

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
HISTORY

**REMARKS UPON THE
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF
THE ANCIENT CHURCHES OF
THE ALBIGENSES**

by Peter Allix D.D

Books For The Ages
AGES Software • Albany, OR USA
Hartland Publications • Rapidan, VA USA
Version 1.0 © 1997

INTRODUCTION

1989 EDITION

We wish to express our gratitude to Leon McBeth and Carl R. Wrotenbery with the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, TX.; also Richard C. Weeks and David A. West, Sr. with Baptist Heritage Publications, Watertown, WI., for their valuable contribution to this reprint. Having made a diligent search, both at home and abroad, for copies of the original works which we could secure and use for reprinting purposes, we soon learned of their scarcity and value. Turning our attention to various libraries and historian friends, we were able to obtain on a loan basis one book from each of the above mentioned sources. We also wish to express our appreciation to James R. Lynch with the American Baptist Historical Society, Rochester, N.Y. and R. L. Crawford, Hayward, CA. for their interest and guidance in the reprinting of these works.

After careful examination and comparison of Allix's original works, *Churches of Piedmont* and *Churches of the Albigenses* published in 1690 and 1692 respectively, with new editions published in 1821, we chose to reprint from the 1821 new editions. The new editions were printed in a more legible modern English type. The original books each contained an ERRATA and or a CORRIGENDA listing many corrections which the reader was to make allowances for. The new editions are a verbatim copy, but incorporating all of the corrections in the new type set. The pages in the new editions have the original page numbers included in the margins. Letter perfect quotations from the Latin and other writings are retained in the latter editions.

Peter Allix was born in France in 1641 and died in London in 1717. Though he was not a Baptist, he was a learned scholar and historian of the Church of England. He penned over twenty-five published works from 1672 to 1711, including the two histories on the *Churches of Piedmont* and

include David Benedict, Adam Blair, Joseph Bingham, William Jarrell, William Jones, John *Lawrence* Mosheim, G. H. Orchard, and Robert Robinson.

As we approach the 300th anniversary of the original publication, may we be able to glean from these pages those records which surely attest to the trials and persecutions of our forebears; and let us receive renewed strength to “earnestly contend for the faith which was *once* delivered unto the saints.” Jude 3.

CHURCH HISTORY RESEARCH
AND ARCHIVES

January 7, 1989

TO THE KING

May it please your Majesty,

If your Majesty, following the example of your glorious ancestors, did not think it an honor to maintain the Reformed Religion, I should never have undertaken to present your Majesty with a treatise of this nature. This defense of the ancient Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, is a kind of apology for the Reformation brought about in the century last past, in which those heroes of your name had so great a part. The Reformation, rightly considered, consists only in the rejecting of what for many ages has been superadded to the Christian religion. The conduct of the ancient Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont has served for a model to our Reformers, and has justified their undertaking, seeing they have always preserved amongst them the sacred truths of the Christian religion committed to them, as they had received them from the disciples of the Apostles, and rejected the corruptions thereof, according as by degrees they broke forth in the west. This hath been the only thing that hath made them the object of the hatred of the Church of Rome, and hath drawn upon them, for so many ages, such prodigious floods of persecution. It is *very* true, that the wretched remains of these ancient Churches appear too contemptible to attract the eyes of the Princes of the earth towards them; their present desolation seeming so universal, that the world looks upon them no otherwise than irrecoverably lost, and finally destroyed. But all Europe knows, that your Majesty does not judge of things according to the corrupt maxims of the world, but the true light of the Gospel, which informs us, that outward prosperity is not entailed on the true Church; that Jesus Christ owns those only for his disciples, who take up their cross, and follow him; that he knows how to frustrate the hopes of their persecutors, by miraculously supporting and continuing his Church, whilst they suppose themselves to have finally triumphed over it. This is that your Majesty gave a high proof of, when, from your Royal Throne, you were pleased to cast an eye on the miserable estate of that little flock of dispersed Christians, in affording them an happy retreat in your dominions, as to the ancient professors of pure Christianity, and the faithful witnesses of those saving truths which all Protestants do profess.

What marks of your charity and compassion have they not received? And of what efficacy hath not this great example of your Majesty been, to oblige your subjects to give them fresh instances of their brotherly love and affection towards them? Thus, Great Sir, whilst you make good the character of a Prince, who draws the eyes of all the world upon him, by the greatness of his exploits, by the steadiness of his conduct, and by the moderation of his government, you, at the same time, bear the impress of a Prince truly Christian, full of zeal for the interests of his Savior, and of compassion for those who suffer for the sake of his Gospel. This being a truth so generally owned, I have taken the boldness to lay at your Majesty's feet, and publish under your august name, the defense of these illustrious confessors of the truth, whom their enemies have endeavored to bear down with their calumnies, after having borne them down with the violence of their horrid and bloody persecutions. God hath so miraculously raised your Majesty for the rescuing of the Protestant religion from the destruction ready prepared for it, and which had been infallible, without the vigilance and heroical courage of your Majesty; that those who suffer for it, suppose they may have leave thus to address your Majesty, whilst they comfort themselves in their sufferings, with the prospect of that powerful safeguard and support God hath provided for his poor distressed and afflicted Church, in the person of your Majesty, as an evident mark of his favor and protection. May the great God, who has so tenderly preserved your Majesty against all the attempts and machinations of your enemies, and hitherto has made you triumph with so much glory over them, continue to pour forth on your Majesty the choicest of his blessings and favors, crown with a glorious success the great undertakings of your Majesty for the good of your subjects, for the advantage of Europe, and for the comfort of all those who profess the truth; are the ardent prayers constantly presented to God by him who is, with a most profound respect,

Your Majesty's
 Most humble and obedient
 Subject and servant,

P. ALLIX.

THE PREFACE

THE Bishop of Meaux has lately published a treatise, entitled, *The History of the Variations of Protestants*. He had formed the draft of it some years ago, to engage the French court to recall the Edict of Nantes, without any scruple or hesitation. The pretense seemed very plausible: the Clergy, who were both party and judge against the Protestants, were to declare, that forasmuch as the French Protestants had changed their belief, the court was no longer obliged to the observation of an edict which Henry IV. had granted to their ancestors, who were of other principles. But this edict being recalled before the Bishop's work was finished, and the French court, which is not guilty of being over scrupulous, not thinking itself to stand in need of so vain a pretense, the Bishop was fain to employ his work to another use. His design therefore in the present publishing thereof is to deceive those, who by ways of violence have been made to enter into the bosom of the Romish Church, and whom the same violence keeps there, against the sense of their conscience.

This Prelate had before endeavored, in his Exposition of the Roman Faith, where he employs his utmost artifice to sweeten, disguise, and dissemble the matters and difficulties in controversy, to abuse the Protestants, in order to make them more easily digest the Roman religion, than they are apt to do when they view it in its natural colors. And now in this his History of their Variations, he endeavors to represent to them the belief of the Reformers, and most illustrious Protestant Doctors, in the strangest colors imaginable; that those whom the dragoons have converted to the Roman faith might look upon the force that has been made use of to drive them from so detestable a communion as a saving and charitable violence. It is always the same spirit of falsification and juggling that animates and guides him.

In this his last design, it had been natural for him, had his intention been right, to have endeavored to make out, that the Protestants, or their teachers, were divided in their belief of the articles of the Creed; about the object of prayer, and the necessity thereof; about the necessity of obedience to the commands of God, as well as the extent of that obedience; and about the doctrine and number of the sacraments: for in these points it

is that the Protestants make the essence of their religion to consist. Now it is well known, that in all these they do agree: the questions that are ventilated among them being, like those questions that remained among the primitive Christians, upon several points of divinity; and some of them being no other than mere controversies, about which the Protestants have learnt to divide themselves in imitation of the Schools of the Romish Divines. But had the Bishop followed this method, he would have failed of his end; wherefore he thought it sufficient for his purpose slightly to touch the matters in controversy, and to put into good French whatsoever he could rake together from the writings of those of his communion, to expose the first Reformers, and to make the Reformation odious.

