis jussu, et universae plebis consensu, igne essent protinus cremandi. - Cernens quoque Rex et universi qui aderant, minus posse illos revocari ab insania, jussit accendi non longe a civitate ignem permaximum, ut, vel eo forte territi, a sua malignitate desinerent. Ad quem cum ducerentur, rabida adacti dementia, se omnimodis hoc velle proclamabant, ac sese ultro ad ignem trahentibus inferebant. Quibus ad ultimum numero tredecim igni traditis, cum jam coepissent acrius aduri, coeperunt, voce qua poterant, ex eodem igne clamare; se, pessime deceptos arte diabolica, nuper de universorum Deo ac Domino male sensisse; et, ob hanc ab iisdem illatam ei blasphemiam, illos temporali atque aeterna ultione torqueri. His vero, plures e circumstantibus, auditis, humanitatis pierate permoti, accedentes, ut vel semivivos ab igne eriperent, minime valuerunt; quoniam, vindice flamma consumente illos, continuo in pulverem fuerunt redacti. Si qui vero postmodum hujus perversitatis sectatores fuerunt reperti, simili ultionis vindicta ubique fuerunt perditi. Rodulph. Glab. Hist. lib. 3. c. 8. in Baron. Annal. ad A. D. 1017. vol. 11. col. 61, 62, 63.

[3] Alanus Magnus, as we have seen above, determines, with laudable precision, the favored Bestiola, which was specially selected as the vehicle of Lucifer, to have been a catus or male cat.

[4] A divinitate devia. I can only understand the word divinitas, as here used, to be a sort of low latin translation of the greek qeolo>gia. We have adopted the term divinity into our own language, precisely in the same sense.

[5] Rursum quoque duxi dignum memoriae tradendum de praefato viro, scilicet Arefasto, quomodo, in Aureliana urbe, divina ope, suique ingenii salubri acumine, haereticam pravitatera, latenter pullulantem, jamjamque per Galliarum provincias nefandi erroris venena exitialia propinantem, non solum deprehenderit, sed etiam omnino compresserit.

Hic, in domo sua, quendam clericum habuisse dicitur, nomine Herbertum: qui, leetionis gratia, Aurelianam urbem adire decreverat. Vetum, dum veritatis auctores quaerere satageret, coeco itinere in totius haeresis barathro dilabitur. Nam, ea tempestate, in eadem civitate, duo clerici, Stephanus et Lisoius, apud omnes sapientia clari, sanctitate seu religione magnifici, eleemosynis largi, opinione habebantur vulgi. Eosdem memo-ratus expetiit clericus, et, parvo temporis interstitio, docilis discipulus cum divini verbi dulcedine ab eis debriatur, mortifero nequitiae haustu: qui, dementia et errore diabolico irretitus, totius divinitatis expers, sapientiae arcem conscendisse se credidit. Qui, patriam repetens, dominum suum, quem singulari affectu diligebat, subtilitate verborum in erroris viam sensim admovendo, secum attrahere cupiebat; testificans Aurelianam urbem, prae caeteris urbibus, coruseare luce sapientiae atque sanctitatis lampade. In cujus verbis, dominus ejus, intellectuali auditu, ipsum animadvertit a via justitiae devium; et cito Comiti Richardo causam innotuit, atque rogavit, ut Rodberto Regi, litteris, pestem in regno ejus adhuc latitantem, antequam propagaretur, patefaceret, et ut Rex eidem Arefasto ad expellendam eam opportunum auxilium non denegaret. Igitur, Aurelianis deveniens, uti edoctus fuerat, quotidie sacra communione ac supplici oratione munitus, ad eorum doctrinam veniens, ad instar rudis discipuli, ultimus intra domum erroneorum adsidebat.

At ille, de omni verbo quod proferebant, semper Deo gratias referebat: unde rati sunt eum conversum esse in eorum errorem; jamque suae nequitia sentinam, verbis divinorum librorum, ante coopertam, securi aperiunt, dicentes: Christum de Virgine Maria non esse natum, neque pro hominibus passum, neque vere in sepulchro positum, nec a mortuis resurrexisse: addentes, In baptismo nullam esse scelerum ablutionem, neque sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi in consecratione sacerdotis. Sanctos Martyres atque Confessores implorare, pro nihilo ducebant.

Cumque haec et alia execranda perditi et miserrimi homines a foetido pectore evomerent, Arefastus sic ad eos dixisse fertur: Si, in his quae enumerastis, salus hominum, quae speratur, nulla, ut dicitis, esse potest; a vobis obnixe rogo, mihi aperire in quibus sperari poterit, ne meus animus, in dubio positus, cito cadat in desperationis ruinam. Proculdubio, frater, inquiunt, in charybdi falsae opinionis hactenus cum indoctis jacuisti: nunc vero, erectus in culmine totius veritatis, integrae mentis oculos ad lucem verae fidei aperire coepisti. Pandemus tibi salutis ostium, quo ingressus, per impositionem videlicet manuum nostrarum, ab omni peccati labe mundaberis, atque Sancti Spiritus dono repleberis. – Deinde, coelesti cibo pastus, – videbis persaepe nobiscum visiones angelicas. Sed, antequam ad conflictum veniamus, de cibo illo, qui coelestis ab illis dicebatur, quali arte conficiebatur, nescientibus demonstrare curabo.

Congrebabantur, siquidem, certis noctibus in domo denominata, singuli, lucernas tenentes in manibus; et, ad instar letaniae, daemonum nomina declamabant: donec subito daemonem, in similitudine cujuslibet bestiolae, inter eos viderent descendere. Qui, statim ut visibilis illa videbatur visio, omnibus extinctis luminaribus, quamprimum quisque poterat, mulierem, quae ad manum sibi veniebat, ad abutendum arripiebat, sine peccati respectu: et, utrum mater, aut soror, aut monacha, haberetur, pro sanctitate et religione ejus concubitus ab illis aestimabatur. Ex quo spurcissimo concubitu infans generatus, octava die, in medio eorum copioso igne accenso, piebatur per ignem more antiquorum

paganorum, et sic in igne cremabatur. Cujus cinis tanta veneratione colligebatur atque custodiebatur, ut christiana religiositas Corpus Christi custodire solet aegris dandum de hoc solo exituris ad viaticum. Inerat enim tanta vis diabolicae fraudis in ipso cinere, ut quicumque de praefata haeresi imbutus fuisset, et de eodem cinere quamvissumendo parum praelibavisset, vix umquam postea de eadem haeresi gressum mentis ad viam veritatis dirigere valeret.

Igitur, illis introductis ante Regem et Episcoporum conventum Arefastus ait: – Docuistis equidem me nullam in baptisto promereri veniam peccatorum, neque Christum de Virgine esse natum, neque pro hominibus passum, neque vere sepultum, neque a mortuis resurrexisse, neque panem et vinum, quod super altare manibus sacerdotum Sancti Spiritus operatione effici videtur sacramentum, converti posse in corpore et sanguine Christi.

Cumque haec Arefastus viva vote perorasset, Guarinus Belvacensis Praesul interrogavit Stephanum et Lisoium, qui hujus erroris videbantur esse magistri, si ita sentirent et crederent quae ab Arefasto erant memorata.

At illi, cum diabolo in inferno jam mansionem paratam habentes, vera esse memorata, et ita se sentire ac credere, constanter adserunt. Ista illis narrare potes qui terrena sapiunt, atque credunt figmenta carnalium hominum scripta in membranis animalium: nobis autem, qui legem scriptam habemus in interiore homine a Spiritu Sancto, et nihil aliud sapimus, nisi quod a Deo omnium Conditore didicimus, incassum superflua et a divinitate devia profers. Idcirco, verbis finem impone: et, de nobis, quicquid velis, facito. Jam Regem nostrum, in coelestibus regnantem, videmus: qui, ad immortales triumphos, dextera sua, nos sublevat: dans superna gaudia.

Cumque, ab hora diei prima usque ad horam nonam, multifariam elaborarent omnes, ut illos a suo errore revocarent; et ipsi, ferro duriores, minime resipiscerent: jussi sunt singuli sacris vestibus indui in suo ordine, statimque ab Antistibus a proprio honore sunt depositi. Et, Rege jubente, Constantia Regina ante valvas basilicae stetit, ne populus eos intra ecclesiam interficeret. Et sic, de gremio Sanctae Ecclesiae, ejecti sunt. Qui cum ejicerentur, Regina, Stephani, sui olim confessoris, cum baculo, oculum eruit. Deinde, extra civitatis educti muros, in quodam tuguriolo copioso igne accenso, praeter unum clericum atque unam monacham, cum nefario pulvere de quo supra diximus, cremati sunt. Gest. Synod. Aurelian, A. D. 1017. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 2. p. 670-676.

[6] Eo tempore, decem ex Canonicis Sanctae Crucis Aurelianis probati sunt esse Manichaei: quos Rex Robertus, cum nollent ad catholicam converti fidem, igne cremari jussit. Simili modo, apud Tholosam, inventi sunt Manichaei: et ipsi igne cremati sunt. Et, per diversas Occidentis partes, Manichaei exorti, per latibula sese occultare coeperunt, decipientes quoscunque poterant. Hist. Aquitan. Fragment. in Baron. Annal. ad A. D. 1017. vol. 9. col. 63.

[7] Volo vos interea scire de haeresi, quae, die Sanctorum Innocentium, fuit in Aurelianensi civitate: nam verum fuit, si aliquid audistis. Fecit Rex Robertus vivos ardere, de melioribus Clericis sive de nobilioribus Laicis, prope quatuordecim ejusdem civitatis: qui, Deo odibiles, perosique coelo et terrae, abnegando abnegabant, sacri baptismi gratiam, dominici quoque corporis et sanguinis consecrationem. Cum hoc, post perpetrata scelera vitiorum, negabant posse recipi veniam peccatorum. Enim vero, cum his assertionibus, nuptiis detrahebant: a cibis, etiam, quos Deus creavit et adipi, tanquam ab immunditiis, abstinebant. Joan. Floriac. Epist. ad Oliv. Auson. in Masson. Annal. Franc. lib. 3. apud Usser. de Eccles. Succes. c. 8 Section 21.

[8] From the brutal rage of this woman against her former Confessor Stephen or Heribert, I suspect, that, in the spirit of the martyred Baptist, a new Herodias had been admonished of her evil ways, too solemnly and too faithfully, ever to forget or to forgive what was felt as an injury and an insult. Constance is described as a woman of extraordinary beauty, but of conduct the reverse of gravity and simplicity and modesty. Hugh de Beauvais, Count Palatine and Prime Minister, enjoyed the confidence of his master: and to him the King communicated the anxiety and uneasiness which he experienced from the impropriety of his wife's conduct. This was sufficient to make that nobleman an object of her hatred and revenge. She, accordingly, had him assassinated in the presence of her husband, who, in vain, endeavored to save the life of his favorite. Gifford's Hist. of France, vol. 1. p. 274.

Now Heribert had been the Confessor of Constance: but, before his martyrdom, he had ceased to be her Confessor. Hence it is evident, that he had been dismissed from his situation. The cause of his dismission and of her hatred may, from her character, be easily divined. It is lamentable to note the rapid historical carelessness, with which Mr. Gifford adopts the wretched figments of popish writers respecting the martyrs of Orleans. Swallowing, without either hesitation or discrimination, the Crambe recocta of pagan calumnies which equally fitted the case of the primitive Christians and of the more modern Albigenses, this author speaks of such men as Heribert and Lisoye under the title of leaders of a voluptuous sect. Verily, a voluptuous Confessor would have been quite secure from the hatred of a voluptuous Queen. Such an Ecclesiastic would not have merited and obtained the mh~niv of Constance.

[9] Voce qua porerant.

[10] If we could smile in the midst of romish horrors, there is certainly something not a little amusing in the even-handed justice, dealt out by the Papacy, to the persecuted Cathari on the one side, and to the persecuting Inquisitors on the other side.

When, on the score of his religion, a Catharus was put to death: nothing could be more laudable and more equitable and more meritorious than such a procedure on the part of his butchers. But, should an Inquisitor, in the discharge of his humane and highly christian duty, happen, through the resistance of worn-out patience, to be unluckily slain: as all undoubted saint and martyr, he was forthwith canonized. Such, for instance, was the appropriate mode, in which the blessed Peter of Verona obtained, in the thirteenth century, his regular patent of celestial nobility.

Beatus Petrus Veronensis ex Ordine Fratrum Praedicatorum, prosequendo inquisitionem pravitatis haereticae sibi ab Apostolica Sede commissam, ab ipsorum haereticorum Credentibus, inter Cumas (ubi Fratrum suorum Prior erat) et Mediolanum occisus, martyrio coronatur. In cujus canonizationis literis quae eodem anno facta est Perusii, testatur Papa Innocentius, ipsum fere annos triginta vixisse in Ordine fultum caterva virtutum; virginitatis etiam florem illibatum servasse, nulliusque mortalis criminis unquam sensisse contagium, suorum probatum testimonio Confessorum: cujus religiosa sanctitas, crebris et in vita et in morte miraculis, noscitur claruisse. Nicol. Trivett. Chron. in A. D. 1252. Of course, the torturing and murdering of a Catharus, so far from being a mortal sin, was an indisputable merit.

The Blessed Peter's Preaching Friars certainly showed some ingenuity in beating up for recruits to their ghostly regiment: a specimen of which is, by Nicolas Trivett, carefully handed down to the due admiration of all succeeding ages.

A Scholar of Bologna, who had been not quite so correct a liver as might have been desirable, dreamed, that he was suddenly, in the midst of a vast plain, caught by a tempest. Thus distressed, he knocked at the door of a house for admittance, lain Justice, said the Mistress thereof: and I cannot, with any regard to my consistency of character, take in such a notorious rogue as your worship.

He knocked at a second door, I am Truth, quoth the tenant: and we have no lodgings here for liars. A third door was tried. I am Peace: and I harbor no swaggering gallants and ruling swashbucklers. But perhaps my sister, who lives at the next door, may take you in.

Thus admonished, the Scholar made a fourth trial. I am Mercy, said the sister of Peace: and the best direction, which I can give you, is this. Go your ways to St. Nicolas, where the Preaching Friars live: and there you shall find, a stable of penance, and a manger of continence, and a belly-full of doctrine, and an ass of simplicity, and an ox of discretion, and Mary illuminating, and Joseph profiting, and the child Jesus saving thee.

Devoutly, when he awoke, ruminating on these matters, and filled with compunction for the crop of wild oats which he had sown, he lost no time in obeying the behests of his dream. And thus, to the confusion of all heretics, was added a Holy Brother to the Order of Preaching Friars. Nicol. Trivett. Chron. in A. D. 1238.

[11] These are duly enumerated by Reinerius, as they were subsisting in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.
Ecclesia Albanensis vel de Sensano; Ecclesia de Contorezo; Ecclesia Bagnolensium sive de Bagnolo; Ecclesia Vicentina vel de Marchia; Ecclesia Florentina; Ecclesia de Valle Spoletana. – Albanenses morantur Veronae et in pluribus civitatibus Lombardiae: et sunt numero fere quingenti, utriusque sexus. Illi autem de Contorezo sunt fere per totam Lombardiam: et sunt bene mille quingenti, vel etiam plures. Bagnolenses morantur in Mantua, Brixia, Bergomi, et in Comitatu Mediolanensium, sed pauci, et in Romaniola: et sunt fere ducenti. Ecclesia de Marchia nihil habet Veronae: sed sunt circiter centum et quinquaginta. Reiner. de haeret. c. 6 in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 304.

In Italy, as usual, and (I doubt not)with the very same measure of truth, the Paulicians or Cathad, during the Pontificate of Innocent III or at the beginning of the thirteenth century, were charged with Manicheism by the Inquisitor Nicolas Eymeric, who pretends to sum up their faith in fourteen several articles. Eymeric. Director. Inquisit. par. 2. quaest. 13. See Allix on the Anc. Church of Piedm. Chap. 15.

Twelve out of the fourteen articles are there given at length. Valeant quantum valere possunt.

CHAPTER 5

[1] Berengarius, novae heresis de corpore Domini auctor, eo tempore deficiens, abiit in locum suum: qui, licet eandem haeresin saepissime in Synodo abjuravit, ad vomitum tamen suum, canino more, non expavit redire. Nam, et in Romana Synodo canonice convictus, haeresin suam, in libro a se descriptam, combussit, et abjuratam anathematizavit: nec tamen postea dimisit. Bertold. in A. D. 1083. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 7 Section 34.

[2] Ita resipuit, ut, sine retractatione, a quibusdam sanctus habeatur. Gul. Malmes. de Gest. Anglor. Contin. lib. 3. c. 27. p. 342: sive, sub alio titulo, Gul. Malmes. de Gest. Reg. Anglor. lib. 3. fol. 63. Vide Nicol. Trivett. Chron. in A. D. 1136.

[3] Fuit eo tempore Berengarius Turonensis haeresiarcha, qui, panem et vinum in altari apposita, post consecrationem sacerdotis, verum et substantiale corpus Domini, sicut Sancta Ecclesia praedicat, esse denegabat. Jamque scatebat omnis Gallia ejus doctrina, per egenos scholares, quos ipse cotidiano stipe sollicitabat, disseminata: unde, soliditati catholicae timens, sanctae memoriae Leo Papa, Vercellis contra eum instituto concilio, tenebras nebulosi erroris, evangelicorum testimoniorum fulgure, depulit. Sed, cum, post obitum Leonis, virus haereseos, diu in sinibus quorundam nebulonum confotum, iterum erumperet: Hildebrandus, cum esset Archidiaconus Turonis, mox Papa, Romae adunatis conciliis convictum, ad dogmatis sui anathema compulit. – Porro, licet Berengarius primum calorem juventutis, aliquantarum haeresium defensione, infamaverit, aevo austeriore ita resipuit, ut, sine retractatione, a quibusdam sanctus habeatur, innumeris bonis maximeque humilitate et eleemosynis approbatus. Largarum possessionum, dispertiendo, dominus: non, abscondendo et adorando, famulus. Foeminiae venustatis adeo parcus, ut nullam conspectui suo pateretur admitti; ne formam videretur delibasse oculo, quam non pruriebat animo. Non aspernari pauperem: non adulari divitem. Secundum naturam vivere: habens victum et vestitum, juxta Apostolum, his contentus esse. Gul. Malmes. de Gest. Anglor. Cont. lib. 3. c. 27. p. 342: sive lib. 3. fol. 63.

Clandestinis colloquiis, primum imperitorum animos in suam sententiam traxit: tum egenos quosque scholares, praesertim theologiae studiosos, quotidiana stipe, cum opulentus esset, ita sollicitavit, ut, eorum opera, omnis pene Gallia ac vicinae gentes eo malo quam citissime laborarent. Alan. de Euchar. lib. 1. c. 21. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 7 Section 57.

Eodem tempore, Berengarius Turonensis, in haereticam prolapsus pravitatem, omnes Gallos, Italos, et Anglos, suis jam pene corruperat pravitatibus. Matt. Westmonast. Hist. Roffens. in A. D. 1087. apud Usser. Ibid.

Imprimis autem afficiebatur omnis Gallia ejus doctrina: siquidem, per egenos scholares, quos quotidianis stipendiis sustentabat, eandem passim divulgabat. Matt. Paris. Hist. Mag. ad A. D. 1087. apud Usser. Ibid.

[4] Berenger n'attaqua jamais que la presence reelle: et laissa tout le reste en son entier. Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11 Section 1.

[5] Damnatus est Berengarius eam ob fidem, quam nos, ut pure et perfecte evangelicam, sectamur. Quia, nimirum, realem corporis et sanguinis Christi praesentiam ex Eucharistia auferebat: tum etiam quia Ecclesiam Romanam, Ecclesiam Malignantium, Concilium Vanitatis, et Sedem Satanae, voeabat; et Leonem nonum, communi hominum opinione Pontificem bonum, immo sanctitate et miraculis (ut fertur) perinsignem, Pompificem et Pulpificem dictitabat, cum nec appellatione Pontificis aut Episcopi dignatus. Gul. Reginald. Calvino-Turcism. lib. 12. c. 5. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 7 Section 24.

[6] Primurn calorem juventutis, aliquantarum haeresium defensione, infamaverit. Gul. Malmes. de Gest. Anglor. Cont. lib. 3. c. 27. p. 342: sive lib. 3. fol. 63.

[7] Die Lunae, Octob. secundo, A. D. 1207, in oppido Montis Regalis prope Carcassonem in Comitatu Tolosano, habitum est memorabile colloquium, inter Episcopum Exovensem Hispanum qui a Papa missus fuerat cum S. Dominico et allis pluribus, et Arnaldum Hot Pastorem Albigensium appellatum,

qui ad haec tria expresse asserebat. Primo: Romanam Ecclesiam non esse Christi Sponsam, nec sanctam Ecclesiam; sed turbulentam, Satanoe doctrina institulam; adeoque Babylonem esse illam de qua in Apocalypsi loquitur B. Joannes, matrem fornicationum et abominationum, sanguine sanctorum, et martyrum Jesu Christi inebriatam. Secundo: Politiam illius non esse bonam neque sanctam, neque a Jesu Christo stabilitam. Tertio: Missam, eo modo quo celebratur hodie, non esse vel a Jesu Christo vel ab Apostolis ejus institutam. Vignier. Hist. Eccles. in A. D. 1207. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 10 Section 22.

Item sunt (doctores Romanae Ecclesiae) divites et avari, quibus dicitur: Vae vobis divitibus, qui habetis hic consolationem vestram. Nos vero, habentes victum et vestes quibus possumus tegi, his contenti sumus. Reiner. de haer. c. 8. p. 307.

[8] Praedicatum est evangelium in omnibus gentibus. Credidit mundus: facta est Ecclesia. Crevit, fructificavit: sed, imperitia male intelligentium, postea erravit et periit. In nobis solis, et in iis qui nos sequuntur, sancta in terris Ecclesia remansit. Lanfranc. Epist. 3. ad Alex. II. apud Baron. Annal. in A. D. 1072.

[9] Ecclesiam Romanam dicunt Meretricem. Unde, Domino Papae, et omnibus Episcopis, Sacerdotibus, et Clericis, catholicis, contradicunt: dicentes; Se Ecclesiam Dei, et illos mundi seductores. Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. p. 306.

CHAPTER 6

[1] Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11 Section 65-69.

[2] Dominis et Patribus, Magistris Ecclesiae Dei, Arelatensi, Ebredunensi, Archiepiscopis; Diensi et Wapicensi Episcopis; Frater Petrus humilis Cluniacensium Abbas, salutem et obsequium. Scripsi nuper epistolam reverentiae vestrae, contra haereses Petri de Bruis disputantem: sed, innumeris et magnis negotiis, a dictando animum, a scribendo stylum, retardentibus, huc usque mittere distuli. Mitto nunc tandem eam prudentiae vestrae, ut, per vos, haereticis contra quos scripta est, et etiam Catholicis quibus forsitan prodesse poterit, innotescat. Vobis etiam mitto, quoniam, in partibus vestris aut circa easdem, stulta illa et impia haeresis, more pestis validae, multos interfecit, plures infecit. Sed, gratia Dei concitante et adjuvante studia vestra, a vestris regionibus sese paululum removit. Migravit tamen, sicut audivi, ad loca satis vobis contigua: et, a Septimania vestra, vobis persequentibus, expulsa, in provincia Novempopulana, quae vulgo Gasconia vocatur, et in partibus ei adjacentibus, sibi foveas praeparavit: in quibus nunc se timore occultans, nunc de ipsis audacia assumpta prodiens, quos potest decipit, quos potest corrumpit; et, nunc istis, nunc illis, lethalia venena propinat. Vestrum est, igitur, ad quos praecipue, tam ex officio, quam ex singulari scientia, in partibus illis cura Ecclesiae Dei spectat, et quibus ipsa velut fortibus columnis maxime innititur: vestrum est, inquam, et, a locis illis in quibus se latibula invenisse gaudet, et praedicatione, et etiam (si necesse fuerit) vi armata per Laicos, exturbare. – Et, quia prima erronei dogmatis semina, a Petro de Bruis per viginti fere annos sata et aucta, quinque praecipua et venenata virgulta produxerunt: contra illa maxime, ut potui, egi. Petr. Cluniac. Tract. contra Petrobrusian. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 12. par. post. p. 206.

[3] Quia sanctis Ecclesiae doctoribus fidem praebere dedignamini, ad purissimum rivulorum omnium fontem mihi est revertendum: et, de Evangelicis, Apostolicis, seu Propheticis, dictis, testimonia, si tamen vel ista suscipitis, sunt proferenda. Videndum est, utrum hi, qui tantis orbis terrarum magistris

non cedunt, saltem Christo, Prophetis, vel Apostolis, adquiescant. Hoc ideo dico, quoniam, nec ipsi Christo, vel Prophetis, aut Apostolis, vos ex toto credere, fama vulgavit: ipsique majestati Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, quae jam ab antiquo totum orbem subdidit, vos detrahere, si tamen verum est, indicavit. Sed, quia fallaci rumorum monstro non facile assensum praebere debeo, maxime cum quidam vos totum divinum Canonem abjecisse affirment, alii quaedam ex ipso vos suscepisse contendant, culpare vos de incertis nolo; sed necessario totum Canonem, qui ab Ecclesia suscipitur, vos suscipere debere, certis auctoritatibus probo. Petr. Cluniac. Tract. cont. Petrobrus. p. 209.

[4] Post rogum Petri de Bruis, quo, apud Sanctum Egidium, zelus fidelium, flammas dominicae crucis ab eo succensas, eum concremando, ultus est; postquam plane impius ille, de igne ad ignem, de transeunte ad aeternum, transitum fecit: haeres nequitiae ejus Heinricus, cum nescio quibus aliis, doctrinam diabolicam non quidem emendavit, sed immutavit; et, sicut nuper in tomo, qui ab ore ejus exceptus dicebatur, non quinque tantum, sed plura, capitula edidit. Contra quae animus accenditur rursus agere, et verbis daemonicis, divinis sermonibus, obviare. Sed, quia eum ita sentire vel praedicare nondum mihi plene fides facta est, differo responsionem, quousque et horum, quae dicuntur, indubiam habeam certitudinem. Petr. Cluniac. Tract. cont. Petrobrus. p. 207.

[5] Si enim, quod omnes affirmant, Evangelium etiam tantum suscipitis; necessario, ut dictum est, et reliqua omnia suscipietis. Nec enim potestis Evangelio credere, et de his, quae idem Evangelium suscipit, dubitare. Petr. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. p. 209.

Evangelium toti Veteri Instrumento testimonium dat: et, ejus insuper auctoritatibus, ea ipsa, quae praedicat, confirmat. Ibid. p. 212.

[6] Christi baptismate. The meaning of this expression, I suppose, must be, not the baptism which Christ himself submitted to, but the baptism which he ordained to be received by others.

[7] The Abbot's statement of this point is evidently a mere perversion of a very just allegation on the part of his opponents.

The gross superstition of the day was not content with the decent setting apart of a new church to the worship of God: but, furthermore, enriched or encumbered it with the fictitious relics of saints and martyrs; attributed to it a sort of mysterious geographical sanctity, quite apart from the spirituality of any service actually performing within its walls; and, in the current phraseology of the age, spoke of it, as the Locus Benedictus Cluniacensis or the Locus Benedictus Clarovallensis.

Arguing against this gross and mischievous superstition, the more evangelically enlightened Petrobrusians, I suppose, urged the words of our Lord to the woman of Samaria: The hour cometh, when, neither in this mount nor yet at Jerusulem, ye shall worship the Father; – but the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.

Throughout his long defense of good substantial churches of stone and timber, the Venerable Peter, as usual, is combating a demon of his own evocation. That the Petrobrusians were for pulling down all the churches in the country and having no churches whatsoever, was purely a matter of ignorant blundering hearsay. The very mode, in which the figment is told, shows us how it originated.

Ecclesiam Dei unitate fidelium congregatorum constare, et vos, ut audio, dicitis, et omnibus clarum est: locorum autem sacrorum aedificia fieri non debere, et facta subrui oportere, vos quidem affirmatis; sed nos, toto mundo nobis adjuncto, contradicimus. Petr. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. p. 220.

The persecuted heretics, who were relentlessly harried by the orthodox from Dauphiny to Gascony greatly to the delight of the holy Abbot, would, I doubt not, like men of plain common sense, have been very glad to have had comfortable churches of their own, if their popish enemies would have permitted them. But such was not the case: and hence they were fain to worship their God, in dens and caves of the earth, or in stables, or anywhere else where they could conceal themselves. Under these circumstances, it is rather too much, that their very latebrae, their unwilling latebrae, should be made a matter of reproach to them, by the two well-housed Abbots of Clugny and Clairvaux. Sibi foveas praeparavit, says Peter: in quibus nunc se timore occultat, nunc de ipsis, audacia assumpta, prodit. Petr. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. p. 206.

Ubi apostolica forma et vita, rejoins Bernard addressing the poor sufferers, quam jactatis? Illi clamant: vos susurratis. Illi in publico: vos in angulo. Illi, ut nubes, volant: vos in tenebris ac subterraneis domibus, delitescitis. Bernard. super Cant. serm. 65. Oper. col. 760. Unluckily, Bernard seems not to have recollected the pathetic eloquence of one of those very Apostles, whom he would place in such strong contradistinction to the afflicted Albigenses.

St. Paul would not have despised their fovea and tenebrae and domus subterraneae. Nay, since he actually lauds those, who wandered about in sheep-skins and in goat-skins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented: it may fairly be doubted, whether he would have fully entered into the spirit of Bernard's Vile nempe hoc genus et rusticanum ac sine literis et prorsus imbelle. Ibid. col.762. Fiat experimentum in corpore vili: said the learned physician to his attendant surgeon. Nullum corpus est tam vile, replied the supposed illiterate patient, pro quo Christus non est dedignatus mori. We all know St. Paul's unrivalled parenthesis: Of whom the world is not worthy.

[8] Primum haereticorum capitulum negat, parvulos, infra intelligibilem aetatem constitutos, Christi Baptismate posse salvari; nec alienam fidem posse illis prodesse, qui sua uti non possunt: quoniam, juxta eos, non aliena fides, sed propria, cum baptismate salvat, Domino dicente: Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit; qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur.

Secundum capitulum dicit, templorum vel ecclesiarum fabricam fieri non debere, factas insuper subrui oportere: nec esse necessaria Christianis sacra loca ad orandum; quoniam aeque, in taberna et in ecclesia, in foro et in templo, ante altare vel ante stabulum, invocatus Deus audit, et eos qui merentur exaudit.
Tertium capitulum, cruces sacras confringi, praecipit, et succendi: quia species illa vel instrumentum, quo Christus tam dire tortus, tam crudelitur occisus, est, non adoratione, non veneratione, vel aliqua supplicatione, digna est; sed, ad ultionem tormentorum et mortis ejus, omni dedecore dehonestanda, gladiis concidenda, ignibus succendenda, est.

Quartum capitulum non solum veritatem corporis et sanguinis Domini, quotidie et continue per sacramentum in Ecclesia oblatum, negat: sed, omnino illud nihil esse, neque Deo offerri debere, decernit.

Quintum capitulum, sacrificia, orationes, eleemosynas, et reliqua bona, pro defunctis fidelibus, a vivis fidelibus facta, deridet: nec, ea aliquem mortuorum, vel in modico, posse juvari, affirrnat. Petr. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. p. 206, 207.

[9] Dixistis: Nec Baptismus, sine propria fide; nec propria fides, sine baptismo; aliquid potuit. Neutrum enim, sine altero, salvat. Petr. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. p. 217.

[10] Praevenistis scelestis operibus celeritatem verborum: et, profundis in religionem odiis, quod vel cogitare scelus fuerat, insigne nostrae fidei tollere attentastis. Quod tunc factum est, quando, ad inauditam Divinitatis contumeliam, magno de crucibus aggere instructo, ignem immisistis, pyram fecistis, carnes coxistis, et, ipso passionis dominicae die paschalem dominicam praecedente, invitatis publice ad talem esum populis, comedistis. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 222.

In spirit, the action was the very same as that of Hezekiah when he brake in pieces the brazen serpent which the Israelites had began idolatrously to fumigate with incense: the same also as that of Epiphanius, when, at Anablatha, he indignantly rent the veil on which was represented the image of some saint or peradventure of Christ himself: the same also as that of holy Serenus of Marseilles, who, in the time of Pope Gregory I, brake in pieces the contemptible puppets, from the insensate worship of which he was unable to restrain the people. Strong cases require strong remedies: and strong remedies (though, after all, mere senseless pieces of wood were burned, because they were wickedly abused) will always move the indignation of idolatrous bigots. Ye have taken away my gods which I made: and what have I more? has been the piteous complaint and angry question of more than Micah of Mount Ephraim.

[11] Si haeresis haec vestra Berengariis limitibus contenta esset, quae veritatem quidem corporis Christi, sed non sacramentum vel speciem aut figuram, negabat: facile me hujus capituli labore expedirem. – Isti, inquam, libri, vos et corrigere, et ad recipiscendum cogere, possent, si nihil deterius Berengarianis Haereticis sentiretis. Sed, quia, ut dixi, errorem errore, haeresim haeresi, nequitiam nequitia, superastis: non tantum veritatem carnis et sanguinis Christi, sed et sacramentum, speciem, ac figuram, negatis; et sic, absque summi et veri Dei sacrificio, ejus populum esse censetis. Pert. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 228.

What Peter means, by saying, that the heretics went beyond Berenger himself, it is not easy to determine. But, from his making the excess to consist in so defining the species and figure of the sacrament as to leave the people without any sacrifice of the true God; which, therefore, implies, that Berenger, though he denied the substantial presence, did not altogether reject the idea of a sacrifice: I am inclined to think, that the difference was this. Berenger, like Justin and Ireneus, was willing to deem the elements, when presented upon the table, to be a sort of sacrifice or oblation to God of the first-fruits of the earth. Justin. Mart. Apol. 1. Oper. p. 76, 77. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 269, 270. Iren. adv. haer. lib: 4. c. 32. p. 261. Bruis, finding this concession abused to the establishment of the utterly unscriptural sacrifice of the Mass, roundly, and very truly, denied the existence of any sacrifice in the Eucharist, according to the sense imposed upon the term by the Romanists. The declamatory rhapsodies of that violent and confessedly half-informed writer Peter of Clugny are built, I believe, upon the truth: but no sober person, I suppose, would care to swallow them undiluted and unanalyzed.

[12] Ce n'est pas nier seulement la verite du corps et du sang; mais, comme les Manicheens, rejeter absolument l' Eucharistie. Boss, Hist. des Variat. Livr. 11:66.

Whenever it suits his purpose, the Bishop either devoutly believes, or at least affects devoutly to believe, all that Peter the Venerable is pleased to tell him: but, when the Abbot unluckily says anything incompatible with the hypothesis of Petrobrusian Manicheism; then the wise practice of Bossuet is the Prudens praetereo.

[13] Negat corpus Christi et sanguinem, divini verbi virtute, vel sacerdotum ministerio, confici: totumque inane ac supervacuum esse, quicquid, in altaris sacramento, altaris ministri agere videntur, affirmat. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 228.

Sacramentum speciem ac figuram negatis: et sic, absque summi et veri Dei sacrificio, ejus populum esse censetis. Ibid. p. 228.

[14] Verba vestra, quae ad nos pervenire potuerunt, ista sunt. Nolite, O populi, Episcopis, Presbyteris, seu Clero vos seducenti, credere: qui, sicut in multis, sic et in altaris officio, vos decipiunt; ubi, corpus Christi se conficere, et vobis ad vestrarum animarum salutem se tradere, mentiuntur. Mentiuntur plane. Corpus enim Christi semel tantum, ab ipso Christo, in coena ante passionem, factum est: et semel, hoc est, tunc tantum, discipulis datum est. Exinde, neque confectum ab aliquo, neque alicui datum, est. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 228.

[15] Dixistis: Nec baptismus, sine propria fide; nec propria fides, sine baptismo: aliquid potuit. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 217.

[16] Praedicatis enim templa superfluo fabricari: cum Ecclesia Dei non constet multitudine sibi cohaerentium lapidum, sed unitate congregatorum fidelium.

Dicitis, crucem Domini honorandam vel adorandam non esse: quoniam species, quae dominicorum cruciatuum et mortis instrumentum fuit, abjicienda, non veneranda; ignibus concremanda, non stultis supplicationibus res insensibilis invocanda est.

Assetiris, corpus Domini, in sacramento altaris, Ecclesiam non habere, et quicquid in eo a sacerdotibus fit, inane prorsus et absque aliquo veritatis effectu: quoniam Christus, non futuris Christianis semper, sed praesentibus tantum discipulis, illud semel dederit.

Affirmatis, vanum esse orare, vel quicquam boni facere, pro defunctis: quia eos vivorum bona juvare non possunt, qui totum meritum suum, cui nihil addi possit, secum, quando hinc transiere, tulerunt. Additis, irrideri Deum cantibus ecclesiasticis: quoniam, qui soils affectibus sanctis delectatur, nec altis vocibus advocari, nec musicis modulis, potest, mulceri. Petr. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. p. 219.

[17] Genebrard. Chronol. apud Allix on the Albig. chap. 18. p. 196.

[18] From the language of the Abbot Peter, we may gather, that, at this time, even some good Catholics, most probably from their converse with the heretical Albigenses, entertained doubts in no wise satisfactory to their ghostly teachers, respecting both the worship of the cross and the efficacy of any good deeds of the living to profit the dead. Cum ergo, irrefragabili auctoritate et invicta ratione, honoranda, collaudanda, glorificanda, crux Christi a Christianis esse probetur: quod et adorari debeat, sicut a quibusdam haereticis negatur; sic, utrum fieri debeat, a quibusdam Catholicis quaeritur. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 226.

Quod bona vivorum mortuis prodesse valeant, et hi haeretici negant, et quidam etiam Catholici dubitare videntur. Ibid. p. 240.

These acknowledgments are very curious. Notwithstanding Peter's logical arguments in favor of idolatry and human meritoriousness, with which he himself at least is evidently quite satisfied, the leaven continued to ferment through all the middle ages until the mass was sufficiently prepared for the glorious Reformation of the sixteenth century.

[19] Parvulis Christianorum Christi intercluditur vita, dum baptismi negatur gratia: nec saluti propinquare sinuntur.