It would be an affront put upon the age we live in, to imagine that this thick laying on of paint should be capable to impose upon any that have never so little judgment left. The Bishop may please to flatter himself with the success of his first work, the Exposition of the Romish Faith: but I believe him too sincere not to own, that he has made no impression upon the spirit of any Protestants, save such only who were ready to embrace the first pretences that were offered, to rid themselves of a religion that exposed them to so many miseries; or the profession whereof hindered their settlement in the world. Those who have been forced to become Papists against their consciences have found by experience, that it was not sufficient for them to subscribe the Exposition of the Bishop of Meaux: No: their persecutors were not at all minded to make them of his religion; but they were fain to swallow whole and entire the Profession of Faith drawn up by Pius IV.

And we may assure the Bishop, that the same will be the lot of this present work, which he has entitled, *The History of the Variations of the Protestants in Matters of Faith*. For let us suppose that this Prelate has very well proved what he pretends to make out, what will follow from hence, but only this; that the Reformers were not infallible; that they did not at first reject all that deserved to be censured as Popery; that some difficulties have been met with in the hypothesis of those who were not happy enough to refine and clear such corrupt matters; in a word, that they did not at first discover all that was to be known and believed as to several points of divinity, and that they were fain to take a great deal of pains in the discovery of that truth which the Roman Church had taken so

much pains to obscure and confound? We will suppose a Protestant casuist at this time to write about matters of conscience, and, for want of examining with sufficient care the decisions of licentious casuists, to follow some of them, being seduced by the false principles of these Roman casuists, which the Bishop of Meaux condemns; will it follow, that an hundred and fifty years after this some other Bishop of Meaux will have right to propose, under the title of Protestant Variations, the mistaken opinion of this casuist, though afterwards his party, perceiving the delusion, have declared against his opinion?

The Bishop is very pleasant in forbidding the Protestants to make use of the way of recrimination against the Church of Rome, in this point of variation, though indeed one only instance of variation in faith, of fifty whereof we can convince them, be a sufficient conviction of a Church which pretends herself to be immoveable, because infallible. But being very sensible of the weakness of his cause in this point, he found he should be obliged, either to acknowledge that his Church is a false Church, and much more deserving that censure than the Protestant, as having been subject to a far greater number of variations in her belief; or else that he would be obliged to make use of the same answer we do, in renouncing the infallibility of his Church. But it is no matter of wonder, if by degrees only we come to the perfect knowledge of the truth.

Moreover, is it not a very pleasant method, to reduce the dispute to the examination of some preliminaries, whereas the ground itself has been disputed above these hundred and fifty years.

In a word, whatsoever the Reformers may have been, yet it is but just that the Church of Rome, being accused of heresy, idolatry, and tyranny, should clear herself of these accusations. Whatsoever may have been the carriage of Constantinus Copronymus, how can the manners of that emperor be concerned in the question, Whether the worshipping of images be contrary to the law of God? The reformation of Jehu, king of Israel, did it cease to be a reformation from Ahab's idolatry, though he himself were a wicked person and an hypocrite, and though he did the thing but imperfectly?

In truth, the care the Bishop of Meaux has taken in his Preface and whole book, to represent to us the immutability of his Church, and her constancy

in matters of faith and worship, has opened so fair a field to his antagonists, whom he attacks about the history of the Reformation in the several parts of Europe, and particularly in France, that he could not reasonably expect but to be opposed by them on all sides, with all the vigor imaginable. There are still some Lutherans, who have already made it appear, they are not at all afraid of the reproaches of a party, whose head that condemned them, Leo X. was an avowed atheist, and who looked upon the Gospel to be no better than a fable. There are French Protestants left still, whom Providence has delivered from the bloody hands of the Bishops of France, to maintain the interest of the Reformation; neither does England want able divines sufficient to repel all the Bishop of Meaux's slanders. After all, I hope the Bishop will give us leave to examine a little the constancy of his Church, as to her faith and worship.

In expectation therefore that the several authors, whom the Bishop of Meaux has been pleased to assault, will give him full satisfaction; which as it is no hard matter for them to do, so I question not but they will do it very suddenly: I thought I might take to task one of his books, *viz.* the XI. wherein he treats concerning the Albigenses and the Waldenses; and forasmuch as therein he has carried calumny to the highest degree imaginable, I thought it was my duty, in examining this part of his book, to give a scantling of his fair dealing, and the sincerity he employs in delivering the history of those two ancient Churches, to whom the reformed party are so much obliged.

I know well enough that the strength of our defense does not depend on the justifying of those Churches. Let the Albigenses have been Manichees, as the Bishop pretends to prove them; let the Waldenses have been only a company of schismatics, as the Bishop is pleased to call them; the grounds of the Reformation will remain just and firm for all that, if the foundation of our reasons holds good, and if the Church of Rome be guilty of the errors, idolatry, and tyranny, whereof we accuse her. But I conceived,

1. That it was well becoming a Christian to undertake the defense of innocence, oppressed and overborne by the blackest calumnies the Devil could ever invent.
2. That we should be ungrateful towards those whose sufferings for Christ have been so beneficial to his Churell, should we not take care

to justify their memory, when we see it so maliciously bespattered and torn.

3. That to justify the Waldenses and Albigenses is indeed to defend the Reformation and Reformers, they having so long before us, with an exemplary courage, endeavored to preserve the ancient Christian religion, which the Church of Rome all this while has endeavored to abolish, by substituting a bastard and supposititious Christianity instead thereof.

Whilst the Ministers of the Church of Rome think fit to follow his conduct, who was a liar and murderer from the beginning; innocence ought at least to have leave to defend herself against their calumnies, whilst she willingly resigns to God the vengeance of the injustice and violence of those who have oppressed her.

It is not my design here to write the whole history of the Waldenses and Albigenses; that has been done already in several parts, by four or five famous authors, whose books are in all hands; I mean Chassagnon, Perrin, the most learned Archbishop of Armagh, Giles Leger, and Morland. If any thing may be added to their writings, it is concerning the original of those Churches, their condition before the twelfth century, and their total ruin about two or three years ago.

It is for those that live in the neighborhood of Piedmont, and who have received into their bosom the miserable remains of those so pure and so ancient Churches, to preserve the memory of so dreadful a desolation. I hope also that their piety and zeal will prompt them to search with all the exactness possible, for what may serve to continue the sequel of the history of the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, since the time where Morland and Leger end their works. I am persuaded also, that those who have undertaken to write an account of the ruin of the Churches of France, will not forget to set down the particulars of that persecution, which has destroyed the flourishing flocks of the province of Languedoc, a country where the Reformation met with so easy a reception at first, because of the remainders of the doctrine of the Albigenses, who had dwelt there for so long a time.

What I undertake in these my reflections is only this; to set down the true antiquity of both these Churches, who were so famous in the thirteenth century, because of the opposition they made against the corruptions which the Romish Church had introduced in matters of faith, worship, and the government of the Church. And as they then maintained, that they derived their original from the Apostles, so I hope to make out, that in so doing they advanced nothing which is not exactly conformable to the history of the ages past, from the time of the Apostles to the thirteenth century. This is that I shall endeavor, by making out the succession of these Churches, as well with respect to their doctrine and worship, as with respect to their ministry.

As this design will engage me in the discussion of a great number of authors, who have lived from the time of the Apostles to the said thirteenth century, so it will be difficult to give so smooth a form to these observations, as might be expected in a continued history. In this case it is unavoidable, but the discourse will prove here and there dry and rugged, what pains soever may be taken to the contrary. But to make amends for this, we may promise, that the judicious reader, who is only in quest of truth, will find abundantly wherewith to satisfy himself, by examining the matters of fact set down in these observations.

I shall treat of the history of each of these Churches in particular, and observe much the same method in the one as the other; and am not without hope, that the remarks I shall make will serve to confound the injustice of those, who, though they know that what the Protestants believe and practice is truly apostolical, cease not to wrangle and prevaricate, upon pretense that we cannot show them any Church before the Reformation, or at least before the twelfth century, which has absolutely defended the same opinions as we do. This also will be of use to strengthen the faith of Protestants, who will perceive from thence, that God, according to his promise, hath never left himself without witness, as having preserved in the bosom of these two Churches most illustrious professors of the Christian religion, which they held in the same purity with which their predecessors had received this precious pledge from the hand of those apostolical men, who at first planted these Churches among the Alps and Pyrenaean mountains, that they might be exposed to the view of four or five kingdoms all at once. I begin with the Churches of Italy.