In the text, I have expressed what I believe to have been the doctrine really taught by Henry. He denied, I suppose, that the inward grace of regeneration always, in the case of infants, attends upon the administration of the outward and visible sign in baptism. This was construed into a denial of baptism itself to infants. Bernard, accurately enough, reported the true doctrine of Henry in the words, Baptismi negatur GRATIA; Henry himself, by the term gratia, meaning the inward grace of Baptism: but I do not think, that Bernard so understood the phraseology which he reported.

[20] Non est hic homo a Deo, qui sic contraria Deo et facit et loquitur. Proh dolor, auditur tamen a pluribus: et populum, qui sibi credat, habet. – Nescio qua arte diabolica, persuasit populo stulto et insipienti, de re manifesta, nec suis credere oculis, fefellisse priores, errare posteros, totum mundum etiam post effusum Christi sanguinem perditum iri, et, ad solos quos decipit, totas miserationum Dei divitias et universitatis gratiam pervenisse. Bernard. Epist. 240. ad Ildefonsum Comitem Sancti Egidii de Henrico haeretico. Oper. col. 1591, 1592.

CHAPTER 7

[1] Saint Bernard assure, que cet heretique et ses sectateurs ne recevoient que l'Evangile: mais Pierre le Venerable n'en parle qu'en doutant. Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11 Section 655.

Why, for the satisfaction of his readers, could not Bossuet cite, in his margin, the precise words of Bernard? That writer does NOT say of the Petrobrusians, that ne recevoient que l'Evangile.

[2] Stat nempe Scripturae veritas: Gloria regum celare verbum; gloria Dei revelare sermonem. Non vis tu revelare? Non ergo vis Deum gloriare. Sed forte non recipis Scripturam hanc. Ita est. Solius Evangelii se profitentur aemulatores, et solos. Bernard. super Cant. serm. 65. col. 760.

[3] I give the text in the Latin Vulgate; which, I suppose, would of course be Bernard's book of reference.

Gloria Dei est CELARE verbum: et gloria regum investigate sermonem. Proverb. 25:2. In what part of Bernard's citation, Gloria Dei REVELARE sermonem, lies his Stat Scripturae veritas? I suspect, that the inveterate heretics, who, as Reinerius tells us, had well nigh the entire New Testament by heart, and who, I shall venture to believe, were reasonably well acquainted with the Old Testament to boot, must have smiled alike, if in the midst of their suffering they could smile, both at the faithfully laid premises, and at the logically drawn conclusion, of the zealous preacher's argument. They sometimes, we are assured, attended church like good Catholics: but it was unluckily discovered, that they did so only to pick holes in the sermon, Intersunt praedicationibus: sed ut praedicantem capiant in sermone. Reiner. de haeret, c. 7. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 307.

[4] The Benedictine, who wrote the General History of Languedoc, assures us: that Bernard, in the year 1147, induced the greater part of these heretics to renounce their errors, either by the force of his eloquence, or by the diverse miracles which God wrought through his hands. Unluckily, however, neither the eloquence nor the miracles of the Saint produced any permanent conviction. The historian very honestly subjoins: Mais ils les reprirent bien-tot apres. After this he acknowledges, that the peculiarly christian logic of the two successive Cardinals, Peter of St. Chrysogon and Henry of Albano,

was not a whit more successful than Bernard's eloquence and miracles. La mission, que le Cardinal de S. Chrysogone fit en 1178 dans les memes pais, n'eut pas un succes plus heureux, malgre les soins qu'il se donna pour faire une recherche exacte de ceux qui s'etoient laisse seduire: les penitences severes qu'il imposa a ceux qui furent convaincus, et la confiscation de leurs biens qui s'ensuivit, ne firent qu'irriter les esprits, et ne changerent rien a la disposition des coeurs. Enfin, le Cardinal Henri Eveque d'Albano, etant venu en 1181 dans le haut Languedoc, a la tete d'un corps de troupes, pour reduire les heretiques, autant par les armes que par la persuasion, fit d'abord quelques foibles progres: mais il n'eut pas plutot termine son expedition, que la crainte ne faisant plus d'impression sur les peuples, ils preterent l'oreille comme auparavant aux discours seducteurs de leurs faux apotres, et que l'erreur, au lieu de diminuer, ne fit que prendre de nouvelles forces. Hist. Gener. de Langued. livr. 21 Section 1. vol. 3. p. 127, 128. How much the general conduct of the Clergy advanced the project of converting the heretics, may be easily inferred from the estimation in which they were held. The Benedictine cites William of Puy-Laurens, a writer of that period, as stating it to be a common proverb among the heretics: I had rather be a Priest, than have done such a thing. Ibid. 2. p. 129.

[5] Videte detractatores, videte canes. Irrident nos, quia baptizamus infantes, quod oramus pro mortuis, quod sanctorum suffragia postulamus. Bernard super. Cant. serm. 66. col. 765.

[6] Non credunt autem ignem purgatorium restare post mortem; sed statim animam, solutam a corpore, vel ad requiem transire, vel ad damnationem. Bernard. super Cantic. serm. 66. col 766.

[7] Nempe jactant se esse successores Apostolorum, et Apostolicos nominaut: nullum tamen apostolatus sui signum valentes ostendere. Bernard. super Cantic. serm. 66. col. 765.
On this point Bernard hits them hard; smiting them, without mercy, both hip and thigh. To the exclusion of the apostatic Romanists, they claimed to be alone the body of Christ: meaning, no doubt, that mystical body of which Christ is the mystical head. But, in spite of their boast, says the victorious Saint, let those of them believe this, who believe also that they have the power of consecrating the body and blood of Christ to nourish them so that they shall become the body and members of Christ. Non ignoro, quod se et solos Corpus Christi esse glorientur. Sed sibi hoc persuadeant, qui illud quoque persuasum habent, potestatem se hubere quotidie in mensa sua corpus Christi et sanguinem consecrandi ad nutriendum se in corpus Christi et membra. Ibid. col. 765.

The heretics believed that they could figuratively consecrate the body and blood of Christ to the nourishing of them into Christ's mystical body and members, no less effectually at their own humble table, than Bernard himself at the gorgeous high altar of his own conventual church of Clairvaux: and he boldly ridicules the idea, that they could produce, by their beggarly consecration, the literal body and blood. Precious Apostolicals these, who claim to BE the body of Christ, and yet cannot MAKE it! By the way, so perpetually does the truth look in upon us, we have here again an incidental proof that the Albigenses could not have been Manicheans. The old Docetae, as we learn from Ignatius, abstained from the Eucharist: because, denying our Lord to have had a substantial body, they of course could not admit the Eucharist, which was his body sacramentally or figuratively. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. 7. But the Albigenses of Gascony, as we are unwittingly told by Bernard, so far from rejecting the Eucharist, were fully persuaded (whereat, the Saint thought foul scorn of them); that, at their own tables, they could consecrate the body and blood of Christ to nourish them into Christ's mystical body and members. Now all this they never could have done, which yet his words plainly imply that they were in the constant habit of doing, if they believed, that Christ never had a material body, but that his form was merely spectral or phantasiastic.

I suspect, that the perpetual charge of Manicheism, brought against the Apostolicals or Albigenses, will afford the true key to a strange story told by William of Newbury.

When Pope Eugenius, Bernard's friend and disciple, presided at the Council of Rheims in the year 1148, a gentleman of Bretagne, Eudo, whose sirname is said to have been Eun, came, with his followers, under the cognizance of that Pontiff: on the ground, that, through the medium of an odd sort of pun upon the appellation Eun, he claimed to be Him who should come to judge both the quick and the dead. Quum, sermone gallico, Eun diceretur, ad suam personam pertinere crederet, quod in ecclesiasticis exorcismis dicitur: scilicet, Per Eum qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Both the name and the story, so far as the claim of being Christ is concerned, I believe to be pure figments; built, however, upon one of the peculiarities of Gnosticism and derivative Manicheism. The Priscillianists of Spain, a race of new Manicheans in the fourth century, borrowed from the older Gnostics the doctrine of Eons or Divine Emanations; a doctrine, which asserted Christ to be a principal Eon. Hence, I suppose, originated the name of Eun or Eon, imposed upon Eudo: and hence, likewise, proceeded the allegation, that he claimed to be the future judge both of the quick and of the dead, or, in other words, that he claimed to be the great Manichean Eon Christ. Eudo was evidently hostile to the romish will-worship of Monasticism; for he is described, as a special enemy to churches and monasteries: ecclesiarum maxime ac monasteriorum infestator. He himself perished in prison, after no very long confinement: and his disciples, at least, showed their sincerity, by submitting to the flames, that ultima ratio papistarum, rather than renounce their doctrinal opinions, whatever those opinions might really have been. Curiae prius et postea ignibus traditi, ardere potius, quam ad vitam corrigi, maluerunt. Gulielm. Neubrig. Rerum Anglican. lib. i.c. 19.

[8] Hi nubere prohibent: hi a cibis abstinent, quos Deus creavit. Nunc autem videre, si non proprie daemonum et non hominum ludificatio haec, secundum quod praedixerat Spiritus, quaere ab illis suae sectae auctorem: neminem dabunt. Quae haeresis non ex hominibus habuit proprium haeresiarcham? Manichaei Manem habuere, principem et praeceptorem: Sabelliani, Sabellium: Ariani, Arium: Eunomiani, Eunomium: Nestoriani, Nestorium. Ita omnes caeterae hujusmodi pestes, singulae singulos magistros, homines habuisse noscuntur: a quibus originem simul duxere et nomen. Quo nomine istos titulove censebis? Nullo. Quoniam non est ab homine illorum haeresis, neque per hominem illam acceperunt; absit tamen, ut per revelationem Jesu Christi: sed, magis et absque dubio, uti Spiritus Sanctus praedixit, per immissionem et fraudem daemoniorum, in hypocrisi loquentium mendacium, prohibentium nubere. Bernard. super Cantic. serm. 66. col. 763.

Strange it is, that this intemperate mall should not have been conscious of his own absurdity. The very circumstance, which he foolishly alleged against them, was precisely that, which afforded one of the strongest arguments in their favor. They knew themselves to be a sound Branch of the Primitive Church Catholic: and, therefore, whatever nicknames their enemies might impose upon them, they themselves would acknowledge no appellation save that of Apostolicals. The name was virtually the same as that of Paulicians. I regret, that I should be obliged to speak in such terms of Bernard: but simple justice to the Albigenses requires it. The Abbot of Clairvaux was, I believe, personally a good man: and his writings contain much that is sound and excellent. But he was too prejudiced to inquire fairly and to act with impartiality.

[9] Monachi, ad ducendas uxores, terroribus sunt ac tormentis compulsi. Petr. Clun. cont. Petrobrus. p. 208.

Die ipso passionis dominicae, publice carnes comestae. Ibid. p. 208.

Sacerdotes et Monachos potius debere uxores ducere, quam scortari. Cocc. Thesaur. Cathol. lib. 8. artic. 6. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8 Section 28.

With respect to the employment of force, so justly reprobated and so pathetically lamented by Peter the Venerable, we may safely, I do suppose, set down, as a mere figure of rhetoric, his appalling statement: that the luckless Monks, who fell into the hands of the ferocious Apostolicals, were, not indeed murdered, but, what is still worse, were, by dint of sheer terror and sundry hard knocks to boot, relentlessly compelled to take wives unto themselves.

Bernard assures us, that, so far as club-law is concerned, these formidable Apostolicals were, after all, a very harmless and peaceable.353 sort of people; quite unfit, the more the pity, to furnish soldiers in the stirring age of the first crusade: vile genus et rusticanum et PRORSUS IMBELLE. And he further tells us, that a great company of Clerks and Priests, leaving their parishioners and their churches, joined themselves, freely and spontaneously, to these despised and persecuted religionists: Clerici et Sacerdotes, populis ecclesiisque relictis, intonsi et barbati, apud eos, inter textores et textrices, plerumque inventi sunt. Bernard. super Cant. serm. 65. Oper. Col. 761.

Hence, unless we can gravely believe Peter the Venerable, that the unhappy Monks were dragged bodily out of the religious houses by a terrific raid of weavers, male and female, for the purpose of marrying them to a corresponding number of females; whence procured, the zealous Abbot is not careful to inform us: we must, I fear, suspect, that no great compulsion was necessary to induce them to exchange their character of Benedictines for that of Benedicts. At all events, the Petrobrusians must have been very unsound and imperfect Manicheans, if they either compelled or persuaded the Monks to enter into a state, professedly, as Bassuet again and again reminds us, abhorred and abjured by Manicheism. The whole serves to show, how badly the miserable figment of Albigensic Manicheism hangs together. Perpetually the pretended Manicheans are described as doing, what real Manicheans, on their own principles, never could have done.

CHAPTER 8

[1] Boss. Hist, des Variat. livr. 11 Section 43.

[2] Iisdem diebus erronei quidam venerunt in Angliam, ex eorum (ut creditur) genere quos vulgo Publicanos vocant.

Hi, nimirum, olim ex Gasconia incerto auctore habentes originem, regionibus plurimis virus suae perfidiae infuderunt. Quippe, in latissimis Galliae, Hispaniae, Italiae, Germaniaeque, provinciis, tam multi hac peste infecti esse dicuntur, ut, secundum prophetam, multiplicati esse super numerum arenae videantur. Denique, cum a Praesulibus Ecclesiarum et Principibus Provinciarum in eos remissius agitur, egrediuntur de caveis suis vulpes nequissimae: et, praetenta specie pietatis seducendo simplices, vineam Domini Sabaoth, tanto gravius quanto liberius, demoliuntur. Cum autem adversus eos igne Dei fidelium zelus succenditur, in suis foveis delitescunt, minusque sunt noxii: sed tamen, occultum spargendo virus, nocere non desinunt. Homines rusticani et idiotae, atque ideo ad rationem hebetes, peste veto illa semel hausta ita imbuti, ut ad omnem rigeant disciplinam: unde rarissime contingit, eorum aliquem, cum e suis latebris proditi extrahuntur, ad pietatem converti.

Sane, ab hac et ab aliis pestibus haereticis, immunis semper exstitit Anglia; cum, in aliis mundi partibus, tot pullulaverint haereses. Et quidem haec insula, cum propter incolentes Brittones Britannia diceretur, Pelagium, in Oriente haeresiarcham futurum, ex se misit; ejusque in se, processu temporis, errorem admisit: ad cujus peremptionem Gallicanae Ecclesiae pia provisio, semel et iterum, beatissimum direxit Germanum. At, ubi, hanc insulam, expulsis Britonibus, natio possedit Anglorum, ut non jam Britannia sed Anglia diceretur: nullius unquam ex ea pestis haereticae virus ebullivit; sed nec in eam aliunde, usque ad tempora Regis Henrici secundi, tanquam propagandum et dioblatandum introivit. Tunc vero, Deo propitio, pesti, quae jam irrepserat, ita est viatum, ut de caetero hanc insulam ingredi vererentur.

Erant autem, tam viri quam foeminae, paulo amplius quam triginta: qui, dissimulato errore, quasi pacifice, huc ingressi sunt, propagandae pestis gratia; duce quodam Gerardo, in quem omnes, tanquam praeceptorem ac principem, respiciebant. Nam solus erat aliquantulum litteratus: caeteri vero, sine litteris et idiotae, homines plane impoliti et rustici, nationis et linguae Teutonicae. Aliquamdiu in Anglia morantes, unam tantum mulierculam, venenatis circumventam susurris, et quibusdam (ut dicitur) fascinatam praestigiis, suo caetui aggregaverunt. Non enim diu latere potuerunt: sed quibusdam curiose indagantibus, quod peregrinae essent sectae, deprehensi tentique sunt in custodia publica. Rex veto, nolens eos indiscussos vel dimittere vel punire, episcopale praecepit Oxoniae Concilium congregari: ubi, dum solemniter de religione convenirentur, eo, qui litteratus videbatur, suscipiente causam omnium, et loquente pro omnibus, Christianos se esse et doctrinam apostolicam venerari, responderunt. Interrogati per ordinem de sacrae fidei articulis, de substantia quidem superni Medici recta, de ejus vero remediis, quibus humanae infirmitati mederi dignatur, id est, divinis sacramentis, perversa dixerunt: sacrum Baptisma, Eucharistiam, Conjugium, detestantes; atque unitati catholicae, quam haec divina imbuunt subsidia, ausu nephario derogantes.

Cumque sumtis de Scriptura divinis urgerentur testimoniis, se quidem, ut instituti erant, credere, de fide vero sua disputare nolle, responderunt. Moniti, ut poenitentiam agerent et corpori Ecclesiae unirentur, omnem consilii salubritatem spreverunt. Minas quoque, ut vel metu resipiscerent, deriserunt; verbo illo dominico abutentes: Beati, qui persecutionem patiuntur propter justitiam; quoniam ipsorum est regnum coelorum.

Tunc Episcopi, ne virus haereticum latius serperet praecaventes, eosdem, publice pronunciatos haereticos, corporali disciplinae subdendos catholico Principi tradiderunt. Qui praecepit, haereticae infamiae characterem frontibus eorum inuri, et, spectante populo, virgis coercitos urbe expelli: districte prohibens, ne quis, eos vel hospitio recipere vel aliquo solatio convovere, praesumeret.

Dicta sententia, ad poenam justissimam ducebantur gaudentes, non lentis passibus; praeeunte magistro eorum, et cantante: Beati eritis, cum vos oderint homines. In tanturn, deceptis a se, mentibus seductorius abutebatur spiritus.

Illa quidem muliercula, quam in Anglia seduxerant, metu supplicii discedens ab eis, errorem confessa, reconciliationem meruit. Porto, detestandum illud collegium, cauteriatis frontibus, justae severitati subjacuit: eo, qui primatum gerebat in eis, ob insigne magisterii, inustionis geminae, id est in fronte et circa mentum, dedecus sustinente. Scissisque cinculo tenus vestibus, publice caesi, et flagris resonantibus urbe ejecti, algoris intolerantia (hiems quippe erat), nemine vel exiguum misericordiae impendente, misere interierunt. Hujus severitatis plus rigor non peste illa, quae jam irrepserat Angliae regnum, purgavit: verum etiam, ne ulterius irreperet, incusso haereticis terrore, praecavit. Guliel. Neubrig. Rer. Anglicar. lib. 2. c. 13. p. 390, 391.

In this last sentence, the word solum, I suspect, ought to be inserted between the words non and peste: but I have not ventured to make any alteration in the text.

It might seem, that Henry afterward repented of his barbarity to these poor unoffending strangers: for, at a subsequent period, though the Publicans abounded in his French Dominions of Guienne and its dependencies, he would not resort to the extreme punishment of burning. To the memory of this great prince it is only an act of justice to say, that the language of Roger Hoveden strongly expresses his abhorrence of the practice, which in other parts of France then prevailed very extensively. Tempus vero, in quo haec visio coutingerat, erat tunc, quando Publicani comburebantur in pluribus locis per regnum Franciae: quod rex nullo modo fieri permisit in terra sua, licet ibi essent perplurimi. Roger Hoveden Annal. par poster. in A. D. 1182. fol. 352.

[3] Avoir en horreur l'Eucharistie, aussi bien que le Bapteme et le Mariage: trois caracteres visibles du Manicheisme. Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11 Section 43.

[4] Bossuet's translation runs as follows. On fit entrer ces heretiques dans le Concile assemble a Oxford. Girard, qui etoit le seul qui sut quelque chose, repondit bien sur la substance du Medecin Celeste: mais, quand'on vint aux remedes qu'il nous a laisses, ils en parlerent tres-mal, ayant en horreur le Bapteme, l'Eucharistie, et le Mariage, et meprisant l'unite catholique. Boss. Hist. des Variat. Livr. 11:43.

I subjoin, for the convenience of the reader's comparison, the original of William of Newbury, in immediate juxta-position.

Interrogati per ordinem de sacrae fidei articuls, de substantia quidem Superni Medici recta, de ejus vero remediis, quibus humanae infirmitati mederi dignatur, id est, divinis sacramentis, perversa dixerunt: sacrum Baptisma, Eucharistiam, Conjugium, detestantes; atque unitati catholicae, quam haec divina imbuunt subsidia, ausu nephario derogantes.

The original and the translation convey two quite different ideas.

[5] Ivodii, quod Trevericae Dioecesis appenditium est, fuerunt co tempore haeretici, qui substantiam panis et vini, quae in altari per sacerdotes benedicitur, in corpus Christi et sanguinem veraciter transmutari negabant; nec Baptismi sacramentum parvulis ad salvationem proficere, dicebant: et alia perplura profitebantur erronea. Hist. Trevir. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 2. p. 221.

Among these sundry other matters deemed erroneous, we may doubtless rank A denial that Marriage is a sacrament.

[6] In the Auctarium Aguicinctinum, edited by Miraeus, there is it curious account of the examination of four heretics at Arras in the year 1183: that is to say, twenty-three years after the examination of the German Publicans at Oxford. The Bishop of Arras was unluckily laid up with the palsy: but his place was supplied by the Archbishop of Rheims, whose theological acuteness was assisted by the military experience of Philip, Count of Flanders. These two sagacious judges, however, could make nothing of them, save that they were, by their own confession, most unclean heretics. Like Bernard's friends in Gascony, they would call themselves by the name of no heresiarch. Hence the Archbishop and the Count were fairly thrown out, having nothing whereby to guide their course. Some amateurs were positive, that these nondescript heretics were Manicheans: others declared them to be Cataphrygians: and others, again, stoutly maintained, that they were Arians. Pope Alexander, in his pontifical wisdom, had, no doubt, decided the point by calling them Paterines: but, still the two judges had to learn what

doctrines the Paterines avowed. They settled the matter, however, very satisfactorily, by determining: that, let them be what they might, they stood self-convicted of being heretics specially distinguished for their uncleanness. Accordingly, the culprits were sentenced to the flames: and, as, under such circumstances, they could no longer have any occasion for their worldly substance, the Priest and the Count amicably agreed to divide the spoil. This, I suppose, is another distinct proof of the undoubted Manicheism of the Albigenses. Quatuor haeretici, in Atrebatensi civitate deprehensi, a Frumaldo, ejusdem civitatis Episcopo, in carcere sunt reclusi: quorum unus dicebatur Adam, litteratus; alter, Radulphus, eloquentissimus laicus. Sequentium nomina nescimus. Horum judicium Episcopus, jam paralysi laborans, Archiepiscopo reservavit. Transactis diebus Nativitatis Dominiae, Wilhelmus Remensis Archiepiscopus, et Comes Flandriae Philippus, in civitate Atrebatensi, de secretis suis locuturi, conveniunt. Ibi multarum haeresium fraudes, per quandam mulierem, in terra Comitis sunt detectre. Isti haeretici nullius haeresiarchae muniuntur praesidio. Quidam dicunt illos Manichmaeos: alii, Cataphrygas: nonnulli, vero, Arianos. Alexander autem Papa vocat eos Paterinos. Sed, quicquid sint, oris proprii confessione convicti sunt haeretici immundissimi. Multi sunt, in praesentia Archiepiscopi et Comitis, accusati: nobiles, ignobiles, clerici, milites, rustici, virgines, viduae, uxores. Tunc decretalis sententia ab Archiepiscopo et Comite praefixa est: ut, deprehensi, incendio traderenter; substantiae vero eorum Sacerdoti et Principi resignarentur. Auctar. Aquicinct. in A. D. 1183, p. 236. Alexander himself, however, saving his presence, was but a blind guide to the Knight and the Prelate: for, infallible as he was, he did not know very well what to call them; and, as for their doctrinal errors, he was quite at sea, being sure of nothing, save that they were abominable and turbulent heretics, who ought incontinently to be cursed and subjected to the liberal system of exclusive dealing and attacked without loss of time at the point of the sword. This precious document issued from the third Lateran Council in the year 1179: so that it appeared just in time to enlighten the judges of heretical pravity at Arras in the year 1183.

Sicut ait beatus Leo, Licet ecclesiastica disciplina, sacerdotali contenta judicio, cruentas effugiat ultiones: Catholicorum tamen Principum constitutionibus adjuvatur; ut saepe quaerant homines salutare remedium, dum corporale super se metuerint evenire supplicium. Eapropter, quia in Wasconia, Albigesio et aliis locis, ita haereticorum, quos alii Cataros, alii Publicanos, alii Paterinos, alii aliis nominibus, vocant, invaluit damnata perversitas, ut jam non in occulto, sicut alibi, nequitiam suam exerceant; sed errorem suum publice manifestent, et ad concensum suum simplices attrahant et infirmos: eos et defensores eorum et receptores anathemati decernimus subjacere; et sub anathemate prohibemus, ne quis ipsos in domo vel in terra sua tenere vel fovere vel negotiationem cum eis exercere praesumat. – Illis autem cunctisque fidelibus in remissionem injungimus omnium peccatorum, ut tantis cladibus se viriliter opponant, et contra eos armis tueantur populum christianum. Confiscentur quoque bona eorum: et liberum sit principibus hujusmodi pestilentes homines subjicere servituti. Concil. Later. III. can. 10. in Roger Hoveden. Annal. par. post. in A. D. 1179, fol. 334.

When the Archbishop and the Count appropriated the substance of the heretics at Arras, they acted, we see, quite correctly.

CHAPTER 9

[1] Un historien du temps, Roger Hoveden, recite au long ce Concile: et donne un fidele abrege des acres plus amples qu'on a recouvres depuis. Voici, comme il commence son recit. Il y avoit dans la

province de Tolouse des heretiques qui se faisoient appeler Les Bons Hommes, maintenus par le soldats de Lombes. Ceux la disoient, qu'ils ne recevoient, ni la loi de Moise, ni les prophetes, ni les psaumes, ni l'ancient Testament, ni les docteurs du nouveau; a la reserve des Evangiles, des Epitres de saint Paul, des sept Epitres Canoniques, des Acres, et de l'Apocalypse. C'en est assez, sans parler davantage du reste, pour faire rougir nos Protestans des erreurs de leurs ancetres. Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11 Section 38.

[2] Erant itaque in provincia Tolosana quidam haeretici, qui se appellari faciebant Bonos Homines, quos manu tenebant milites de Lumbertio; proponentes, et docentes populum, contra Fidem Christianam: dicentes etiam, quod non recipiebant Legem Moisi, neque Prophetas, neque Psalmos, neque Vetus Testamentum, neque Doctores Novi Testamenti; nisi solummodo Evangelia, et Epistolas Pauli, et septem Canonicas Epistolas, et Actus Apostolorum, et Apocalypsim.

Et, interrogati de fide sua; et de baptismo parvulorum, et si salvabantur per baptismum; et de corpore et sanguine Domini, ubi consecrabatur, vel per quos, et qui sumebant, et si magis vel melius consecrabatur per bonum, quam per malum; et de matrimonio, si poterant salvari, si carnaliter jungebantur vir et mulier: responderunt, quod, de fide sua et de baptismo parvulorum, non dicerent; neque dicere cogebantur. De corpore et sanguine Domini dicebant: quod, qui digne sumebat, salvabatur; et, qui indigne, adquirebat sibi damnationem. De matrimonio autem dicebant: quod vir et mulier jungebantur, proper luxuriam et fornicationem vitandam; sicut dicit Paulus. Dixerunt etiam multa, non interrogati: quod non debebant jurare omnino per aliquod juramentum; sicut dicebat Joannes in Evangelio, et Jacobus in Epistola sua. Dixerunt etiam: quod Paulus praedicebat, quod essent ordinandi in Ecclesia Episcopi et Presbyteri; et, si tales non ordinabantur quales praecipiebat, non essent Episcopi nec Presbyteri, sed lupi rapaces, hypocritae, et seductores, amantes salutationes in foro, primas cathedras, et primos accubitus in coenis, volentes vocari Rabbi, contra praeceptum Christi, ferentes albas et candidas vestes, gestantes in digitis aureos annulos et gemmatos, quos non prancepit Magister eorum. Et, idcirco, quia tales Episcopi et Presbyteri erant quales fuerunt presbyteri qui tradiderunt Jesum, non debebant illis obedire, quia mali erant.

Auditis, itaque, utrinque allegationibus coram Girardo Albiensi Episcopo; electis etiam et statutis judicibus ab utraque parte; et consentientibus, et assidentibus praefato Episcopo Girardo Albiensi, et Rogero Castrensi Abbate, et Petro Abbate Ardurellensi, et Abbate de Candilio, et Arnaldo Narbone, in praesentia bonorum virorum, tam Praelatorum et Clericorum quam Laicorum, videlicet, Domini Petri Narbonensis Arehiepiscopi atque aliorum Episcoporum et Abbatum, et Archidiaconorum, necnon et Comitum et Virorum Potentum numero viginti illius provinciae, et fere totius populi Albiae et Lumberci: contra quae praedicti haeretici proponebant, et inductae sunt Novi Testamenti multae autoritates, a Domino Petro Narbonensi Arehiepiscopo, et a Neumacensi Episcopo, et a Petro Ceudracensi Abbate, et Abbate de Fonte Frigido; praefati enim haeretici nolebant recipere judicium, nisi per Novum Testamentum. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. par. post. in A. D. 1176. fol. 317.

[3] Roger Hoveden. Annal. fol. 317-319.

[4] Non recipiebant Legem Moisi, neque Prophetas, neque Psalmos, neque Vetus Testamentum. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. fol. 317.

[5] Confessi sunt etiam isti haeretici, se recipere Moysen et Prophetas et Psalmos, in his tantum testimoniis quae inducuntur a Jesu et Apostolis, et non allis. Non enim dicimus: quod, si instrumentum vel scriptum testimonium in aliqua parte sui creditur, debet totum credi, vel in nulla parte sui recipi.

Roger. Hoveden. Annal. fol. 318. The learned Benedictine, who, in the earlier part of the eighteenth century, published the large History of Languedoc, states the confession of the Albigenses to have been: that They rejected the Law of Moses and the other Books of the Old Testament, and received nothing save the New.

L'Eveque de Lodeve interrogea ensuite les heretiques au nom de l'Eveque d'Albi, qui, comme Diocesan, avoit la principale autorite sur eux: et leur demanda, s'ils recevoient la Loi de Moyse et les autres livres de l'Ancien Testament. Ils repondirent: qu'ils n'admettoient que le Nouveau. Hist. Gener. de Langued. livr. 19 Section 2. vol. 3. p. 3. I can only say, that, in regard to their confession on this point, I have faithfully given the precise words, in which Roger Hoveden records the statement of it, as made by the acting Bishop himself.

In the narrative of Roger Hoveden, the Bishop, who acted by the authority of the Bishop of Albi, is variously called Gilebertus Lugdonensis Episcopus and Gocelinus Lodovensis Episcopus. Probably the first title ought to be erased in favor of the second. This, I suppose, was the opinion of the Benedictine: for he speaks of the acting Prelate, as being Gaucelin Bishop of Lodeve. It is a matter of no great consequence in itself: I have, however, in the text, thought it best to refrain from giving either christian name or episcopal title to the spokesman.

[6] Expresse vero declarabant, canonicos se, tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, libros recipere. Vignier. Hist. Eccles. in A. D. 1206. See below, book 2 chap. 10 Section 11.

[7] Videntes haeretici, se esse convictos atque confusos, converterunt se ad omnem plebem, dicentes: Audite, O boni viri, fidem nostram quam confitemur: nunc confitemur autem propter amorem et gratiam vestram. Respondit Episcopus praedictus: Vos dicitis, quod non propter Deum dicatis, sed propter gratiam populi. Et illi inquiunt: Nos credimus unum Deum, trinum et unum; Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum.

Et Fillum Dei carnem nostram suscepisse; baptizatum esse in Jordane; jejunasse in deserto; praedicasse salutem nostram; passum, mortuum, atque sepultum; ad inferos descendisse; resurrexisse tertia die; ad coelos ascendisse; Spiritum Paracletum, in die Pentecostes, misisse; venturum, in die judicii, ad judicandum vivos et mortuos; et omnes resurrecturos.

Cognoscimus etiam: quia, quod corde credimus, ore debemus confiteri. Credimus: quia non salvatur, qui non manducat corpus Christi; et quod corpus Christi non consecratur, nisi in Ecclesia; et non nisi a Sacerdote, sive bono sive malo; nec melius fieri per bonum quam per malum. Credimus etiam: quod non salvatur quis, nisi qui baptizatur; et parvulos salvari per baptisma.

Credimus etiam: quod vir et mulier salvantur, licet carnaliter misceantur; et poenitentiam debeat unusquisque accipere ore et corde et a Sacerdote, et in Ecclesia baptizari.

Et si quid amplius posset eis ostendi, per Evangelia vel Epistolas, illi crederent et confiterentur. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. Fol. 319.

The Benedictine Historian of Languedoc, in his general narrative of this transaction, is far more fair and honest than Bossuet. This Noble Confession of Faith, publicly recited by the Albigenses on the present occasion, and fully recorded by Roger Hoveden, he does not indeed give at large, as he ought to have done. But he, at least, mentions it: and, on the contested articles, namely, the articles wherein they were charged with manicheanising, he distinctly owns, that they spoke soundly, even as Catholics themselves would have spoken.

Les heretiques, se tournant alors vers le peuple: Ecoutez, dirent-ils, gens de bien, notre profession de foi. Ils parlerent ensuite sur les articles contestes, comme les Catholiques. Hist. Gener. de Langued. livr. 19 Section 2. vol. 3. p. 3.

It may be proper to state: that, according to our Benedictine, the Council, before which these Albigenses were examined, was held, not in the year 1176 but in the year 1165, and not at Lombez on the Save in the Toulousain (as Bossuet supposes) but at Lombers which is distant only about two leagues from Albi. Ibid. p. 4. Locality, I think, determines Lombers to have been the place: but, so far as my purpose is concerned, such a variation of time and place is of no consequence. He further states very justly: that the Albigenses of Lombez or Lombers, whichever town may have been the real seat of the council, were Henricians. That is to say, they professed the same religious principles as Henry and his master Peter de Bruis. Ibid. p. 3, 4. It will be remembered, that the idle and unsubstantiated charge of Manichi, ism was similarly preferred against both of those pious and eminent reformers. See above, book 2. chap. 6. Such a charge more or less served the purpose of the day and the priesthood. If its utter and hopeless falsehood be not completely established by the distinct and unequivocal confession of faith, publicly made by the Albigenses at Lombers, and duly handed down to us by Roger Hoveden, I am at a loss to understand what greater and more precise historical testimony can be required for the establishment of a fact.

[8] Subjunxerunt etiam haeretici illi: quod: Episcopus, qui sententiam dederat, haereticus erat, et non ipsi; et quod inimicus eorum erat; et quod lupus rapax erat, et hypocrita, et inimicus Dei; et quod non bene judicaverat. Nec, de fide sua, respondere voluerunt, quia cavebant se ab eo, sicut eis praeceperat Dominus in Evangelio; Attendite a falsis prophetis, qui veniunt ad vos in vestimentis ovium; intrinsecus autem sunt lupi rapaces: et quod ipse erat persecutor eorum fraudulentus; et parati erant ostendere per Evangelia et Epistolas, quod non erat bonus pastor, nec ipse, nec caeteri episcopi vel presbyteri, sed potius mercenarii. Respondit episcopus, dicens: quod sententia in eos de jure erat dictata, et hoc paratus erat probate in curia Domini Alexandri Papae Catholici vel in curia Ludovici Regis Francira vel in curia Raimundi Comitis Tolosani, – quod recte fecerat judicatum, et quod ipsi manifeste essent haeretici, et quod haeresi notati. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. fol. 319.

[9] Denique indixere, ut dicitur, latebras sibi: firmaverunt sibi sermonem nequaquam; Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli. Enimvero alias, ne tenuiter quidem, jurare ullatenus acquiescunt, propter illud de Evangelio: Non jurate, neque per coelum, neque per terram. Bernard. super Cantic. serm. 65. col. 759, 760.

In spite of Bernard's prudent ut dicitur, Bossuet, for the good of his Church and with a most magnanimous disregard of his own digestion, swallows bodily, at one brave gulp, the whole of this most ridiculous and most self-contradictory figment. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11 Section 32. The Abbot of Clairvaux, I suppose, had either read or heard of the maxim, which, according to Augustine, was patronized by the Manichean Priscillianists: and thence, without further ceremony, though not without telling us that the whole was pure hearsay, he very liberally, on the grave authority of his talebearers, made a present of it to the conscientiously over-scrupulous religionists of Gascony who would not take an oath even in a court of justice. Meanwhile Bossuet is quite sure, that these men, who, notwithstanding their alleged maxim that a person might allowably either swear or forswear himself at pleasure, would actually suffer death rather than confirm the truth of their confession by an oath: Bossuet is quite sure, that they must have borrowed their philoepiorcian maxim from some lurking remnant of the Priscillianists, who flourished in Spain in the time of Augustine.

Priscillianistae, quos in Hispania Priscillianus instituit, maxime Gnosticorum et Manichaeorum dogmata permixta sectantur. Quamvis, et ex aliis haeresibus, in eas sordes, tanquam in sentinam quandam, horribili confusione confluxerint. Propter occultandas autem contaminationes et turpitudines suas, habent, in suis dogmatibus, et haec verba: Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli. August. de haeres, ad Quodvultdeum. Oper. vol. 6. p. 12.

The transfer might have been very plausible, no doubt, if the Priscillianists, however inconsistently, had made a conscience of taking an oath, as we know the ancient Albigenses to have done: but Augustine gives no hint, that they entertained any scruples of the sort. On the contrary, as they allowed both swearing and forswearing in a good cause (some specimens of which by the way, we have recently seen in certain religionists, who would not acknowledge themselves to be disciples of Priscillian): a fortiori, they could not be expected to strain at a mere simple falsehood.

Porro, inter alia dogmata eorum quae subvertenda sunt, etiam hoc est utique: quod dogmatizant, ad occultandam religionem, religiosos debere mentiri in tautum, ut, non solum de aliis rebus ad doctrinam religionis non pertinentibus, sed de ipse quoque religione, mentiendum sit, ne patescat alienis: ut, videlicet, negandus sit Christus, quo possit inter inimicos suos latere Christianus. August. cont. mendac. ad Consent. c. 11. Oper. vol. 4. p. 19.