THE CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

CONCERNING the first rise and original of the Churches of Italy

CHAPTER 2

*The state of the Christian religion in the diocese of Italy,
until the end of the fourth century*

CHAPTER 3

*Opinions of authors of the diocese of Italy,
in the fourth century concerning matters of faith and worship*

CHAPTER 4

*Concerning the faith of the Churches of the diocese of Italy
during the fifth century*

CHAPTER 5

Opinions of the Churches of Italy during the sixth century

CHAPTER 6

Opinions of the diocese of Italy during the seventh century

CHAPTER 7

*Some reflections upon the Liturgy of this diocese,
called the Ambrosian Liturgy*

CHAPTER 8

Opinions of the Churches of Italy during the eighth century

CHAPTER 9

Opinions of the Churches of Italy, during the ninth century

CHAPTER 10

The faith of the Churches of Italy in the tenth century

CHAPTER 11

*An inquiry into the opinions of Gundulphus and his followers,
before the year*

CHAPTER 12

Reflections upon some practices of the Churches of the diocese of Italy

CHAPTER 13

*That the diocese of Italy was an independent diocese,
till after the midst of the eleventh century*

CHAPTER 14

*Concerning the separation of the Churches of the diocese of Italy
from the Church of Rome; and of the faith of the Paterines*

CHAPTER 15

*Concerning the belief of the Manichees; of their rise in Italy,
their growth, and their establishment*

CHAPTER 16

*Concerning the Catbari spoken of by Evervinus and St. Bernard,
and their distinction from the Patetines*

CHAPTER 17

*A Continuation of the History of the Catbari in Italy, as elsewhere,
and their distinction from the Paterines*

CHAPTER 18

That the Paterines and Subalpini were not Manichees, as is evident from their writings, and from their opinions in the twelfth century

CHAPTER 19

That the Churches of Italy were not founded by Peter Waldo

CHAPTER 20

Whether the Waldenses were at first only schismatics

CHAPTER 21

Concerning the state of the Church of Rome at the time of the separation of the Paterilles or Waldenses; together with the accusations charged upon them by the said Church, and the idea they had conceived of her

CHAPTER 22

Concerning the belief and conduct of the Waldenses in Bohemia

CHAPTER 23

Some instances of the arguments which the Waldenses of Bohemia waged in their disputes with the Church of Rome

CHAPTER 24

Concerning the government of the Churches of the Waldenses, and of the succession of their Ministers

CHAPTER 25

Concerning the persecutions which the Waldenses have suffered since the eleventh century

CHAPTER 26

An instance of the calumnies of some Inquisitors

CHAPTER 27

That the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont have constantly persevered in the same faith, until the time of the Reformation

CHAPTER 28

Containing the conclusion of this Treatise

Scriptum Inquisitoris cujuspiam anonymi de Valdensibus, ex codice MS. G. in publica Bibliotheca Cantabrig.

Processus Inquisitoris contra Barbam Martinurn, ex Cod. MS. H. in Biblioth. publica Cantabr.

Sumptum ex ore Peyronettae

Processus Inquisitionis contra Peyronettam, ex Codice H. Waldensium in public. Biblioth. Cantabrig.

SOME REMARKS

UPON THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT

CHURCH OF PIEDMONT

CHAPTER 1

Concerning the first rise and original of the Churches of Italy.

By Italy, I do not understand here the several countries which, at this day, bear that name, but only the seven provinces to which that name was given, by way of distinction, and which constituted a particular government, being particularly under the care of the lieutenant of the western Praetorian Prefect. These provinces were Liguria, Aemilia, Flaminia, Venetia, the Alps, both Cottian and Greek, and Rhaetia, or the country of the Grisons. There were three legions amongst the troops of the empire, which peculiarly had the name of Italic, because probably at first they had been raised in that diocese; whereof Milan was the capital city, and the place of residence of the lieutenant we have just now mentioned.

Baronius takes it for an undoubted truth, that St. Barnabas, the famous companion of St. Paul in the work of the ministry, was the first founder of the Church of Milan, and of the Churches of Liguria, which he refers to the year 51 of our Savior Jesus Christ; that is, to the forty-ninth year, if we rectify his chronology. In defending this his opinion, he grounds himself on very sure traditions, as he reckons upon the records of the Church of Milan, and upon the testimonies of many authors. Ughellus is of the same mind, and Ripamontius, who hath written the history of that Church, from the beginning thereof, and sets down all he could get together for support of this opinion. But to speak my sense plainly concerning this opinion of Baronius, and those that follow him therein; I believe they have abused

themselves by following late authorities, and such as cannot make out so ancient a matter. All this so sure tradition, and these monuments of the Church of Milan, owe their rise to the foolish vanity, which the emulation of the western Prelates, for precedency and jurisdiction, has given birth to, since the eighth century- indeed, since that time, there is scarcely a considerable church in Italy, France, Spain, or England, that did not challenge some Apostle, or disciple of the Apostles, for their founder.

I acknowledge that the Liturgy, which bears the name of St. Ambrose, supposes St. Barnabas to have been the first Bishop of Milan; but that alone is sufficient to make it appear, that that Liturgy, as well as others of the same nature, hath suffered great alterations since its first reception in that diocese. The later ages have made a great part of their piety to consist in inventing these fables, and the ignorance and blind zeal of people hath prompted them to entertain impertinent legends as articles of faith, whereof the least footstep is not to be found in the first monuments of antiquity. The learnedest men of the Church of Rome have, in a manner, wholly banished these apostolical originals into the land of fables, from whence they all proceeded at first; though some sooner, others later, yet all of them since the eighth century, as we have hinted. Baronius therefore ought to have called to mind here that judicious maxim, with reference to history, which he himself allegeth elsewhere, *Quod sine antiquo auctore dicitur, contemnitur*,

“Whatsoever is asserted without the testimony of some ancient author ought to be despised.”

Though it is plain, I might draw some advantage in the sequel of my discourse, from the confession of Baronius and other authors that have written the originals of the Churches of Liguria; yet I shall take heed of making use of it, my aim being not to gain any tiling by the ignorance or fabulousness of our adversary, but exactly to search out truth.

Accordingly I find,

1. That the ancient ecclesiastical history doth not give us the least, hint, that ever St. Barnabas preached in Italy, properly so called. Several authors, as Origen and St. Chrysostom, give not him the same allotment that the later historians of Milan have done.

2. I find it was a thing wholly unknown in the time of St. Ireneus and Tertullian, as also to Pope Innocent the First, in the beginning of the fifth century.

3, I do not find that any of the authors who lived in that diocese, as St. Ambrose, St. Maximus, and others, have ever set forth the glory of this apostolical foundation of the Church of Milan by St. Barnabas.

4, Petrus Damianus might alone have served to correct this erroneous opinion of Baronius: for being sent to persuade the Church of Milan to submit to that of Rome, he doth not at all take notice of the Clergy of Milan, pretending to descend from St. Barnabas; but maintains to their face, that they had received the Gospel from the Bishops of the Church of Rome. There is no man of any judgment, who is never so little versed in the history of the Church, on whom these remarks will not make a greater impression, than all those fables on which Baronius, and others like him, have built, in order to establish their pretended tradition.

I am not ignorant, that since the thirteenth century, Raynerius reports, that the Churches of the Waldenses maintained, that they were apostolical Churches: but the word *apostolical* must then be taken in the sense Tertullian gives it in his book of Prescriptions, which I have just now alleged, *Nascentes ex matricibus apostolicis deputantur ut sobdes apostolicarum Ecclesiarum*. Indeed, they are never the less apostolical, because they did not receive the doctrine of the Gospel immediately from the Apostles themselves. It is sufficient to make them deserve the name of *apostolical*, that they received the doctrine of the Apostles, as a pledge from the hand of their first disciples, which they preserved so very tenderly throughout the following ages.

It is hard to determine whether it was in the first century that these apostolical men planted the Christian religion at Milan, and the diocese thereunto belonging; or whether it were done in the second century; forasmuch as Milan was a considerable city in those primitive times, and we find that the Churches of Lyons and Vienna were already famous in the second age, by reason of their martyrs, apostolic men having first of all preached in the capital cities, that the Gospel from thence, as the head spring, might diffuse itself throughout the whole diocese, and so facilitate

the propagation thereof. I am very much inclined to believe, either that the same preachers who came from Greece, out of the bosom of the apostolic Church, to plant the faith amongst the Gauls, did also cultivate the diocese of Milan, that belonged to Gallia Cisalpina: or, that the disciples of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, who for their master Jesus Christ had conquered the cities neighboring to Borne, pursued their victories as far as Milan and its diocese.