Had the confessors of Lombers been Priscillianists, as Bossuet either wildly or wickedly supposes, would they have fallen into the snare which was so cunningly laid for them by Bishop Gilbert? Would they not at once have disappointed him and kept their secret, by swearing, according to their alleged maxim, that they believed the truth of their confession? Happily it is so ordered by Providence that malice is not always so sharp-sighted as to avoid inconsistencies in its labor of calumny.

[10] Interrogavit etiam eos praedictus Episcopus, si jurarent, se tenere fidem istam, et credere, et siquid amplius deberent confiteri: quia male senserant et praedicaverant ante. Respondentes dixerunt: quod nullo modo jurarent; quia, contra Evangelium et Epistolas, facerent. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. fol. 319.

[11] Videntes, itaque, quod super hoc erant convicti, dixerunt: quod Episcopus Albericus fecerat eis pactum, quod non cogeret eos jurare. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. fol. 320. Was there ever such a conviction in a court of law, save where law is administered by popish priests and inquisitors? The prisoners saw plainly enough, that they were scandalously entrapped: but, according to the notions of Protestants at least, entrapment is not precisely the synonymn of conviction.

[12] Quod et Albiensis Episcopus negavit. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. fol. 320.

[13] Hanc sententiam ratam habemus: et istos haereticos esse scimus, et eorum sententiam improbamus. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. fol. 320.

[14] Auditis igitur UTRINQUE allegationihus. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. fol. 317.

CHAPTER 10

[1] Albigensium religionem parum admodum ab ea discrepasse quam hodie profitentur Protestantes, tam ex pluribus fragmentis et monumentis quae antiqua patriae illius lingua de horum temporum historia conscripta sunt, quam ex publica et solenni disputatione inter Apamiensem Episcopum et Magistrum Arnoldum Hot Lombrensem Ministrum habita: cujus Acta integra, ad hunc usque diem,

extant, lingua, ad Catalanicum potius quam patrium sive Francium idioma accedente, conscripta. Imo plures mihi pro certo dixerunt, vidisse se ARTICULOS FIDEI IPSORUM, veteribus quibusdam tabulis quae Albii sunt incisos, doctrinae Protestantium usquequaque conformes. Popliner. Hist. Franc. lib. 38. fol. 245. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 10 Section 15.

[2] Homo quidam fide dignus, e Gallia Novempopulana, mihi affirmavit: legisse se UNAM EX CONFESSIONIBUS EORUM, veteri lingua Gasconica conscriptam, ac Cancellario Hospitalio paulo ante secundas Galliae turbas oblatam; quae cure Valdensium doctrina plane consentiebat, nullo omnino Manicheismi comparente vestigio. Expresse vero declarabant: Canonicos se, tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, Libros recipere; omnemque doctrinam rejicere, quae in eis fundamentum non haberet, aut aliquid eis contrarium contineret. Indeque omnes Romanae Ecclesiae ceremonias, traditiones, et ordinationes, repudiabant ac condemnabant: dicentes, eam speluncam esse latronum et meretricem apocalypticam. Vigner. Hist. Eccles. in A. D. 1206. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 10 Section 15.

[3] Anno gratiae 1178, – pervenit ad aures illorum (scil. Petri Cardinalis Apostolicae Sedis Legati et assessorum ejus), quod quidam falsi fratres, Raimundus videlicet, et Bernardus Raimundi, et quidam alii haeresiarchae, transfigurantes se in angelos lucis cum sicut Sathanae, et Christianae Fidei contraria praedicantes, multorum animas falsa praedicatione sua decipiebant et secum traxerant ad inferos. Qui cum invitati fuissent, ut ad praesentiam Cardinalis sociorumque ejus venirent, ut fidem suam confiterentur, responderunt: se ad illorum praesentiam venturos, si eundi et redeundi haberent securitatem. Data itaque eis securitate eundi et redeundi, venerunt coram praedicto Cardinali et Episcopis et Comitibus et Baronibus et Clero et Populo qui aderant: et in medium protulerunt quandam char-tam, in qua FIDEI SUAE ARTICULOS conscripserant. Quam cum prolixius perlegissent, quaedam verba videbantur in ea suspecta existere, et, nisi plenius exponerentur, haeresim quam praedicaverant possent velare. – Itaque, de Articulis Fidei Christianae examinati, responderunt super omnibus Articulis Fidei ita sane et circumspecte, ac si Christianissimi essent. Quod cum Comes Tolosae, et caeteri qui prius audierant ipsos Christianae Fidei contraria praedicasse, audissent; vehementi admiratione commoti, Christianae Fidei zelo succensi, surrexerunt, et eos plane in caput suum mentitos fuisse manifestius convicerunt: dicentes, se audisse a quibusdam illorum, quod duo Dii existerent, alter bonus et alter malus; bonus, qui invisibilia tantum, et ea quae mutari aut corrumpi non possunt, fecisset; malus, qui coelum, terram, hominem, et alia visibilia, condidisset. Alii autem affirmaverunt: se, in illorum praedicatione, audisse, corpus Christi non confici per ministerium sacerdotis indigni aut aliquibus criminibus irretiti. Alii autem dicebant: se audisse ab eis, in praedicatione sua, virum cum uxore non posse salvari, si alter alteri debitum reddat. Alii autem dicebant: se ab eis audisse baptismum parvulis non prodesse; et alias quamplures contra Deum et Sanctam Ecclesiam atque Catholicam Fidem blasphemias protulisse, quas pro abominabili earum enormitate tacere utilius est quam referre. Haerctici autem illi haze contradicebant, illos falsum dixisse adversus eos testimonium. Dicebant enim PUBLICE, coram predicto Cardinali et Episcopis et universis astantibus; et confitebantur; et firmiter asseruerunt: quod Unus Deus Altissimus omnia visibilia et invisibilia condidisset; et penitus denegabant duo esse Principia. Confessi sunt etiam: quod sacerdos, sive bonus sive malus, justus vel injustus, et talis etiam quem adulterum aut alias criminosum indubitanter esse scirent, corpus et sanguinem Christi posset conficere; et, per ministerium hujusmodi sacerdotis, et virtute divinorum verborum quae a Domino prolata sunt, panis et vinum in corpus et sanguinem Christi vere transubstantiabantur. Asseruerunt quoque: quod parvuli vel adulti, nostro baptismate baptizati, salvantur; et nullus, sine eodem baptismo, potest salvari: omnino inficiantes, se aliud baptisma aut manus impositionem, sicut eis imponebatur, habere. Affirmaverunt nihilominus: quod vir et mulier, matrimonio copulati, si aliud peccatum non impediat, licet carnaliter alter alteri

debitum reddat, propter bonum matrimonii excusati, salvantur. Haec omnia, licet prius dicerentur negasse, juxta sanum intellectum se intelligere asserentes, praedictus Cardinalis et Episcopi praeceperunt, quod ipsi jurassent, se ita corde credere, sicut confitebantur. Ipsi vero, sicut homines tortae mentis et intentionis obliquae, tandem haeresim nolerunt relinquere, ubi, crassum et sopitum intellectum eorum alicujus auctoritatis superficies videbatur juvare, occasione verbi illius, quod Dominus in Evangelio dixisse legitur: Nolite omnino jurare. Quod cum illi, in arcum pravurn conversi et mente perdita indurati, facere recusarent, praedictus Cardinalis et praenominati Episcopi, in conspectu totius populi, eos iterum, accensis candelis, una cum praefato Pictavensi Episcopo et aliis religiosis viris qui cum illis in omnibus astiterunt, excommunicatos denunciaverunt, et ipsos, cum suo auctore Diabolo, condemnaverunt. Roger. Hoveden. Annal. fol. 327, 328. Vide etiam Epist. Petr. Cardin. de S. Chrysog. Ibid. fol. 328, 329.

CHAPTER 11

[1] I may here remark, that the tales, associated with witchcraft, have evidently been borrowed from the older figments respecting the Albigenses; and they rest, [suppose, upon equal trust-worthiness of evidence. If the Albigenses had their infernal orgies; the witches had their diabolical sabbaths: if Lucifer visited the Albigenses under the form of a cat, which Bossuet's witnesses assure us was the case; he presented himself, as we all know, to the witches, under the aspect of the very same respectable animal: if the Albigenses worshipped the devil; the witches were not a whir behind them in selling their souls to the prince of darkness and in adoring him as a present and potent deity. In short, the witches were the plagiarized Albigenses of an age not very remote from that, in which, without the least fear of sorcery before our eyes, we ourselves securely expatiate. In the reign of Charles II. when some shrewd doubts upon the subject began to creep in, honest Joseph Glanvil, himself a Fellow of the Royal Society, set his face like a flint against what he deemed the growing Sadducism of the times: yet, though in the very title of his book, as some other clerks on other topics have also done, he claims a decided victory over the sceptics; still, in despite of his learned and ingenious Sadducismus Triumphatus, witches themselves, with the belief in their existence, have totally vanished out of the ! and, and our faith is no longer required to be shown by the strenuous vexing of black cats and the resolute tormenting of old women. I have certainly done my best to send the chatharistic cat of Alanus Magnus and the clerical bestiola of the Actuary of Orleans after the familiar deliciae of the witches: and, if I do not absolutely venture to style my tractate Bossuetismus Triumphatus, I am not without hopes, that in future we may be allowed to doubt, notwithstanding the positive asseveration of Peter of Vaux-Sernay, whether it was an article of faith with the Albigenses, that John the Baptist was one of the larger devils, that Christ and Satan were brothers, and that the good God had two wives, hight Colla and Coliba, by whom he became the happy parent of a numerous and hopeful family. Petr. Vallisarn. Hist. Albig. c. 2. If any curious inquirer wishes to see a caricature of the persecuted Albigenses, let him read the second chapter of the History penned by Peter of Vaux-Sernay. This same Monk, I may observe in passing, is one of Bossuet's cherished witnesses, on whose credit we are invited to believe that the Albigenses were rank Manicheans.

[2] Gulielmus Paradinus, quasdam se historias vidisse, ait; in quibus Albigenses eorumque Principes eodem modo excusantur: quod hujusmodi, scilicet, vitia et errores afficta illis fuerint et malitiose imposita; nec quicquam illi fecerint eorum quorum falso accusarentur, praeterquam quod vitia et

corruptelas Praesulum liberius reprehenderint. Paradin. Annal. Burgund. ad A. D. 1209. lib. 2. p. 247, 248. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 10 Section 15.

[3] Eorum partes secuti sunt Comites Tolosae, Convenarum, Bigerronum, et Carmanii, ipseque Rex Tarraconnensium. Et, quamvis pravis imbuti fuerint opinionibus, non hoc tamen tantum Papae et magnorum Principum odium in eos concitabat, quantum libertas orationis, qua dictorum Principum atque Ecclesiasticorum vitia et mores dissolutos culpare, ipsiusque Papae vitam et actiones reprehendere, consueverunt. Haec praecipua res fuit, quae universorum eis conflavit odium, quaeque effecit, ut plures nefariae affingerenter eis opiniones, a quibus omnino fuerant alieni. Rex Augustus, a regni sui Clericis excitatus (qui Albigenses, ob hoc, omnis generis haeresium insimulabant, quod ipsorum vitia insectarentur et assusarent), Innocentium III. Pontifficem rogavit, ut suam hic vellet authoritatem interponere et haereticos ad frugem bonam reducere conaretur. Girard. Histor. Franc. lib. 10. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 10 Section 15.

The theological abuse, poured upon these Princes by the monastic historiographer of Vaux-Sernay, for resisting, on behalf of their oppressed subjects, what he humorously calls The business of Jesus Christ and The affair of the Faith, is in the highest degree amusing and characteristic. In the same spirit, if the pious Crusaders devoutly burn the Albigenses alive: nothing can be more proper and more humane and more christian. But, if, in reprisal, the Albigenses simply hang, NOT BURN, that unnatural rebel and odious persecutor Count Baldwin: Peter incontinently breaks forth; O unheard-of cruelty! O deed worse than that of the first murderer Cain! Petr. Vallisarnens. Hist. Albig. c. 133. Cain is brought in to enliven the Monk's exclamations: because, without a shadow of evidence even by his own showing, the death of the traitor Baldwin is charged by him upon the pretended orders of his brother Count Raymond.

CHAPTER 12

[1] Allix's Remarks on the Anc. Church of the Albig. chap. 1-10. p. 1-109,

[2] Allix on the Albig. chap. 11. p. 109.

[3] Among the names which have come down to us, we meet with Gerard and Arnold and Radulph and Bruis and Henri: but we never meet with Constantine or Sergius or Simeon or Michael or Canaxares or Carbeas or Chrysocheris, though all these names were famous among the Paulicians of Asia.

[4] Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. p. 304. Their Priests were divided into senior and junior.

[5] Lector, dicas secure, quod in toto mundo non sunt Cathari utriusque sexus quatuor millia; sed Credentes, innumeri. Et dicta computatio pluries facta est inter eos. Reiner. de haeret. c. 6. p. 304.

[6] Haec Tolosa, tota dolosa, a prima sui fundatione, sicut asseritur, raro vel unquam expers hujus pestis vel pestilentiae detestabilis hujus haereticae pravitatis, a patribus in filios successive veneno superstitiosae infidelitatis diffuso. Petr. Vallisarn. Hist. Albig. c. 1. In another place, the Monk breaks out: O Toulouse, mother of heretics! O tabernacle of robbers. Ibid. c. 108.

Exactly to the same purpose, somewhat earlier, or in the year 1178, speaks Henry of Clairvaux. From his statement, indeed, it might appear, that the very Clergy, as well as the Laity, determinately worshipped God in the way which the Abbot called Heresy. Audite coeli, quod plangimus: scias terra

gemitum cordis nostri. Doleant vices Christi catholici christiani! et, ad detrimenta fidei, fidelis populus ingemiscat. Quique terrigenae et filii hominum humanae salutis damna deplorent: et generalis vitae nostrae subversio ab omnibus viventibus generaliter lugeatur. Stat contra phalangas Israel novus nostri temporis Philistaeus, haereticorum ordo, exercitus perversorum, qui agminibus Dei viventis irreverenter exprobrat, et Deum majestatis in prima praesumptione blasphemat. Quid dubitas, O David? Quid trepidas, ira fidelis? Sume tibi fundam et lapidem. Percuriatur protinus in fronte blasphemus: et caput nequam, quod impudentur erigitur, suo tuis manibus mucrone tollatur. – Surgite, inquam, surgite, viri patres, duces gentium, principes populorum, abigite feras pessimas, quas vidimus, quas monstramus: vel saltem vulpes parvulas effugare et capere quidem melius. Sed, ad hoc, quis idoneus? Non habent certos aditus: semitas ambulant circulares: et, in quodam fraudium suarum labyrintho, monstra saevissima reconduntur. Tanquam damula, de manu diffugiunt: et, instar colubri tortuosi, quo eo plus astrinxeris, facilius elabuntur. – Contigit nuper, ad imperium Domini Papae, et hortatu piissimorum Principum Ludovici Francorum et Henrici Anglorum Regum, dominum Petrum Apostolicae Sedis Legatum, virosque venerabiles Pictavensem et Bathonensem Episcopos, nosque in comitatu eorum, urbem adire Tolosam: quae, sicut erat civitas maximae multidudinis, ita etiam dicebatur esse mater haeresis et caput erroris. Perreximus ergo ad illam: ut sciremus, si, juxta clamorem qui ascendit, esset dolor ejus. Et, ecce, inventa est plaga ejus magna nimis: ita ut, a planta pedis usque ad verticem capitis, vix esset in eo sanitas. Vere enim tertia pars nobis nunciata non fuerat de omnibus abominationibus suis malis, quas civitas illa nobilis, in incredulitatis suae gremio, confovebat. Locum in ea sibi abominatio desolationis invenerat: et propheticorum similitudo reptilium in latibulis ejus domicilium obtinebat. Ibi haeretici principabantur in populo, dominabantur in Clero: eo Quod populus, sic sacerdos; et, in interitum gregis, ipsa configurabatur vita pastoris. Loquebantur heretici: et homnes admirabantur. Loquebatur catholicus: et dicebant, Quis est hic? in stuporem et miraculum deducentes, si esset aliquis inter eos, qui de verbo fidei auderet aliquid vel mutire. In tantum praevaluerat pestis in terra, quod illi sibi non solum sacerdotes et pontifices fecerant, sed etiam evangelistas habebant, qui corrupta et cancellata evangelica veritate nova illis evangelia cuderent, et de corde suo nequam recentia dogmata seducto populo proedicarent. Epist. Henric. Abbat. Clarevall. in Roger. Hoveden. Annal. A. D. 1178, par. post. Fol. 329, 330.

The various particulars, set forth in this most graphical exhibition both of the temper of popery and of the state of religion in and round Toulouse, will readily account for the circumstance, noted, with so much wrath, by Peter of Vaux-Sernay. He tells us, that the greater part of the Barons and Nobles loved and protected the heretics, in opposition to the Catholic Church, far more ardently than was consistent with their duty. Petr. Vallisarnens. Hist. Albig. c. 1.

[7] Ecce quidam latibulosi homines, perversi et perversores, qui per multa tempora latuerunt et occulte fidem christianam in multis stultae simplicitatis hominibus corruperunt, ita per omnes terras multiplicati sunt, ut grande periculum patiatur Ecclesia Dei a veneno pessimo, quod undique adversus eam effundunt: nam sermo eorum serpit ut cancer, et quasi lepra volatilis 1onge lateque discurrit, pretiosa membra Christi contaminans. Hos nostra Germania, Catharos; Flandria, Piphles Gallia, Texerant ab usu texendi; appellat. Sicut de eis praedixit Dominus, dicunt In penetralibus esse Christum: quid, veram fidem Christi et verum cultum Christi non alibi esse, dicunt, nisi in conventiculis suis, quae habent in cellariis et in textrinis et in hujusmodi subterraneis domibus. Apostolorum vitam agere se dicunt: sed contrarii sunt fidei sanctae et sanae doctrinae, quae a sanctis Apostolis et ab ipso Domino Salvatore nostro tradita sunt. Eckbert. adv. Cathar. serm. 1. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 12. p. 898.

In the estimation of the Romanists, these widely-spreading religionists perverted sound doctrine, because, among other matters, as Eckbert testifies, they rejected prayers and masses for the dead, denied the existence of a purgatory, and disbelieved the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Ibid. serm. 9. p. 913. serm. 11. p. 922. Eckbert flourished A. D. 1160.

Bernard, as we have seen, speaks very contemptuously of the textores and textrices; who contrived, nevertheless, to seduce numbers even of the Clergy from their allegiance to their sovereign lord the Pope. Bernard. super Cantic. serm. 65. col. 761.

[8] Primis temporibus, quibus haeresis Catharorum in Lombardia multiplicari coepit, primum habuerunt Episcopum quendam Marcum nomine; sub cujus regimine Lombardi et Tusci et Machiani regebantur. Iste Marcus ordinem suum habebat de Bulgaria. Veniens, autem, quidam Papa, Nicetas nomine, a Constantinopoli in Lombardiam, coepit accusare ordinem Bulgariae quem Marcus habebat. Unde Marcus Episcopus, haesitare incipiens, relicto ordine Bulgariae, suscepit ab illo Papa Niceta ordinem Druguriae cum suis complicibus, et tenuit per multos annos. Vet. Auct. in Vignier. Hist. Eccles. in A. D. 1023. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8 Section 18.

The Druguria of these early writers seems probably to be Hungary. Hence one branch of the Community bore the local name of Runcarii: which I take to be a corruption of Hungarii. See Reiner. de haeret, c. 4. p. 299. c. 6. p. 301.

Some further divisions produced another metropolitanship in Slavonia: so that the European Paulicians, at an early period, had three of those superior Episcopates.

Ex his porro aliae divisiones ortae, processu temporis, in tres sectas desierunt: quarum unaquaeque suum seorsim habebat Episcopum. Prima suum ordinem e Bulgaria, secunda e Druguria, tertia ex Slavonia, accepit. Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8 Section 18.

The Albigenses of Aquitaine, however, it might appear, preferred the more ancient and original connection with Bulgaria. Aliquam quoque inter Bulgaros et Albigenses intercessisse necessitudinam, ex eo colligitur: quod Albigenses papam, in finibus Bulgarorum, Croatiae, et Dalmatiae, sibi constituisse, ex epistola Conradi Portuensis Episcopi, tradat in Majore Historia, ad A. D. 1223, Matthaeus Parisius: et Albigenses Galliae, in Roberti Altissiodorensis et Gulielmi Nangiaci Chronologia, ad A. D. 1207, appellentur Bulgari. Ibid. 19. See also Hist. Gener. de Langued. Livr. 23:74.

The connection, I suppose, was broken, when the Albigenses were well nigh exterminated in the Crusade of Simon de Montfort. What finally became of the Paulicians of Bulgaria and Hungary and Slavonia, I know not. Apparently, they gradually wasted away, and became extinct. According to Eneas Sylvius, some of them still existed in the fifteenth century.

[9] For the extraordinary moral influence, which the Albigenses exercised over the minds both of the Count of Toulouse and of the Count of Foix, see Petr. Vallisarnens. Hist. Albig. c. 6, 7.

[10] Introd. to Translat. of Sismondi's Hist. of the Crusades against the Albig. p. 18.

BOOK 3

CHAPTER 1

[1] De sectis antiquorum haereticorum nota: quod sectae haereticorum fuerunt plures quam septuaginta; quae omnes, per Dei gratiam, deletae sunt, praeter sectas Manichaeorum, Arianorum, Runcariorum, et Leonistarum, quae Alemanniam infecerunt. Inter omnes has sectas, quae adhuc sunt vel fuerunt, non est perniciosior Ecclesiae, quam Leonistarum: et hoc, tribus de causis. Prima est; Quia est diuturnior: aliqui enim dicunt, quod duraverit a tempore Sylvestri; aliqui, a tempore Apostolorum. Secunda; Quia est generalior: fere enim nulla est terra, in qua haec secta non sit. Tertia; Quia, cum omnes aliae sectae; immanitate blasphemiarum in Deum, audientibus horrorem inducant, haec, scilicet Leonistarum, magnam habet speciem pietatis; eo quod, coram hominibus, juste vivant, et bene omnia de Deo credant et omnes articulos qui in Symbolo continentur: solummodo Romanam Ecclesiam blasphemant et Clerum; cui multitudo Laicorum facilis est ad credendum. Reiner. de haeret. c. 4. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 13. p. 299.

Respecting the Church of the comparatively modern French Leonists or Poor Men of Lyons, which was founded in the twelfth century by Peter the Valdes, and which is fully described by Reinerius in the fifth or immediately following chapter of his Tractate, see below, book in. chap. 8. 11. and book 3. chap. 12. Section 1. 2.

Speaking of these French Valdenses, whose founder is recorded to have been an Italian Valdensis, and who thus through him stand connected as an offshoot with the remotely ancient Vallensic or Leonistic Church of Piedmont, Moneta, the contemporary of Reinerius, says, no doubt, with much truth: Non multum temporis est quod esse coeperunt; quoniam, sicut patet, a Valdesio cive Lugdunensi exordium acceperunt: qui hanc viam incepit, non plures sunt quam octoginta anni. Monet. adv. Cathar. et Valdens. lib. 5. c. 1. Section 4. p. 402.

A good deal of confusion has sometimes arisen from want of attention to the accurate distinction which Reinerius makes between the ANCIENT Leonists and the MODERN Leonists.

[2] Dicentes (scil. Valdenses): Sectam eorum durasse a temporibus Sylvestri Papae. Pilich. cont. Valdens. c. 1. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 13. p. 312.

I ascribe Pilichdorf to the thirteenth century, on the authority of the Editors of the Cologne Bibliotheca Patrum. See the Catalogue prefixed to Bibl. Patr. Colon. vol. 13. Bossuet, on what authority I know not, places him a century later. See Hist. des Variat. livr. 11 Section 95. So far as concerns my own use of this author here and elsewhere, it is a matter of no great consequence, whether he belonged to the one century or to the other.

[3] Nonnulli haeresis hujus assertores, ad adblandiendum apud vulgares et historiarum ignaros favorem, hanc eorum Sectam, Constantini Maximi temporibus, a Leone quodam religiosissimo initium sumpsisse fabulantur: qui, execrata Sylvestri Romanre Urbis tunc Pontificis avaritia et Constantini ipsius immoderata largitione, paupertatem in fidei simplicitate sequi maluit, quam, cum Sylvestro, pingui opulentoque sacerdotio contaminari. Cui cum omnes, qui de Christiana Religione recte sentiebant, adhaesissent, sub Apostolorum regula viventes, hanc per manus ad posteros verae religionis normam transmiserunt. Claud. Scyssel. Taurin. adv. error. et sect. Valdens. Fol. 5, 6.

I suppose it will be allowed, that the well-informed Reinerius could scarcely, for the sake of currying favor with the vulgar and the ignorant on behalf of the Valdenses, have described them as being the oldest of all sects: older, as he distinctly specifies, than the Arians who sprang up in the fourth century, and the Manicheans who succeeded the Gnostics in the third century. This, at all events, he could not have done from a wish to promote the respectability and interest of the Valdenses. Therefore we may safely conclude, that his statement was extorted from him simply by the irresistible force of overwhelming evidence.

[4] De sectis modernorum haereticorum, nota, quod secta Pauperum de Lugduno, qui etiam Leonistae dicuntur, tali modo orta est. Reiner de haeret. c. 5. p. 300. He then sets forth their foundation by Peter.

[5] D'Anville's Anc. Geog. vol. 1. p. 74.

[6] Nimirum respondet generi suo; ut qui de latronum et convenarum natus est semine: quos Cneius Pompeius, edomita Hispania, et ad triumpham redire festinans, de Pyrenaei jugis deposuit, et in unum oppidum congregavit. Unde et Convenarum urbs nomen accepit. Hieron. adv. Vigilant. c. 2. Oper. vol. 2. p. 159.

Quia ad radices Pyrenaei habitas, vicinusque es Iberiae. Ibid. p. 159.

[7] Frustra autem est Plessaeus, cum fictitiae Valdensium antiquitati advocatum adsciscit Reinerium. Non, enim, ex sua, sed ex aliorum sententia, cap. 4, ait: sectam Valdensium, a temporibus S. Sylvestri Papae vel etiam ipsorum Apostolorum, durasse. Gretser. Prolegom. in Scriptor. cont. sect. Valdens. Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 296.

It may be doubted, whether Du Plessay was quite so much frustra, as Gretser alleges.

[8] Claude Scyssel of Turin, who mentions (as we have seen) that the old tradition respecting Leo still existed in Piedmont at the beginning of the sixteenth century, speaks, with curious inconsistency, respecting the origination of the Vallensic Church and Creed.

He would have us believe, that, about three centuries and a half before the time when he wrote, Peter Valdo of Lyons was the first author of the contagious pestilence: and yet he speaks of what by his own account was a mere upstart invention of yesterday, as being all the while a most ancient heresy. Valdensis quippe, ut aiunt, appellabatur; et Lugdunensis urbis municeps fuit: unde et prima hujus pestis contagio pullulavit. Claud. Scyssel. adv. Valdens. fol. 5. In spem maximam eliminendae haeresis hujus antiquissimae erecti proculdubio sumus. Ibid. fol. 3.

His ascription of it to Valdo clearly enough sprang from the circumstance of many of the French Valdenses having taken permanent refuge from persecution among their elder brethren of the Cottian Alps; an emigration, which he places about two hundred years before his own time: but nothing can be more amusing than his demonstration, that no primeval individual named Leo, could have been concerned with this most ancient heresy. Even those retired anchorites, he remarks, Antony and Hilary, are duly mentioned by ecclesiastical writers: but, respecting Leo, all such writers are silent. Ibid. fol. 2, 6. We shall perhaps find, in the sequel, that the true Leo or Leonist of Valdensic Tradition is noticed most abundantly and most vituperatively by the angry bigots of the day. In the humble friends and followers of this distinguished individual, the poor Vallenses of Piedmont, the theological perspicacity of Scyssel detects, both the apocalyptic harlot, and the ten horns of the seven-headed wild beast. Synagogam Sathanm, Ecclesiam Malignanturn, et Scottum vilissimum Meretricemque omni turpitudine infamem, vel Bestiam ascendentem de mari habentem capita septem et cornua decem. Ibid.

fol. 39. Truly, the Archbishop well repays the heretics in their own current coin. Scyssel charges the Valdenses with dissembling or concealing their doctrine: and professes to think, that, on their principles, Peter's denial of the Lord might be excused. But his own statement of their language evidently shows their sole offense to have been, that they were not forward in disputing with those whose minds they perceived to be impenetrably hardened against conviction.
Hi perditi hypocritae illam Salvatoris sententiam, in suam excusationem, adducunt; Non est bonum sanctum dare canibus, neque sunt inter porcos seminandae margaritae: quasi vero nos incapaces sumus veritatis evangelical. Ibid. fol. 47.

In his time, it seems, they claimed to themselves exclusively the title of The Catholic Church: thus asserting their true prophetic character of the Communion, in which the two promises of Christ should be fulfilled.

Se solos evangelicam atque apostolicam doctrinam servare profitentur: ob eamque maxime causam, Ecclesiae Catholicae nomen, intoleranda impudentia, sibi usurpant. Ibid. fol. 46.

Scyssel, however, somewhat heretically, himself pronounces the Rock, upon which Christ would found his Church, to be, not Peter, but Peter's Confession or (what is equivalent) Christ himself. How his peace was made at Rome for such a slip, I know not.

Petro dixit: Tu es Petrus; et super hanc Petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, Non super ipsum Petrum aedificaturum se Ecclesiam intellexit; sed super seipsum, qui est vera Petra, sicut dicit Paulus. Petra, inquit, erat Christus: et Lapis angularis, et Petra scandali, sicut dicit Petrus. Ibid. fol. 25. Dungal gives the same interpretation in the ninth century. Dung. adv. Claud. Taurin. in Bibl. Parr. vol. 9. par. post. p. 891.

[9] M. Raynouard, a la page 137 de ses Monumens de la Langue Romane (Choix des poesies originales des troubadours, tom. 2.), appelle le vaudois Une Langue Romane primitive, idiome intermdiaire entre la decomposition de la langue des Romains et l'etablissement d'une nouveau systeme grammatical: circonstance, qui atteste la haute antiquite de cet idiome dans le pays que ce peuple habitait. Et, dans le lettre de lui, parlant de la Nobla Leytcon, qui montre pourtant la date assez ancienne de l'an 1100, et qui par cela meme doit etre anterieure a la plupart des ecrits des troubadours, il s'exprime de la sorte: Le langage m'en parait etre d'une epoque deja eloignee de sa formation: ou y remarque la suppression de quelques consonnes finales; ce, qui annonce que les mots de la langue parlee depuis long-temps, avaient deja perdu quelque chose de leurs desinences primitives. Muston. Hist. des Vaudois, livr. 2. note 3. vol. 1. p. 361, 362.

[10] Arnold's Preface to Glorious Recov. p. 13, 14, translated and edited by Acland.

[11] Boyer. Abrege de l'Hist. des Vaudois. p. 23.

[12] Leger. Hist. des Vaud. par. 1. p. 163.

[13] Muston Hist. des Vaud. livr. 2. note 101. Scultet. Annal. Evangel. Renovat. in A. D. 1530. p. 163. Leger. Hist. des Vaud. par. 1. p. 164. Gilly's Waldens. Research. p. 40.

CHAPTER 2

[1] This evidence, however, in brief, has twice appeared in print. I communicated it to Dr. Gilly who introduced it into the second edition of his Memoir of Felix Neff: and Dr. Gilly communicated it to Dr. Muston, who, on the strength of his authority, has similarly introduced it into his recently published History of the Vaudois. See that Work, book 2. note 15. vol. 1. p. 178.

[2] Hieron. adv. Vigilant. c. 2. Oper. vol. 2. p. 159. Epist. 75. vol. 2. p. 251, 252.

[3] Hieron. adv. Vigilant. ad Ripar. Oper. vol. 2. p. 157. Hieron. adv. Vigilant. cap. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6. Oper. vol. 2. p.158-161.

[4] Hieron. Epist. 53. Hieron. adv. Vigilant. Oper. vol. 2. p. 157-161.

[5] Ego vidi hoc aliquando portentum: et, testimoniis Scripturarum, quasi vinculis Hippocratis, volui ligare furiosum. Sed abiit; excessit; evasit; erupit: et, inter Hadriae fluctus Cottiique Regis Alpes, in nos declamando clamavit. Hieron. Epist. 53. Oper. vol. 2. p. 158.

[6] The wisdom of God works not miraculously, when the natural operation of second causes may serve as the substratum of his high purposes. Seclusion within a mountainous district has a physical tendency to preclude change and innovation. Opinions and practices are handed down from father to son: and, until an intercourse is opened with the lower world at their feet, one generation is but the faithful reflection of another. Hence, in the course of God's providence, the alpine mountains and valleys were selected as the retreat, where, unchanged from the first ages, pure Christianity was to be preserved. When persons, imitatively nurtured in these solitudes, first emerge into an ever-fluctuating world, their feelings are not unlike those of the fabled sleepers of Ephesus. Retiring, like the ancestors of the Vaudois, from the persecution of Decius, they concealed themselves in a spacious cavern. Here they were overpowered by a sleep of one hundred and eighty-seven years. When they emerged, they themselves remained consciously the same, faithfully reflecting the feelings and habits and opinions of a period long since passed away: but, meanwhile, what a change in the world! Christianity, trampled upon and persecuted, was now triumphant. Every thing was new: every thing was strange. Their tale of the Primitive Church was recited: their benediction was bestowed: and, their appointed task being accomplished, they forthwith expired. The application of the tale is easily made: and the Cottian Alps are not the only land of mountains, in which it has been practically exemplified.

When, in the eighth age, the Roman world had fallen deeper and deeper into the wretched superstition of image-worship, the person, who strenuously opposed this odious and unscriptural corruption, was the Emperor Leo Isauricus. In his unsophisticated native mountains, the practice had as yet obtained no footing: and Leo, at Constantinople (surely the name is destined to be fatal to Popery), was shocked and surprised to find a system of idolatry, so utterly unlike that primitive and simple form of Christianity to which he and his fathers before him had been accustomed.

Such were the natural feelings of this iconoclastic Sovereign. Now, unless I altogether mistake in what, subordinately to God's providential dispensation, may be called the philosophy of the matter, the unchanging character of the secluded Alpine Mountaineers is accurately exhibited in the similarly unchanging character of the Mountaineers of Isauria. The inhabitants of the cities and of the richer provinces of the Roman Empire gradually apostatized from the sincerity of the Gospel: but the very character of their country was, in the hand of God, the secondary cause which led the sequestered Vallenses to persevere in the unadulterated faith of the Primitive Apostolic Church. Unchanged

themselves, when at length they emerged from the figurative sleep of their allegorical Ephesian cavern, they marveled to find: that the Gospel, which they had carried away with them from pagan persecution, had become rank heresy; and that they had only to bear their testimony to the doctrines and practices of the Primitive Church, and then, like the seven resuscitated sleepers of Asia, meekly bow down their heads in death.

[7] Miror, sanctum episcopum, in cujus parochia esse presbyter dicitur, acquiescere furori ejus, et non virga apostolica virgaque ferrea confringere vas inutile, et tradere in interitum carnis ut spiritus salvus fiat. Hieron. Epist. 53. Oper. vol. 2. p. 158.

[8] Auctores sunt hujus dictatiunculae meae sancti presbyteri Riparius et Desiderius, qui parochias suas vicinia istius scribunt esse maculatas: miseruntque libros per fratrem Sisinnium, quos inter crapulam stertens evomuit: et asserunt, repertos esse nonnullos, qui, faventes vitiis suis, illius blasphemiis acquiescant. Hieron. adv. Vigilant. c. 2. Oper. vol. 2. p. 159. Alas, poor Vigilantius, that his whole heresy should have been produced by an unlucky fit of indigestion!

Incurset Galliarum Ecclesias, portetque nequaquam vexillum Christi, sed insigne diaboli. Hieron. adv. Vigilant. c. 2. Oper. vol. 2. p. 159.

[9] Proh nefas! episcopos sui sceleris dicitur habere consortes: si tamen episcopi nominandi sunt, qui non ordinant diaconos, nisi prius uxores duxerint. Hieron. adv. Vigil. c. 1. Oper. vol. 2. p. 158.

[10] Male ergo facit Romanus Episcopus, qui super mortuorum hominum, Petri et Pauli, secundum nos ossa veneranda, secun dum te vilem pulvisculum, offert Domino sacrificia, et tumulos eorum Christi arbitratur altaria: et non solum unius urbis, sed totius orbis, errant episcopi, qui, cauponem Vigilantium contemneutes, ingrediuntur basilicas mortuorum? Hieron. adv. Vigil. c. 3. Oper. vol. 2. p. 160.

CHAPTER 3

[1] For the dates of the establishment of the ten gothic kingdoms upon the platform of the Western Roman Empire, see my Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, book in. chap. 2. Section 4. 1. (4.)

[2] The true import and etymology of this title was still, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, preserved by the pious individuals who bore it: though, spiritualizing, on account of persecution, their merely descriptively local name, they professed, as we learn from Everhard de Bethune, to call themselves Vallenses, because they abode upon earth in a Valley of tears.

Vallenses se appellant, eo quod in Valle lachrymarum maneant. Eberhard. Bath. Antihaer. c. 25. In thus mysticizing their usual designation, they alluded, I suppose, to that of the Psalmist in the familiar translation of the Latin Vulgate. Beatus vir, cujus est auxilium abs te: ascensiones in corde suo disposuit, in valle lachrymarum, in loco quem posuit, Psalm 84:5, 6.

[3] Valdenses dicunt: quod socius Sylvestri, tempore Constantini, noluit consentire, quod Ecclesia, Constantini temporibus, ditaretur; et ex hoc a Sylvestro recesserit, viam paupertatis tenendo: apud quem etiam, suis adhaerentibus in paupertare degentibus, Ecclesia permansit; et Sylvestrum, cum sibi adhaerentibus, ab Ecclesia dicit cecidisse. Item: quod, post annos trecentos a Constantino, surrexit quidam e regione Valdis, Petrus nominatus; qui similiter viam paupertatis docuit. A quibus secta Valdensis est orta. Pilich. cont. Pauper. de Lugdun. Fragment. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 13. p. 333, 334.