I do not think any man can precisely define the time of their preaching, those first disciples having been much more careful to preach the Gospel, than to write the history of it. For, we cannot rely much upon what they tell us concerning the first successors of St. Barnabas at Milan, no more than we can upon that which they assert, that St. Barnabas was the founder of that Church. Lastly, I do not think it necessary to show, (as some reformed Divines do,) that the Bagaudae, of whom mention is made in the time of Dioclesian, were the predecessors of the Waldenses, and that they were both Christians and martyrs. It is true that they build this their opinion upon the martyrdom of St. Maurice, and of the Thebaean legion, which seems to be confirmed by the life of St. Babolenus, published by Chiffietius at the end of Bede. But this foundation is of no strength. The martyrdom of the Thebaean legion is no more than a ridiculous fable, unknown to all the ancient historians of the Church; published by some impostor, under the name of St. Eucherius: and the life of flit. Babolenus is a ridiculous legend, being no ways fit to confirm so great an action of that antiquity. We need only read what is set down by those ancient authors, who make mention of these Bagaudae, and it will be found, that we cannot with reason make Christians of them.

But, however it may be, and though we should acknowledge, that the Church of Milan was founded by the care of the successors of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome; yet it is of importance to observe, that this can give no right to the Bishop of Rome over him of Milan, no more than St. Polycarp acquired any right over the several dioceses amongst the Gauls, whose churches were founded by those whom he had sent abroad to preach the Gospel. Pope Innocent the First complains, in his Epistle to Decentius, that the Bishops of his own province did not follow the customs of the Church of Rome. If this happened in his own province, which without doubt had been converted by the endeavors of his

predecessors, we may very well judge, that the first preachers of Milan and its diocese had not subjected Milan to the Bishop of Rome.

This is acknowledged by Pope Pius the Second, who owns, in his Apology for the Romish Church, written in the year 1457, that before the Council of Nice small regard was had to the Bishop of Rome. It is very necessary that this truth should be solidly proved, which accordingly I design to do in the sequel of this work; and to show the independence of that diocese on the Bishops of Rome: my business at present is to lay down the belief and worship of those Churches which were planted by the disciples of the Apostles, and will be the subject of the following chapters.

CHAPTER 2

*The state of the Christian religion, in the diocese of Italy,
until the end of the fourth century.*

FORASMUCH as we have scarce any author of this diocese, during the three hundred and fifty-first years after the birth of Jesus Christ, whose writings are still in being, it will be impossible for us to give an account of the state of the Christian religion in that diocese, any other way than by considering the state of the neighboring dioceses, and most other Churches during that interval. But with this assistance we may be able to supply the want of those authors, whose memory time hath buried in oblivion, or whose writings have been destroyed by persecutions or by barbarisms.

We cannot doubt but that the principal articles of their faith were contained in the Apostles' Creed, which, though it were not written by the Apostles, yet was received with a general approbation, as appears from what Tertullian and St. Irenaeus tell us. Neither did they, without doubt, own any other tradition, besides that of St. Irenaeus, that nothing ought to be laid down for certain truth, but what Jesus Christ hath taught, or the Apostles written, and left to the apostolical Churches as a sacred *depositum*.

It is undoubtedly, sure, that this was the instruction which was given to the *Catechumeni*, who, after private instructions, were earnestly exhorted to read the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, to confirm and advance themselves in the knowledge of the truths of the Christian religion. And it is as sure that the strangers, who came with this profession, were received as brethren, and they looked upon as heretics who advanced any doctrine contrary to the abridgment of the Christian faith.

The Bishops, when they preached, took the holy Scripture for the subject of their sermon; they explained the mysteries thereof. The Priests and Deacons did as much afterwards, by order of the Bishops, in the several places where they were settled; the one as well as the other being called to their offices by the consent of the people, without which their ministry was not acknowledged, or owned.

They admitted the *Catechumeni*, after an exact instruction, and baptized them on Easter-day and Whit-Sunday, and prepared them for the receiving of that sacrament by long continued fasts, which were prescribed them, and which the Church observed with them, to witness to them the concern they took in their conversion.

The *Catechumeni* did not assist at the celebration of the Eucharist, but were admitted to it after that they had received Baptism, and before that were to make confession of their sins, in token of their contrition.

It was not till some time after the Apostles, yea even till after the second century, that anointings were added to the ceremony of Baptism, as well before as after the receiving of it; which was the charge of the Bishops, who gave the chrism to the new baptized, together with the imposition of hands. The new baptized were clothed in white, eight days after their baptism: before which they gave them salt to taste, and milk and honey to drink. Thus by little and little did they stuff out this holy ceremony, as if it were come too plain and homely out of the hands of our Savior and his Apostles.

They received the Lord's Supper immediately after Baptism, and the people offered bread and wine on the table whereof they communicated. All that were present were obliged to communicate. The Deacons proclaimed the *Sursum corda*, which was a sufficient hint that they were to seek Christ with their hearts in heaven, and that they looked upon that ceremony as a commemoration. Both men and women received the Sacrament in their hands, without any adoration exhibited to it, and they communicated all under both kinds.

We do not find that they prayed to any, but God through Jesus Christ; they prayed to him for the penitents, for believers, for all the necessities of the Church and the world, for the conversion of the heathens, Jews, and heretics, for the emperors, and for the government. They blessed God for the triumphant death of the martyrs; and in process of time they prayed for the dead, that God would be pleased to make them partakers of the first resurrection, which was not till after the doctrine of the temporal reign of one thousand years was introduced.

They carried the Eucharist to the sick, and those that were absent, and they called it the *viaticum*; a name which would better have suited with extreme unction, had that been the last sacrament of the Church.

The Bishops were every one of them heads of their Churches, but they acted nothing without the consent of the Clergy of their Church, and the people. The Priests administered the lesser Churches, but so as that their behavior, as well as their ordination, depended on the Bishop and his Clergy, who exercised discipline upon the delinquents. They were the Bishop's council, they preached, they baptized, they celebrated the Eucharist, they governed the parishes, as well those that were in the city, as in the country; they had Deacons, who expounded also the Gospel, who distributed the Eucharist, who carried it to those that were absent, who baptized, and who sometimes, in less considerable places, had the oversight of Churches. They were ordinarily those that visited the sick and prisoners, and that took care of the temporal concerns of the Church.

In process of time the number of Church-officers was multiplied: there were sub-deacons, acolythi, readers, exorcists, choristers, porters, and men that buried the dead: all these were reduced under the title of Church-officers: whereas before, the Bishops and Priests performed the duty of exorcists, which consisted only in praying over the heads of those that were believed to be possessed of the Devil, or which were overtaken with maladies that were looked upon as possessions. The Diaconesses, who were of apostolical institution, and received the imposition of hands, and who, together with the virgins and widows, made, as it were, a part of the Clergy, were employed, to instruct the women in their houses, to visit the prisoners, and to prepare and dispose those of their own sex for the reception of Baptism.

They made a very exact scrutiny into the manners and knowledge of those that were admitted into the number of the Clergy; but it was not required of them in some places to forbear the company of their wives, in order to their admission, until the beginning of the fourth century; neither was it approved of by the Council of Nice in the year 325, which left them at liberty in that respect. In process of time they rarely admitted any to Orders that were married, except they made a vow to abstain from their wives. Pope Siricius was one of the first that endeavored to introduce the

usage of ecclesiastical celibacy, and to make it pass into a law for his diocese.

The Church had at the first divided sins into two sorts: there were sins, which whosoever was found guilty of were excommunicated for ever: these were idolatry, murder, and adultery: the others did not exclude the persons guilty for ever from being reconciled to the Church, but only laid a necessity upon them of doing public penance at the church-gate; which at first was done with less severity during the two first centuries, but afterwards was made subject to more strict and severe rules, and continued for some years together, the Church requiring these precautions, the better to be assured of the sincerity of their conversion. The intercession of martyrs and confessors, or the apparent danger of death, wherein the penitents were fallen, obliged the Church to remit somewhat of the severity of these rules, which was called Indulgence.

The respect they had for confessors and for martyrs gave them a great authority, though many times they were only women or laics: oftentimes by their solicitations peace was granted to penitents, especially if they were any way related to them. The memory of their death was celebrated with thanksgivings to God for their triumph; which commemoration was renewed every year. Their bodies were buried very carefully; and the churchyards being often the most secure places for the assemblies of Christians, they celebrated the Eucharist in the same places, and upon their tombs. They boasted of their communion; and, from an heathenish conceit, which crept in during the fourth century, they considered them as present, and joining their prayers with the Church for the salvation of those who resorted to their graves. The veneration they had for their relics was carried so far, after the midst of the fourth century, that in diverse places they lighted lamps and wax candles on their tombs, and brought thither bread and wine, to eat and drink at their graves, and celebrate a kind of feast in honor of them. St. Austin in his Confessions observes, that his mother, willing to observe this African custom at Milan, was reprov'd therefore by St. Ambrose, as being a heathenish custom, and that she acquiesced in the Bishop's determination.

In the fourth century images began to be introduced into some churches, *viz.* the pictures of martyrs: but they knew nothing yet of painting the Deity, or of giving the images any religious worship.

They made the sign of the cross on all occasions, as if it had been an abridgment of the profession of Christianity amongst the heathens, or a powerful weapon against the devils.

They did not bury any at first, but in the churchyards; afterwards they began to bury in places adjoining to the church, and at last in the churches themselves. And it was in those church-yards, ever since the third century, that they celebrated the sacrament of the Eucharist, to render thanks to God for the deliverance of those, whose decease had been commendable and praiseworthy.

In the fourth century they consecrated churches but to God alone, and distinguished them from those places where the bodies of martyrs were buried.

They read only in the churches the canonical Scriptures, with the respect due unto the word of God; to which they afterwards joined some hymns composed by some men of great renown, and the sufferings of martyrs, whose examples were of use to confirm the faith of the Church.

The people sang in their assemblies the Psalms of David; and this was the most ordinary exercise of believers, when they met together before day, and at other hours set apart for public acts of piety.

They almost continually concluded the sacrament of the Lord's Supper with feasts of charity, to comfort the poor, and to entertain brotherly unity amongst believers. At the breaking up of these feasts, they gave alms, which were employed for the maintenance of the poor, and the Clergy, who had no other incomes, until that Constantine had embraced the Christian religion.

They celebrated fasts that were very different as to their duration: some ending after three of the clock in the afternoon, some lasting the whole day; but all of them consisted in a total abstinence from meat and drink. Some of these fasts were kept every week, on Wednesday and Friday; the Church of Rome fasted also on Saturday. These days of fasting having not

been instituted by the authority of the Apostles, according to the general consent of ancient Christians, and every one using them with great liberty.

The body of the Christian Churches continued united together by the bond of one and the same faith, and by the mutual care which every Bishop took to keep up the same zeal for the purity of manners, as for that of faith. If there happened any difference, the Bishops and the Priest of the same province assembled, and determined the matter, without any appeal: and it was not till the midst of the fourth century, when the dioceses were better formed, that the Council of Sardica granted to Pope Julius, Bishop of Rome, the privilege of examining afresh all causes that had been determined in the provincial synods; which however never, took full effect, all the Greeks, and a great part of the Latins having rejected that Canon. The Bishops of Rome endeavored to attribute and preserve to themselves this authority, though they could never bring it about, but by means of the favor of the Emperors Gratian at the end of the fourth age, and of Valentinian the Third in the midst of the fifth age.

This was the general state of the Church, whilst under the heathen persecutions, and after having endured the furies of Arianism, which almost wholly laid her waste, during the fourth century. On which occasion I desire the reader to observe:

First, That the most part of the human constitutions I have mentioned were not observed with that rigour, with which Rome imposeth them at present.

Secondly, That some part of those Church-orders have been changed and abolished in process of time.

Thirdly, That a considerable part of these customs, unknown to Scripture, had their rise from a design the Christians had of accommodating themselves to the notions of the Jews and heathens.

Fourthly, That the opinions amongst the ancient Christians upon many questions of divinity being very different, they made use of great forbearance one with another, as long as they did but agree in matters of faith.

Fifthly, That although they received not men excommunicated for scandalous manners in another diocese; notwithstanding the excommunications of one diocese did not hinder, but that those who could prove the injustice thereof might communicate with those whom the Bishops of another diocese had excommunicated.

Sixthly, That every diocese was looked upon as being independent of all other authority: so that what respect soever they might have for the apostolical Churches, yet did not they think themselves obliged to follow them, in case they were persuaded that they had violated the purity of the faith.

And now having made these general observations, which are to be applied to. the state of the diocese of Italy in particular, we shall proceed to what farther information we can get from those authors who have wrote and lived in this diocese.

CHAPTER 3

Opinions of authors of the diocese of Italy, in the fourth century, concerning, matters of faith and worship.

FORASMUCH as the Doctors of the Roman Church generally acknowledge, that the Church of this diocese continued pure until the fourth century, and that it enjoyed the communion of the Pope of Rome; it will not be needful particularly to examine, what was the faith of that diocese about the articles which the Church of Rome rejects or receives in common with Protestants: our business, to speak properly, being only to inquire concerning those articles and ways of worship, which the Church of Rome considers as making a part of their religion, and which the Protestants reject, as being more proper to corrupt, than perfect it. If it be then certain and evident, that the believers of that diocese were either altogether ignorant of, or formally relicted those articles of faith, and that worship, which the Church of Rome prescribes to its people, and which she imposeth on the rest of the world under pain of damnation; it will most evidently appear by this, that these believers were not of the Romish religion, but that, in respect of their faith and worship, they were true Protestants.

And of this it is easy to convince an unprejudiced reader, by examining, century after century, the writings of the ecclesiastical authors of that diocese. I begin with St. Ambrose, who died anno 397, after having possessed the see of Milan twenty-three years. This great man (whose elogy is set down by Cassiodore in three words, when he calls him *virtutum Episcopum, arcera fidei, oratorera catholicum*;

“the Bishop of virtues, the castle of faith, the catholic orator”)

can inform us, whether or no his diocese embraced those maxims which the Protestants, in conformity with the Waldenses, do condemn in the Church of Rome.

If we desire to know what he believed concerning the ruiness and sufficiency of the Scripture, he maintains, that there we are to learn that which makes the object of our faith; because therein the Father, the Son,

the Prophets, and the Apostles, satisfy and answer the questions of believers. *Lib. 1. de Fide, ad Gratian. e. 4.*

Would you know, according to what standard he believed the versions of the Scripture ought to be examined? He will answer you, that it must be by the original. *Lib. 2. de Spir. S. cap. 6. et de Incarnat. cap. 8.*

If the Scripture seems any where obscure, what is to be done in this case, according to his judgment? We are to compare the several passages, *et aperietur*, saith he, *non ab alio, sed a Dei verbo*;

“and it shall be opened to thee, not from another, but from the word of God,”

in Psalm 118. *Serm. 8.*

See here one of his maxims concerning what is maintained at this day about the succession of the Bishop of Rome to the rights of St. Peter:

“Those who have not the faith of Peter, neither can they pretend to the inheritance of Peter”

lib 1. de Poe—nit. c. 6. And indeed how could he have spoke otherwise, after the apostasy of Liberius to the heresy of the Arians? Neither do we find him acknowledging any other rock of the Church besides Jesus Christ, or other foundation of the Church but the true faith; for so he expresseth himself in *Luc. 1. c. 9. & lib. 5. Epist. 32.*

He considers the justification of a sinner as consisting in the remission of sins. *De dacob, et Vita beata, lib. 1. c. 6.* and in other places.

He leaves no room for the merit of works, and maintains, that all our glory consists in the remission of our offenses. *De Bono Mortis, c. 2.*

He maintains, that the alone sufferings of Jesus Christ are the means of our justification, without any concurrence of our own good works: *Ecce Agnus Dei, qui tollit peccata mundi, et ideo, emo gloriatur in operibus, quia nemo factis suis justificabitur.*

“Behold the Lamb of God, which takes away the sins of the world, and therefore let no man glory in his works, because no man shall be justified by his own doings.” *Epist. 71. lib. 9*

Would you know, whether St. Ambrose did believe the seven sacraments, as does the Church of Rome? You need only call to mind, that St. Augustin, who had been his disciple, owned only two, *viz.* Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

He took care to distinguish that which is visibly done, from that which is invisibly celebrated: so far was he from tying grace to the sacraments themselves, as the Church of Rome does. *Epist.* 84. *et de Spiritu Sancto*, lib.3, cap. 11.