Pilichdorf does not quarrel with any part of this tradition in the abstract: but he, somewhat ludicrously, twits the Vaudois with their inability to demonstrate its truth by miracles: whereas the whole world rang with the undoubted miracles of the holy Pope Sylvester. Sed quae signa virtutum praedictis perhibent testimonium? Cum tamen facta celeberrima et miracula Sylvestri totum mundum non latuerint. Ibid. p. 334.

[4] Pilich. cont. Valdens. c.1. Reiner. de haer. c. 5. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 13. p. 300, 312, 313.

CHAPTER 4

[1] Claude de Turin etoit Arien et disciple de Felix d'Urgel, c'est-a-dire, Nestorien de plus. Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11 Section 1. I subjoin the precise words of Jonas: for Bossuet, according to his established custom, never gives the originals.

Ut relatione veridica didici, non modo error (de quo agitur) in discipulorum suorum mentibus reviviscit, quin potius (co dicente) haeresis Arriana pullulare deprehenditur, de qua fertur quaedam monumenta librorum congessisse, et ad simplicitatem et puritatem fidei catholicae et apostolicae oppugnandam in armario episcopii sui clandestina calliditate reliquisse. – Sufficere namque Claudio poterat, ad cumulum miseriarum suarum, error quem secutus est duorum scilicet haereticorum, Eustathii et Vigilantii. Sed, his geminis pestibus minime contentus, altiori perditionis suae baratro sese praecipitem dedit, dum infestissimi hostis sanctae Dei Ecclesiae, Arrii se sectatorem discipulumque, et in vita, et in morte, extitisse monstravit: in vita quidem, docendo et praedicando; in morte quoque, in nefandis codicibus suis eundem errorem a se scriptum relinquendo. Secta quippe ejusdem Arrii, olim a sanctis patribus damnata, catholicoque mucrone sub perpetuo anathemate confossa, quae sub eodem Claudio dicitur resuscitata, necesse est, ut, sagacissimo quaesitu et diligentissimo scrutamine, extat inventa, et in lucem perferenda, et cum resuscitatore suo ab ecclesiasticis viris rursus sanctarum scripturarum telis ferienda atque frustranda. Jon. Aurelian. de cult. imag. praefat, in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 9. par. prior, p. 91.

It may be observed, that, as Jonas waited for the death of Claude ere he brought his charge of Arianism, so, even then, he adduces it purely as a matter of hearsay: fertur; dicitur.

In justice to Jonas it ought to be stated: that, although, in the ninth century, he composed a work against Claude and in favor of images; he has merited and received the censure of more advanced Romanists, at a later period, because he labored under the grievous error of his age, in denying to them all religious adoration. Hence this pillar of the Church, as Bellarmine remarks, must be read cautiously by all good Catholics. Jonas Episcopus Aurelianends, imperante Ludovico Pio, scripsit libros tres, qui extant, adversus Claudium Episcopum Taurinensem pro defendone sacrarum imaginum et signi sanctae crucis et peregrinationum ad loca sancta. Sed hic tamen auctor caute legendus est, quoniam laborat eodem errore, quo Agobardus et reliqui ejus aetatis Galli, qui negabant sacris imaginibus ullum debere cultum religiosum. Bellarm. de Scriptor. Eccles. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 9. par. prior, p. 91.

The editors of the Bibliotheca piously follow ill the track of the Cardinal.

Etsi Jonas laude dignus extiterit, quod, adversus iconomachos sacras imagines demolientes, strenue veritatem catholicam, de retinendis et conservandis imaginibus, propugnaverit: et in eo merito rejiciendus, quod nullam sacris imaginibus adorationem aut venerationem deferendam existimaverit,

qui fuit error nonnullorum gallicanorum magni nominis theologorum, uti praediximus. Ob id, scripta ista Ionte magno cum judicio et caute legenda. Ibid. p. 90.

[2] Dungal has written a long and angry answer to what he calls the perverse sentiments of Claude of Turin: and, though he manifestly wished to speak all the evil of him that he could do, he never once, the object of his wrath being then alive, has ventured to charge him with either Nestorianism or Arianism. He refers, in a single place, to Felix, as the author of the error, which Claude maintained, and which he (not very wisely for a man of such limited powers and such a rambling illogical head) had undertaken by the aid of mere verbose declamation to confute: but this error, against which he directs the whole of his small strength, is the rejection of image-worship, and saint-worship, and relic-worship, and cross-worship, and foolish pilgrimages to Rome, and perhaps still more foolish acknowledgments of papal supremacy in the chair of the Apostle; not the heresy either of Arius or of Nestorius. He simply says: in magisfro hujus erroris Felice. Dungal. Respons. cont. pervers. Claud. Tanrim sentent, in Bibl. Parr. vol. 9:par. poster, p. 878. The hic error, is the subject of the entire Treatise, which extends through twenty two very closely printed folio pages. On this same Hic error, Dungal is very full and very angry: but not a syllable has he to say upon either the Nestorianism or the Arianism of the mad blasphemer and the hissing serpent, whose head, for the good of the Church and the preservation of the faith, he had undertaken to crush. Possibly some allowance ought to be made for the exuberance of his indignation: for the zealous Claude, disgusted, like Vigilantius, with the unscriptural folly of the cinder-men and bone-worshippers, certainly did not mince the matter. Dungal, at the close of his Treatise, reminds him, how he refused to attend a Convention of Bishops on the not very complimentary ground of their being a Congregation of Asses. Propter istam antem insanissimam perversitatem, renuit ad Conventum occurrere Episcoporum; vocans illorum Synodum Congregation era Asinorum. Dungal. cont. Claud. Taurin. in Bibl. Patr. par. post. vol. 9. p. 895.

[3] Absentibus illis qui priores facti erant Apostoli, Paulus a Domino perfectus est, ut, quando cum eis contulit, nihil esset quod perfectioni ejus adderent; sed potius viderent, eundem Dominum Jesum Christum, qui sine personarum acceptione salvos facit, hoc dedisse Paulo ut ministraret gentibus, quod etiam Petro dederat ut ministraret Judaeis. Claud. Taurin. Enar. in Epist. ad Galat. 2:6. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 9. par. prior, p. 71.

In commune vero hoc eos habuisse propositi, ut Christo, ex cunctis Gentibus, Ecclesiam congregarent. Legimus enim, et a sancto Petro gentilem baptizatum fuisse Cornelium, et a Paulo in Synagogis Judaeorum Christum saepissime praedicatum: sed tamen plena auctoritas Petro, in Judaismi praedictione, data dignoscitur; et Pauli perfecta auctoritas, in praedicatione Gentium, invenitur. – Petrum solum nominat, et sibi comparat; quia primatum ipse accepit ad fundandam Ecclesiam: se quoque pari modo electum, ut primatum habeat in fundandis Gentium Ecclesiis. Ibid. 2:8. p. 72.

[4] Coguntur fateri, non legis operibus justificari hominem, sed fide. Simul etiam nos cogit intelligere, omnes antiquos patres, qui justificati sunt, ex ipsa fide justificatos. Claud. Taurin. Enarr. in Epist. ad Galat. 3. 16. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 9. par. prior, p. 76.

Lex ostendebat esse peccatum, quod illi, per consuetudinem caecati, possent putare justitiam: ut, hoc modo humiliati, cognoscerent, non in sua manu esse salutem suam, sed in manu Mediatoris. Ibid. 3. 21. p. 77.

Perdit ergo gratiam Christi, et evangelium quod tenuerat amittit, qui in aliqua observatione legis se justificari putat: et cum gratiam amisserit, a Christi fide destruitur, et in ejus opere conquiescit. – Nunc

tota lege generaliter comprehendit, nihil eos in Christi opere proficere, qui in quacunque observatione se crediderint justificandos, dicendo: Si ergo in lege spem ponitis, infirmam Christi gratiam judicatis; et, quod gratis jam accepistis, tanquam non habentes, propriis vultis laboribus adipisci. Ibid. v. 4. p. 83. Non in propria justitia vel doctrina, sed in fide crucis per quam mihi omnia peccata dimissa sunt. Ibid. 6:14. p. 89.

[5] Nec mirum, si, recedente Apostolo, vase electionis, et in quo Christus Dominus loquebatur, Galatae sunt mutati; cum etiam nunc, cernamus in Ecclesiis id ipsum fieri. Claud. Taurin. Enarr. in Epist. ad Galat. 4:18. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 9. par. prior, p. 81.

[6] Haeresis autem Graece ab electione dicitur, quod scilicet eam sibi unusquisque eligit disciplinam, quam putat esse meliorem. Quicunque.386 igitur aliter Scripturam intelligit, quam sensus Spiritus Sancti flagrat, quo conscripta est, licet de Ecclesia non recesserit, tamen haereticus appellari potest, et de carnis operibus est eligens quae pejora sunt. Claud. Taurin. Enarr. in Epist. ad. Galat. 5:19-21. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 9. par. prior. p. 86.

[7] Adoptionem propterea dixit, ut distincte intelligamus unicum Dei Filium. Nos enim, beneficio et dignatione misericordiae ejus, filii Dei sumus: ille, NATURA, est Filius; QUI HOC EST QUOD PATER. Claud. Taurin. Enarr. in Epist. ad Galat. 4:5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 9. par. prior, p. 79.

The man who wrote this, could by no possibility have been an Arian. From a manuscript in the possession of Mr. Theyer, Dr. Allix gives, at considerable length, the sentiments of Claude respecting the Eucharist. The following brief extract may suffice.

Quia panis corpus confirmat, vinum vero sanguinem operatur in carne: hic ad corpus Christi MYSTICE, illud refertur ad sanguinem. Claud. Taurin. Comment. in Matt. lib. 3. c. 14. The same passage contains yet another proof, that Claude could not have been an Arian. In flagello positus, Patri gratias agit AEQUALIS. Ibid.

[8] Epistolam tuam, cum adjunctis subter capitulis, plenam garrulitate atque stoliditate per quendam accepi rusticum portitorem: in quibus capitulis, denuncias, to esse turbatum, eo quod rumor abierit ex Italia de me per omnes Gallias usque ad fines Hispaniae, quasi ego sectam quandam novam praedicaverim contra regulam Fidei Catholicae; quod omnino falsissimum est. Nec mirum est, si de me ista dixerunt diaboli membra, qui ipsum Caput nostrum et seductorem et daemoniacum proclamaverunt. Ego enim non sectam doceo, qui unitatem teneo et veritatem proclamo: sed sectas et schismata et superstitiones atque haereses, in quantum valui, compressi, contrivi, et pugnavi, et expugnavi; et expugnare, in quantum valeo, prorsus Deo adjuvante, non cesso. Hoc autem idcirco provenit: quia, postquam coactus suscepi sarcinam pastoralis officii, missus a Pio principe sanctae Domini Ecclesim Catholicae filio Hludovico, et veni in Italiam civitatem Taurinis, inveni omnes basilicas, contra ordinem veritatis, sordibus anathematum imaginibus plenas. Et, quia quod omnes colebant, ego destruere solus coepi: et, idcirco, aperuerunt omnes ora sua ad blasphemandum me; et, nisi Dominus adjuvisset me, forsitan vivum deglutissent me. Claud. Taurin. Epist, ad. Abbat. Theutmir. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 9. par. post. p. 876.

Jonas of Orleans is very indignant at the whole of this passage: and, in reference to its conclusion, he kicks the dead lion with all the energy of a popish controversialist.

Id nuili, nisi tibi, imputandum est. Debueras siquidem cavere, ne sectatores Christi tam infauste reprehenderes, eisque sacrilegii notam inureres, traditionesque quas sibi a sacrosanctis patribus traditas

sancta simpliciter tenet Ecclesia, etsi non voto tuo, saltem silentio, gravitate magistra comprobare. Jon. Aurelian. de cult. imag. lib. 1. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 9. par. prior. p. 94.

Good Jonas however, himself, as we have seen, must be read cautiously, because he denies that any adoration ought to be paid to images. Thus, in the judgment of better instructed Romanists, does the castigator of Claude actually tremble on the very verge of heresy. On this curious and interesting topic Bossuet, with much sound judgment, is profoundly silent. Jonas, however, sorely enacting the Marplot, quotes, in favor of his dangerous and semi-heretical opinion, Origen and Augustine and Lactantius. Hence we are warned. I suppose, against the following sufficiently distinct statement, which the Prelate of Orleans makes his own by adoption.

Ut enim breviter, et omnia in unum collecta, definitione dicamus: Adorare alium, praeter Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, impietatis est crimen. Ibid. lib. 1. p. 95.

Here, no doubt, Bellarmine and the Editors of the Bibliotheca would place a Lege caute.

[9] Claud. Taurin. Comment. in Levit. apud Allix on the Anc. Church of Piedm. chap. 9. p. 79.

[10] Hunc itaque libellum, responsiones ex auctoritate ae doctrina sanctorum patrum defloratas et excerptas continentem, sub nomine et honore gloriosissimorum principum, christianissimorum Sanctae Ecclesiae rectorum, domini Hludovici maximi ac serenissimi Imperatoris, ejusque filii nobilissimi Augusti Hlotharii, ego Dungalus, in Dei et eorum obsequio esse dicandum componendumque devovi, contra insanas blasphemasque Claudii Taurinenis Episcopi naenias: non quod ante jam dudum, ex quo in hanc terram advenerim, occasio mihi copiosa hac de re reclamandi conquerendique assidue non occurreret, dum dominicam ubique messem malignis zizaniis lolioque infelici horrere cernendo suspirarem; sed ne conatus nostri, aerem, ut dicitur, verberando, incertave pro certis adfirmando, deluderentur; sub silentii diutina anxiaque obseratione ora continui, moerens dolensque murmur multum, antiquamque contentionem de corpore Christi, hoc est Ecclesia, in turbis fieri, quae quondam praecessit de capite. -Sequestrato ab invicem in hac regione, ac diviso in duas partes, populo, de observationibus ecclesiasticis, hoc est, de imagine dominicae passionis et sancta pictura, murmurantes et contendentes, Catholici dicunt: bonam et utilem esse eam picturam; et pene tantundem proficere ad eruditionem, quantum et Sacrae Literae. Haereticus, e contra, cum parte a se seducta, dicunt: non; sed seductio est erroris et idololatria.

Talis de cruce contentio habetur, catholicis dicentibus: quod bona et sancta sit, vexillumque triumphale, et signum perpetuae salutis. Pars adversa, cum suo magistro, e contra respondet: non; sed opprobrium tantum passionis, et irrisio mortis, in ea continetur et ostenditur ac memoratur.

Pari ratione, de memoriis sanctorum causa orationis adeundis, et reliquiis eorum venerandis, obnituntur, aliis adfirmantibus: bonam et religiosam esse consuetudinem basilicas martyrum frequentare; ubi eorum sacri cineres et sancta corpora, quasi quaedam venerabilia vasa a Deo acceptabilia, in quibus omnigena pro fide Christi tormenta sunt usque ad mortem perpessi, cum honore eorum meritis congruo, condita habentur; ubique, ipsis intervenientibus, corporales ac spiritales quotidie languores, divina operante manu et gratia coruscante, copiosissime et praesentissime sanantur. Alii vero resistunt, dicentes: sanctos post obitum nullum adjuvare nullique posse intercedendo succurrere, nihil eorum duntaxat scientes quae in terris geruntur; illorumque reliquias nullam alicujus reverentiae gratiam comitari, sicut nec ossa vilissima quorumlibet animalium, reliquamve terram communem. Dungal. Respons. cont. pervers. Claud. Taurin. sentent. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 9. par. post. p. 878.

As a specimen of his intolerably turgid and wearisome style, I give Dungal's exordium at full length. He evidently thought it a piece of very fine writing, fit to be placed in most advantageous contrast with the straight-forward simplicity of Claude. Nothing can be more amusing, than the complacency with which he speaks of his opponent. Licet autem incondito ac rustico, utpote ab homine doctrinalis expertis scientiae, sit haec edita contextu epistola; tamen non magnopere de hoc excutiendo vel inquirendo curavi: sed tantum sensus dispar, et catholicae contrarius fidei, adeo me movit et conturbavit. Ibid. p. 878.

This rambling and declamatory mode of writing, which occupies with an endless Crambe recocta half-a-dozen pages where one would amply suffice, characterizes all the modern popish controversialists with whom I am acquainted, save and except Bossuet. Would he were more honest: but, unlike some whom I could mention, he assuredly knows how to use his pen.

[11] See Claude. Taurin. Epist. ad Abbat. Theutmir. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 9. par. post. p. 876, 877.

[12] Claud. Epist. ad Theutmir. p. 877. I must not suppress the singular felicity of Dungal's retort courteous. He is quite sure that all Claude's contempt for relies is bottomed upon mere envy. If the Cathedral of Turin was but as well stocked with dead bones and old rags as the richer cathedral of Rome; truly Claude would then be as warm an advocate, as he is now an opponent. Dungal. Respons. p. 888. I do not recollect to have ever met with so palpable a hit. The suppression of it would have been a sin without benefit of Clergy.

[13] Dungal. Respons. p. 880, 881, 883, 888, 893, 895.

[14] Cognovit, quod illa (scil. Hieronymus) contra suum vicinum suaeque auctorem insaniae Vigilantium haereticum scripserit. Dungal. Respons. p. 883.

[15] Claude's appeal to Scripture runs, as follows: – Cum enim distincte dicatur, non faciendam similitudinem omnium quae in coelo sunt aut quae in terra vel quae sub terra; non de solis similitudinibus alienorum deorum intelligitur dictum, sed de coelestibus creaturis aut quae in honore Creatoris humanus sensus potuit excogitare. Claud. Taurin. apud Dungal. Respons. p. 880. On this tough morsel, his stupendously long-winded antagonist hammers, with most exemplary perseverance, through eight closely-printed and double-columned folio pages.

[16] Dungal. Respons. p. 879.

[17] Della loro origine non si puo haver certezza. – Nel nono e decimo secolo, non era nuovo setta. Rorenc. Natrat. dell'in-trodutt, delle heresie nella valli, in Muston. Hist. des Vaud. vol. 1. p. 165.

[18] Nel nono secolo, non vi fu nuova setta, ma ben nuovo fomentatore delle precedenti: fra quali fu Claudio, vescovo di Torino, discepolo di Felice, che negava la reverenza alla santa croce, come anche la veneratione ed invocatione de Santi, e fu principale destrutor dell'imagini. Rorenc. Memor. Istoric. dell'introdutt, delle heresie, in Muston. Hist. des Vaud. vol. 1. p. 166.

It is somewhat extraordinary, that neither of these Works of Rorenco is in the Bodleian Library: but, as Dr. Muston gives the precise words of the author, I cannot reasonably doubt his accuracy. Had the Works been withill my reach, I shotlid have been much gratified by the perusal of them. As it is, I am unable to specify the nature and amount of the evidence, which brought the Prior to his conclusion. That it was overwhelming and decisive, is certain: because, as in the case of Bossuet, it is the ordinary

humor and practice of the Romish Divines to assert, that none of the Valdenses could claim a higher antiquity than the times of Peter the Valdo or the latter half of the twelfth century.

CHAPTER 5

[1] Atto, gratia Dei, humilis Episcopus, cunctis fidelibus in nostra parochial consistentibus, salutem et gaudium.
Nuper in vigilia Octavae Domini, quemdam sermonem, his qui praesentes erant, Deo donante, retulimus: quem vobis dirigere necessarium aestimamus, Heu! quia sunt multi in vestris partibus, qui divina servitia contemnunt, et auguria vel coeli signa seu vanas praecantationes intendunt, nec metuunt illud quod Dominus de Judaeis ait: O generatio incredula et perversa, signum quaerit. Beatus quoque Paulus clamat Apostolus: Videte, ne quis vos reducat, per philosophiam et inanem fallaciam, secundum traditiones hominum, secundum elementa mundi, et non secundum Christum. Et alibi: Quomodo convertimini iterum ad infirma et egena elementa, quibus denuo servire vultis? Psalmista quippe dicit: Filii hominum, usquequo graves corde; ut quid diligitis vanitatem, et quaeritis mendacium? Et iterum : Beatus vir, cujus est nomen Domini spes ejus; et non respexit in vanitates et insanias falsas. Valete in Domino. Atton. Vercell. Epist. 2. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 8. p. 110, 111.

[2] Atto, Christi misericordia, humilis Episcopus, cuncto populo nostrae dioecesis sanctae matris Vercellensis Ecclesiae. Noveritis igitur, quia, et per ipsum Christum Dominum atque sanctos Apostolos seu Prophetas sive sanctos reliquos Doctores, audivimus, plurimos venturos esse pseudo-prophetas, qui, quod gravissimum est, subvertere a via veritatis multos studebunt, ita ut eos in perniciem perducant, qui illis crediderint. Unde – non tam facile justum habetur cor, ut etiam quibusdam, simplicia atque bruta referentibus tantummodo verba, credere omnino festinetis; eosque, heu miserrimi, diabolico errore decepti, prophetas nominetis; relinquentes sanetam matrem vestram Ecclesiam seu Sacerdotes per quos ad aeternam pervenire debetis salutem.

Quocirca, his visis litteris auditis vel cognitis, si quis vestrum forte, quod absit, deinceps hujuscemodi nefas perpetraverit, sciat se omnimodis damnandum, et non habeat licentiam manducandi quid coctum nisi panem nec bibendi vinum, quousque ad suam sanctam matrem scilicet Vercellensem Ecclesiam nostramque praesentiam, ad satisfactionem veramque poenitentiae humilitatem, judicandus adveniat. Si quis autem, superbia inflatus, contra hoc agere tentaverit, sciat se ab Ecclesiae liminibus pellendum et a sancta communione extraneum omnibusque fidelibus abominandum, donec Sanctae Ecclesiae susceperit correptionem, tam ipse, quam omnes qui ipsi communicant postquam eum talem cognoverint.
Sacerdotum vero, siquis fortasse, quod Deus avertat, tali abominatione pollutus fuerit: nullum divinum audeat usurpare mysterium, donec dignam Deo, nostro judicio, persolvat satisfactionem. Atton. Vercell. Epist. 3. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 8. p. 111, 112.

The next Epistle, which it is superfluous to quote at length, indicates: that these perverse religionists, somewhat after the manner of the Petrobrusians, turned Good Friday into a festival, because the Romanists observed it as a fast. Epist. 4. p. 112, 113. They refused, I suppose, to acknowledge the scriptural obligation of its observance, because their opponents enjoined such observance as divinely binding upon the conscience.

Though not immediately to the present purpose, it is worthy of note, that Atto adopts the primitive interpretation of the Rock upon which Christ promises to build his Church. He rightly pronounces it to be the Faithful Confession of St. Peter.

Cujus institutionis exordium in beatissimi Petri fideli confessione credimus fundatum, cum ait ad Dominum: Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi. Pro qua etiam remuneratione audire inter caetera meruit: Et ego dico tibi, guia tu es Petrus; et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam. Edificata est ergo sancta Ecclesia supra petram in soliditate Apostolicae Fidei, per fidem et dilectionem Christi, et perceptionem sacramentorum, et observantiam mandatorum ejus. Att. Vetcell. Libell. de pressur, ecclesiast, par. 1. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 8. p. 45.

We have already seen, that Dungal and Claude Scyssel do the very same. Certainly it is somewhat remarkable, that, even within the pale of the Romish Church, the ancient interpretation should have so long struggled with the favorite newfangled gloss of the Papacy.

[3] See Muston's Hist. des Vaud. vol. 1. p. 515, 516.

[4] Muston's Hist. des Vaud. vol. 1:p. 509, 510.

[5] From Vaulderie, I conclude, and thence ultimately from Vauldois, we must derive Baulder; one of the regular official names of a witch's black grimalkin: just as Boggard, a northern provincial appellation of a foul fiend, evidently resolves itself into Bulgard or Bulgarian, a very common designation of the Albigenses whose Manicheism and dealings with Satan are notorious to all persons of an easy faith. I may add, while on the subject of etymology, that many family names ill this country clearly indicate the descent of their possessors from those Valdenses and Albigenses whom persecution served only to scatter all over Europe. Such, for instance, are Pickard, Cotterel, Waldy, Humble, Perfect, and Bonomi: derived severally from Picardi, Cotterelli, Valdenses, Humiliati, Perfecti, and Boni Homines. In forming the last name, Boni Homines passed into Bonomii. This is evident from the two following citations.

Quotiens es tu confessus haeresiarchis, id est, illis Bonis Hominibus, qui ad te venerunt occulte dicentes, se loco Apostolorum in mundo de loco ad locum ambulare, praedicare, et confessiones audire? Modus examin. haeret. in Biblioth. Patr. vol. 13. p. 342.

Interrogavit Episcopus, quid vellet fieri de seipso? An in coenobio Galliaci, an Candelii, an in ecclesia Albiensi, eligeret sepeliri? Qui respondit: Non oportet Episcopum curam habere super his; cum ipse deliberasset, quid esset facturus. Episcopus nihilominus insistebat, quo trium istorum locorum eligeret sepeliri. Ille tandem respondit, se velle ad Bonomios deportari. Pontifice vero in contrarium asserente, quod super hoc licentiam non haberet: ille inquit; Non ad hoc laboretis, quoniam, si secus non possem, ad eos reptando quadrupedaliter festinarem. Bertrand. de gest. Tholoson. fol. 31.

[6] Memoires de Jacques Du-Clercq, in suppl. vol. 9. de la Collection des memoires relatifs a l'histoire de France, cited by Muston. Hist. des Vaud. vol. 1. p. 507, 508. This Jacques Du-Clercq was born in the year 1424.

[7] Memoires de Jacques Du-Clercq, in Muston's Hist. des Vaud. vol. 1. p. 509.

[8] Si quis Episcopus aut Presbyter sive Diaconus, vel quilibet ex Ordine Clericorum, magos, aut aruspices, aut ariolos, aut certe augures, vel sortilegos, vel eos qui profitentur artem magicam, aut aliquos eorum similia exercentes, consuluisse fuerit deprehensus: ab honore dignitatis suae depositus,

monasterium ingressus, poenam accipiat; ibique; perpetuae poenitentiae deditus, scelus admissum sacrilegii solvat. Item: si quis, post hanc cognitionem, ecclesiasticam contemnens doctrinam, ad prophetas aut angelos vel aliquos sanctorum defunctorum quos aequivocos falso vocant abierit, eorumque pravis doctrinis inhaeserit, anathema sit. Atton. Vercell. Capitular. c. 48. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 8. p. 18, 19. Vide etiam Atton. Vercell. Epist. 9., 10. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 8. p. 126-132. I subjoin a brief extract, that the Bishop may speak in his own proper person.

Praeterea, quod dicere pudet, tacere autem periculum, quidam in tantum libidini municipantur, ut obscoenas meretriculas sua simul in domo secum habitare, una cibum sumere ac publice degere, permittant. – Ecclesiae gremio sunt recepti. Inde quid-quid postmodum subtrahere valent, ipsis non desinunt erogare. Et unde meretrices ornantur, Ecclesiae vastantur, pauperes tribulantur. Hac occasione Publicani Clericorum domos irrumpunt: non ipsos, sed commanentes mulieres, cum ipsis quos genuerant spuriis, quasi sibi commissos, extrahere simulantes. Id trepidant miseri, et munera quaeque promittunt: et, qui adorari poterant, cunctos adorare coguntur; et, qui omnium viriliter vitia declamare debuerant, de suis apud judicem quaerunt licentiam. Sic sacrae aedes publicantur, et a vulgo deridentur: et nomen Domini blasphematur. Solent etiam, tali pro scelere, vicinorum vicinarumque odium incurrere. Quoties namque hujuscemodi mulieres vel earum spurii cum aliquibus litigant, ipsi, abjecta omni sacerdotali reverentia, sese opponunt; injurias et contumelias, quas possunt, inferre, et deteriora, minantur. Insuper, ut talis ditetur familia, ipsi cupidi, rapaces, usurarii, avari, et invidi, ac fraudulenti, efficiuntur. Unde non modicum Christi Ecclesia patitur detrimentum. Atton. Vercell. Epist. 9. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 8. p. 127, 128.

Let not the incautious reader imagine, that the Publicans, mentioned in this passage, were those persecuted Publicans or Paulicians whom their immaculate enemies charged with Manicheism and with every evil word and work. As Dacherius justly observes, they were either the public judges themselves or else their serjeants. Publicani hie, nut judices publici, aut certe eorum ministri vulgo servientes dicti.

[9] See the preceding note.

CHAPTER 6

[1] With respect to the singular ecclesiastical arrangement mentioned by Jerome, when we recollect that he is speaking of the commencement of the fifth century, we may perhaps learn from history the reason of its adoption.

In the reign of Theodosius and toward the close of the fourth century, one of those unhappy circumstances occurred, which, it is to be feared, too often disgrace and pollute the private confessionals of a young and unmarried Priesthood. The affair happened at Constantinople: and the sacerdotal culprit, who had thus been guilty of a profligate abuse of his office, was forthwith degraded. But husbands and fathers and brothers were not altogether satisfied with a punishment, which affected an individual only, while it left untouched the palpable evils and temptations attendant upon private confession itself. Nectarius, the Patriarch, was not a little perplexed what to do: but the Presbyter Eudemon wisely advised, what in the Greek Church was wisely adopted. Private confession to a Priest was abolished: and each person was freely admitted to the holy communion, according as, in the presence of God, he judged himself to be in a fit state of preparation. Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. c. 19. Sozomen. Hist. Eccles. lib. 7. c. 16. But, though abolished in the Greek Church, the mischievous and

soul-tainting practice was still retained in the western Churches, and more especially in the Church of Rome. Sozomen. Hist. Eccles. lib. 7. c. 16. There, associated with directions to the confessors which it were more decorous not to particularize, it still, as we all know, subsists in its entire baneful luxuriancy. Now, with such a case before them as that which had recently occurred at Constantinople, how would the pious Bishops and People of the primitive Vallenses be likely to act, in order to prevent the inroads of profligacy and the occurrence of disgraceful scandals?

Why, just as Jerome tells us, they did act. Whether the lapse at Constantinople actually produced the vallensic regulation, I shall not pretend to determine. But, in point of fact, we find it subsisting among the Cottian Bishops immediately after the occurrence of the lapse in question: and the recorded misconduct of Atto's unmarried Clergy in the neighboring diocese of Vercelli, about the middle of the tenth century, would not afford to their successors any very strong inducement to patronize the ordinance of Clerical Celibacy. Truly, from their own Bishop's account of them, the unmarried Vercellese Priesthood would have been, to young women, a body of most edifying confessors.

[2] Sunt nonnulli rectores Ecclesiarum, qui quodammodo tunc coruscare incipiunt, cum ad corrigenda mala subjectorum quasi zelo se ultionis accendunt: sed protinus extinguuntur; quia, qualibat adversitate fracti, vel torpore desidiae resoluti, cito deficiunt. Unde et ille Barach, desidis ac resoluti pastoris figuram gerens, aiebat ad Deboram: Si veneris mecum, vadam; si nolueris venire, non pergam. Quapropter, sicut vir ille cum femina, Barach scilicet cum Debora, mutuis se fulcientes auxiliis, contra Sisaram praelium susceperunt, cumque suis agminibus et nongentis falcatis curribus funditus debellarunt: ita et vos, tu scilicet et Taurinensis Episcopus, contra Sisaram luxuriae ducem, arma corripite; eumque in filios Israel, hoc est, in Clericos Ecclesiae, dominantem, miseratione pudicitiae, jugulate. Quatenus et Episcopus, immo omnes Episcopi qui in administrationis tuae finibus commorantur, sacerdotali Clericos disciplina coerceant: et tu, in feminas, vigorem terrenae potestatis extendas. Tres quippe tantummodo feminas Deus novit. Quae his plures sunt, in ejus notitiam non venerunt. Novit enim virgines cum Maria; viduas, cum Anna; conjuges, cum Susanna. Illorum vero Clericorum feminas, qui matrimonia nequeunt legali jure contrahere, non conjuges, sed concubinas potius sive prostibula, congrue possumus appellare: ideoque, quia a Deo non merentur agnosci, de templo Dei merentur excludi. B. Petri. Damian. Oper. lib. 7. epist. 16 ad Adelaidem Ducissam, et Marchionissam Alpium Cottiarum. p. 339.

Shortly after this time or in the year 1074, the notorious Pope Gregory VII attempted to enforce celibacy upon the Clergy of the hitherto independent Ambrosian Church of Milan. But those ecclesiastics rejected his decree, and branded him and his adherents as heretics. Arnulph. Hist. Mediolan. lib. 4. c. 6, 9, 10, in M'Crie's Hist. of the Reform. in Italy, chap. 1. p. 2.

Peter Damian was a literary character: literaturae peritus, as William of Malmsbury speaks. Hence we shall not be surprised at the intellectual influence which he exercised over the mind of his contemporary Pope Leo IX. Of this influence, so creditable to Peter and so beneficial to the Pope, the historian gives an instance alike remarkable and edifying. Two old women near Rome, noted sorceresses and in other respects also specially ill conditioned subjects, had caught an unlucky buffoon, and had metamorphosed him into an ass. In this unseemly disguise, they sold him to a rich citizen: the animal being warranted to possess most extraordinary powers of entertainment, and thence being admirably qualified to set the table on a roar and to promote the digestion of a liberal dinner. The apparent ass performed his part to the entire satisfaction of his purchaser: and his fame spread far and wide, until, at length, leaping into a pool of water, he suddenly recovered his pristine human figure.

Pope Leo heard the story from the late master of the ass: and the master himself had it from a trusty and wondering servant, confirmed also by the actual confession of the two mischievous old women. His holiness, however, notwithstanding such undeniable evidence to the fact, was somewhat sceptical: but his literary friend, Peter Damian, by a clever inductive argument from the true feats of Simon Magus as performed at Rome, convinced him that the tale was no less correct than strange. Dubitantem Papam confirmat Petrus Damianus literaturae peritus. Non mirum, si haec fieri possunt: productoque exemplo de Simone Mago, qui Faustinianum in Simonis figura videri et a filiis horreri fecit, instructiorem de caetero in talibus reddidit. Gul. Malmes. Gent. Anglor. Continuat. lib. 2. c. 15. The case of the Golden Ass of Apuleius, whence indeed the figment has evidently been plagiarized, would have afforded a more exact parallel: but Peter, I suppose, deemed it not so solid a basis whereupon to construct an argument.

CHAPTER 7

[1] Chron. Abbat. S. Trudon. lib. 9. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 7. p. 455. Who the tutelary St. Trudon was, I am not antiquary sufficient to inform my reader. His name is abbreviated into Tron: and he must, I conclude, have been somewhat of a favorite in Romish Scotland, since two churches, now severally denominated The Tron Church, appear to have been dedicated to him in Edinburgh and Glasgow.

[2] Ubi (scil. Romae) cum, per aliquot dies, moraretur; et, de apostolico et de his qui circa eum erant, viderent et intelligerent quae dicta sibi domi credere non vellent: in diversas animi partes ferebantur; plurimum Rodulfus Abbas, qui sibi bene conscius erat pro quo terram egressus fuerat. Cumque vigilans nocte aliquando jaceret, et die in ecclesiis solus Romae resideret, diligenti cura et sollicito retractabat animo, quae peregrinationis suae fuisset intentio, et de ea revelata religiosis viris quid in itinere dedicisset ab eis. Sollicitabat enim eum hoc non parum ad ea quae cogitaverat, si essent explenda, cuncta ei jam surrepta fuerant necessaria. Praeterea terram, ad quam ulterius disposuerat peregrinari, audiebat pollutam esse inveterata haeresi de corpore et sanguine Domini: sed et, de consilio animae suae et eorum qui sibi fuerant commissi, nihil aliud audierat a religiosis viris, nisi quod domi didicerat ex ecclesiastica disciplina et libris communibus tam nobis quam illis. Super hoc accreverat ei passio jamdudum in clune, quam physici solent ciaticam appellare: ea, cum gressum ei perstringeret, equitare etiam sine continuo cruciatu non sinebat. Quid moror? Per multas animi tribulationes, per multas corporis passiones, per exitialia Montis-Jovis pericula, recepit eos tandem civitas Basilea. Alexander inde remeavit eques per Burgundiam: Rodulfus naufragoso navigio usque prope Coloniam. Chron. Abbat. S. Trudon. lib. 12. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 7. p. 493, 494.

[3] Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 304.

CHAPTER 8

[1] The individuals, who appeared at Arras in the year 1025 and who professed to be pupils of Gandulph, have sometimes been adduced as affording a specimen of missions, undertaken by the Vallenses of Piedmont, more than a century prior to the time of Peter the Valdes. But the sole ground for such an opinion is the circumstance, that they came from the borders of Italy. Doubtless they came from that region: but this does not prove them to have been Vallenses. They were evidently, I think, a

band of missionaries, not from the Cottian Alps, but from the lowlands of Lombardy: in other words, they were not Vallenses, but (as such religionists were afterwards called in France) Albigenses. I subjoin, in brief, the account of the matter from the Acts of the Synod of Arras: and, if the intelligent reader compares it with what has already been said respecting the Albigenses or Paulicians, he will probably agree with me in regard to the true classification of these missionaries. They finally, when matters were fully explained to them, signed a confession drawn up by the Bishop of Arras. Anno dominicae incarnationis 1025, Domino Gerardo Ecclesiam Kamaracensis seu Attrebatensis urbis regente, contigit, ut idem Praesul per aliquot dies stationem in sede Attrebatensi facere deberet. Ubi, cum de ecclesiasticis functionibus satis pro opportunitate temporis tractaret, relatum est ei, quosdam ab Italiae finibus viros eo loci advenisse, qui quamdam novae haereseos sectam introducentes, evangelicae atque apostolicae sanctionis disciplinam pervertere tentabant, et quamdam justitiam praeferentes, hac sola purificari homines asserebant, nullumque in sancta Ecclesia aliud esse sacramentum, per quod ad salutem pervenire potuissent. -Quaenam est, inquit (Episcopus) doctrina vestra, lex, atque cultura: quisve auctor est disciplinae vestrae?

At illi referunt: se esse auditores Gandulphi cujusdam ab Italics partibus viri, et ab eo evangelicis mandatis et apostolicis informatos, nullamque praeter hanc Scripturam se recipere, sed hanc verbo et opere tenere. Verum – ad notitiam Episcopi pervenerat, illos sacri baptismaris mysterium penitus abhorrere, dominici corporis et sanguinis sacramentum respuere, negare lapsis poenitentiam post professionem proficere, Ecclesiam adnullare, legitima connubia execrari, nullum in sanctis confessoribus donum virtutis spectare, praeter apostolos et martyres neminem debere venerari. -Lex et disciplina nostra (aiebant), quam a magistro accepimus, nec evangelicis decretis nec apostolicis sanctionibus contraire videbitur, si quis eam diligenter velit intueri. Haec namque hujusmodi est: mundum relinquere; carnem a concupiscentiis fraenare; de laboribus manuum suarum victum parare; nulli laesionem quaerere; caritatem cunctis, quos zelus hujus propositi teneat, exhibere. Synod. Attrebat. Act. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 13. p. 2, 3, 4.

Through the usual veil of misrepresentation, it is easy to read here the true doctrines of the Albigenses. We learn also from the narrative the.400 additional important matter, that they held, what indeed was then also held by their examiners themselves, the doctrine of Justification through faith in the alone merits of Christ.

The same classification, I think, must be adopted also in the case of those, who appeared in the diocese of Treves in the year 1101. They were of the Albigensic, not of the Vallensic, stock. Ivodii, quod Trevericae Diocesis appenditium est, fuerunt eo tempore (A. D. 1101.) haeretici, qui substantiam panis et vini, quae in altari per sacerdotes benedicitur, in corpus Christi et sanguinem veraciter transmutari negabant; nec baptismi sacramentum parvulis ad salvationem proficere dicebunt; et alia perplura profitebantur erronea quae memoriae tradere nefas duxi. De his quatuor oblati sunt ei: quorum duo Presbyteri; reliqui vero duo erant Laici. Presbyterorum unus, Fredericus: alter, duobus vocabatur nominibus, Dominicus Willelmus. Laicorum vero alter, Durandus: alter dicebatur, Halmericus. Histor. Trevir. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 12. p. 243.

[2] What Herodotus means by saying, that the Pelasgi never changed their place of residence, I know not. Certainly, from the universal evidence of antiquity, they were the very pink of ramblers. Herod. Hist. lib. 1. c. 56.

[3] Sunt sedecim omnes Ecclesiae Catharorum. Nec imputas mihi, O lector, quod eas appello Ecclesias, sed potius eis qui se ita vocant. Reiner. de haeret. c. 6. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 304.

[4] In omnibus vero civitatibus Lombardiae, et in Provincia, et in allis regnis et terris, plures erant scholae haereticorum quam theologorum, et plures auditores, qui publice disputabant, et populum ad solennes disputationes convocabant, in foro et in campis praedicabant et in tectis: et non erat, qui eos impedire auderet, propter potentiam et multitudinem fautorum ipsorum. Inquisitioni et examinationi haereticorum frequenter interfui: et computatae sunt Scholae haereticorum, in diocesi Pataviensi, quadraginta et una; in loco, qui dicitur Clemmaten, fuerunt decem Scholae. Reiner. de haeret, c. 3. p. 299.

He then, in Germany and elsewhere, specifies no fewer than forty-one places where there were Schools of these heretics, without determining the number of the Schools themselves. How wonderful must have been the zeal and activity of these Cathari or Paulicians, when in the whole world, as Reinerius assures us, the number of their associated members of both sexes fell short of four thousand. Ibid. c. 6. p. 304.

[5] Vidimus in Concilio Romano, sub Alexandro Papa III celebrato (A. D. 1179.), Valdesios, homines idiotas illiteratos, a primate ipsorum Valde dictos, qui fuerat civis Lugduni super Rhodanum. Gualt. Map. de Nugis. Curial. distinct, 1. c. 31. ex MS. in Biblioth. Bodleian. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8. Section 12.

[6] Eo tempore, mundo jam senescente, exortae sunt duae Religiones in Ecclesia, cujus, ut aquilae, renovatur juventus; etiam e Sede Apostolica sunt confirmatae: videlicet, Minorum Fratrum et Praedicatorum. Quae forte, hac occasione, sunt approbatae: quia, olim duae sectae in Italia exortae, adhuc perdurant; quorum alii Humiliatos, alii Pauperes de Lugduno, se nominabant. Quos Lucius Papa quondam inter haereticos scribebat, eo quod superstitiosa dogmata et observationes in eis reperirentur. In occultis quoque praedicationibus, quas faciebant plerumque in latibulis Ecclesiae Dei et Sacerdotio derogabatur. – Caeterum dominus Papa, in loco eorum, exurgentes quosdam alios, qui se appellabant Pauperes Minores, confirmavit. – Hi tamen, postea attendentes, quod nonnunquam nimiae humilitatis nomen gloriationem importet, et de nomine paupertatis, cum multi eam frustra sustineant, apud Deum vanius inde gloriantur, maluerunt appellari Minores Fratres quam Minores Pauperes. Alii, videlicet Praedicatores, in locum Humiliatorum successisse creduntur. Conrad. Abbat. Ursperg. Chron. in A. D. 1212. apud Gretser. Proleg. in Script. cont. Valdens. c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 291.

In point of habits and character, the Abbot, like Pope Lucius III before him in the year 1184, appears to have somewhat confounded the Humiliated with the Poor Men properly so called. For he describes the Minor Friars, as being specially opposed to the Poor Men of Lyons; whom we positively know to have been a body of missionaries: while he exhibits the Preaching Friars, as being specially opposed to the Humiliated; who, though (as he speaks) they may sometimes have thrust their sickle into another man's harvest, do not seem, at least before the time of Peter Valdo, to have been distinguished by the characteristic of extensively bearing the Gospel beyond the limits of their native Valleys. The important part of his testimony, however, is this. He explicitly tells us: that, In point of ultimate origination, the two sects, into which the Valdenses were divided, sprang up, at a remote period, in Italy. OLIM duae sectae IN ITALIA exortae. This statement at once agrees with, and confirms, my own view of the matter. The Poor Men of Lyons, through the active proselytism of Peter Valdo, sprang up in France; but then Peter himself was one of the Humiliated of Italy: so that the ultimate theological pedigree of each branch alike was Italian, not French.

Such an account of the matter, thus happily preserved by Conrad, will explain what Reinerius meant; when, in one breath (as it were), he speaks of the Leonists as being the oldest of all heretical sects; and

yet, under the name of the Poor Men of Lyons, asserts them to have had for their founder an individual who flourished not more than seventy years before himself. It will also account for the singular fact recorded by him: that the Poor Men of Lyons, or the French Valdenses, were wont to journey into Lombardy, and there visit their Bishops.

Item peregrinantur: et ita, Lombardiam intrantes, visitant Episcopos suos. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 301.

The distinction, in short, between the French and the Italian Valdenses, is specifically drawn by himself in his Summa.

Nunc dicendum est de haeresi Leonistarum, seu Pauperum de Lugduno. Dividitur autem haeresis in duas partes. Prima pars vocatur Pauseres Ultramontani; secunda vero, Pauperes Lombardi: et isti descenderunt ab illis. Reiner. Summ. de Cath. et Leon. in Marten. Thesaur. Anecdot. vol. 1. col. 1775. By the Lombard or Cismontane Valdenses, Reinerius can only mean, as our modern geography speaks, the Valdenses of Piedmont. He uses, I apprehend, the term Lombard, in its ancient and larger and proper sense. The Kingdom of Lombardy extended, from the Adriatic Sea, to the Cottian Alps: thus including both Turin and the still more westerly country of the Vallenses. See Gibbon's Hist. of Decline, chap. 45. vol. 8. p. 147, 148.

CHAPTER 9

[1] Morland's Hist. of the Churches of the Valleys of Piedm. chap. 4. p. 30- 37. chap. 5. p. 72-93. chap. 6. p. 94-141. chap. 7. p. 142-177. Perrin. Hist. des Albig. p. 157-178, 253-333.

[2] Let this Confession of Faith, as given by Morland, chap. 4. p. 30-34, be compared with the simple Creed or Symbol of the Albigenses, as given by Roger Hoveden, and as assigned to the year 1176; the Confession of Faith, according to its pretended date, being fifty-six years older than the Symbol: and, I think, the spuriousness of the Confession will irresistibly force itself upon our belief. See above, book 2. chap. 9. Section 1. (2.)

[3] Perrin. Hist. des Alb. p. 157-178. Morland's Hist. of the Church of Piedm. chap. 5. p. 75-84.

[4] Perrin. Hist. p. 253-295. Morland's Hist. chap. 7. p. 142-160.

[5] Morland's Hist. chap. 6. p. 99-120.

[6] Perrin. Hist. p. 253, 254. note. Morland's Hist. chap. 7. p. 142.

[7] Bossuet. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11. Section 127.

[8] We may compare the language of the Treatise, with that of the Poor Men of Lyons, and consequently with that of their teacher Peter the Valdes. Aital congregation, ensemp presa, es appella Antichrist, o Babylonia, o quarta bestia, o meretrix, o home de pecca filli de perdition. – La Sancta Gleisa se sia et es tengua per Synagoga: et la Synagoga de li malignant es predice per maire ben cresent en la ley. Treat. on Antich. in Perrin. p. 255, 264, 265.

Primo dicunt (Pauperes de Lugduno), quod Romana Ecclesia non sit Ecclesia Jesu Christi, sed Ecclesia malignantium; – et quod ipsi sint Ecclesia Jesu Christi; – et quod Romana Ecclesia sit meretrix in Apocalypsi. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 300.

[9] Ma creissent en li ses membres, zo es en li menistre cec et hypocrit, et de li sojet del mond, et el meseime creisec entro a baron parfait en pleneta daita. Treat. on Antichr. in Perrin. p. 258, 259. Car la soa potesta et authorita es amerma, e que lo Seignor Jesus occi aquest felon per lo sperit de la soa bocca, en moti home de bona volunta, e tramet potesta contraria a si et a li seo amador, et decipa li seo luoc e possessions, et depart aquesta cita de Babylonia en laqual tota generacion hac vigor de malicia. Ibid. p. 262.

La octava obra de l'Antichrist es, que et eyra et persec et acaisonna, roba e mortifica, li membre de Christ. Ibid. p. 269.

An objection has, I believe, been made to the antiquity of the Treatise respecting Antichrist, on the ground: that, When the inspired books are there cited or referred to, the chapters are specified; though the division of the Bible into chapters did not take place until the middle of the thirteenth century or about the year 1250.

Now, even if the validity of this objection were admitted, it would do nothing more, so far as my own views are concerned, than induce a necessity of placing the Treatise about a century later than I am myself inclined to place it. But, in truth, even upon the very face of it, never was there an imaginary difficulty more childishly started. For let us take a case in point. Claude's Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians is known to have been written in the ninth century. Now that Commentary exhibits the Epistle as being regularly divided into six chapters. Therefore, clearly, on the principle of the present objection, the Commentary, instead of having been written in the ninth century, is a mere comparatively modern fabricator. I suppose [need scarcely state the obvious solution to be, that the division into chapters was the work either of a modern transcriber or of the editors of the printed Bibliotheca Patrum: and I suppose I need scarcely say, that the same remark is equally applicable to the Valdensic Treatise on Antichrist.

After all, though I deem it by no means essential for the meeting of the present somewhat idle objection, the assertion, that the Bible was first divided into chapters about the middle of the thirteenth century, is incorrect. The manuscript Bible of Hugh Pudsey, Bishop of Durham, which was written by his order some time between the years 1153 and 1194, and which is now in the Library of the Chapter, is actually divided into chapters, though not perfectly coincident with our present chapters. For a knowledge of this fact I am indebted to my learned and persevering friend Dr. Gilly.

[10] Cum autem esset aliquantulum literatus, Novi Testamenti texture docuit eos vuigariter. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 300.

[11] Morland's Hist. of Church of Piedm. chap. 3. p. 12.

[12] From this passage it appears, that the idolatrous worship of the Eucharist had been fully established when the Treatise was written, or, as I suppose, in the twelfth century. The doctrine of the preceding century exhibits a curious instance of the variation of the Roman Church in regard to the effect produced by the words of the Priest in the consecration of the elements. William of Malmsbury, who flourished during the reigns of our three first Norman Kings, after censuring the pretended heresy of his contemporary Berenger, professes his own full belief; that, after the ecclesiastical benediction, the elements are the true body and blood of the Savior: and he says, that he was induced thereto, both by the ancient authority of the Church, and likewise by many newly displayed miracles.

One of these convincing miracles was the following.

A little Jew boy, entering into a church with a Christian boy, beheld, upon the altar, a child, torn limb from limb, and thus severally divided to the people. Returning home, he innocently told the story to his parents: who, in a rage, threw him upon a burning pile. Here he lay unhurt for several hours: until, at length, he was drawn out by the Christians. When asked, how he escaped the effects of the fire, he said: The beautiful woman, whom I beheld sitting on a throne, and whose son was divided to the people, always stood at my right hand in the furnace, turning aside with her robe the volume of fire and smoke. Nos sane credimus, post benedictionem ecclesiasticam, illa mysteria esse verum corpus et sanguinem Salvatoris: adducti, et veteri Ecclesiae auctoritate, et multis noviter ostensis miraculis. Quale fuit, quod beatus Gregorius exhibuit Romae. Quale, quod Pascasius narrat contigisse in Alemannia, Presbyterum Plegildum visibiliter speciem pueri in altari contrectasse, et, post libata oscula in panis similitudine, conversum ecclesiastico more, sumpsisse: quod, arroganti cavillatione, ferunt Berengarium carpere solitum, et dicere; speciosa certe Pax nebulonis, ut cui oris praebuerat basium, dentium inferrat exigium. Quale, de pusione judaico, qui, in ecclesiam cum aequaevo christiano forte et ludibunde ingressus, vidit puerum in ara membratim discerpi et viritim populo dividi; id cum innocentia puerili parentibus pro veto assereret, in rogum detrusum, ubi occluso ostio aestuabat incendium, multis post horis, sine jactura corporis exuviarum et crinium, a christianis extractum; interrogatusque, quomodo voraces ignium globes evaserit, respondit: Illa pulchra foemina, quam vidi sedere in cathedra, cujus filius populo dividebatur, semper mihi in camino ad dexteram astitit, flammeas minas et fumea volumina peplo suo submovens. De Gest. Anglor. Continuat. lib. 3. c. 27.

Now it is clear, that this figment, detailed by William with implicit credulity and evidently with full approbation, could never have been constructed save on the basis of the recognized orthodox theology of the eleventh century.

Therefore the orthodox theology of the eleventh century must have been: that, In each celebration of the Eucharist, the entire coherent mass of bread was changed into the UNDIVIDED body of ONE Christ: and that Such body, when distributed to the communicants, was afterwards DIVIDED into numerous portions or fragments, so that each communicant received, not the WHOLE Christ, but a PART only of a leg or an arm or any other member according as it might happen. Yet, strange to say, what, in the eleventh century, was so preeminently orthodox as to be confirmed by the testimony of a miracle, had become, in the sixteenth century, such a damnable heresy, that the infallible Fathers of the Tridentine Council actually subjected the unlucky holder of it to all the pains and penalties of a formal anathema.

If any one, say these unerring settlers of the Faith, shall deny, that, in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist, the WHOLE Christ is contained under each species, and, when a SEPARATION is made, under EVERY PART of each species : let him be anathema.

Si quis negaverit, in venerabili sacramento Eucharistiae, sub unaquaque specie, et sub singulis cujusque speciei partibus, separatione facta,.407 totum Christum contineri: anathema sit. Concil. Trident. sess. 13. c. 8. can. 3.

Here I submit, that the decision of the Tridentine Fathers is altogether irreconcilable with the necessary purport of the miracle attested by the little Jew boy.

The decision of the Tridentine Fathers asserts: that the whole Christ is substantially contained, when a separation is made, under every particle of each species; so that every communicant receives the whole Christ full and complete in all his members.

Whereas the purport of the miracle, attested by the little Jew boy, was: that the whole Christ is NOT contained under every particle of each species when a separation is made; for the boy beheld the child Christ on the altar, under the hands of the Priest, torn limb from limb, and distributed in this divided state, man by man, to the people. But, in the eleventh century, the miracle, as we learn from William of Malmesbury, was held to be good and sufficient evidence of the soundness of the doctrine then inculcated respecting the practical results of what was afterward styled Transubstantiation: and, in the sixteenth century, the decision of the Tridentine Fathers was held to be a good and sufficient establishment of the entire doctrine of Transubstantiation under all its various aspects, which has ever since been devoutly held by each true son of the Roman Church.

Hence, the orthodoxy of the eleventh century, which DENIES that the whole Christ is substantially received by every communicant; and the orthodoxy of the sixteenth century, which MAINTAINS that the whole Christ is substantially received by every communicant; are two entirely different systems: and, hence, the miracle which establishes the former, and the decision which establishes the latter, stand so directly opposed to each other, that the decision even pronounces all those to be accursed who adopt the system established by the miracle. We have here, I take it, a very ugly business: for the matter finally resolves itself into the following awkward dilemma.

Is the well-meaning Romanist to believe, with his Church in the eleventh century: that in the administration of the Eucharist, Christ's substantial body is divided into as many parts as there are communicants?

Or is he to believe, with his Church in the sixteenth century: that Christ's substantial body, in the administration of the Eucharist, is NOT divided; but that every communicant receives substantially the WHOLE Christ complete in all his members?

If the former: then the Fathers of the Tridentine Council, so far from being infallible, must have grievously and presumptuously erred, when they anathematized all those who denied, that the WHOLE Christ is contained under EVERY PART of each species.

If the latter: then the Church of the eleventh century, so far from being infallible, taught a grossly erroneous doctrine; and the miracle, which had such a convincing effect upon the mind of William of Malmsbury and his contemporaries, could only have been a disgraceful figment, got up for the establishment of what the Council of Trent, in its infallible wisdom, has since pronounced to be an accursed heresy. At all events, the doctrine of the eleventh century is palpably irreconcilable with the doctrine of the sixteenth century.

[13] Treatise on Antichrist, in Perrin's Hist. des Albig. p. 253-287.

[14] Raynouard's Choix des Poesies Originales des Troubadours, vol. 2. pref. p. 137-143. Hallam's Introduct. to the Literature of Europe in the Middle Ages, chap. 1. 33. note. vol. 1. p. 37, 38.

[15] Ben ha mil et cent anez compli entierement, que fo scripta L'ora car sen al derier temps.

[16] 1 Peter 1:20. 1 John 2:18. According to Michaelis, the first Epistle of St. Peter was written A. D. 49, and the first Epistle of St. John A. D. 70: according to Lardner, the first Epistle of St. Peter was written A. D. 64, and the first Epistle of St. John A. D. 80.

[17] Had the author said, ABOUT eleven centuries have elapsed, since it was written Now we are in the Last Time; the present supposition would have been reasonable and intelligible: but, since he definitely says, WELL have a thousand and a hundred years been COMPLETED ENTIRELY, since it was written Now we are in the Last Time; the supposition involves what to myself at least is incomprehensible.

[18] There is much on this curious subject in Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 1- 4. Perhaps I may be allowed to add the following to the authorities collected by the Archbishop.

About the year 906, we find the Abbot of St. Germain's, attesting the general expectation that the end of the world was approaching, and adding the speculation that the Hungarians would be the predicted Gog and Magog.

Dicunt enim nunc esse novissimum saeculi tempus, finemque imminere mundi; et idcirco Gog et Magog esse Hungros, qui nunquam ante auditi sunt, sed modo in novissimo tempo apparuerunt. From this then fashionable speculation he himself dissents: pronouncing, that, by Gog and Magog, we ought rather to understand a formidable body of heretics; who, at the instigation of Satan, should arise out of the allegorical corners and caverns of error, and should grievously persecute the Church. Abbat. S. German. Epist. ad Episc. Virdum. in Dacher. Spicil. vol. 12. p. 352, 353.

The singular legend of the second sight of Edward the Confessor, shortly before his death in the year 1066, as detailed by William of Malmesbury, has evidently the same reference.

Stupenda, inquit, vidi: – Septem dormientes in Coeli monte requiescere, jam ducentis annis in dextro jacentes latere, sed tunc, ipsa hora risus sui, latus invertisse sinistrum. Futurum, ut septuaginta quatuor annis ita jaceant, dirum nimirum mortalibus omen. Nam omnia ventura in his septuaginta quatuor annis, quae Dominus circa finem mundi praedixit discipulis suis: gentem contra gentem surrecturam, et regnum adversus regnum; terrae notus per loca, pestilentiam, et famem; terrores de coelo, et signa magna; regnorum mutationes, Gentilium in Christianos bella, item Christicolarum in Paganos victorias. Talia mirantibus inculcans, passionem septem dormientium et habitudines corporum singulorum, quas nulla docet litera, ita prompte disseruit ac si cum eis cotidiano victitaret contubernio. Gul. Malines. de Gest. Anglor. Contin. lib. 2. c. 34. p. 324.

It must, I suppose, have been on the same principle of interpretation, that, even at the close of the sixth century, Pope Gregory the great, in his Epistle to the newly converted King Ethelbert, anticipates the approaching end of the world and the speedy commencement of the portents which should be its harbingers.

Praeterea scire vestram gloriam volumus, quod, sicut in scriptura sacra ex verbis Domini Omnipotentis aguoscimus, praesentis mundi jam terminus juxta est, et sanctorum regnum venturum est quod nullo unquam poretit fine terminari. Appropinquante autem eodem mundi termino, multa imminent quae antea non fuerunt: videlicet, immutationes aeris, terroresque de coelo, et contra ordinem temporum tempestates, bella, fames, pestilentiae, terrae motus per loca; quae tamen non omnia nostris diebus ventura sunt, sed post nostros dies omnia subsequentur. Gregor. Magn. Epist. ad Edilbert. in Bed. Eccles. Hist. lib. 1. c. 32. p. 172.

[19] Esser mot avisa CANT venre l'Antechrist.

[20] Nos veen aquest mont esser pres del chavon.

[21] Poc deorian cubitar, che sen al remanent.

[22] Undecimo saeculo, ut vere jam post mille annos solutus Satanas videri queat (ut Joannes praedixit Apoc. 20.), nempe ut ex hac parte mysterium iniquitatis operosius operaretur et plenius conficerit, multa et varia haeretieorum turba exorta est. Stapleton. Orat. Academ. 28. in Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 3. Section 7.

Haeretiea sententia, quae a somniis Berengarii excitatur, omnes doctores et Ecclesiae Patres secundi Millenarii (nunc modo loquendi eorum utamur), id est, qui fuerunt infra trecentos et octoginta annos, aperte affirmat, fuisse post solutionem Satanae; proferens, ex testimonio Apocalypsis, solutum fuisse Satanam post annos Domini mille: doctrinamque, quam communiter tenemus esse fidem Ecclesiae de benedicta Eucharistia, astruit, non esse rectam, sed errorem, imo haeresim ac lolium et zizania Satanae jam soluti. Joan. Tissington. Confess. A. D.1830. in Usser. Ibid. c. 3. 9.

Some suspicions, on the point complained of by Tissington, were entertained by others as well as by the Berengarians and Albigenses and Vallenses. Thus, in the year 992, when the supposed thousand years of the binding of Satan were on the eve of expiring, Arnulph, Bishop of Orleans, addressed the Fathers of the Synod of Rheims in terms, which directly applied to the Pope the character of the Man of Sin as delineated by St. Paul.

Quid hunc, reverendi Patres, in sublimi solio residentem, veste purpurea et aurea radiantem: quid hunc, inquam, esse censetis? Nimirum, si charitate destituitur, solaque scientia inflatur et extollitur, Antichristus est, in templo Dei sedens, et se ostendens tanquam sit Deus. – Quod jam in aperto fit, ut, Romana potentia conquassata, religione profligata, nomen Dei frequentibus perjuriis impune humilietur: ipsiusque divinae religionis cultus etiam a summis sacerdotibus contemnatur. Act. Synod. Rhemens. c. 28. in Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 2. Section 15.

[23] Ad fo fayt un pobie de novel converti. Chrestian foron nomina, che illi creyan en Christ. Ma co troben, que l'Escriptura di; Mot fort perseguian Jusios e Saracins.

[24] Mahound is evidently no other than Mohammed: what is meant by Termagant, may not be quite so easy to determine. She was a Goddess, apparently of no very amiable character: for, by etymologists, she is, I believe, generally deemed the prototype of our English word termagant.

[25] I am not without some suspicion, that the circumstance of the Noble Lesson mentioning the five wounds of Christ, while it is silent as to the number of nails employed, affords another incidental testimony to the correctness of its date.

Lucas of Tuy, in the thirteenth century, is very large on this subject, lie tells us, that the world had turned to many false opinions: and he specially enumerates, the alleged Docetism of the Albigenses which denied that Christ had truly suffered in the flesh, and the unsound tenet unauthoritatively advanced by other sectaries that three nails only were used in the crucifixion and that the left side (not the right side) of our Lord was pierced by the spear.

This last opinion was advocated from about the latter end of the eleventh century: but Pope Innocent III finally and infallibly determined, that four nails were used, and that the roman soldier pierced the right side of Christ; a decision, which of course stamped the brand of heresy upon Triclavianism. The judgment of the Pope was confirmed by a miracle: and, as a decisive proof that four nails were

used and that the right side was pierced, Lucas of Tuy brings forward the remarkable case of St. Francis Assissi, upon whose body were preternaturally impressed the five wounds of our Savior, in such a manner, that the semblance of the heads of four nails appeared in the inside of the two hands and on the outside of the two feet, while there was so real a wound on the right side that it often emitted blood. Now this impostor was the founder of one of the two Orders which were started by Innocent III against the Humiliated and the Poor Men of Lyons: and as a part of the project, he contrived, we see, to mark himself in such a manner, as to bear a sort of practical testimony against the old triclavian heresy of those whom he was appointed specially to oppose. All parties acknowledged five wounds: but the semblance of four rusty nail-heads on the hands and feet of Francis were, of course, proof positive, that four of the wounds were inflicted by four nails and not by three.

Such an argument would not have been used against those whom Francis was appointed to oppose, unless they had believed that three nails only were employed: and, accordingly more than a century earlier, the author of the Noble Lesson, whom I suppose to have been a Triclavian, mentions the five wounds; but, probably in order to avoid giving needless offense is silent as to the number of the nails, and specifies not whether the right side or the left side was pierced. Four wounds they gave him, beside other blows. After that, they gave him, a fifth, to make the completion: for one of the knights came and opened his side; and forthwith there flowed out blood and water mingled together.

I may add, that the very phraseology here employed, still quite incidentally, refers the poem to the time specified in its own date. The side of the Savior is pierced by a Cavalier or Knight. Un de Cavalier vene, e li ubere la costa.

Lucas of Tuy tells us, that the heretics were confounded by the practical argument of Francis: but this assertion ought perhaps to be received cum grano salis. See Luc. Tudens, adv. Albig. error. lib. 2. c. 11. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 262, 263.

[26] L'esprit de ce poeme est tout-a-fait celui d'un age simple et recule; d'un peuple nourri sans alteration de la pure doctrine primitive, si touchante dans ses naivetes, si belle dans sa tolerance. Muston. Hist. des Vaud. vol. 1. p. 146.

[27] From this recommendation to study Scripture, an occasion, I believe, has been taken to assert: that The Noble Lesson could not, agreeably to its own pretended date, have been written in the year 1100. Who, it has been asked, could then have thought of propounding such a recommendation: for, as no translation of the Bible into the vulgar tongue then existed, who could then have acted upon it? And, furthermore, in the particular case of the Valdenses, if they already possessed a translation of the Bible in the year 1100, what occasion was there for Peter Valdo to make, or cause to be made, another translation in the year 1160?

I. It is really marvelous, that so futile an objection could ever have been seriously advanced. According to the testimony of Peter Siculus, the Paulicians, even before they emigrated from Armenia, both possessed and so familiarly read the greater part of the New Testament, that even females were accustomed to its perusal. Petr. Sic. Hist. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 9. par. post. p. 31, 88. The sacred volume, confessedly altogether uncorrupted, they brought with them into the West. Cedren. Hist. Compend. vol. 1. p. 341. And, so early as the year 1017, we find a branch of them, the converts of a woman, charged with reading both the Old and the New Testament only to deny the truth of their contents. Rodulph. Glab. Hist. lib. 3. c. 8. Hence we need not be surprised at the statement of Reinerius, that, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, most of those who were called heretics, were so familiar with their translation

of Scripture, that they could even say the entire New Testament by heart. Reiner. de haeret, c. 3, 8. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 299, 307.

Nor is this all. William of Malmsbury tells us: that, in the eighth century, the venerable Bede put forth an interpretation of St. John's Gospel in English for the benefit of those who were imperfectly acquainted with Latin. Evangelium quoque Johannis, quod difficultate sui mentes legentiam exercet his diebus, lingua interpretatus anglica, condescendit minus imbutis latina. Gul. Malines. de gest. reg. Anglor. lib. 1. p. 12. In the same eighth century also, Alcuin, the friend of Charlemagne, the native son of England and the adoptive son of France, gives that precise recommendation, which occurs in the Noble Lesson, and which has rapidly been deemed fatal to its claim of having been written in the last year of the eleventh century. The reading of Holy Scriptures, says he, is the knowledge of everlasting blessedness. In the Holy Scriptures man may contemplate himself, as in some mirror, what sort of person he is. Just so the reading of the Holy Scriptures: it cleanseth the reader's soul; it bringeth into his mind the fear of hell-punishment; and it raiseth his heart to the joy above. The man, who wishes ever to be with God, he should often pray to him, and he should often read the Holy Scriptures. – He is very happy, who readeth the Holy Scriptures, if he turneth the words into works. All the Holy Scriptures are written for our health, that we may through them understand the truth. Ale. M. S. in Bibl. Publ. Cant. apud. Soames's Bampt. Lect. p. 92, 93.

II. But it is urged by the objector, that, if the Valdenses possessed a translation of the Scriptures in the year 1100, Peter Valdo would never have undertaken another translation in the year 1160. This objection, as it stands, will clearly, mutatis mutandis, demonstrate the non-existence of any English translation of the Bible anterior to our common version put forth in the time of King James: for, if we Anglicans had already a translation of the Bible, what need could there be of another? In truth, however, the objection before us is built upon a gross confounding of the ancient Italian Valdenses with the comparatively modern French Valdenses: and, when sifted, it will probably bring out a result exactly opposite to that intended by its contriver. The making of a French translation for the use of the French Converts of Valdo by no means implies, that the Italian Valdenses did not already possess a translation in their own dialect. On the contrary, if the character of Valdo in point of literary attainments be considered, I deem the production of his French translation, to afford something very like a proof of the anterior existence of a translation in the dialect of the Italian Valdenses. When Reinerius tells us, that he translated the Scripture into the vulgar French tongue, he remarks: that he was only, aliquantulum literatus, slightly tinged with letters. Now the very circumstance of a person thus characterized, himself all the while an Italian Valdensis, attempting such an arduous task as a translation of the Bible, though we may admit his being aided by a friend more learned than himself, imports, both his own previous acquaintance with Scripture, and his taking as the basis of his French version an older version in the familiar dialect of his own country. At all events, nothing can be more futile, than to make the production of a French translation, in the year 1160, a proof, that a vallensico-italian translation, could not have previously existed in the year 1100. In some of these remarks I have been anticipated by Dr. Gilly.

[28] This passage strongly indicates the unbroken doctrinal descent of the secluded Vallenses from the Primitive Church. It was a constant dogma of the early Christians, that the second Person of the Holy Trinity, who at length took upon him our nature from the womb of the Virgin, was the Jehovah of the Levitical Dispensation, who delivered the Law at mount Sinai, and who often appeared under the temporary form of a man bearing the economic title of The Messenger of Jehovah.

The doctrine is clearly the doctrine of Scripture: but the Vallenses, I apprehend, so far as we may judge from their character and habits, received it catechumenically and by descent from generation to generation, rather than by any independent investigatory deduction of their own. In fact, the Noble Lesson itself is an evidence, as to how the dogma was transmitted.

[29] Illi dicon, quel es VAUDES e degne de punir, ban cayson menconias en engan, cusi illi li paysan toler co quel ha de son just a fan. The proof of the existence of a race of Italian Valdenses, long anterior to the time of Peter the rich merchant of Lyons, is, I think, quite independent of the occurrence of the term VAUDES in the Noble Lesson: though, certainly, if, with Raynouard and agreeably to the internal evidence afforded by the poem itself, we receive the year 1100 as its true date, we shall have a powerful confirmation of the fact.

[30] Respecting the persecutions undergone by the Piedmontese Vaudois anterior to the time of their countryman Peter, we know little or nothing. Their long seclusion in the fastnesses of the Alps, where, like the beleaguered woman in the Apocalypse (to whom, indeed, their descendants were fond of comparing them), they had a place in the wilderness prepared of God for their nourishment both spiritual and temporal, precluded much knowledge of them save among their immediate Italian neighbors. But, from the language both of Claude and of Atto and of Damian and of Rodolph of St. Trudon, it is evident, that they were held in abhorrence as inveterate heretics: and the concurring statement of the Noble Lesson shows, that, although, at the end of the eleventh century, they might not have been called upon to seal their faith with their blood; yet were they exposed to those minor persecutions of rapine and pillage and fraudulent calumny, which, from time to time, impoverished them and harassed them and deprived them of their lawful and hard-earned substance. I may remark, that the very sort of persecution, here mentioned, forms another point of internal evidence, that the Noble Lesson was written in the year 1100, and not during the latter half of the twelfth century. Had the poem been written after the time when Peter began his ministration, persecution of a worse kind than that of plunder and imprisonment would assuredly have been mentioned: for so violently were the French Vaudois and their Founder harried by the Archbishop and the Church of Lyons, that those, who could escape, were fain to disperse themselves through all parts of France and Italy. But no persecution of this sort is specified in the Noble Lesson. On the contrary, imprisonment and loss of goods alone, not torture and loss of life, are mentioned as the trial to which the Vaudois were then exposed. Hence I think it clear, that the poem cannot consistently be referred to the latter half of the twelfth century: a period, to which a rough calculation of about eleven centuries, from the day when it was written Now we are in the Last Time, would of necessity conduct us. On the whole, I can have no hesitation in subscribing to the judgment of the learned Raynouard, respecting the age of the Noble Lesson. La date de l'an 1100, qu'on lit dans ce poeme, merite toute confiance.

[31] This reference to Cardinals, in the year 1100, may be viewed as another internal and unintentional testimony to the genuine antiquity of the Noble Lesson.

The mere name of Cardinal had long existed, both in the Roman Church itself, and in others also of the Latin Churches: but the College of Cardinals, with the power of electing the Pope, was first instituted in the Pontificate of Nicolas II, who sat in the Papal Chair from A. D. 1059 to A. D. 1061.

His edict, to this effect, runs as follows.

Constituimus: ut, obeunte hujus Romanae Universalis Ecclesiae Pontifice, imprimis Cardinales Episcopi, diligentissima simul consideratione tractantes, mox sibi Clericos Cardinales adhibeant, sicque reliquus Clerus et Populus ad consensum novae electionis accedant. Hug. Floriac. in Baluz. Miscell. vol. 4. p. 62. See Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. vol. 2. p. 483.

The College of Cardinals, with this prerogative, having been thus instituted only about forty years before the composition of the Noble Lesson, the reference to them, with their allocation between the Pope and the Bishops, was at once natural and correct.

[32] A reference is here made to various phenomena, which are said to have occurred in the course of the eleventh century, and which the persuasion of the age construed to be signs of the approaching end of the world. Usher has collected a curious multiplicity of examples. See his Work de Eccles. Success. c. 2. Section 33. c. 3. Section 3, 4. c. 4. Section 2, 3, 4, 5, 9.

CHAPTER 10

[1] Per vocatos et multos, intelligis Catholicos: et, per paucos electos, intelligis complices tuos. Pilich. cont. Valdens. c. 14. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 315.

[2] Tenent Valdenses haeretici; beatam Virginem Mariam et Sanctos in patria tantis impletos esse gaudiis, quod nihil possint cogitare de his quae in terris fiunt; et, per consequens, eos non esse invocandos a nobis, quia non possunt orare pro nobis. Pilich. cont. Vald. c. 19. p. 317.

[3] Dicunt etiam haeretici Valdenses: quod solus Deus sit laudandus, honorandus, et invocandus, et sibi soli serviendum; et quod Sancti non orent pro nobis propter plenitudinem gaudiorum, quam habent; et quod, quia solus Deus redemit nos, ideo solus possit juvare nos; et Sancti sibi ipsis meruerunt, et non nobis; et, quia Deus per se bene scit quod nobis necessarium sit, non indiget Sanctorum precibus moveri; et, quia, quidquid ipse vult, hoc volunt omnes Sancti: ergo non oportet invocare Sanctos, sed solum Deum. Pilich. cont. Vald. c. 20. p. 318.

[4] Item dicunt haeretici Valdenses: solum esse duas vias post hanc vitam, et non purgatorium. Pilich. cont. Vald. c. 21. p. 320.

[5] Item dicunt haeretici Valdenses: quod non sit melius, corpus hominis defuncti sepeliri in coemeterio, quam in alio quocunque agro vel loco. Pilich. cont. Vald. c. 22. p. 322.

[6] Dicunt Valdenses haeretici: ecclesiam materialem ab episcopo catholico dedicatam seu consecratam non fore, quacunque alia domo, meliorem, sanctiorem, vel digniorem; cum ubique Deus possit ac debeat adorari et sibi serviri. Pilich. cont. Vald. c. 23. p. 323.

The Valdenses, I apprehend, did not so much object to the decent setting apart of a church to the service of God, as to the superstitious notion that our prayers would be more acceptable and more efficacious when offered up in a consecrated building than when offered up privately in our closet or conjointly with our family in an apartment of a dwelling-house. Among the Romanists, a notion has always been encouraged, that God may be better worshipped in one place than in another; a fancy, which runs directly counter to our Lord's own decision as to the nature and principles of genuine Christian service. See John 4:20-24. Clement of Alexandria well teaches us: that a church is, not the building, but the

worshippers. Ouj gapon, ajlla< to< a]qrisma tw~n ejklektw~n, ejkklhsi>an kalw~. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 7. Oper. p. 715.

[7] Item reprobant Valdenses haeretici consecrationes vestium sacerdotalium et pontificalium, aquae, salis, cinerum, candelarum, ciborum tempore paschali, et omnium aliorum quae per episcopos et sacerdotes consecrantur: et etiam consecrationes episcoporum, sacerdotum, ecclesiarum, altarium, coemeteriorum, aquae baptismalis, chrismatis et olei unctionum, palmarum, frondium, et herbarum; dicentes, illas res, taliter consecratas, nihil omnino singularis sanctitatis ex illis verbis percipere, licet verba in se sancta sint et bona. Pilich. cont. Vald. c. 25. p. 325.