Let any one judge, whether he did believe the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, when he wrote these words, in Luc. lib. 10. c. 24. *Seek those things which are on high, where Jesus Christ is seated at the right hand of God?* And lest we should believe, that it is rather the duty of the eyes, than of the soul, he here speaks of, he adds, “Savor the things that are on high, and not those that are on the earth.” So then, it is not on the earth, nor in the earth, nor according to the flesh, that we must seek him, if we would find him. Lastly, Stephen did not look for Christ upon earth; Stephell touched him, because he sought him in heaven. Jesus Christ is present, according to the manner of our seeking him.

It is well known, that in his time the Church communicated under two kinds: besides, he overthrows the possibility of a body existing in more places at once: he maintains, that the Gospel has only the image, and not the truth; and in several places he explodes the carnal manducation, which the Church of Rome admits of.

This makes it very evident, that he knew nothing of the sacrifice of the Mass: indeed, he formally opposes the same, and maintains, lib. 1. *de Offic.* c. 41. that since his passion, he offers up himself only by way of representation, as being really and in truth in heaven, where, as our advocate, he intercedes for us.

If we read the death of St. Ambrose, related by Paulinus in his Life, we shall find nothing there, either of confession, or of adoration of the Eucharist, when he received it, or of extreme unction practiced there, no more than at the death of a true Protestant.

Would we know his thoughts concerning the religious worship of creatures? He is the author of this maxim, That we may not serve any

creature; a foundation to prove that Jesus Christ is God, because the Scripture teaches us, that we ought to worship him. *De Fide, ad Gratian.* lib. 1. c. 7. And it is with respect to the same that he proves, that the Holy Ghost is God, because he has temples. *De Spit. Sancto*, lib. ,3. c. 13. As to the use of images in religious worship, see how eloquently he expresses himself, *De Fuga Seculi*, c. 5.

“Holy Rachel hid the images, that is to say, the Church or wisdom because the Church does not own the vain representations and figures of images.”

He tells you, that Helen worshipped Jesus Christ, and not the wood of his cross, which she had found; for that is a Pagan error, and a vanity of ungodly men. *Conc. de Obitu Theodosii*. He maintains, that it is pure Paganism to worship stones, and to implore the assistance of images, that have no understanding. *Lib. 1. de Offic.* c. 26.

Do we suppose he attributed to ministers the power of pardoning sins? We may undeceive ourselves, by hearing him deliver himself like a Protestant, thus:

“Men afford their ministry for the remission of sins, but do not exercise the right of any power; they pray, but God pardons.”

L. 3. *de Spir. Sancto*, c. 18. He asserts, that the ministry may be in the hands of heretics, and this without corrupting the faith of the people, the ears of the people being more wise than the mouth of the preachers; as happened at the time when Arianism seemed to prevail. *In Psalm.* cxviii. *Serm.* 17.

He sets down for a certain maxim, that we are bound to separate ourselves from a Church that rejects the faith, and does not possess the foundation of the preaching of the Apostles. *Lib. 6. in Lucam*, c. 9.

We may see, that he was wholly estranged from that maxim which the Papists have maintained these last six hundred years, that the Church hath the power of deposing a prince who is turned heretic; for he maintains, that the Church has no other. arms but prayers and remonstrances, or at the most excommunications.

I pass on to Philastrius Bishop of Brescia, contemporary with St. Ambrose, from whose writings we may gather these following particulars. He did not believe that the Church of Rome could authorize the Canon of Scripture, as the Gloss maintains; for he asserts, that the Apostles and their successors determined the number of the canonical books, which only ought to be read in the Church. *Haer.* 40.

It is plain, he did not believe the Church of Rome to be exempt from error, if he minded what he said; because, *Haeres.* 41. he rejects as heretical the opinion of those who held the Epistle to the Hebrews to have been writ by Barnabas, by Clemens Romanus, or by St. Luke, which had given occasion to make the authority thereof suspected and doubtful in the Roman Church, which rejected the same. As we may see by the testimony of St. Jerome.

He did not believe, that it belonged only to the Church of Rome to condemn heresics, which power she arrogates to herself at this day; because he observes, concerning several heresics, that the particular Bishops or councils of the diocese, where the heresy first appeared, had right to condemn them.

So little did he think, that it was the right of the Church of Rome only to canonize the versions of Scripture by her authority, that he fixeth the brand of heresy upon the opinion of those who did not receive the version of the Septuagint; whereas it was the only version the Church admitted of in his time. *Haeres.* 89, 90. One may see by this, wiletiler he was like to have rejected the same upon the Pope's determination.

We cannot find that he believed transubstantiation; for giving an account of the heresy of the Artotyrites, who celebrated the Eucharist with bread and cheese, he doth not, to condemn them, make use of the reasons which a transubstantiator might have alleged, *Haeres.* 27. And we ought to make the same reflection on the 30th heresy of the Aquarii, who celebrated the Eucharist with water only, which at least they might defend by way of concomitance; but might, on the other hand, be more strongly attacked, by the idolatry which would have been committed by adoring the water in the Sacrament.

He would never have employed, in defense of the real presence, the Acts of St. Andrew, which they nowadays object to us, to establish the carnal presence of Jesus Christ; forasmuch as he maintains, *Haeres.* 40. that those Acts had been feigned by the Maniehees.

We find not, when he speaks of Aetius, *Haeres.* that he looked upon his opinion against prayers for the dead to be an heresy.

It is evident he did not approve of the principles of idol-worshippers, because he calls their opinion an heresy, who thought that man was the image of God, according to his body, and not according to his soul.

Haeres. 49.

It appears from *Haeres.* 53. that he did not admit of the Romish divinity concerning the punishments, properly so called, which God, say they, makes his children to suffer during the course of this life.

He lays it down for a rule, *Haeres.* 60, 61. that the *Christian faith* is more ancient than the *Jewish*; which can no longer now be maintained, since the Church of Rome has been pleased to add so many articles to the Creed, and introduced into its worship so many practices contrary to the law of God.

He declares expressly, that the sacrifice of the Church is a sacrifice of bread *in mysterium Christi*, to be a mystery of Jesus Christ. *Haeres.* 96.

He was so sensible, with the Protestants, that the children of believers have a right to the covenant, that he maintains, *Haeres.* 69. that formerly the patriarchs, judges, and other believers, were sanctified in their mothers belly. A doctrine which has so extremely disgusted the Romish censors, that they thought fit to guard the margin with a *Caute lege*.

He asserts, *Haeres.* 74. that he who called upon the Father, before Christ's coming in the flesh, was thereby freed from the condemnation of the wicked; which does not seem to agree very well with the Popish doctrine of a *Limbus Patrum*; or else it must be owned, that the *Limbus* must take place as well under the New Testament, as under the Old: because he makes use of the words of Jesus Christ, or, at least, makes a plain allusion to them.

He overthrows the doctrine of merit, in maintaining, *Haeres. 77.* that it is by the sole mercy of Jesus Christ we are saved, *non virtute et justitia condigna,*

“not by any condign virtue and righteousness of our own.”

It does not appear that he owned a Purgatory, such as the Romanists do, because, *Haeres. 73.* he saith, that the soul of man, whether good or bad, whether godly or ungodly, is conducted by an angel to its appointed place, there to receive according to what he has done in this life. It is evident from the Epistle of St. Gaudentius to Benevolus, that he believed a fire, through which the most righteous, even the Apostles and blessed Virgin herself, were to pass, at the end of the world: which opinion has been since rejected in the west.

It appears from *Haeres. 97.* that the number of fasts was very small in his time; he takes notice only of four, that of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, and Whitsuntide, besides that of Lent; the rest were left to the devotion of believers: and there is great probability, that these fasts were only observed on the eves before the Communion.

True it is, that he speaks of a local descent of the soul of our Savior Jesus Christ into hell, *Haeres. 22.* but in *Haeres. 73.* he terms their opinion an heresy, who maintain, that after his death he descended into hell, and preached the Gospel, that the souls there receiving the same might be saved: which was the opinion of most of the ancients, both before and after him. Whence we may judge, whether this article, about which so much pains has been taken to explain it in a good sense, was a doctrine which the Apostles had left in the Church; or whether it was not drawn from some passages of Scripture, ill understood in the second century, as we assert, because the Fathers did not at all times, in all places, and with all agree therein; which is the character of a doctrine truly catholic, according to the famous maxim of Vincentius Lirinensis.