[8] Item reprobant haeretici Valdenses indulgentias praelatorum Ecclesiae, peregrinationes ad limina sanctorum, et annum jubilaeum. – Nunc etiam advertamus merita sanctorum Dei: quia, sicut, exigente divina justitia, per peccatum mortale, perdit homo gaudia coelestis regni, et meretur poenam aeternam: sic, exigente divina clementia et misericordia per opus meritorium factum, postquam, per veram contritionem, confessionem, satisfactionem, poena illa aeterna intransitoriam fuerit mutata, meretur illius temporalis poenae diminutionem et coelestis praemii salutem et accidentalem augmentationem. Sed, quia beata Virgo Maria nunquam aliquam poenam meruit, et tamen infinita opera meritoria in ferventissima fecit charitate, ideo solummodo adepta est augmentationem praemii et non poenae diminutionem. Et illa secunda pars cessit in thesaurum Ecclesiae: unde multorum peccatorum et multarum peccatricum poenam diminuit meritum beatae Mariae: et de illo thesauro dantur indulgentiae. Similiter, sancti Apostoli, martyres, et multi perfecte justi, etsi prius peccatores fuerint, tamen ita sufficienter in hac vita poenituerunt, quod nullins poenae obnoxii permanserunt, etiam cum adhuc in hac vita mortali fuerunt; et sic adepti sunt, eorum operibus meritoriis, solummodo praemii augmentationem: et illud totum cedit in Ecclesiae thesaurum. Et sic patet, quomodo Ecclesiae thesaurus non potest exhauriri. Et hujus thesauri dispensator noluit esse ipse Christus Dominus solus: imo commisit ipse praelatis Ecclesiae, secundum tamen plus et minus. Pilich. cont. Vald. c. 30. p. 328, 329. To this wretched unscriptural trash, the views of the enlightened Valdenses, by the very necessity of Pilichdorf's argument, stood directly opposed.

[9] Item reprobant haeretici imagines et earum venerationem. Et videntur habere pro se multas authoritates diversarum Scripturarum, quae postea adducentur et solventur. Pilich. cont. Vald. c. 33. p. 329.

[10] Item dicunt Valdenses haeretici: quod omne juramentum, quantumcunque judicialiter et veridice factum, sit peccatum et reprobatum. Pilich. cont. Vald. c. 36. p. 331.

[11] Item, de signo crucis, nihil credunt: asserentes, quod nec venerentur illam crucem in qua Christus pependit, nec spineam coronam, nec clavos, nec lanceam, nec tunicam consutilem, si viderent; quorum omnium venerationem dicunt esse vanam et inutilem, et quod sacerdotes invenerunt propter lucra. Ind. error. Vald. ad calc. Pilich. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 341.

[12] Item dicta sanctorum nihil curant, nisi quantum pro secta eorum confortanta retinent: sed tantum Novum Testamentum ad literam observant. Ind. error. Vald. p. 341.

[13] Item confessionera generalem nihil advertunt. Ind. error. Vald. p. 341.

[14] Item miracula, quae fiunt in Ecclesia Dei Sanctorum meritis, omnino abjiciunt. Ind. error. Vald. p. 341.

[15] Item dicunt: Papam esse caput omnium haeresiarcharum. Ind. error. Vald. p. 340.

[16] Item improbant omnes Religiones, tam monachorum quam sanctimonialium, dicentes esse superfluas et inanes. Ind. error. Vald. p. 341.

[17] Item dicunt: omnia verba Missae et omnia praeparamenta ad Missam spectantia, esse de errore, praeter verba consecrationis. Ind. error. Vald. p. 340.

[18] Blasphemant insuper sacerdotium Christi, presbyteros in Ecclesia Dei, Deifices, quasi Deum facientes, illusive seu derisorie nominando. Cum tamen non Christum faciant sacerdotes; sed, per verba consecrationis a Christo instituta, sub speciebus panis et vini aqua misti, Christum Dominum nostrum esse praesentem faciunt corporaliter ubi corporaliter non fuerat prius, Spiritu Sancto hujus oblationis transubstantiationem deifice operante. Conrad. de Mont. Puell. cont. Beghard. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 343.

[19] See Thuan. Hist. lib. 6. 16. vol. 1. p. 221.

CHAPTER 11

[1] Nempe ignavum est et belluinum hoc genus hominum, neque ad disputationes aptum. Sed, quum sunt coeteris acutiores, nonnullas suo sensu ex sacris literis citant authoritates nec sanctorum doctorum responsiones admittunt; verum, cortici literae inhaerentes, quicquid adversus eorum opinionem affertur una responsione absolvunt; depravasse, scilicet, Pontifices Romanos caeterosque sacerdotes suis dogmatibus et glossematibus sacram scripturam avariciae causa, et in rem suam convertisse, verumque literae sensum excaecatos cupiditate pervertisse. Rationibus vero suis, quamvis, apertissimis in adversum argumentis, revincantur, tenaciter adeo obstinateque adhaerent, ut, nullis demonstrationibus nullaque rei evidentia, convinci se patiantur. Claud. Scyssel. Taurin. adv. error. et sect. Valdens. fol. 6, 7.
For a specimen of their reasoning, as exhibited by Scyssel himself, see Ibid. fol. 11-15, et alibi.

[2] Scyssel. adv. Vald. fol. 6. See the last note.

Quicquid a Christo expresse dictum, aut ab Apostolis traditum, non invenerint etiam si hoc in sacris generalibus, Synodis sit definitum, hoc nulla lege introduci a posteris potuisse, obstinate contendunt: quasi nullam posterior Ecclesia habuerit statuendi authoritatem; omniaque in Evangeliis et Epistolis aut Actibus Apostolorum aperte distincteque sint conscripta, quae, particulatim unumquemque et generatim omnes, singulis temporibus, et cum caeteris hominibus et cum semetipsis, sint facturi. Ita ut nihil ad mores vel ad religionem statui possit aut servari debeat, quod non sit in his ipsis sacris scripturis speciatim expressum. Ibid fol. 10.

[3] Inde fit, uti neque censuram ecclesiasticam metuant, neque Praelatorum et Sacerdotum authoritati tribuant quicquam. Scyssel. adv. Vald. fol. 7. Catholicam Ecclesiam apud se solos consistere credunt: et Romanam Sedem, Meretricem Magnam et Errorum Omnium Magistram, appellant. Ibid. fol. 9. Qui igitur se Episcopos et Apostolorum Vicarios Successoresque affirmant, dicant, cujus Ecclesiae, vel civitatis, et provinciae: tum enim nullam Ecclesiam constituunt, quum sunt ab omnibus exclusi; et ipsi omnes reprobas dicunt, eo quod Romanam sequuntur. Ibid. fol. 39. Falso illos nomen Ecclesiae sibi usurpare. Ibid. fol. 43.

[4] Sanctorum praeterea festivitates, eodem errore, non colunt: utpote quorum suffrugio mortales non indigeant, Christo omnibus ad omnia abunde sufficiente. Scyssel. adv. Vald. fol. 7.

[5] Nec alio pertinet, quam impiissime asserunt: quicquid, ad defunctorum animas purgatoriis poenis expiandas, impenditur, inane, perditum, superstitiosumque, esse; parique cupiditate, hanc, ut ipsi praedicant, fabulam a sacerdotibus fuisse confictam. Scyssel. adv. Vald. fol. 7, 8. Aiunt, defunctorum animas, nulla purgatione exanimatas, ad aeterna vel gaudia vel supplicia, quum corporibus exeunt, confestim recipi; ecclesiasticosque viros, cupiditate excaecatos, animarum purgatorium confinxisse. Ibid. fol. 66.

Se duas tantum vias, ex sacris scripturis post praesentis vitae exitum, didicisse dicunt. Ibid fol. 66.

[6] Matrimonia libere in omni gradu contrahi posse, affirmant, uno aut altero ad summum exceptis; quasi in reliquis prohibendi nullam Pontifices habuerint potestatem. Scyssel. adv. Vald. fol. 7.

[7] Sed et, dimittendorum peccatorum nullam sacerdotes nostros potestatem habere, aperte protestantur: et, proinde, neque illis confitendum esse affirmant, neque sacramenta reliqua ab his suscipienda; neque constitutionem Ecclesiae, qua ad sacramentalem confessionem sacramque communionem singulo quoque anno astringimur, ipsi recipiunt. Scyssel. adv. Vald. fol. 8.

[8] A multis eoram Barbis hoc fuerit saepenumero praedicatum, ut gloriosae Virginis Mariae et caeterorum Sanctorum cultus abrogarent, et summorum Ecclesiae doctorum caeterorumque confessorum authoritati detraherent, qui, ut fidelium mentes ad Deum vehementius inflammarent, varias, et quidem potissimas ad Deum et Sanctos ejus, praesertim Mariam Virginem, orationes composuerunt, ex quibus sacrosanctae Missae pars maxima constat, quam hoc pacto fere totam abrogant atque abjiciunt. – Virginem et Sanctos reliquos adorari colique, nefas dicunt. Scyssel. adv. Vald. Fol. 54, 55.

Porro et hoc Valdensis non admittit, ut, qui cum Christo regnant in patria, quae in hoc saeculo mortales faciant, intelligere possint, utique de his curam ullam gerant, aut a Deo impetrare quicquam pro nobis possint; Et, proinde, inanes esse ad Christi Matrem caeterosque Sanctos preces nostras, superstitiosamque esse illorum adorationem. Ibid. fol. 68.

Quin Sanctos electos Dei, immo et ipsam Christi Genetricem, honorandos negant, illisque ceremoniarum cultum prohibent exhiberi: hoc pacto, divinae majestati derogatum iri reputantes quod ipse dixit; Dominum Deum tuum, adorabis, et illi soli servies. Ibid. fol. 72, Claude, in reply, employs the usual popish subterfuge, that the Romanists do not honor the Saints with the same worship as God. Ibid. fol. 72.

He admits, nevertheless, the existence of the idolatrous abuse, which is the sure consequence of what the Papists are pleased to contradistinguish by the name of Dulia. Hae, in Dei Sanctorumque honorem, introductae feriae: hic cultus; heac religio. Quibus si immorigeri mortales prava corruptela abuntuntur: num, ex eo, Deum Sanctosque ejus, honore privandos, arbitrabimur? Corrigi certe magis, atque emendari, abusus nostros oportet. Ibid. fol. 74.

It is vain to talk of correcting abuses, when the very practice itself of Saint-Worship is an abuse to be abolished.

[9] Quae vero, de Eucharistiae sacramento, deque ejus substantia et veritate, nonnulli ex ea secta, quo se caeteris doctiores ostendant, derident, seu garriunt potius quam loquuntur, persequenda hoc loco non videntur: quando quidem tam alta sunt tamque arcana, ut et fideles quidem ipsi, vel peritissimi theologi, vix capere, minime vero tradere caeteris, possint. Scyssel. adv. Vald. Fol. 55.

Claude rightly supposes, that such rustic barbarians as the Vallenses would never comprehend the force of an orthodox catholic statement; and he recommends it, as by far the best plan, to submit ourselves implicitly to the decision of the Holy Catholic Church; provided only, as he judiciously subjoins, we acknowledge the Holy Catholic Church to be the Roman.

Neque hi, ad quos nobis habendus est sermo, sane rustici agrestes, montani, literarumque prorsus ignari, idonei sint, qui, vel eo modo quo nos catholici tenemus, vel eo quem eorum scioli Barbae tradunt, rem ipsam percipere possunt. Ibid. fol. 55.

Ne ultra quam dictum est inquirant: sed, Ecclesiae Sanctae Catholicae decisioni, casteras hujus sacramenti, et aliorum fidei nostrae articulorum, ecclesiasticorumque mysteriorum difficultates absolute relinquant, omniaque sub illo articulo includant Credo in Sanctam Ecclesiam; quod proculdubio absque ulla controversia sunt facturi, tantum ut Romanam hanc esse fateantur. Ibid. fol. 56.

[10] Haec superstitiosa esse affirmant, et ad extorquendas ab imperitis pecunias, a pseudo (ut ipsi appellant) sacerdotibus adinventa, sicuti et indulgentias, et ecclesiarum consecrationes, caeterasque sacerdotales benedictiones. Scyssel. adv. Vald. Fol. 7.

Irridenda vero est potius quam impugnanda horum belluinorum hominum illa assertio, qua, ut Praelatorum et Ecclesiae authoritati derogent, indoctissime affirmant, benedictiones sacerdotum virtutem habere omnino nullam. Propterea, neque coemeteria, neque aquam, neque oratoria, neque ornarnenta ecclesiastica, neque reliqua quae de more benedici solent, ex ea benedictione quicquam percipere. Scyssel. adv. Vald. fol. 56.

[11] Multo vero magis imagines detestantur, et crucis signum quod nos adoramus; hanc idololatriae speciem reputantes: quasi nos imagines Christi et Sanctorum, velut pagani deorum suorum simulachra, colamus. Scyssel. adv. Vald. Fol. 68.

Quod vero imaginum adorationes in nobis arguunt, hoc, si id ita fiat ut ipsi intelligunt, non adversamur. Neque ignoramus, in generalibus quoque conciliis, publicisque Christianorum conventibus, inter Ecclesiae Principes et Pastores, haud parva contentione disceptatum fuisse, an prohibendus esset, ex toto, statuarum atque imaginum usus; multosque non levis doctrinae nec contemnendae authoritatis viros in eam partem subscripsisse: scilicet, ne ad idololatriam homines, alioquin ex recenti gentilitatis memoria satis proni, paulatim redirent. Ibid. fol. 75.

[12] Quippe hoc a plerisque eorum extortum est, et apud assectatores est manifestum, suadere illos, a matris tantum filiae, et commatris, et fortassis etiam sororis, nuptiis abstinendum esse: caeterarum matrirnonia non improbare, quasi hoc lege divina non sit prohibitum, neque potuisse humana prohiberi. Scyssel. adv. Vald. Fol. 48.

They scrupled I suppose, to obtain a popish dispensation to marry an aunt after the portuguese fashion; though they might not deem such an instrument necessary to authorize them to marry a cousin.

[13] In reliquis ferme puriorem, quam caeteri Christiani, vitam agunt. Non enim, nisi coacti, jurant: raroque nomen Dei in vanum proferunt. Promissaque sua, bona fide, implent: et, in paupertare pars maxima degentes, apostolicam vitam doctrinamque servare se solos protestantur. Ob idque, potestatem Ecclesiae apud se, velut innoxios et veros Christi discipulos, residere affirmant; pro cujus fide religioneque in egestate vivere et a nobis persecutionem pati, pulchrum et gloriosum ducunt. Scyssel. adv. Vald. fol. 9.

[14] Crispin. Act. et Moniment. Martyr. lib. 3. fol. 88, 100, 110.

[15] Credimus et confitemur universi: sanctam Scripturam, inclusam Veteri Novoque Testamento, divino afflatu plane instinctuque coelitus infusam. -Ex ejusdem Scripturae disciplina, confitemur et credimus in unum Deum; Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum; tribus distinctum personis; sed eadem una, spirituali, aequabili, perpetua, nullum neque principium neque divinitatis exitum habente, essentia praeditum: qui, maxima potentia sua infinitaque bonitate, creavit omnia, eaque vegetet, tueatur, et conservet. -Certum habemus, Dei Filium in hunc mundum venisse, et humanae carnis involucro tegi voluisse: qua in re una, Christianae Religionis mysterium est constitutum, eoque nomine spem nostram totam et fidem in Jesu Christo, Filio Dei, Domino nostro, Deo admirabili, authore aeternae vitae, solo salvatore, justificatore sanctificatore, solo interprete et patrono generis humani, solo sacrificatore, cui successore non sit opus: eumque vere Deum, ac vere hominem, existere. Credimus atque confitemur, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum conceptum esse ex Spiritu Sancto, opere virili in totum detracto sublatoque, quemadmodum angelus ante conceptionem ipse nunciavit: idque eo consilio potissimum, uti sanctus integerque nasceretur; cujus procreationem, ab omni labe deformationeque vacuam esse, necessarium esset.

Credimus et confitemur, Jesum Christum, omni detracta corruptione, ex virgine Maria natum in Bethleem civitate, corpusque sumpsisse ad nostri plane similitudinem, excepto peccato, cui obnoxius esse minime potuit. - Credimus et confitemur, Jesum Christum, sub Pontio Pilato passum, crucifixum, mortuum, sepultum, pro peccatis nostris: illum enim unum Agnum vere Paschalem esse, in victimam oblatum, ut nos ex diaboli faucibus eriperet. -Credimus et confitemur, descendisse illum ad inferos. – Credimus et confitemur, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum tertio postea die suscitatum a mortuis, ad justificationem nostram. Credimus et confitemur, Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum, quadraginta post resurrectionem suam diebus, in coelum ascendisse, corporeamque praesentiam suam ex his inferioribus locis submovisse. -Credimus et confitemur, sedere illum ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis. -Credimus, Jesum Christum judicatum venturum superstites ac mortuos semel aliquando extremo ipso judicii die. -Credimus in Spiritum Sanctum, tertiam ejusdem cum Patre et Filio divinae essentiae personam, ex eodem Patre Filioque manantem, utrique eorum aequalem. -Credimus et confitemur sanetam Ecclesiam Catholicam, quae est Congregatio et Coetus omnium vere credentium, fidelium, et electorum Dei, qui fuerunt a principio mundi et erunt usque ad finem: cujus quidem Ecclesiae Jesus Christus est caput. -Credimus et confitemur remissionem peccatorum gratuitam, a misericordia et mera bonitate Domini nostri Christi, profectam; qui mortuus est semel pro peccatis nostris, justus ille pro injustis; qui tulit peccata nostra in corpore suo ad crucem; – qui noster est advocatus apud Deum, ipse est pretium reconciliationis nostrae; – sanguis ejus mundat conscientias nostras ab operibus mortuis, ut serviamus Deo vivo; – qui solus pro fidelibus satisfecit, quibus peccata non imputantur quemadmodum incredulis atque reprobis. Confess. Vald. in Crispin. Act. Martyr. lib. in. fol. 104-106.

[16]Credimus resurrectionem carnis benedictorum Dei, ad possidendum regnum coeleste in aeternum; maledictorum vero Dei, ad ignem et cruciatum perpetuum. Credimus item, animas esse immortales: fidelium autem ac filiorum Dei animas, quamprimum ex hoc corpore migrarunt, ad gloriam coelestem transire; – infidelium vero ac reproborum animas, cum e corporibus discedunt, ad inferorum cruciatus se conferunt usque ad diem judicii et resurrectionis carnis, ut ibi corpore et anima in perpetuum torqueantur in gehenna ignis inextincti.

Credimus, vitam aeternam, nobis, gratia Dei per Christum, oblatam: qui vere vita est, ac mortem confecit, ut fideles vitae aeternae haeredes fiant. -Credimus et confitemur, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, abolita Circumcisione, instituisse Baptismum, per quem in populi Dei Ecclesiam recipimur. – Baptismus vero exterior alium quoque interiorem nobis exhibet, Gratiam scilicet Dei, quae cerni his oculis non potest. – Apostoli atque alii ministri Ecclesiae baptisant, prolato verbo Dei ad sacramentum; ac signum visibile tantum donant: Dominus vero Jesus Christus, ajrcipoi>mhn, solus incrementum dat; et facit, ut res signatas percipiamus. – Errant etiam graviter, qui pueros Christianorum a Baptismo removent.

Credimus et confitemur, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum deinde ordinasse sacramentum Coenae, quae gratiarum est actio, et memoria mortis ac passionis Jesu Christi, in coetu populi Dei rite celebrata. In quo quidem panis et vinum distribuuntur et sumuntur, ut visibilia signa et monimenta rerum sacrarum: corporis videlicet et sanguinis Jesu Christi suspensi atque in cruce oblati pro peccatorum nostrorum remissione, et generis humani cum Deo reconciliatione. Quisque credit Jesum Christum, tradidisse corpus suum, et profudisse sanguinem, ad remissionem peccatorum; ille comedit carnem e bibit sanguinem Domini, et utriusque fit particeps: considerans convenientiam earum rerum quae oculis subjiciuntur et cibi quo corpus istud sustentatur, cum iis rebus quae non videntur atque cibo spirituali. Etenim, ut corpus in hac vita pane corroboratur, vinumque cor hominis recreat: ita etiam corpus Jesu Christi morti traditum, ejusque sanguis pro nobis effusus, nutrit, confirmat, et reficit, animam tristem et afflictam. Coeterum nequis existimet, signum visibile, cum re per id significata quae est invisibilis, adeo conjungi aut conglutinari, ut disjungi aut dissolvi nequeant, quin unum sine altero esse possit. Nam Judas signum quidem cepit, rem vero significatam et fructum non percepit, nec unquam corporis et sanguinis Jesu Christi particeps factus est. – Atqui istud non eo modo accipiendum quo nonnulli opinati sunt, verum Christi corpus et naturale, carnem et ossa, in pane illo Coenae esse ac delitescere, aut in eum converti; nam haec opinio pugnat cum verbo Dei, et fidei nostrae articulis est contraria, in quibus clare habemus, Christum ascendisse ad coelos, sedere ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis, unde et venturus est ad judicandum vivos et mortuos: sed Dominus Jesus Christus sacramento Coenae adest, potentia, virtute, atque praesentia, Spiritus sui, in cordibus electorum suorum et fidelium. – Errant etiam, qui affirmant, in Coena Christi corpus comedi corporaliter: caro enim nihil prodest; Spiritus est, qui vivificat. Fideles igitur vere Jesu Christi carnem edunt et sanguinem bibunt spiritualiter in ipsorum cordibus. Confess. Vald. in Crispin. Act. Martyr. lib. 3. 106-108.

[17] Credimus et confitemur, sincerum Dei cultum consistere in eo, ut voluntati ejus pareamus, atque omnem nostram diligentiam, operam, ac studium, conferamus in hoc, ut, quoad in nobis erit, eam consequamur. – Porro finis praecepti est Deo obedire in vera charitate, ex puro et integro corde, et conscientia bona, et fide non simulata. – Confitemur, agnitionem peccati ab ipsa Legis intelligentia proficisci; quae nostram, quasi digito, ostendit imbecillitatem, quum nemo sit mortalium qui eam implere valeat: omnes enim homines peccatores sunt. -Confitemur, bona opera, quae Deus praeparavit ut in iis ambularemus, quaeque in verbo ejus proposita sunt, fieri debere atque studiose impleri: non quidem spe promerendi aliquid apud Deum, aut metu aeterni exitii; sed ex officio atque amore, quo communem omnium nostrum Patrem amplecti oportet. -Credimus et confitemur, sobrietatem et continentiam nobis, ex praeceptis divinis, in omnibus rebus servandam. Jejunium quoque nobis in Scriptura injunctum est, quod corporis affiictione atque humiliatione constat, non id quidem ut tantummodo caro affligatur, sed ut alacriores, magisque ad precandum idonei, reddamur. -Confitemur etiam, in Veteri quidem Testamento certos cibos fuisse prohibitos, quorum tamen, apud Christianos, liber mansit usus per Jesum Christum. - Confitemur, reges, principes, ac magistratus, personas esse a Deo constitutas, ut gladium gestent ad bonorum defensionem atque punitionem facinorosorum. Ideoque

eis obedientia debetur, non modo propter iram, sed etiam propter conscientiam. -Confitemur, ministros et Ecclesiae pastores, exemplo gregi et fidelibus esse oportere, in sermone, consuetudine, charitate, fide, et castimonia; aliis praelucere, concionando verbum Dei, et perseverando in sincera doctrina. Contra, vero, pastores avari, qui, turpis lucri causa, sub praetextu nihilominus cultus Dei, falsas doctrinas comminiscuntur; – qui templum Dei prophanant, ut speluncam latronum efficiant; qui pecunia se animas e purgatorio, ut vocant, redimere posse confirmant; atque, accepto pretio, veniam et peccatorum remissionem promittunt; qui mala opera venditant: tales, inquam, impostores, sacrilegi, atque idololatrae, de gradu demovendi regum ac magistratum authorirate, aliique in ipsorum locum substituendi forent. Confess. Vald. in Crispin. Act. Martyr. lib. 3. fol. 108-110.

[18] Crispin. Act. Martyr. lib. 3. fol. 111.

[19] Crispin. Act. Martyr. lib. in. fol. 112.

[20] Bossuet. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11. 119, 120.

[21] In his tantis calumniis et criminibus, reliquus populus, qui ad pedem Alpium, et qui Merindolii Cabrieraeque, degit, ita pie ac modeste semper vixit, ut, in eorum tota consuetudine ac vitae ratione, timor Dei maxime eluxerit, summa fides et justitia perspecta fuerit. In exigua cognitionis luce quam Dominus eis dederat, in eam unam curam incumbebant, ut id, quod habebant, magis quotidie accenderent, nullis rebus aut facultatibus suis parcentes, sive libri Scripturae Sacrae parandi essent, sive homines optimo ingenio praediti, in doctrina pietatis instituendi, sive huc illucque mittendi etiam usque ad extremas mundi partes, ubi aliquem lucis salutaris radium exortum esse audiverant. Crispin. Act. Martyr. lib. 3. fol. 88.

[22] Itaque, quod antea saepius professi sunt, id etiam nunc confirmant: nempe, si, idonea inquisitione habita, probentur in aliquo errasse, aut ex verbo Dei haereseos convincantur; se, absque ulla cunctatione, abjuraturos esse quicquid in ipsorum Confessione reperietur quod cum sacrosaneta Dei doctrina non consentiat: contra, si, ipsos, nullo errore ductos, nullave haereseos nota vel macula infectos, constat puram Evangelii doctrinam SEMPER docuisse et coluisse; non esse consentaneum, se ad canendam palinodiam errorum quibus obnoxii non sint, impelli aut ulla yi cogi. Crispin. Act. Martyr. lib. 3. fol. 111.

[23] Sumus qualeseunque doctores cujusdam plebis indignae et pusillsae. – In omnibus tamen vobiscum convenimus: et, a tempore Apostolorum, semper de fide, sicut vos, sentientes concordavimus: in hoc solo differentes; quod, culpa nostra, ingeniique nostri pigritia, scriptores, tam recte quam vos, neutiquam intelligimus. Scultet. Annal. Evangel. Renovat. in A. D. 1530. p. 161, 163.

[24] See Preface to Glorious Recov. p. 13, 14, translated by Acland. See also Gilly's Mem. of Neff. Introd. p. 21.

[25] Tertia causa haeresis est: quia Novum et Vetus Testamentum vulgariter transtulerunt: et sic docent et discunt. Audivi et vidi quendam rusticum idiotam, qui Job recitavit de verbo ad verbum: et plures, qui totum Novum Testamentum perfecte sciverunt. Et, quia sunt laici idiotae, false et corrupte Scripturam exponunt. Reiner. de haeret. c. 3. p. 299. Apud nos vero rarus est vir vel femina, qui textum non sciat vulgariter recitare. Ibid. c. 8. p. 307.

This extraordinary intimacy with Scripture was in the early part of the thirteenth century: and, if I mistake not, the account very faithfully reflects the condition of the Vallenses, on either side of the Cottian Alps, at the time of the Reformation.

The remark of the present excellent Bishop of Chester, Dr. Sumner, exactly applies to the old Vallenses. Spiritual knowledge has this peculiar characteristic: it has little connection with superior education or cultivation of mere intellect. Charge A. D. 1832. p. 25.

CHAPTER 12

[1] See above, book 3. chap. 8.

[2] Petrus Valdus, locuples civis Lugdunensis, anno Christi circiter 1170, Valdensibus nomen dedit. Is, domo ac bonis relictis, totum se evangelicae professioni devoverat; et prophetarum atque apostolorum scripta, populari lingua vertenda, curaverat. – Cum jam multos sectatores, exiguo tempore, circa se haberet; eos, tanquam discipulos, ad evangelium promulgandum, in omnes partes ablegat. Thuan. Hist. lib. 6. 16. vol. 1. p. 221.

Valdesios, a primate ipsorum Valde dictos, qui fuerat civis Lugduni super Rhodanum. Gualt. Mapes. de Nugis Curial. distinct. 1. c. 31. apud Usser de Eccles. Success. c. 8. 6.

Valdenses dicuntur a suo haeresiarcha, qui Valdius dicebatur: qui, suo spiritu ductus, non a Deo missus, novam sectam invenit. – Quorum discipuli, id est, muscipulae, jam per diversas mundi partes, simplices seducunt a via. Alan. cont. Valdens. lib. 2. c. 1. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8. Section 5. Fuit quidam civis Lugdunensis, nomine Valdensius seu Valdensis, qui dives existens divitias reliquit, ut pauper fieret et Christum sequeretur et evangelicam perfectionem servaret. Sed, errore pravae intelligentiae Scripturarum abductus a veritate demens, ipse et ejus sequaces, ab unitate et obedientia Ecclesiae alienati, per schisma in haeresim sunt prolapsi. Guid. Perpin. in Summa de haeres. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8. Section 5.

Insurrexit in partibus gallicanis, in archiepiscopatu et civitate Lugdunensi, quidam vocatus Valdensius seu Valdensis; qui, relictis omnibus, proposuit servare evangelicam paupertatem, sicut Apostoli servarunt: qui plures sibi adhaerentes habuit, et congregationem magnam virorum et mulierum fecit. – Hi vocantur Valdenses, a Valdense eorum magistro errorum et auctore. Vocantur etiam Pauperes de Lugduno, a civitate Lugdunensi unde traxerunt originem, et quia vitam elegerunt pauperem. Nic. Eymeric. Direct. Inquisit. par. 2. quaest. 14. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8. Section 5.

[3] Petrus quidam Valdensis, ab oppido Valdis sito in marchia Galliae, unde erat oriundus, sic appellatus. Centur. Magd. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8. 5.

Petrus ei nomen fuit; Valdo, cognomen: natus in vico, qui, prisco nomine postea mutato, dictus est Vaudra; eo quod, populari lingua, Valdo et sectarii ejus Vaudois cognominarentur. Masson. Praefat. in Alan. cont. Valdens. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8. Section 5. Ortus et origo Valdensium haereticorum talis est. – Notandum, quod, fere octingentis annis post Papam Sylvestrum, tempore Innocentii Papae II, in civitate Valden, quae in finibus Franciae sita est, fuit quidam civis dives, qui vel ipse legit vel audivit, Dominum dixisse cuidam adolescenti, Si vis perfectus esse, vade et vende omnia quae habes, et da pauperibus. – Putabat ille Petrus Valdensis, cum hanc audiret aut legeret scripturam, quod vita apostolica jam non esset in terra. Unde, cogitabat eam innovare: et, omnibus venditis et pauperibus datis, coepit vitam pauperem ducere; quod videntes, quidam alii corde compuncti sunt, et fecerunt similiter. – Cum autem diu in paupertate stetissent, inceperunt cogitare, quod etiam Apostoli

Christi non solum erant pauperes, imo etiam praedicatores: coeperunt et ipsi praedicare verbum Dei. Pilich. cont. Valdens. c. 1. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 312, 313.

What Masson means, is, I suppose, this. The place of Peter's nativity was originally called Valden or Valles: and thence he and his disciples were styled Valdenses or Vallenses. But, since the French called the men Vaudois; they similarly, and on the same principle of lingual alteration, called the place Vaudra. The term Vauderie, by which the pretended sorcery of the Vaudois was described, is formed in a manner strictly analogous.

[4] Nota, quod secta Pauperum de Lugduno, qui etiam Leonistae dicuntur, tali modo orta est. Cum cives majores pariter essent in Lugduno, contigit, quendam ex eis mori subito coram eis. Unde quidam inter eos tantum fuit territus, quod statim magnum thesaurum pauperibus erogavit. Et ex hoc maxima multitudo pauperum ad eum confluxit, quos ipse docuit habere voluntariam paupertatem et esse imitatores Christi et Apostolorum. Cum autem esset aliquantulum literatus, Novi Testamenti textum docuit eos vulgariter. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 300.

According to Stephen de Borbon, what seems not unlikely, Peter, in his work of translating the Scriptures, employed two Priests, Stephen de Ansa and Bernard Ydros: the one, dictating the words of the translation; and the other, writing them down from his mouth. He professes to have received the account, both from many who claimed to have been eye-wit-nesses, and especially from Ydros himself. Steph. Borbon. aliter Bellavill. de Septem Donis Spiritus S. par. 4. c. 30. in Ricchin. Dissert. de Valdens. c. 1. Section 5.

[5] Quod Romana Ecclesia sit meretrix in Apocalypsi: – quod Papa sit caput omnium errorum: – quod ipsi sint Ecclesia Jesu Christi. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 300.

[6] Ad Adelaidem, Ducissam, et Marchionissam Alpium Cottiarum. Pet. Damian. Oper. lib. 7. epist. 16. p. 339.

[7] I doubt, what (I believe) has sometimes been proposed, the derivation of Valden from the Teutonic Walden: whence our English Wild and Would and Wilderness.

[8] Olim duae sectae in Italia exortae, adhuc perdurant: quorum alii Humiliatos, alii Pauperes de Lugduno, se nominabant. Conrad. Abbat. Ursperg. Chron. in A. D. 1212. See above, book 3. chap. 8. Section 2. note.

[9] De sectis ANTIQUORUM haereticorum, de quarto nota: quod sectae haereticorum fuerunt plures quam septuaginta; quae omnes, per Dei gratiam, deletae sunt, praeter sectas Manichaeorum, Arianorum, Runcariorum, et Leonistarum, quae Alemanniam infecerunt. Inter omnes has sectas, quae adhuc sunt vel fuerunt, non est perniciosior Ecclesiae, quam Leonistarum: et hoc, tribus de causis. Prima est, quia est DIUTURNIOR. – De sectis MODERNORUM haereticorum, nota: quod secta Pauperum de Lugduno, qui etiam Leonistae dicuntur, tali modo orta est. Reiner. de haeret. c. 4. 5. p. 299, 300.

In his Summa, Reinerius speaks much to the same purpose: though here he reduces all the then existing sects under the two principal heads of Cathari and Leonists; identifying the latter with the Poor Men of Lyons, because the more modern French Valdenses were a branch or offset from the ancient stock of the Piedmontese Valdenses. Cum sectae haereticorum olim fuerint multae, quae omnino fere destructae sunt per gratiam Jesu Christi, tamen duae principales modo inveniuntur: quorum altera vocatur Cathari

sive Paterini; altera, Leonistae seu Pauperes de Lugduno. Summ. Frat. Reiner. in Marten. Thesaur. Anecdot. vol. 5. col. 1761.

The view, taken of the engraftation of the modern French Valdenses upon the ancient Piedmontese Valdenses by Mr. de la Rogue, as cited by Bossuet for the purpose of showing its erroneousness, is, nevertheless, with submission to the learned Prelate, perfectly correct. Pierre Valdo ayant trouve des peuples entiers separes de la communion de l'Eglise Latine, il se joignit a eux avec ceux qui le suivoient, pour ne faire qu'un meme corps et une meme societe par l'unite d'une meme doctrine. The entire bodies of men already separated from the Roman Church, to which Peter Valdo and his disciples joined themselves, were assuredly the Piedmontese Valdenses: those very ancient Leonists, from whom, through the connecting link of their founder himself a Valdensis, the more modern French Leonists were derived, and with whom, consequently, they were in close and immediate communion. Such obviously, is the import of the statement made by Mr. de la Rogue: and it perfectly agrees with the classification of Reinerius, who describes the Leonists as being the oldest of all known sects, and who yet says that the Poor Men of Lyons under the same name of Leonists were founded by Peter the Valdo as late as the twelfth century. But Bossuet impugns this very just assertion of his countryman, on the ground: that, Anterior to the time of the merchant Peter, there were no bodies of men in a state of separation from the Roman Church, save the various branches of the Cathari or Albigenses, all of whom, with whatever minor variations, were alike fundamentally Manicheans. Whence, if any such engraftation, as that asserted by Mr. de la Rogue, took place: it will serve only to bring out the not very satisfactory result, that The Manicheans were the spiritual ancestors of the Reformed. Boss. Hist. des Variat. Livr. 11. 91.

The attack of Bossuet rests, throughout, upon an entirely false foundation. Anterior to the time of Peter the Valdo, the ancient Valdenses of Piedmont had long been in a state of separation from the Roman Church: and they confessedly were never Manicheans. Therefore, previous to the twelfth century, the Cathari or Albigenses, alleged by Bossuet to have been Manicheans, were not the only entire bodies of men that were separatists.

And, even if the Albigenses had been the only entire bodies of men that were separatists, and even if Peter and his French disciples had exclusively joined themselves to those previously existing religionists: still the Bishop's attack upon Mr. de !a Rogue would exhibit nothing better than a complete Non sequitur; for it has been fully shown, and will hereafter yet further be inductively shown, that the Albigenses were not Manicheans. See above, book 2; and below, book 4. chap. 1.

[10] Gualter. Mapes. de Nugis Curial. distinct. i.e. 31. apud Usser de Eccles. Success. c. 8. Section 12.

[11] Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11. Section 2, 3, 73.

[12] Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11. Section 126.

[13] Boss, Hist. des Variat. livr. 11. Section 46.

[14] Ultimately, I believe, either directly or indirectly, they did thus carry the Gospel to every quarter of Europe: and, hence, the language of Reinerius, even in the thirteenth century, will scarcely be deemed an exaggeration; Fere nulla est terra, in qua haec secta non sit. But the south of Europe, as we may gather from the obviously far too diminishing allegations of Pilichdorf, was the chief theater of their missionary labors.

Licet tu, Valdensis haeretice, minimos credentes habeas ad aeternam damnationem, ostendam tibi tamen gentes, tribus, populos, et linguas, ubi, per Dei gratiam, sunt omnes Catholici, et omnes homines sunt immunes, a tua secta penitus conservati: scilicet, Angliam, Flammingiam, Flandriam, Brabantiam, Garlandriam, Westphaliam, Daciam, Sueciam, Norwegiam, Prussiam, et regnum Cracoviae, pene nullos habens Valdenses. Pilich. cont. Vald. c. 15. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 315.

[15] What Reinerius says of the Leonists being spread over the whole world (Secunda est, quia est generalior: fere enim nulla est terra, in qua haec secta non sit. Reiner. de haeret. c. 4. p. 299), must undoubtedly be understood of the Leonists as he viewed them in the middle of the thirteenth century, after the missionary labors of Peter and his Poor Men had been full seventy or eighty years in active operation: for, previous to the time of the holy merchant, the Vallenses, so far from being spread over the whole world like the Paulician Albigenses, were known only in their own immediate neighborhood. It is very probable:, that Peter borrowed from the ever-migratory Albigenses, the idea of a select missionary establishment.

[16] Reinerius very justly says, that such is their strictly proper designation. The disciples of Peter the Valdo were called The Poor Valdenses of Lyons in evident contradistinction to The Poor Valdenses of Piedmont.

[17] Duo sunt genera sectae ipsorum. Quidam dicuntur Perfecti eorum: et hi proprie vocantur Poure Valdenses de Lion. Nec omnes ad hanc formam assumunt: sed prius diu informantur, ut et alios sciant docere. Hi nihil proprium dicunt se habere, nec domos, nec possessiones, nec certas mansiones: conjuges, si quas ante habuerunt, relinquunt. Hi dicunt se Apostolorum successores; et sunt magistri aliorum et confessores: et circuunt per terras, visitando et confirmando discipulos in errore. His ministrant discipuli necessaria. In quocunque loco veniunt, insinuant sibi mutuo adventum illorum. Conveniunt ad eos plures in tuto loco in latibulis audire eos et videre; et mittunt eis illuc optima quaeque cibi et potus. Et indicunt collectas nummorum discipulis pro sustentatione eorundem Pauperum et magistrorum suorum et studentium, qui per se sumptos non habent; vel etiam ad alliciendum aliquos, quos cupiditas nummi trahit ad sectam eorum. Auctor. Anon. de haer. Pauper. de Lugdun. in Marten. Thesaur. Anecdot. vol. 5. col. 1781.

The gratuitous slander, that these poor persecuted people tempted proselytes to join them by pecuniary bribery, is so palpably absurd upon the very face of it, that it could deserve no notice save as exhibiting the genuine animus of a true popish priest and inquisitor. Accordingly, it appears to have been somewhat of a favorite among the Romish divines: for, as I find from Usher, it again turns up, totidem verbis, in the Summa of Ivonet, par. 2. c. 2. The writer whom Marten styles an anonymous author, is, I believe, now ascertained to be Reinerius. In the collection of Marten, the Tractate is placed immediately after the Summa of that well-known apostate Inquisitor.

[18] Vidimus in Concilio Romano, sub Alexandro Papa III celebrato (A. D. 1179), Valdesios, homines idiotas illiteratos (a primate ipsorum Valde dictos, qui fuerat civis Lugduni super Rhodanum); qui librum Domino Papae praesentaverunt lingua conscriptum gallica, in quo textus et glossa Psalterii plurimorumque Legis utriusque librorum continebatur. Hi multa petebant instantia, praedicationis authoritatem sibi confirmari: quia periti sibi videbantur, cum vix essent scioli. – Ego multorum millium, qui vocati fuerunt, minimus, deridebam eos, quod super eorum petitione tractatus fieret vel dubitatio: vocatusque a quodam magno pontifice, cui et ille maximus Papa confessionum curam injunxerat, conjeci sagittam ad signnum. Multisque legis peritis et prudentibus adscitis, deducti sunt ad me duo Valdesii, qui sua videbantur in secta praecipui, disputaturi mecum de fide: non amore veritatis

inquirendae, sed ut, me convicto, clauderetur os meum quasi loquentis iniqua. Timidus, fateor, sedi; ne, peccatis exigentibus, in Concilia tanto mihi gratia negaretur sermonis. Jussit me pontifex expediri adversus eos, qui respondere parabant. Primo, igitur, proposui levissima, quae nemini licet ignorare: sciens, quod, asino cardones edente, dignam habent labra lactucam. Creditis in Deum Patrem? Responderunt: Credimus. Et in Filium? Responderunt: Credimus. Et in Spiritum Sanctum? Credimus. Iteravi: In matrem Christi? Et illi item: Credimus. Et ab omnibus multiplici sunt clamore derisi. Gualter. Mapes. de Nugis Curial. distinct, 1. c. 31. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8. Section 12. I am not quite certain as to the intention of Mapes, when he says: Timidus, fateor, sedi; ne, peccatis exigentibus, in Concilio tanto mihi gratia negaretur sermonis. That is to say, I am not quite certain: whether he means, that he felt some qualms, lest, the grace of eloquence being denied to him, he should thence make but a bad figure in this examination of the Valdenses; or whether he would intimate, that he was afraid lest the permission of speaking and of thus honorably distinguishing himself should be denied on account of his comparative obscurity. The former, perhaps, in the case of any other man, would not be an unlikely sense: for to examine is, in effect, to be examined. But, with the evident comfortable self-conceit of the facetious Presbyter, the latter may peradventure seem better to accord: and thence, probably, is his real meaning. In my translation, I have copied the ambiguity of the original. Walter seems to have had a shrewd guess, as to the ultimate tendency of the preaching of these Valdenses. They were bringing the roman craft into danger of being set at nought: so that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshipped. The sacred image that fell from heaven was as much jeopardized in one case, as in the other. On the curious subject of the imitative Diopete Walterus Map, de quo multa referentur jocunda, ex Praecentore Lincolniensi Archidiaconus Oxoniensis efficitur. Nicol. Trivett. Chron. in A. D. 1197.

One of the jocunda of this vir lepidissimus was, doubtless, his humorous banter of the Valdenses: a good story, often, I dare say, waggishly recited by the Archdeacon himself.

[19] Olim duae sectae, in Italia exortae, adhuc perdurant: quorum alii Humiliatos, alii Pauperes de Lugduno, se nominabant quos Lucius Papa quondam inter haereticos scribebat; eo quod superstitiosa dogmata et observationes in eis reperirentur. In occultis quoque praedicationibus, quas faciebant plerunque in latibulis, Ecclesiae Dei et Sacerdotio derogabatur. Vidimus tunc temporis (anno scilicet 1212) aliquos de numero eorum, qui dicebantur Pauperes de Lugduno, apud Sedem Apostolicam, cum magistro suo quodam, ut puto, Bernhardo: et hi petebant, sectam suam a Sede Apostolica confirmari et privilegiari. Sane ipsi, dicentes se gerere vitam Apostolorum, nihil volentes possidere aut certum locum habere, circuibant per vicos et castella. Ast Dominus Papa quaedam superstitiosa, in conversatione ipsorum, eisdem objecit: videlicet, quod calceos desuper pedem praedicabant, et quasi nudis pedibus ambulabant. Praeterea, cum portarent quasdam cappas, quasi religionis, capillos capitis non attondebant, nisi sicut Laici. Hoc quoque probrosum in eis videbatur, quod viri et mulieres simul ambulabant in via, et plerumque simul manebant in una domo: et de eis diceretur, quod quandoque simul in lectulis accubabant. Quae tamen omnia ipsi asserebant ab Apostolis descendisse. Conrad. Abbat. Ursperg. Chron. in A. D. 1212. apud Gretser. Proleg. c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 291.

[20] Rarus est doctor inter eos (scil. pontificios), qui tria capitula continuata Novi Testamenti literaliter sciat de corde. Apud nos vero (scil. Valdenses) rarus est vir vel femina, qui textum non sciat vulgariler recitare. Reiner. de haeret. c. 8. p. 307.

[21] Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? 1 Corinthians 9:5.

[22] Qui enim Lugduni quiescere non poterant, Archiepiscopum et Ecclesiam metuentes, inde fugerunt: atque, per partes Franciae et Italiae dispersi, quamplures complices habuerunt; et, usque hodie, errores suos hinc inde seminaverunt. Eyrmeric. Direct. Inquis. par. 2. quaest. 14. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8. Section 10.

[23] Petrus Valdus, eorum antesignanus, patria relicta, in Belgium venit: atque, in Picardia quam hodie vocant, multos sectatores nactus, cum inde in Germaniam transiisset, per Vandalices civitates diu diversatus est, ac postremo in Boemia consedit; ubi etiam hodie ii, qui eam doctrinam amplectuntur, Picardi, ea de causa, appellantur. Thuan. Hist. lib. 6. 16. vol. 1. p. 221.

The Germans corrupted Picards into Pighards and Beghards: hence some have supposed that the word denotes Beggars from the verb Beggen. But Pighard so evidently forms the transition link between Picard and Beghard, that there can be little doubt, I think, of the true etymology: though it is not unlikely, that Pighard may have passed into Beghard with an allusion to the missionaries subsisting by voluntary alms or contributions. We must not, however, confound the Vallensic Beghards with the Franciscan Beguins. The mendicant Friars of St. Francis Assisi were one of the two Orders set up by Innocent III. in express opposition to the Humiliated and the Poor Men of Lyons. See Conrad. Abbat. Ursperg. Chron. in A. D. 1212, and Luc. Tudens. adv. Albig. lib. 2. c. 11. It was evidently against the Valdensic Beghards or Picards in Germany, who ridiculed the doctrine of Transubstantiation and who called the Romish Priests, God-makers, that Conrad of Magdenberg wrote his Treatise, a part of which was edited by Gretser, at the end of the Work of Pilichdorf. The fragment will be found in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 342, 343.

[24] Lorsqu'ils se sont separes, ils n'avoient encore que tres-peu de dogmes contraires aux notres, et peut-etre point du tout. – C'etoit une espece de Donatisme. Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11. Section 73, 86.

[25] Boss. Hist. des Variat. livr. 11. Section 83, 93.

[26] The state of Luther's mind, during the progress of his dispute with the Pope, cannot be better described than in his own words.

I permit the publication of my propositions against indulgences for this reason: that the greatness of my success may be attributed to God, and that I may not be exalted in mine own eyes. For, by these propositions, it will appear, how weak and contemptible I was, and in how fluctuating a state of mind, when I began this business. I found myself involved in it alone, and, as it were, by surprise. And, when it became impossible for me to retreat, I made many concessions to the Pope: not, however, in many important points; though certainly, at that time, I adored him in earnest. In fact, how despised and wretched a monk was I then; more like a lifeless body, than a human being! Whereas, in regard to the Pope, how great was his Majesty! The potentates of the earth dreaded his nod. How distressed was my heart, in that year 1517, and in the following; how submissive my mind then was to the hierarchy, not feignedly but really; nay, how I was almost driven to despair, through the agitations of care and fear and doubt: those secure spirits little know, who at this day insult the majesty of the Pope with much pride and arrogance. But I, who then alone sustained the danger, was not so certain, not so confident. I was ignorant of many things, which now, by the grace of God, I understand. I disputed: and I was open to conviction. Not finding satisfaction in the books of theologians and canonists, I wished to consult the

living members of the Church itself. There were indeed some godly souls, who entirely approved my propositions: but I did not consider their authority as of weight with me in spiritual concerns. The Popes, Cardinals, Bishops, and Monks, were the objects of my confidence. I waited for divine instruction with such ardent and continued eagerness and was so overloaded with cares, that I became almost stupid or distracted. I scarcely knew, when I was asleep, or when awake. ,it length, after I became enabled to answer every objection that could be brought against me from the Scriptures, one difficulty still remained, and only one: namely, that the CHURCH ought to be obeyed. By the grace of Christ, I at last, overcame this difficulty also. Most certainly I had formerly a much greater veneration for the Roman Church, than those have; who, at this day, with a perverse spirit of opposition, extol Popery so exceedingly against me. Pref. in Luther. Oper. vol. 1. cited by Milner in Hist. of Church, cent. 16. chap. 3. vol. 4. p. 330-332.

So little do I speculate in supposing such to have been the mental operations of Peter's French Converts from Popery, that, in the very nature of things, I am fully satisfied, that something strictly analogous must be the internal process experienced by every serious and devout person who is led honestly to work his painful way from the darkness and bondage of the Roman Church to the glorious light and liberty of the Gospel.

[27] Even if Reinerius favored his opinion, which I venture to deny, he would still have to contend with the decisive testimony of Stephen of Borbon, who flourished from the year 1223, to the year 1264. This writer says expressly, that the Valdenses refused to adore that which the Romanists believed to be the body of Christ: a mode of expression, which clearly imports, that the Valdenses did not believe the consecrated elements to be the body and blood of Christ through any material transubstantiation, and that they consistently refused on that precise ground to offer to them any religious worship. Item solum Deum adorandum dicunt omni genere adorationis: et dicunt peccare eos, qui crucem, vel illud quod nos credimus Corpus Christi, adorant; vel Sanctos alios a Deo, vel eorum imagines. Steph. Borbon. de Septem Donis Spiritus Sanct. in Richin. Dissert. de Valdens. c. 3. Section 4. artic. 17. The Nos credimus of necessity imports the Illi non credunt: and the Illi non credunt is the obvious cause of the Illi non adorant.

[28] Item dicunt: quod transubstantiatio non fiat in manu indigne conficientis, sed in ore digne sumentis. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 300.

[29] Item dicunt: quod Missa nihil sit, quia Apostoli eam non habebant, et fiat propter quaestum. Item Canonem Missae non recipiunt, nisi tantum verba Christi vulgariter. – Item dicunt: quod oblatio, quae fit in sacerdotibus in Missa, nihil sit, neque proficit. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300..442

[30] Corpus Christi et sanguinem non credunt vere esse, sed tantum panem benedictum; qui, in figura quadam, dicitur Corpus Christi: sicut dicitur, Petra autem erat Christus, et similia. Auctor. Anon. (scil. Reiner.) de haer. Pauper. de Lugdun. in Marten. Thesaur. Anecdot. vol. 5. col. 1779.

Reinerius, even as edited by Gretser, uses an expression, which implies, of necessity, that the Valdenses rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation.

Siscidenses concordant cure Valdensibus fere in omnibus, nisi quod recipiunt Eucharistiae Sacramentum. Reiner. de haeret. c. 6. p. 301. The Siscidenses, it appears, received the Sacrament of the Eucharist. In this, they differed from the Valdenses. Therefore, by the very turn of the expression, the Valdenses did not receive it.

Now the Valdenses, so far as I am aware, are never charged with rejecting altogether the supper of the Lord: and Bossuet himself, even on the professed authority of Reinerius, contends, that they went so far as to hold the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

What, then, can the passage mean: and what was it that the Valdenses did reject? The only reasonable answer, which can be given to this question, is: that They rejected the Sacrament of the Eucharist according to its definition in the Roman Church; while the Siscidenses, agreeing with them in almost all points save this, received that sacrament according to its popish definition. In other words the Valdenses denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Bossuet felt the difficulty of this passage: and thence attempted to get over it, by asserting its import to be simply; that The Siscidenses readily received the Eucharist from the hands of a Romish Priest, while the Valdenses, on the plea of that Priest's unworthiness, would not receive it from him. Hist. des variat. livr. 11. Section 3.

The gloss bears the impress of Bossuet's ingenuity: but it is not, therefore, the less inadmissible. When Reinerius, as in the present passage, uses the word recipio nakedly and absolutely; he uses it only in the sense of receiving or admitting or acquiescing in some book or doctrine or ordinance. Thus, in the very same chapter as that wherein the present passage occurs, he says: Scripta Patrum non recipiunt; and Istos (scil. Matthaeum, Marcum, Lucam, et Joannem) dicunt recipiendos, et ipsi eos recipiunt; and Idem Joannes recipit totam Bibliam. Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. p. 302, 305. The several expressions all convey one and the same idea. Consequently, the sense, which Bossuet would here gratuitously affix to the word, must be rejected.

[31] Haec fuit prima haeresis eorum, contemptus ecclesiasticae potestatis. Ex hoc, traditi Satanae praecipitati sunt ab ipso in errores innumeros. Auctor. Anon. (scil. Reiner.) de haer. Pauper. de Lugdun. in Marten. Thesaur. Anecdot. vol. 5. col. 1779.

Thuanus seems never once to have suspected, that they scarcely differed from the Roman Church at the time of their first separation from it. See Thuan. Hist. lib. 6. 16. vol. 1. p. 221.

[32] If Bossuet means only, that the French Proselytes of Peter the Vaudois did not instantaneously renounce all the errors and heresies of the Roman Church, but that they were gradually brought to the truth by their fully enlightened teacher: he very probably at least may speak correctly, though I am ignorant of the existence of any precise evidence for the direct establishment of such an opinion. In that case, their progress would only resemble the progress of Luther. Yet it would, I suppose, be far more rapid: because Luther had painfully to search out the scriptural way by himself; whereas the French Proselytes had the advantage of an instructor, who being born and bred a Vaudois, had known in speculation the sincere Gospel from his very childhood. 33 Dicunt: quod Romana Ecclesia non sit Ecclesia Jesu Christi, sed sit Ecclesia Malignantium; et quod defecerit sub Sylvestro, quando venenum temporalium infusum est in Ecclesiam. Reiner de haeret. c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 300.

[34] Dicunt: quod ipsi sint Ecclesia Christi; quia Christi doctrinam, Evangelii et Apostolorum verbis et exemplis, observent. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. p. 300.

[35] Secundus error est: quod omnia vitia et peccata in Ecclesia sint, et quod ipsi soli juste vivant. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. p. 300.

[36] Tertius est; quod doctrinam evangelicam prone nullus servet in Ecclesia, praeter eos. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300.

[37] Quartus: quod ipsi sint vere pauperes spiritu, et persecutionem patiuntur propter justitiam et fidem. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300.

[38] Quintus: quod ipsi sint Ecclesia Jesu Christi. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. p. 300.

[39] Sextus: quod Romana Ecclesia sit meretrix in Apocalypsi propter superfluum ornatum. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300.

[40] Septimus: quod omnia statuta Ecclesiae contemnunt, quia sunt gravia et plurima. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300.

[41] Octavus: quod Papa sit caput omnium errorum. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300.

[42] Nonus; quod Praelati sint Scribae; et Religiosi, Pharisaei. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. p. 300.

[43] Decimus: quod Papa et omnes Episcopi sunt homicidae propter bella. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. p. 300.

[44] Undecimus, quod non sit obediendum Praelatis, sed tantum Deo. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300.

[45] Omnia sacramenta Ecclesiae damnant. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300. This only means, that they condemn the sacraments as administered and defined by the Romish Priesthood. Accordingly, they themselves administered Baptism and the Lord's Supper; though it was truly said of them, Omnes exorcismos et benedictiones baptismi reprobant; and, Quod Missa nihil sit, quia Apostoli eam non habebant. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300.

[46] Item, quod Ecclesia erraverit, dicunt matrimonium Clericis prohibendo. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. p. 300.

[47] Item, quicquid praedicatur, quod per textum Bibliae non probatur, pro fabulis habent. Item dicunt, quod Sacra Scriptura eundem effectum habeat in vulgari, quam in latino. Unde etiam conficiunt in vulgari, et dant sacramenta. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300.

[48] Item, Testamenti Novi textum, et magnam partem Veteris, vulgariter sciunt corde. Item, decretales et decreta et dicta et expositiones sanctorum respuunt, et tantum inhaerent textui. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300.

[49] Item, excommunicationem contemnunt; et absolutionem non curant. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. p. 300.

[50] Item, indulgentias Ecclesiae respuunt: et dispensationes derident. Irregularitatem non credunt. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300.

[51] Item, nullum sanctum credunt, nisi Apostolos. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. p. 300.

[52] Nullum sanctum invocant, nisi Deum solum. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. p. 300.

[53] Item, canonizationes, translationes, et vigilias, sanctorum, contemnunt. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 300.

[54] Item, Laicos, qui sorte sanctos eligunt in altari, derident. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[55] Item, Letaniam nunquam legunt: legendas sanctorum non credunt. Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. p. 301. They objected not to Litanies in the abstract, but to such blasphemous trumpery, I suppose, as the Litany of the Virgin and the like.

[56] Item miracula sanctorum subsannant. Item, reliquias sanctorum contemnunt. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[57] Item, sanctam crucem reputant, ut simplex lignum. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[58] Item, signum sanctae crucis horrent, propter supplicium Christi: nec unquam signant se. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[59] Item dicunt, quod doctrina Christi et Apostolorum, sine statutis Ecclesiae, sufficiat ad salutem; quod traditio Ecclesiae sit traditio Pharisaeorum. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[60] Omnes consuetudines Ecclesiae approbatas, quas in Evangelio non legunt, contemnunt: sicut Festum Luminum, Palmarum, Reconciliationem Poenitentium, Adorationem Crucis in Parascene, Festum Paschae, Christi et Sanctorum Festa, spernunt. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[61] Item, omnes dedicationes, benedictiones, et consecrationes, candelarum, carnium, palmarum, chrismatis, ignis, cerei, Agni Paschalis, mulieris post partum, peregrinorum, sacrorum locorum, sacrarum personaram, vestium, salis, et aquae. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[62] Aquam benedictam dicunt esse, ut simplicem. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[63] Imagines et picturas dicunt esse idolatricas. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[64] Item, processiones festivas ut Paschae, et lugubres ut dies Rogationum et funerum, respuunt. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[65] Item, sepulchrum Domini, et sepulchra sanctorum, contemnunt. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[66] Item dicunt, quod exequiae mortuorum, Missae defunctorum, oblationes funerum, testamenta, legata, visitatio sepulchrorum, vigiliae lectae, anniversarius, tricesimus, septimus, suffragia, non prosint animabus. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[67] Hos omnes errores habent, quia negant Purgatorium: dicentes, tantum duas vias esse; scilicet, unam, electorum, ad coelum; aliam, damnatorum, ad infernum. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301.

[68] Item dicunt, quod unum Pater Noster plus valeat, quam sonus decem campanarum, et plus quam Missa. Reiner. de haeret. c. 5. p. 301. It may not be useless to subjoin the summary of their doctrines, which has been given by Thuanus.

Eorum haec dogmata ferebantur: Ecclesiam Romanam, quoniam verae Christi fidei renunciaverit Babylonicam Meretricem esse, et arborem illam sterilem quam ipse Christus diris devovit at revellendam esse praecepit; proinde minime parendum Pontifici et Episcopis, qui ejus errores fovent; monasticam vitam Ecclesiae sentinam ac plutonium esse; vana illius vota, nec nisi foedis puerorum amoribus servientia; Presbyterii Ordines magnae bestiae, quae in Apocalypsi commemoratur, notas esse; ignem purgatorium, solemne sacrum, templorum encaenia, cultum sanctorum, ac pro mortuis propitiatorium, Satanae commenta esse. His praecipuis ac certis eorum doctrinae capitibus alia afficta, de conjugio, resurrectione, animae statu post mortem, et de cibis. Thuan. Hist. lib. 6. 16. vol. 1. p. 221.

BOOK 4

CHAPTER 1

[1] Morland's Hist. of the Church of Piedm. p. 12, 289. Morland erroneously speaks of these emigrants as Valdenses: for he falls into the mistake, so justly pointed out by Bossuet, of styling, as it had become common in the time of the Jesuits Gretser and Mariana, all the dissident religionists of France, by the general name of Valdenses, as if they had universally sprung from the disciples of Peter Valdo.

[2] Petrus Valdus, locuples civis Lugdunensis, anno Christi circiter 1170, Valdensibus nomen dedit. Thuan. Hist. lib. 6. Section 16. vol. 1. p. 221.

[3] Qui enim Lugduni quiescere non poterant Archiepiscopum et Ecclesiam metuentes, inde fugerunt: atque, per partes Franciae et Italiae dispersi, quamplures complices habuerunt; et, usque hodie, errores suos, hinc inde, seminaverunt. Eymeric. Direct. Inquis. par. 2. quaest. 24 in Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8. Section 10.

The same account is given by Thuanus, with the additional particular that their chief place of refuge was the country of the Alps. This would very naturally be the case: for here they would join their brethren, the more ancient Vallenses of Piedmont.

Omnibus invisi et execrabiles facti, passim exules, sine lare per provinciam Narbonensem, Galliam Cisalpinam, ac praecipue inter Alpes, effunduntur; ubi, tutissimum perfugium nacti, complures annos latuerunt. Thuan. Hist. lib. 6. Section 16. vol. 1. p. 221.

[4] Stulta illa et impia haeresis (scil. Petri de Bruis), more pestis validae, multos interfecit, plures infecit: sed, gratia Dei concitante et adjuvante studia vestra, a vestris regionibus sese paululum removit. Migravit tamen, sicut audivi, ad loca satis vobis contigua: et, a Septimania vestra, vobis persequentibus, expulsa, in provincia Novempopulana quae vulgo Gasconia vocatur, et in partibus adjacentibus, sibi foveas praeparavit. – Incitat magis ad haec, et velut adjectis dorso stimulis acrius instigat, fama nuper relata: quod scilicet anguis lubricus, de regionibus vestris elapsus, immo vobis prosequentibus expulsus, ad Narbonensem Provinciam sese contulerit; et, quod apud vos in desertis et villulis cum timore sibilabat, nunc in magnis conventibus et populosis urbibus audacter praedicat. Putabam, Alpes gelidas, et perpetuis nivibus opertos scopulos, incolis vestris barbariem invexisse, et dissimilem terris omnibus terram dissimilem caeteris omnibus populum creavisse: itaque, agrestibus et indoctis hominum moribus, peregrinum dogma facilius irrepsisse. Sed, hanc opinionem meam, ultima rapidi Rhodani littora, et circumjacens Tolosm planicies, ipsaque urbs vicinis populosior, expurgat: quae adversus falsum dogma, tanto cautior ease debuit; quanto, assiduitate frequentantium populorum, et experientia multiplicium doctrinarum, doctior esse potuit. Petr. Vener. Cluniac. cont. Petrobrus. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 12. par. 2. p. 206, 208.

[5] Die Lunae, 2 Octobr. A. D. 1207, in oppido Montis Regalis prope Carcassonem in Comitatu Tolosano, habitum est memorabile colloquium, inter Episcopum Uxamensem Hispanum qui a Papa missus fuerat cum S. Dominico et aliis pluribus, et Arnaldum Hot Pastorem Albigensium appellatum qui heac tria expresse asserebat. Primo: Romanam Ecclesiam non esse Christi Sponsam nec sanctam Ecclesiam; sed turbulentam, Satanae doctrina institutam, adeoque Babylonem esse illam de qua in Apocalypsi loquitur B. Joannes, matrem fornicationum et abominationum, sanguine sanctorum et martyrum Jesu Christi inebriatam.

Secundo: Politiam illius non esse bonam neque sanctam neque a Jesu Christo stabilitam. Tertio: Missam, eo modo quo celebratur hodie, non esse, vel a Jesu Christo, vel ab Apostolis ejus, institutam.
Contrarium suscepit Episcopus, ex Novo Testamento confirmandum; coram B. de Villanova, B. Auzerbensi, R. de Bot, et A. Riberia, delectis arbitris.

Postquam triduo durasset disputatio, petiit Episcopus quindecim concedi sibi dies, quibus thesium suarum probationes scripto mandaret: et Arnaldus Hot, octo dies, quibus adversarii scripto responderet. Reversi die praestituto, ad quatriduum colloquium produxerunt: quo tempore Episcopo praesto fuerunt, legati duo, P. de Castronovo, M. Radulphus Candelensis Abbas, P. Bertrandus Prior Auteribi, Prior Palatii, atque alii plures.

Demum, asserente Episcopo; Ea, quae non sunt de Missa, ex ea esse auferenda: dimissa est concio; nec quicquam aliud de istis controversiis constitutum. Vignier. Histor. Eccles. in A.D. 1207. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 10. Section 22.

To the Pontificals, in this disputation, no credit is due for their semblance of moderation. The fact was: the Albigenses securely discussed the points at issue, under the protection of their territorial lords; and their usually insolent and overbearing adversaries, instead of sitting as judges, were compelled to meet them on equal terms as fairly pitted disputants. This readily accounts for the abrupt breaking up of the conference and for the discontinuance of the controversies. The papal party, although privileged by the presence of the blessed Dominic, found that they required arguments somewhat more cogent than verbal: the sword of de Montfort was felicitously substituted for the less effectual tongue of the presiding Spanish Bishop: and holy Dominic found himself much more at home in managing the merciful concerns of his offspring the Inquisition, than in discussing points of theology with the acute Arnold Hot and his Albigensic associates.

[6] Sub anno Domini 1205, Dominus Deus ipse, qui sagittas electas providentiae suae conservat pharetra, duos de Hispania ad hoc opus produxit electos Dei pugiles: dominum Didacum Episcopum Uxamensem, et virum per omnia benedictum (sanctum postea declaratum) socium ejus Dominicum, Canonicum suae Uxamensis Ecclesiae regularem.

Duo igitur isti Episcopi (Fulco scilicet Tholosenus et Didacus Uxamensis) et beatus Dominicus, mittentes manus ad fortia, aggregatis illis Abbatibus duodecim Cisterciencis ordinis, contra superstitiones haereticorum in altitudine Satanae gloriantium, omni humilitate, abstinentia, et patientia, coeperunt procedere et congredi: non pomposa aut equestri multitudine, sed calle pedestri, ad indictas disputationes contra haereticos, de castro in castrum, nudis plantis et pedibus ambulantes. Fuitque una de primis congregationibus apud Viridefolium: ubi palam haeresiarchiae ad disputandum contra nostros convenerunt; et confusi fuerunt, non tamen conversi.

Altera vero fuit apud Appamias specialiter contra Valdenses: qui, arbitri electi judicio, succubuerunt; et quidam ex ipsis ad cor et poenitantiam redierunt.

Demum inter alias plurimas disputationes, quas in diversis locis nostri contra haereticos illo tempore habuerunt, una fuit solemnior apud Montem Regalem dioececis Carcassonensis anno Domini 1207: cui interfuerunt praedicti Christi pugiles, Fulco Tholosanus, et Didacus Uxamensis Episcopus, et B. Dominicus, ac venerabilis vir dominus frater Petrus de Castro Novo Cisterciencis Ordinis Apostolicae Sedis legatus, ac collega suus magister Radulphus; contra plures haeresiarchas, ibidem congregatos. Fuitque, praescripta die et aliis pluribus, disputatum, coram quatuor arbitris laicis a partibus electis.

Gulielm, de Podio Laurent. Chronic. in A. D. 1205, 1207, apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 10. Section 20, 21.

The episcopal style of the Spanish Didacus I have uniformly written Uxamensis, as corrected by Usher. Vignier writes it Exovensis: and Puy-Laurens, still worse, writes it Exoniensis. Probably the spelling of Nicolas Trivett, Didacum Oxomensem Episcopum, is the best. Chron. in A. D. 1204. Didacus, I suppose, was Bishop of Oxuma or Osma in Spain. It is, however, a point of no great consequence: nor do I claim to be at all particularly skilled in the nomenclature of the Romish College of Bishops. For the satisfaction of the curious, Trivett is somewhat large upon the manifold excellences of the blessed Dominic; from whom it may briefly be said: Coepit odor sanctitatis ejus circumquaque diffundi. Chron. In A. D. 1203. The same author records a miracle, which was wrought at this famous conference: but it produced no effect upon the stubborn Albigenses.

Eo tempore, quo Episcopus Didacus cum beato Dominico insistebat praedicationi in partibus Tolosanis, contigit, ut apud Montem-Regalem cum praedicatoribus catholicis haeretici disputarent. Unus autem de nostris, Dominicus nomine, socius Episcopi Oxomensis, sicut in gestis viri nobilis nominatique Simonis Comitis Montis-Fortis legitur, auctoritates, quas in medium produxerat, redegit in scriptis, et cuidam haeretico tradidit schedulam ut super objectis deliberans responderet. Qui, nocte ad ignem sedens cum sociis, de eorum assensu schedulam projecit in ignem: facta protestatione, quod, si combureretur, vera esset fides haereticorum, immo perfidia; si vero incombusta maneret, fidem, quem praedicabant Catholici, veram esse faterentur. Projecta schedula in ignem, non tantum semel sed iterum et tertio, totiens resiluit etiam incombusta. Nicol. Trivett. Chron. in A. D. 1205. See also Petr. Valsarn. Hist. Albig. c. 8.

[7] A similar junction of the Albigenses and the Valdenses had already occurred in the year 1203 when a disputation was held at Carcasson. Colloquium Carcassone habitum est A. D. 1203 mense Februario, inter Catharos atque Valdenses ex una, et Carcassonem Episcopum Radulphum et Petrum de Castronovo Romani Pontificis Nuncios ex altera, coram Petro Aragonum Rege. Ricchin. Dissent. de Cathar. c. 8. Section 17.

[8] Arualdum Hot, Pastorem Albigensium appellatum. Vigner. Histor. Eccles. in A. D. 1207. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 10. Section 22.

Nomina haeresiarcharum haec sunt: Ponticus Jordanus, Arnoldus Aurisanus, Arnoldus Otthonus, Philabertus Castrensis, Benedictus Thermus. Jacob. de Rebir. in Collect. de Urbe Tolos. apud Usser de Eccles. Success. c. 10. Section 21.

Ex publica et solemni disputatione, inter Apamiensem Episcopum et Magistrum Arnoltotum Lombrensem ministrum, habita. Poplinier Hist. Franc. lib. 38. vol. 2. fol. 245. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 10. Section 16.

For the narrative of Roger Hoveden, see above, book 2. chap. 9.

[9] Petrus Valdus, eorum antesignanus, patria relicta, in Belgium vetlit: atque, in Picardia quam hodie vocant, multos sectatores nactus, cum inde in Germaniam transiisset, per Vandalicas civitates diu diversatus est, ac postremo in Boemia consedit; ubi etiam hodie 2, qui eam doctrinam amplectuntur. Habuerat Valdus et socium Arnaldum, qui diverso itinere in Septimaniam descendit, et Albae Augustae sive Helviorum olim dictae haesit: unde Albigei, qui Tolosates, Rutenos, Cadurcos, Aginnates, brevi tempore pervaserunt. Thuan. Hist. lib. 6. Section 16. vol. 1. p. 221.

As the Valdensian Arnold fixed himself at Albi and became a minister among the Albigenses; so Thuanus very reasonably considers the Albigenses, as differing, in no material point, either from the Valdenses of that day, or from Wickliff and Huss and Jerome of Prague and Luther at a later period; for, when they were dispersed by the crusade of Simon de Montfort during the first half of the thirteenth century, he speaks of them in manner following.

Cum huc illuc ab eo tempore dispersi ubique exagitarentur, tamen exstitere semper per intervalla, qui eorum doctrinam intermortuam renovarent: Joannes Wiclevus in Anglia, in Bohemia Joannes Hussus et Hieronymus Pragensis; nostra vero aetate, postquam Lutheri doctrina obvio tam multorum favore accepta est, reliquiae illorum ubique sparsae colligi, et, crescente Lutheri nomine, vires et auctoritatem samere coeperunt; praecipue in regionibus Alpinis et provinciis Alpibus vicinis. Ibid. p. 223. To this same alpine country, likewise, their brethren the French Valdenses, when scattered by persecution from Lyons, very naturally resorted, and there, in the bosom of their ancient mother Church, found, at least for a season, concealment and security.

Omnibus invisi et execrabiles facti, passim exules sine lare per provinciam Narbonensem, Galliam Cisalpinam, ac praecipue inter Alpes, effunduntur; ubi, tutissimum perfugium nacti, complures annos latuerunt. Ibid. p. 221.

In truth, in the very country of the old Piedmontese Vallenses, there was, from a most remote period, a mixture of those, who, in France, were finally distinguished by the name of Albigenses. It is an interesting circumstance, that one of the sixteen Churches of the Cathari was seated, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and doubtless at a much earlier time also, at Bagnolo, which lies in the most southern district of the country of the Piedmontese Vallenses. Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 304.

All these matters show the early intercourse and connection of the Albigenses or Cathari with the ancient Vallenses of the Cottian Alps: and thus, incidentally, tend to exhibit their freedom from Manicheism. Had they really been Manicheans, they could never have harmonized with the Vallenses either of France or of Piedmont: for Manicheism and the sincere Gospel can never amalgamate. Accordingly, if I may again refer to Thuanus, that great historian will tell us, that the Cathari or Albigenses of France doctrinally answered to the Puritans of England: nay, so little difference could he discover between them and the Leonists or Valdenses, that, like many others, he even identifies these two symbolizing classes of religionists; for he supposes, that the Cathari were yet additionally called Leonines or Leonists from their theological correspondence with the iconoclastic Emperor Leo. Cathari dicuntur; quibus respondent, qui hodie in Anglia puriorem doctrinam prae se ferunt. Iidem Leonini rursus appellati sunt, ab eo Leone, qui nihilominus justi ac prudentis principis, a Zonara ipso, qui, cum haereticae pravitatis accusat, elogium meruit. Thuan. Hist. lib. 6. Section 16. vol. 1. p. 221, 222. The ready intermixture of the Valdenses with the Cathari of Provence and Lombardy, and their intercommunity of doctrine, is distinctly noticed by Stephen de Bourbon who flourished during the earlier part of the thirteenth century.

Postea, in Provinciae terra et Lombardiae, cum aliis haereticis se admiscentes, et errorem eorum bibentes et serentes, haeretici sunt judicati. Steph. Borbon. de Sept. Don. Spir. S. par. 4. c. 30. in Ricchin. Diss. de Valdens. c. 1. Section 5.

The Alii Haeretici of Provence and Lombardy are clearly the Cathari or Albigenses. Yet, notwithstanding this acknowledged intercommunity of doctrine, it is not pretended that the Valdenses were ever Manicheans. From such a fact, the conclusion is abundantly obvious.

[10] Papae Lucii III. Decret. in Bernard. Papiens. Collect. Decretal. lib. 5. C. 11. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8. Section 39.

[11] Aldefons. Aragon. Diplom. apud Marian. Praefat. in Luc. Tudens. adv. Albigens. error. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 230.

[12] Innoc. III. Epist. Decretal. lib. 1. p. 56, 57. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 9. Section 7.

[13] Ut vobis, reverendissimo in Christo patri et domino, domino Rostagno Ebredunensi Archiepiscopo; vobisque, reverendis patribus et dominis, Fratri Laurentio Cistaricensi Episcopo, et Thomae Paschalis Orlianensi Officiali, Commissariis Apostolicis, Regia et Dalphinali auctoritate suffultis, ad causam eorum Pauperurn de Lugduno, quos vulgus Valdenses appellat, dictos a Valdeo cive Lugdunensi, in loco dicto vulgariter Val grant moram faciente.