And forasmuch as St. Gaudentius succeeded Philastrius, whom he calls a most apostolical man, it is no wonder to find him so closely following his steps; for we find him every where of the same opinion with St. Gaudentius in the points he treats of, as I have already made it appear from his Epistle to Benevolus; for, writing to him a consolatory letter,

upon occasion of his sickness, he treats the matter altogether like a Protestant, without mingling any Popish notions therewith, such as are the considering Of the afflictions of believers as punishments and satisfactions God exacts from them as a judge; as may be seen in that Epistle. It is true, that amongst other things he observes, that they serve also to lessen the force of the purgative fire of the last judgment. But I have showed what he meant by that; and the same is acknowledged by the learned of the Roman Church. He lays down two things in the same Epistle; the one is, that the bosom of Abraham signifies eternal life, which does no service to the Popish polemical writers; the other is, that neither angels nor men know the secrets of conscience, that being the privilege of God only; which maxim wholly overthrows the invocation of angels, as well as the authority the priests arrogate to themselves of pardoning sins, as judges. But we will pass on to his Sermons, and instance in some other of his opinions.

He tells us plainly in his first sermon, that we shall not eat the true manna, which is Jesus Christ, till after the resurrection in heaven, where we shall drink of the Rock, which is Jesus Christ, cleaving to the feet of that immaculate Lamb. Is this the: language of a man that believes the carnal presence?

The whole of his second sermon is spent in explaining the doctrine of the Eucharist, where at the first he lays down, that the figure is not the truth, but an imitation of it. He saith, Jesus Christ has suffered death for all men, and that he feeds them in all the Churches: but how? *In mysterio panis et vini rescit immolatus, vivificat creditus;*

“He refresheth, being offered up in the mystery of bread and wine; and quickens, being believed on:”

so that he is only offered up in figure, and not truly, and only quickens those that believe his word. And he explains himself, by declaring, that the doctrine of Jesus Christ is the flesh of that immaculate Lamb, the whole body of the Scriptures containing the Son of God. He explains that phrase, *to receive the body of the Son of God*, by receiving with the mouth the mystery of the body and blood of the Lord. He maintains, that it was of the consecrated bread that Jesus Christ said, *This is my body*; which, according to the doctors of Rome, overthrows transubstantiation. Lastly,

he maintains, that Jesus Christ made choice of the bread and wine, to make them the sacraments of his body and blood, that there might be no blood in this new sacrifice, and to figure the body of the Church, which is composed of many believers, as the bread is made up of many grains. Can any thing be said more contrary to the maxims of the Church of Rome?

In his third sermon he asserts, that the Church resembles the moon, which increases in times of peace, and decreaseth in times of persecution; that she decreaseth with respect to her fullness, but not with respect to her brightness. He seems after her ruiness, to which she was arrived, to foresee her wane and decrease, which he had already had a view of, during the reign of Arianism.

CHAPTER 4

Concerning the faith of the Churches of the diocese of Italy during the fifth century.

ONE of the most illustrious witnesses we have of the belief of the Churches of Italy, at the beginning of the fifth age, is Rufinus, Presbyter of Aquileia.

As for the rule of faith, which is the Scripture, Rufinus sets down a catalogue of the books of holy Writ, the same that is at present received by the Protestants, calling the books that we reject apocryphal, *apud Cyr.* p. 552 and 553. which is an evident mark, that the Church of Italy made a more accurate distinction of the canonical books from the apocryphal, than the Church of Rome at that time did. So that Rufinus, in this respect, knew more than Innocent I. who began to confound the canonical writings, by a mixture of the apocryphal.

As for the Creed, which is an abridgment of the articles of our belief, we cannot meet with a more orthodox explication of it than is that of Rufinus; and would to God the Church of Rome would keep to that, for then we should be soon agreed; at least, in so doing she would not propose any thing to Christians which was not owned for the Creed of the ancient Church; whereas since she has added new articles, altogether unknown to Rufinus and the Bishops of that diocese. In a word, we may say, it is most certain, that there is as much difference between this treatise of Rufinus and the Catechism of the Council of Trent, as there is between the Catechism of the Protestants and that of the Papists.

I own, that Rufinus, in this explication of the Creed, asserts a local descent of Jesus Christ into hell: but we are to observe, that though already in his time this was looked upon as an article of faith; yet the Fathers, as well those that went before, as those that followed after, had such different notions concerning it, that the Church of Rome, which at this day follows one of those opinions, but had not that article in her Symbol in Rufinus's time, can scarcely draw any advantage from thence, except only against those who hold, that this article is only an allegorical explication of the article, *He was buried.*

But, however, we may observe, that Rufinus expressly notes, at the beginning of this his exposition of the Creed, that *believers* received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper with an extraordinary respect, *maxima cure observantia*, but not worshipping it, as the Church of Rome does at this day.

Though we have no remains of St. Chromatius, Bishop of Aquileia, save only some commentaries and homilies; yet from thence we are sufficiently informed, how far his divinity differed from that which is now professed by the Church of Rome. He plainly asserts the perspicuity of the Scriptures, when he accuses the heretics and Jews of darkening it by their perverse explications. *Serra*. 2. p. 162. Accordingly he also maintains, that the Lord's Prayer contains all things necessary to salvation, p. 175. which is not very agreeable to the palate of the doctors of Rome, who furnish us with a far greater number. He asserts, that the prison from whence there is no coming out until the last farthing be paid, is hell, which does not at all suit with Popish *purgatory*, 166. Conformably to this, he lays down, that the afflictions which happen to the faithful, are either to correct their defects, or to try their faith, or to prepare them for glory; not a word concerning the use the Roman Church puts them to, *viz.* for the expiation of sin, and for a satisfaction properly so called. He acknowledges indeed, that the Christian Church is typified by a city situated upon a mountain; but we do not find him concluding from thence its equal visibility, no more than St. Ambrose. We are not to forget here, that St. Chromatius had so little deference for the authority of the Church of Rome, that Rufinus having been condemned by Pope Anastasius, because he seemed to favor the Origenists, St. Chromatius took no notice of this proceeding, but received him to his communion, as before; an abundant testimony that the thunderbolts of Rome, at that time, reached no further than the ten provinces in subjection to the Pope, St. Chromatius's bishopric being without them, and consequently, that he did not own the Pope for the *head* of the Church, out of whose communion salvation was not to be hoped for.

He plainly asserts, that marriage is so wholly dissolved by adultery, that it is lawful for the innocent party to marry again: which was the opinion of the Romish Church till after the tenth century, p. 168. A.B. He maintains it to be a piece of impiety, to swear by any creatures; which is not the

faith of Rome at this day, p. 169. A. He owns no other union in the Church, but the unity of the Catholic faith, *ibid.* p. 158. We find, by all his expressions, that the carnal presence was unknown to him: First, he proposeth Jesus Christ as the meat and drink of the believer, that comes hungry to it. *Cortc.* 2. p. 157. Secondly, he holds, that a change is made when *ex eo quod fuit in aliam speciem generatur*;

“out of that which was before, a thing of another kind is generated.”

Thirdly, he applies, p. 174. our daily bread to the body of Jesus Christ, but he considers it spiritually, which makes it appear what notion he had of the manducation or eat-mg of it, and that the expression he useth of *a cotpore Domini separari*, signifies nothing else but the exclusion from the Sacrament.

Moreover, if we find that he has been a guide of the Waldenses towards truth, it will not be amiss withal to observe, that he seems to have suggested to them a wrong understanding of the Scripture. For this great man maintains, that the Gospel absolutely forbids swearing, p. 168. and the letter of Scripture so far imposed upon him, that he pretends we are obliged, according to the law of Jesus Christ, to offer the other cheek to him that has already struck us, p. 169, 170.

Niceas Bishop of Aquileia, who lived anno 420. has a very remarkable expression in his book *ad Virginem lapsam*, which we find in the works of St. Ambrose.

“Stick close to the exercise of repentance, till the end of thy life, and never think of obtaining pardon *ab humano die*, because he who has made thee make this promise has deceived thee. As thou hast properly sinned against the Lord, so seek thy remedy only at his hands.”

It is evident, that these words either are the expressions of a downright Novatian, which we cannot suspect him of, after the many testimonies we have of his soundness in the faith, or that they represent a very different notion from what has been entertained at Rome, since their espousing the secret of auricular confession, and the priestly power of pardoning sins, as judges properly so called.