Qui homo dives haeresiarcha primus haeresis sectae Valdensium inventor fuit, secundum Scripturam bonis temporalibus renuncians, coepit, cum suis complicibus, vitam apostolicam cum cruce et paupertate ducere. Et, experrectis viris ecclesiasticis, multos sibi discipulos sociavit, qui inde dicti sunt Pauperes de Lugduno. Qui, dicentes vivere sub obedientia apostolica, ab illa tamen se separantes, pertinaciter respondebant cum redarguerentur, Magis esse Deo obediendum quam hominibus. Fuerunt tandem, et merito, per militantem Ecclesiam damnati, sed non radicitus extirpati. Quia, Lugduno fugientes ad ultimas Dalphinatus partes, se transferentes in Ebredunensi et Taurinensi dioecesibus in Alpibus et intra concava montium accessu difficilia, plures ibi ex illis habitaverunt: ubi, paulatim procurante satore zizaniae, in copioso numero excreverunt: et demum palmites suos tristes in Liguriam, Italiam, et ultra Romam in Apuliam, transmiserunt. Script. Inquis. cujusp. anon. de Valdens. apud Allix on the Church of Piedm. p. 324. It is observable, that here also the original connection of Peter Valdo with the Valleys of the Cottian Alps is duly mentioned. He is said to have once lived in the region commonly called Val grant or (I suppose) The Great Valley.

[14] Imprimis ponit et dicit, ac probare intendit: quod ipsi homines vallis Frayxineriae fueruut, a centum annis citra ultra.

Cujus siquidem damnatissimae haeresis cultores, quibus viri et mulieres vallis Clusionis Taurinensis dioecesis, et omnes mares et foeminae vallis Frayxineriae, ac plures vallium Argenteriae et Loysiae Ebredunensis dioecesis, a tanto tempore quod non est memoria hominum, in contrarium fuerunt proni. Script. Inquis. anon. apud Allix on the Church of Piedm. p. 325.

[15] Script. Inquis. anon. apud Allix on the Church of Piedm. p. 326-329. The whole document is extremely curious, but too long for insertion.

[16] For an account of these papal horrors during the whole course of the protracted crusade, or rather succession of crusades, the reader may consult Perrin's Histoire des Albigeois and (as a more modern Work) Sismondi's History of the Crusades against the Albigenses. This last work has very seasonably been translated into English: and forms one thin volume 8 vo. Wightman and Cramp. London. 1826. The singular merit of the blessed Dominic, who (as Trivett speaks) wielded the spiritual sword while his friend Simon managed the secular, procured for him an equally singular reception into heaven. Transitus autem ejus, Fratri Gualae Priori Brixiae, qui postea fuit ejusdem civitatis Episcopus, revelatus

est per hujusmodi visionem. Eadem namque hora qua beatissimi Patris anima migravit a corpore, sicut postea compertum est, vidit aperturam in coelo, per quam dimittebantur candidae scalae duae: quarum unius summitatem tenebat Christus Dominus; alterius, mater ejus: angeli autem lucis discurrebant, adscendentes per eas. Et, ecce, inter utramque scalam, sedes posita est in imo; et, supra sedem, sedens: et, qui sedebat, similis erat Fratri habenti faciem velatam capucio, quemadmodum in Ordine moris est Fratres mortuos sepelire. Trahentibus autem sealas illas Christo Jesu et matre, trahebatur et sedes pariter cum sedente: donec, psallentibus angelis, coelo illatus est. Receptis igitur in coelum scalis, et sede cum eo qui in sede fuerat collocatus, coeli apertura clausa est. Nicol. Trivett. Chronic. in A. D. 1221.
The Brother, whom the Prior thus beheld translated, was of course holy Dominic, What became of Simon, cui admodum familiaris erat beatus Dominicus propter communem zelum adversus haereticorum perfidiam, Trivett does not inform us. Ibid. in A. D. 1209. Dominic's canonisation followed in regular order: and the miraculous fragrancy, which issued from his opened sepulchre, afforded an ample warrant for the celestial nobility conferred upon him by the patent of Pope Gregory IX. See Nicol. Trivett. Chron. in A. D. 1233. Hence, with much reason, Ricchini, who wrote in the year 1743, lands both the saint and his spiritual offspring the Inquisition: while he justly thinks foul scorn of our Dr. Cave, for vilipending the one, add for making Hell the true parent of the other. In these liberal days, a Protestant will doubtless be much refreshed in spirit by the decisive language of the learned Preaching Friar.

Jam vero, ne recrudesceret in posterum malum, aut impia haeresis repuilularet ex cineribus suis, saluberrimo consilio, Romani Pontifices Sanctae Inquisitionis Officium, auctore S. Dominico, instituerunt: eidemque beato viro et Fratribus Praedicatoribus praecipue detulerunt. – Et quidem, sacrorum Fidei quaesitorum cura, zelo, ac diligentia, factum est; ut sensim, post A. D. 1300, decreverit in Italia cun primis ejusmodi sectarum pestilentia; nec ulla haeresis, aut noviter procusa aut renovata, apud Italcs radices amplius egerit. – Scio equidem, adversus Sanctissimum Fidei Tribunal effuse atque impotenter ferri Haereticorum omnium odia, eoque nomine S. Dominicum, ita conviciis proscindere ut Albigensium Carnificem vocare non dubitent: ipsum vero Inquisitionis Officium gravissimum appellent, et ab Orco petitum, Christianae Religionis dedecus, simul et flagellum conscientiarum et carnifcinam, summaeque tyrannidis et crudelitatis officinam, qua Siculi non invenere Tyranni majus tormenta. Ita Cavaeus. – At, si, quantum res ipsa momenti habeat, mature ac sine praejudicati animi turbatione expenderetur, SUMMI BENEFICII LOCO caeci homines acciperent, quod gravissimam carnificinam et tyrannidem vocant. Ricchin. Dissert. de Cathar. c. 7. 5, 6.

Ricchini will absolutely make our English lips water for the legal establishment of the Holy Office in each of the two British Islands. 17 Contra quos (scil. Albigenses) cum exquisita supplicia parum proficerent; et remedio, quod intempestive adhibitum fuerat, malum exacerbaretur; numerusque eorum in dies cresceret: justi tandem exercitus conscripti sunt; nec minoris molis bellum, quam quod antea nostri adversus Saracenos gesserant, contra eosdem decretum est. Cujus is exitus fuit: ut, potius caesi, fugati, bonis ac dignitatibus ubique spoliati, atque huc illuc dissipati sint, quam erroris convicti resipuerint. Itaque, qui armis se initio luctati fuerant, postremo armis victi, in Provinciam apud nos et Gallicae Ditionis Alpes vicinas confugerunt; latebrasque vitae ac doctrinae suae, iis in locis, repererunt. Pars in Calabriam concessit: in eaque diu, usque ad Pii IV pontificatum, se continuit. Pars in Germaniam transiit: atque, apud Boemos in Polonia et Livonia, larem fixit. Alii, ad Occidentem versi, in Britannia perfugium habuerunt. Thuan. Praefat. Hist. vol. 1. p. 7.

I have not heard, that any Manicheans were ever discovered in Britain after the middle of the thirteenth century: which, however, must certainly have been the case, had the Albigensic Refugees been really votaries of the ancient Oriental Heresy. Be this as it may, we find much the same statement in the General History of Languedoc, with the additional particular, that the expatriated Albigenses organized themselves into a French Church in Lombardy.

Cela fit, que, s' ils ne purgerent pas entierement le pais d' heretiques, les sectaires n' oserent plus du moins se montrer publiquement: et que plusieurs, pour eviter de tomber entre leurs mains, se refugierent dans les pais etrangers, et surtout en Lombardie, ou ils formerent une Eglise particuliere appellee L'Eglise de France composee d' environ cent cinquante personnes. Il n'en resta gueres davantage dans le pais. Hist. Gener. de Langued. livr. 20. Section 82.

By Lombardy, as the word is used by Reinerius whom the Benedictine adduces as his authority, we must, I think, agreeably to a remark which I have already made, understand the whole region which extended from the Cottian Alps to the Adriatic Sea. Most probably, this Lombard Church was the Church of Bagnolo, which was a Church of the Cathari, and which locally was situated in the southern part of the country of the Vallenses.

With respect to the Calabrian Albigenses, who, as Thuanus observes, subsisted down to the Pontificate of Plus IV, Dr. M'Crie has given an interesting though mournful account of their condition and final extermination in the sixteenth century. See Hist. of the Reform. in Italy. chap. 5. p. 299-308. Nowhere does the brutal and odious superstition of Popery appear in blacker colors. What, however, is specially to my own purpose, as in Britain so in Calabria, not a vestige of Manicheism can be discovered, or is even pretended to have been discovered, among the pious emigrants in the day of their extirpation. Dr. M'Crie calls them Valdenses; nor, in his present narrative, was the title altogether improper: for they were composed of Albigenses mingled both with French and with Piedmontese Valdenses; and the name of Albigenses, lost and swallowed up in that of Valdenses since the bloody crusade of Simon de Montfort and the Inquisition, had now become extinct. That such was their national composition, is evident from their whole history. Thuanus tells us; that they were Albigenses, who had escaped from the butchery of Languedoc: and one of Dr. M'Crie's authorities states; that they came originally from the Valley of Angrogna near Savoy. Clearly, therefore, they must first have taken refuge with their brethren the Valdenses of Piedmont: and, afterward, a mixed company, must thence have migrated into Calabria, where they were deemed and styled Valdenses. Dr. M'Crie's description of their religious state and behavior, when they first heard the glad tidings of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, well deserves the attention of the devout reader.

[18] For my acquaintance with this interesting testimony of Ferrier, I am indebted to Ricchini, the editor of the large Work of his ancient Confrater Moneta.

Cum late grassantem Valdensium Sectam cohibere severius Catholici Principes instituissent, eamque e latibulis omnibus Quaesitorum Fidei vigilantia diligentissime extruderet, ut jam nulla pateret ei secura mansio, in Cottiarum Alpium Valles, velut certum tutumque asylum, plurimae eorum reliquiae, ex Italia et finitima Gallia pulsae, sese receperunt, difficili locorum accessu fretae ac securae. Regionis jam pene desertae solum sterile illud quidem atque infoecundum, diuturno improboque labore ab iis subactum, alendis sustentandisque multis Valdensium millibus eo facilius deinceps suffecit, quo, tributis oneribusque ferme soluti, ab omnibus negligerentur, nec quispiam de iis sollicitus in eorum fidem ac religionem diligentius inquireret. – Ibi, per tria ferme saecula, pacatissime incubarunt, priorum Valdensium religionem et fidem plerumque profitentes, quanquam alterius Sectae haereticis intermixti.

Nam S. Vincentius Ferrerius, qui e proximo Delphinatu ad eas Valles praedicationis causa descenderat A. D. 1405, in Epistola quam dedit ad reverendissimum Johannem de Pedonatis Ordinis Praedicatorum tunc Generalem Magistrum apud Fontanam (Mon. Dominic. par. 2. c. 1.) testatur; plures ibidem reperisse Gazaros seu Catharos, ex quorum grege illuc olim se receperant interfectores S. Petri Martyris: additque; se accepisse ab earum Vallium incolis, nullum ab annis triginta Verbum Dei ibidem praedicasse nisi Valdenses haereticos, qui ad ea loca ex Apulia bis in anno veniebant, Ricchin. Dissert. de Valdens. c. 5. Section 1.

The Barbs, who visited them from Apulia, were doubtless the Clergy of the mingled Valdensic and Albigensic Colony of Calabria: and the very circumstance of those Preachers being styled Valdenses shows the complete doctrinal intercommunion of the two Churches. I suppose the reader will not imagine, that St. Peter the Martyr, mentioned by Ferrier, is the same person as St. Peter the Apostle. He was doubtless the preacher Brother Peter de Chasteau Neuf, whose tragic death, ascribed by the infallible decision of Pope Innocent III to Count Raymond of Toulouse, brought on the bloody crusade of Simon de Montfort against what his holiness appropriately styles The bloody and perverse generation of the Provincials, meaning thereby the horrible Albigenses. See Petr. Vallisarn. Hist. Albig. c. 9.

CHAPTER 2

[1] See above, book 1. chap. 1, 2.

[2] Compare Revelation 1:20, with Revelation 11:4.

[3] The circumstance of precisely two witnessing Churches being foretold, united with our Lord's general prophecy that the gates of Hades or the Invisible State shall never prevail against his Sincere Church, finally and distinctly establishes the position: that We must look for a continuance of sound and spiritual religion, throughout all the middle ages, in a VISIBLE and ORGANIZED Church or succession of Churches. It is clear, I think, that the concurrent predictions of Christ and St. John cannot, without a most arbitrary and unnatural strain upon the terms in which they are conveyed, be said to have been accomplished in a mere succession of detached and unconnected individuals, jointly constituting what some have styled The INVISIBLE Church. So manifestly are Churches VISIBLE and TANGIBLE spoken of, that, if the prophecies have not been accomplished in such actually subsisting Communions, they have never been accomplished at all. The figment of an INVISIBLE Church can here have no place. I mean not to assert, that, with a proper explanation, the phrase can never be used: but I certainly must assert, that, in the present case, the very terms of the prophecies now before us forbid its introduction as affording a sufficient explanation of the accomplishment of Christ's promises. As for those Protestants, who strangely labor to malign the Vallenses and the Albigenses, they do not seem to perceive the inevitable tendency of their worse than bootless efforts. We must either admit, that the Church of Rome is a perfectly sound and spiritual Church: or we must produce some VISIBLE Church or Churches, in which the succession of doctrinal soundness and abiding spirituality has been preserved.

Now, if, as these ill-judging men endeavor to show, the latter be impossible: then, unless we admit the promises of Scripture to have never been fulfilled, we must acknowledge the truth of the former; and,

in that case, our reformation and separation from the Roman Church stand condemned by our own sentence.

Writers of the stamp alluded to preclude themselves from all ability to answer the argument of Bossuet: and thence, even by their own showing, can never vindicate their own theological position. The question will always run: If Rome be a sound and spiritual Church, in which the promises of Christ have been fulfilled; why do you dissent from her, and renounce her communion? If you deny to her this character; where is the VISIBLE Church, in which Christ's promises have been accomplished? How the protestant maligners of the Vallenses and the Albigenses can answer this question, I am at a loss to perceive.

[4] On this point, see Gibbon's Hist. of Decline and Fall, chap. 49., 1. vol. 9. p. 113, 114, 115, 261, 262.

[5] In saying this, I speak with reference to History, not with reference to Prophecy. In the latter, the circumstances are defined, as occurring synchronically with a great allegorical earthquake which throws down a tenth part of the mystical city Babylon, and immediately before the passing away of the second woe. These synchronisms are noted and explained in my Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, book 4. chap. 7. Section 2. 5, and book 5. chap. 2. Section 3. 2.

[6] See Muston's Hist. des Vaudois, vol. 1. p. 322, 323.

[7] Muston's Hist. Des Vaud. vol. 1. p. 323. Acland's Translat. of Glorious Recovery, Pref. p. 6. Sequel, p. 210.

[8] Whiston's Essay on the Revelation part. 3. p. 238-241. Jones's Hist. of the Christ. Church. vol. 2. p. 406-444. Gilly's Narrat. p. 171-178. The reader may particularly consult Arnold's Glorious Recovery, as translated and illustrated and beautifully edited by Mr. Acland. I would also refer him to my own Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, for a full establishment of the synchronisms prophetically connected with these particulars, book 5. chap. 2. Section 3.

[9] The oppressiveness of this particular seems recently, in the true spirit of the ever tyrannical and persecuting Popish Church, to have been increased. In the Nouvelliste Vaudois of September 22, 1837, is contained the following article.

We have been impatiently expecting this long time the publication of the new Civil Code, which a Committee of jurists has been laboring at during the last seven years. We had hoped, that, in the absence of political liberty, we should at least be blessed with a good civil legislation: but our expectations, I am sorry to say, have been most cruelly deceived. The Code in question has just appeared: and the first thing, that struck us on opening the book, was a legislative enactment which throws us back at least two centuries. The Protestants are placed, by the new Code, in a condition inferior to that of the Jews, as regards civil rights. A circular has lately been addressed to all public notaries, forbidding them to draw up deeds in favor of Protestants, such as acts for the alienation or purchase of property. Persons of that persuasion are no longer to be allowed to give evidence as witnesses. In short we are replaced under the law of 1610. Behold how we proceed in the walk of civilization!

Disgraceful as such conduct is on the part of the minions of Popery, it serves only to display the wonderful accuracy of the apocalyptic oracle.

I will give power unto my two witnesses: and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and three score days, clothed in sackcloth. Revelation 11:3.

The fated period has not yet evolved. Therefore the witnessing Churches still prophesy in a state of insult and injury and oppression.

[10] See Brief Observ. on the present state of the Valdenses, by Gorges Lowther, Esq.

CHAPTER 3

[1] It may perhaps endanger the whole System of Apostolical Succession, if we too rigidly insist upon the absolute necessity of a transmission through the medium of Bishops exclusively. In the year 558, Pelagius was actually consecrated Bishop of Rome herself, not by three Bishops, but by two Bishops and a Presbyter.

Dum non essent Episcopi qui eum ordinarent, inventi sunt duo Episcopi, Joannes de Perusio et Bonus de Ferentino, et Andreas, Presbyter de Ostia: et ordinaverunt eum Pontificem. Tunc enim non erant in Clero, qui poterant eum promovere. Anastat. Biblioth. Lib. Pontifical. in vit. Pelagii I. On this case, which, according to the amount of our requirement, may or may not vitiate the entire Apostolical Succession of at least the Western Patriarchate, it is obvious to remark: that the Presbyter Andrew either did, or did not, possess the power of transmission. If he did: then the point in litigation is forthwith conceded. If he did not: then his concurrence and cooperation with the two Bishops was an idle and inexplicable mockery; though a mockery, which, under such an aspect, might justly be pronounced to nullify the whole transaction. Nor can it, with any decent show of argument, be alleged: that the Presbyter acted merely by the warrant of the two Bishops, that he possessed no inherent power of his own, and that he really himself did nothing whatsoever toward the transmitting of the episcopate. For, should this ground be taken, the answer is plain.

If Andrew possessed not the right of continuing the Apostolical Succession; and if, for that continuance, the joint agency of three Bishops was essentially necessary: then the consecration of Pelagius by only two Bishops and a Presbyter was, to all intents and purposes, invalid; and, consequently, nothing could have been more strangely absurd, than for the two Bishops to call in, as their officially equal coadjutor, one, whom all the while they themselves knew to possess no legitimate authority of transmission.

Nor yet will it very materially mend the affair, to assert: that two Bishops can transmit the succession just as well as three Bishops. For it is quite plain; that neither the two Bishops nor the Church at large entertained any such opinion: because, if they had, they would have proceeded forthwith to the consecration without in any wise calling in the Presbyter Andrew. And it is likewise plain; that the right and power of transmission must have been fully believed by them to reside in the Presbyter: because, if they had not believed it, they would never, both Bishops and Clergy and People of the faction of Pelagius, have invited him to join in the consecration of Pelagius.

In short, from this remarkable transaction, we seem to learn: that, in the judgment of the Church of the sixth century, the Apostolical Succession was indeed deemed essential to a legitimate discharge of the Clerical Office; but that, in a case of necessity, such succession might be canonically transmitted by the hands of a Presbyter as well as by the hands of a Bishop.

From the major case of the consecration of a Bishop by a concurring Presbyter, we may turn to the minor case of the similar ordination of Presbyters themselves.

In our own church, the concurrence of Presbyters with the presiding Bishop, in laying hands upon those who are themselves about to be ordained Presbyters, is familiar and notorious. Now here, again, the very same reasoning palpably applies. Presbyters either have, or have not, a power of transmitting the presbyterate. If they have: then the point is conceded, If they have riot: then their joint imposition of hands is an unmeaning and nugatory ceremonial.

The whole transaction is rendered still more striking, by the circumstance: that, in the ordination of deacons, there is no concurrence of the Presbyters. Whence the inference seems to be: that, in the judgment of the Anglican Church, a single Bishop, without the concurrence of Presbyters, cannot legitimately transmit the higher order of the presbyterate; but that no such concurrence is necessary in conferring the very inferior Order of Deacon.

On this difficult question much light is thrown by the historical attestation of Jerome, who flourished about a century and a half before the consecration of Pelagius by two Bishops and a Presbyter. He tells us: that, From the beginning, Bishops and Presbyters were, in point of Order, the same; though, in point of Church Polity, it had been deemed expedient to set one Presbyter over his brethren, in the capacity of a Bishop or Superintendent, and with the right of ordination or rather (as I gather from the context) with the special right of presidence in ordination.

Audio, quendam in tantam erupisse vecordiam, ut Diaconos Presbyteris, id est, Episcopis, anteferret. Nam, cum Apostolus perspicue doceat, Eosdem esse Presbyteros quos et Episcopos: quis patiatur, mensatum et viduarum Minister ut supra eos se tumidus efferat? – Quod antem postea unus electus est, qui caeteris praeponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est: ne unusquisque, ad se trahens, Christi Ecclesiam rumperet. Nam et Alexandriae, a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclem et Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in celsiori gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant: quo modo, si exercitus Imperatorem faciat; aut Diaconi eligant de se quem industrium noverint, et Archidiaconum vocent. Quid nam facit, excepta ordinatione, Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat? Hieron. Epist. 85. Oper. vol. 2. p. 259, 260.

Idem est ergo Presbyter, qui et Episcopus: et, antequam, diaboli instinctu, studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis, Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cephae; communi Presbyterorum consilio Ecclesiae gubernabantur. Postquam, vero, unusquisque eos, quos baptizaverat, suos putabat esse, non Christi: in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus, de Presbyteris electus, superponeretur caeteris, ad quem omnis Ecclesiae cura pertineret, et schismatum semina tollerentur. Putet aliquis, non Scripturarum, sed nostram, esse sententiam, Episcopum et Presbyterum unum esse; et aliud aetatis aliud esse nomen officii: relegat Apostoli ad Philippenses verba dicentis; Paulus et Timotheus, servi Jesu Christi, omnibus sanctis in Christo Jesu qui sunt Philippis, cum Episcopis et Diaconis, gratia vobis et pax. Philippi una est urbs Macedoniae: et certe in una civitate plures, ut nuncupantur, Episcopi esse non porerant. Sed, quia eosdem Episcopos illo tempore quos et Presbyteros appellabant, propterea indifferentur de Episcopis, quasi de Presbyteris, est locutus. Adhuc hoc alicui videatur ambiguum, nisi altero testimonio comprobetur. In Actibus Apostolorum scriptum est, quod, cum venisset Apostolus Miletum, miserit Ephesum, et vocaverit Presbyteros Ecclesiae ejusdem, quibus postea inter caetera sit locutus: Attendite vobis et omni gregi, in quo vos Spiritus Sanctus posuit Episcopos pascere Ecclesiam Domini, quam acquisivit per sanguinem suum. Et hoc diligentius observate, quo modo unius civitatis Ephesi Presbyteros vocans, postea eosdem Episcopos dixerit. – Haec propterea, ut ostenderemus Apud

veteres eosdem fuisse Presbyteros, quos et Episcopos: paulatim vero, ut dissentionum plantaria evellerentur, ad unum omnem sollicitudinem esse delatam. Sicut, ergo, Presbyteri sciunt se, ex Ecclesiae consuetudine, ei qui sibi praepositus fuerit esse subjectos: ita Episcopi noverint, se, magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis dominicae veritate, Presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere Ecclesiam regere. Hieron. Comment. in Tit. 1:5. Oper. vol. 6. p. 198, 199.

The statement of Jerome seems to be confirmed by the very early testimony of Clement of Rome. This Father, who flourished in the first century, incidentally gives us a very distinct account of the Ecclesiastical Polity which had then been established. In each Church there was a presiding Bishop with his subordinate Presbyters and Deacons, after the model of the High-Priest and the Priests and the Levites of the Hebrew Church. This arrangement was of apostolical institution. But still, while in the Church Catholic there were thus three divinely appointed Classes of spiritual officers, Clement, in a mode which cannot be misunderstood, intimates, that there were only two Orders.

Preaching through countries and cities, says he, the Apostles appointed the first-fruits of their conversions to be BISHOPS and MINISTERS over such as should afterward believe, having first proved them by the Spirit. Nor was this any new thing: seeing that, long before, it was written concerning BISHOPS and DEACONS. For thus saith the Scripture in o certain place: I will appoint their OVERSEERS in righteousness, and their MINISTERS in faith. Clem. Romans Epist. ad Corinth. 1. 42. Chevalier's Translat.

Here, we may observe, no more than two Orders are specified, the word Bishops being plainly used as equipollent to the word Presbyters: and all possibility of misapprehension is avoided by the circumstance of Clement's affirmation, that the appointment of these two Orders was foretold in a prophecy which announced the appointment of exactly two descriptions of spiritual officers. I will appoint their OVERSEERS (jEpisko>pouv) in righteousness, and their MINISTERS (Diako>nouv) in faith. In point of evidence, it matters nothing, whether Clement applied the prophecy itself correctly or incorrectly. Under the simple aspect of testimony to a fact, had the Church in Clement's time universally understood and believed that three distinct Orders of Clergy had been appointed, that Father could never have asserted such a form of Ecclesiastical Polity to be foretold in a prophecy which announced the appointment of no more than two sorts of officers described as being Overseers and Ministers. Hence Clement seems to confirm the statement of Jerome: that the creation of superintending Bishops did not introduce a third and additional Order into the Church. The attestation of Jerome, that Bishops and Presbyters are in point of Order the same, and that The setting of one Bishop or Presbyter over his fellows was only done for the prevention of schism, and for the better government of the Church which had hitherto been ruled (communi Presbyterorum consilio) by the common counsel of Presbyters, probably affords the true key to the remarkable language of Ignatius in his seven genuine Epistles.

When one Presbyter was placed authoritatively both over other Presbyters and over a whole Church, such is the pride of human nature, that a strong disposition to resistance, or (to say the least) a strong inclination to undervalue and depreciate the novel Superior even though apostolically appointed, would be very apt to show itself. In fact, from the charge of St. Paul to Timothy, whom he had appointed Bishop or Overseer of the Church of Ephesus, we may learn, not equivocally, that this was really the case: for, when he directed him to command and teach, he would scarcely have said Let no man despise thy youth, unless he had anticipated a spirit of resistance and insubordination. 1 Timothy 4:11, 12. Under such circumstances, Ignatius, who, like Timothy and Titus and Clement and Polycarp, had

received his supervisal authority from the immediate hands of an Apostle, would naturally write, to the Churches which he addresses, with this impression full upon his mind.

Take, for example, his address to the Magnesians.

It is your duty not to despise the youth of your Bishop, but to yield all reverence to him, according to the power of God the Father. As also I perceive your holy Presbyters do, not considering his youthful appearance, but, as men prudent in God, submitting to him; and not to him indeed, but to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Bishop of us all. It becomes you, therefore, to be obedient with all sincerity, in honor of him whose pleasure it is that ye should do so. – Some call a Bishop by the name of his office: yet do all things without him. But such men appear to me void of a good conscience: since they are not gathered together firmly, according to God's commandments. Ignat. Epist. ad Magnes. Section 3, 4, Chevalier's Translat.

Ignatius, I take it, speaks to the following effect.

If Bishops, who often may chance to be younger men than several of the subjected Presbyters, have been introduced, for the express purpose of avoiding schism, and for the greater uniformity of ecclesiastical government; what benefit can be derived from this apostolical ordinance, should matters be transacted without any regard to them, and should they be viewed in any other light than that of the delegated representatives of him who is the true Shepherd and Bishop of our souls?

This, so far as respects the episcopate, is the very clear and very reasonable argument of Ignatius: and hence arose his saying, which might seem to have passed into a sort of proverb; Let no one do anything, which belongs to the Church, separately from the Bishop. Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. 8. Unless the authority of the Bishop were respected, he might just as well never have been appointed at all. With this key, thus furnished by Jerome, let us read those numerous statements of Ignatius which some have deemed so extravagantly high-church: and the whole, I think, will appear natural and consistent. They are little more than sermons upon St. Paul's text to a newly-appointed Bishop; Let no man despise thy youth: for they all bear upon the point, that The authority was not to be undervalued, but to be acknowledged and reverenced. With the same key also, we may open the full drift and purpose of the Apostle's wise admonition to the youthful Prelate, touching the very delicate matter of dealing with his subject Presbyters; many of whom, no doubt, exceeded him in age. Rebuke not a Presbyter: but admonish him as a father. 1 Timothy 5:1. As if he had said, in the tone and manner of Jerome: Execute thy official duties meekly, especially toward those who are older than thyself: for, though Presbyters, by a custom henceforth to be introduced into the Church, are subjected to thee; yet know, that thou art greater than thy Presbyters, rather by this ecclesiastical custom than by the verity of the Lord's disposition, and therefore that thou oughtest to govern the Church in common with them. Jerome, I am aware, has been cited, as saying in another place, that Bishops and Priests and Deacons constitute three distinct Orders. If he really made any such declaration, he would, so far as I can perceive, directly contradict himself. But, in truth, his language, when cited to this effect, is given in a somewhat mutilated form, the commencement and the termination of the sentence being alike omitted. When given in full, it will be found to speak, not of Orders in the ecclesiastical sense of the word, but only of different degrees of rank with reference to the many mansions which our Lord declares to exist in his Father's house. Si autem non sunt plurimae mansiones, quomodo, et in Veteri Testamento et in Novo, alium ordinem Pontifex tenet, alium Sacerdotes, alium Levitae, alium Janitores, alium Editui? Hieron. adv. Jovinian. lib. 2. c. 15.

Does Jerome here speak of Porters and Churchwardens constituting two additional apostolic Orders? Certainly, to depart from the divinely-appointed model by the entire rejection of Bishops, save only in a case of palpably overbearing necessity, would, I think, be unwarrantable and presumptuous and not improbably in the event dangerous. Yet, when the departure had occurred, I cannot, with some, undertake to say, that, in such circumstances, the transmission of the Apostolical Succession was an ecclesiastical impossibility. I would rather, until better informed, express myself as in the text. A transmission of the Apostolical Succession, by the simple imposition of the hands of the Presbytery, they themselves having previously received the imposition of hands, and so backward to the very beginning, is rather to be deemed less regular than roundly to be pronounced invalid.

[2] See above, book 3. chap. 4.

[3] Gilly's Excurs. to Piedm. p. 74.

[4] Gilly's Excurs. to Piedm. p. 74.

[5] Gilly's Excurs. to Piedm. p. 73, 74.

[6] See above, book 2. chap. 1.

[7] Vetust. Auctor. in Vignier. Hist. Eccles. in A. D. 1023. apud Usser. de Eccles. Success. c. 8. Section 18.

[8] Ordines Catharorum sunt quatuor. Ille, qui est in primo et maximo ordine, vocatur Episcopus. Ille, qui in secundo, vocatur Filius Major. Qui in tertio, Filius Minor. Qui in quarto et ultimo, vocatur Diaconus. Caeteri, qui sunt sine ordine, vocantur Christiani et Christianae. Officium Episcopi est, semper tenere prioratum in omnibus quae faciunt, scilicet in impositione manus, in fractione panis, et in incipiendo orare: quae quidem servant, Filius Major absente Episcopo, et Filius Minor absente Majore. Reiner. de haeret, c. 6. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 304.

Probably the junior Priests of the Cathari were simply coadjutors or (as we should say) curates to their seniors.

[9] See Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. c. 20.

[10] On the supposition, that The Albigenses and the Vallenses had, in their Communities, no Apostolical Succession, either less regular or altogether regular; which supposition, however, is incapable of evidential establishment: I should say that we have here a case directly in point to the present statement.

From the Condition of the dominant Church, whether in the East or in the West, during the long and dreary period of the middle ages, it would have been impossible for any Society of serious and enlightened Christians, circumstanced as the supposition makes them to be circumstanced, to have obtained at least an episcopal transmission of the Succession: nay, so far as respects the French Valdenses, two attempts, as we have seen, were actually made, without success, to obtain the papal sanction and authority.

How, then, by the hypothesis, would such Communities be situated? Inevitably, they must either remain within the awfully predicted Church of the Apostasy, and thence, under the soul-destructive guidance of the Man of Sin, partake of all its idolatrous and heretical abominations; in order that they may enjoy the privilege of an Apostolical Succession: or else they must relinquish the privilege of an Apostolical

Succession; in order that they may worship God, in separate assemblies, with a pure and scriptural worship, unstained by the idolatrous and heretical abominations of the awfully predicted Church of the Apostasy.

This is the alternative: and which part of it is to be chosen by these seven thousand men, who resolve not to bow the knee to Baal? Truly, unless I altogether mistake, the Spirit of God himself has answered the question: and has thus, still on the supposition now before us, decided in favor of the course taken by the two Communities of the Vallenses and the Albigenses.

Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven: and God hath remembered her iniquities.

To such of the Lord's people as are within the mystical Babylon, the unconditional command, we see, is to COME OUT. This command must, at all hazards, be obeyed: and, when weighed against the duty of implicit obedience, every ulterior ecclesiastical consequence, and every difficult and curious question which may be raised upon it, are but as dust in the balance.

Thus, even on an extreme supposition, which yet can never be verified, I should say, that the Vallenses and the Albigenses stand fully vindicated: and thence, even according to the course of God's providential dispensation, I should say, that they stand recognized by himself as two most amply commissioned Churches, whose office was to prophesy in sackcloth against the degenerate rotaries of a new form of Paganism.

CHAPTER 4

[1] Hist. des Variat. livr. 11. Section 93, 96.

[2] Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum sacramenta conficiunt et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi quod facit, Ecclesia: anathema sit. Concil. Trident. sess. 7. can. 11. p. 85.

[3] I subjoin the statements of Reinerius and Pilichdorf, that the reader may judge of their value in regard to evidence.

Quidam autem hoc dicunt tantum per bonos fieri: alii, per omnes qui verba consecrationis sciunt. – Dicunt, quod peccator sacerdos aliquem solvere aut figare non possit, cum ipse sit ligatus peccator; et quod quilibet bonus et sciens laicus alium absolvere valeat et poenitentiam injungere. Reiner. juxta Coussord. cont. Vald. p. 126.

De sacramento Eucharistiae dicunt, quod sacerdotes in mortali non possint conficere. – De sacramento Poenitentiae dicunt, quod nullus possit absolvi a malo sacerdote; item quod bonus laicus potestatem habeat absolvendi; -item, quod confitendum sit potius bono laico, quem malo sacerdoti. Reiner de haeret. juxta Gretser. c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 300.

Obloqueris etiam sacerdotibus Ecclesiae, dicens: Fornicarii sunt; usurarii sunt; tabernarii sunt; et alia multa vitia conjectas in eos. Respondeo: Quid ergo? Numquid ideo sacerdotes non sunt? Absit. Sicut autem bonitas hominis singularis non confert sacerdotium: sic ejus pravitas non aufert ipsum. - Sed dicis, haeretice: Tamen dixit Christus ad discipulos; Accipite Spiritum Sanctum: quorum remiseris peccata, remittuntur eis. Ergo sacerdos, qui Spiritum Sanctum non habet quando fornicarius est aut aliter criminosus, non potest absolvere. Respondeo: Etsi Presbyter criminosus charitatem non habet aut

Spiritum Sanctum, ut homo singularis: nihilominus dignum est ejus sacerdotium, dignum est ejus ministerium, quoad sacramentorum efficaciam, etsi, quoad ministerium indignum. – Est ergo idem valor sacramentorum, dignitas, et nobilitas, sive a digno, sive indigno, Presbytero conferantur. Pilich. cont. Valdens. c. 16. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 316.

[4] Credimus: quia non salvatur, qui non manducat corpus Christi; et quod corpus Christi non consecratur, nisi in Ecclesia; et non nisi a sacerdote, sive bono sive malo; nec melius per bonum, quam per malum. Confess. Albig. apud Roger. Hoveden. Annal. par. poster. in A. D. 1176. fol. 319.

[5] Art. 25.

[6] Reiner. de haeret, c. 5. in Bibl. Patr. vol. 13. p. 300. Bohem. Confess. A. D. 1508. art. 11. in Morland's Hist. of the Churches of Piedm. p. 52.

[7] Neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam atque agros, superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est. Plin. Epist. ad Trajan. lib. 10.

[8] Obsessam vociferantur civitatem; in agris, in castellis, in insulis, Christianos: omnem sexum, aetatem, conditionem, etiam dignitatem, transgredi ad hoc nomen, quasi detrimento, moerent. Tertull. Apol. adv. Gent. Oper. p. 801.

[9] Hesterni sumus, et omnia vestra implevimus: urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum. Tertull. Apol. Oper. p. 874.

[10] How vivid is St. John's picture of a Church, which, during the rampancy of Paganism, could not subsist otherwise than on what, in modern nomenclature, is called the Voluntary Principle. I wrote unto the Church: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, RECEIVETH US NOT. Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words: and, not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and CASTETH THEM OUT OF THE CHURCH. 3 John 9, 10.

Well may we say, that Scripture is written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come! Here, even while the living authority of an .Apostle subsisted, we behold, painted to the life, the genuine workings of coarse tyrannical Voluntarism!

[11] De vestris fuimus: fiunt, non nascuntur, Christiani. Tertull. Apol. Oper. p. 844.

CHAPTER 5

[1] In novum inchoatur saeculum, quod, sua asperitate ac boni sterilitate ferreum, malique exundantis deformitate plumbeum, atque inopia scriptorum, appellari consuevit, obscurum. Baron. Annal. in A. D. 900.

[2] Dormiebat tunc plane alto (ut apparet) sopore Christus, cum navis fluctibus operiretur: et, quod deterius videbatur, deerant, qui Dominum sic dormientem clamoribus excitarent discipuli, stertentibus omnibus. Baron. Annal. in A. D. 912.

[3] Quippe, quia, a longe potentissimo hoste invasus, praeter opinionem victor, aut omnino invictus, evasit; multo, quam prius, fit insolentior atque audacior: et, quen prius valde formidabat, repulsum

facile deinceps contemnit. Idque tunc magis contigit, quum hostis conatus saepius inanes fuere. Claud. Scyssel. Taurin. adv. Valdens. fol. 1.