The remaining part of this century was terribly agitated by the disputes raised upon occasion of Nestorianism and Eutychianism, insomuch as the Bishops were all divided, and the Council of Chalcedon was unable to appease their differences. The diocese of Italy was at the same time ravaged by the Huns. Attila rased Aquileia, destroyed Milan, Pavia, and diverse other places. Some years after, Odoacer invaded the said diocese; and not long after, the Goths marched through it under the command of Theodoric, so that scarcely was there any place left for learned men to write, during the inundation of these barbarous nations. Proceed we therefore to the following century.

CHAPTER 5

Opinions of the Churches of Italy during the sixth century.

ONE of the first that can give us any information herein is Laurentius, who was translated from the bishopric of Novara to that of Milan, about the year 507, We have three of his pieces, which he reached upon his return to his see, after the destruction of Milan, and his own banishment.

The first is a sermon upon the Canaanitish woman, his design therein being to administer comfort to repenting sinners, and to assure them of the easiness of God's mercy. Mabillon, who published them, tells us as much. I shall set down some of his propositions or doctrines which he borrowed from St. Chrysostom.

I. He requires nothing as necessary for the re- mission of sin, save only a lively compunction, without so much as one word of the Priest's absolution, p. 24. *Sed dicis, Feci peccata multa et magna: Et quis est de hominibus qui non peccet? Tu dic; Erravi super omnes homines, sufficit mihi in sacrioqcio ista confessio. Dic tu prius iniquitates tuas, ut justifceris: cognosce quoniam peccator es; babe tristitiam cure converteris; esto ac si desperatus et moestus, sed et lachrymas compunctus effunde. Numquid aliud aliquid fuit in meretrice, quam lachrymarum effusio? et ex hac profusione invenit presidium, et accepta fiducia accessit ad fontem Dominum Jesum.*

“But thou wilt say, I have committed many and great sins: and who is there amongst men that sinneth not? Say thou, I have sinned beyond all men; this confession is sufficient to me, for a sacrifice. Do thou first declare thy iniquities, that thou mayest be justified; acknowledge thyself to be a sinner: be full of sorrow in this thor conversion; yea, be grieved, and as without hope: moreover, pour forth tears of compunction. Do you find ought else in her that had been a common harlot, but shedding of tears? and by this her weeping she found help; and having received confidence, she drew near to the fountain, our Lord Jesus.”

He answers the unworthiness of sinners in these words, p. 25. *Et quomodo ausa est mulier legis ignara, tam iniqua, sic abrupte accedere ad fontem salutis? Non petiit Jacobum, non rogavit Johannem, non accessit ad Petrum; sed hoc intermittens, quid dicit? Non est mihi necessarius fidejussor: suscipit in se poenitentiae patrocinium, et sola currit, tenet eum in voce ac dicit, Miserere mei Domine fili David. Ideo descendisti, ideo carnem suscepisti, ut et ego loquar ad te et cure fiducia petam, etc.*

“But how durst a woman ignorant of the law, and besides so wicked, so abruptly draw near to the fountain of salvation? she did not entreat James, nor ask John, neither came she to Peter [to speak for her.] But leaving all this, what saith she? I have no need of a sponsor. And taking upon herself the patronage of her own repentance, she runs to him alone, stops him with her voice, and saith, Lord have mercy upon me, thou Son of David. Therefore it is that thou camest down [to us,] therefore thou tookest flesh upon thee, that even I also might speak to thee, and with confidence ask of thee, etc.”

See here a very exact imitation of St. Chrysostom, after Nectarius had taken away the use of penitentiary Priests.

It is worth our taking notice how he speaks of prayers without attention, p. 35. *Sunt multi quidera qui inrant in ecclesiam, et strepunt in oratione, confuse atque intemperata voce dispergunt verba sua, et egressi foras oblitii sunt omnia. Hi sunt qui labijs hinniunt, et corde non concipiunt. Si tu ipse dicta tua et preces ignoras; quomodo te exaudit Deus?*

“There be many indeed that come into the church, and make a noise in prayer, scattering their words with a confused and rude bawling, who as soon as they are got abroad, quite forget all. These are they who neigh with their mouths, without conceiving in their hearts. If thou thyself dost not know what thou sayest or prayest, how shall God hear thee?”

From whence we may easily judge how he would have approved of praying in an unknown tongue, which necessarily destroys attention.

As concerning the place where we ought to pray, that we may be heard, he expresseth himself in this manner, as if he had designed to furnish the

Waldenses with an answer, p. 36. *Grandis sermo est, Miserere mei Deus, brevis quidera sed virtute plenus. Nam et si foris fueris, clama et dic, Miserere mei Deus. Clama, non voce, sed mente; ham et tacentes exaudit Deus. Nec tam locus queritur, quantum sensus. Hieremias in careere conbrtatur; Daniel inter leones exultat; tres pueri in fomace tripudiant; Job nudus sub divo triumphat; Paradisum de cruce latro invenit. Quid ergo si fueris in publico foro? Ora intra te. Noli querere locum, locus ipse es, ibi ubi fueris ora. Si fueris in balneo, ora, et ibi ternplum est.*

“This is a great word, Lord have mercy upon me; short indeed, but full of virtue. For though thou art abroad, yet cry and say, Lord have mercy upon me. Cry, not with thy voice, but with thy mind, for God hears even those that are silent; neither does he regard the place where, but our mind and attention in prayer. Jeremiah receives comfort in the dungeon; Daniel rejoieeth in the lions’ den; the three young men leap in the midst of the fiery furnace; Job, naked and destitute, triumphs in the open air; the thief finds a Paradise upon the cross. What therefore, though thou art in the public market? pray within thyself; do not seek for another place, thou thyself art a place; wheresoever therefore thou art, there pray. If thou be in the bath, pray there, for there also is the church.”

And p. 37. *Nunquid homo est Deus, ut labore quceratur per loca diversea? Deus est qui adest ubique? Si quaeris hominem, dicitur tibi non est hic, aut non illic vacat : non est sic in causa Dei; hoc tanturn est ut dicas, Miserere mei Deus, et ipse prope est ut to liberet, et adhuc loquente to dicit, Ecce adsum.*

“What! is God a man then that thou must take pains to seek him in several places? It is God who is present every where. If indeed thou chancest to look for a man, thou art answered, He is not here, or he is not at leisure: but the case is not so with God.: Do thou only say, Lord have mercy upon me, and he is near thee to deliver thee, and whilst thou art yet speaking, saith to thee, Behold, here am I.”

The second homily published in the Bibliotheca Patrum, t. 3. utterly overthrows the pretended tribunal of penance, p. *Mox ut ascendisti de fonte, vestitus es veste alba, et unctus es unguento mystico; facta est super*

to invocatio, et venit super to trina virtus, quam vas novurn hac nova perfundit doctrina, exinde teipsum tibi statuit judicem et arbitrum.

“As soon as thou art come up from the fountain, thou art clothed with white raiment, and annointed with the mystical ointment; prayers have been made over thee, and the threefold virtue is come upon thee; after that thy new vessel is once filled with this new doctrine, thenceforward he has constituted thee a judge and disposer for thyself.”

In the third homily, which treats of alms, he makes use of this expression; *In Jordane Christus semel tinctus, sanctificavit aquas; in pauperibus autem semper manet, et assidue abluit crimina largientium.*

“Christ being once dipped in the river Jordan, thereby sanctified the waters; but he always abides in the poor, and continually washeth away the sins of those that give to them.”

This notion of the presence of Jesus Christ in the poor sufficiently makes out the sense of the Fathers, when they speak Of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist; especially if we join with it that expression of his second homily, p. 127. B. *Asperges me aqua Filii tui sacro sanguine mixta.*

“Thou wilt sprinkle me with the water mingled with the holy blood of thy Son.”

The opinions of Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia, are evident in several of his works; we shall instance the following places.

We find in the Life of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Pavia, writ by Ennodius, a representation of the manner how that Bishop did celebrate the Eucharist, which makes it apparent how far he was from adoring the Eucharist as his God. *Junctis pedibus usque ad consummationera mystici operis stare se debere constituit, ira ut humore vestigiorum locum suum depingeret, et longe aspicientibus indicaret.*

“He had purposed with himself,” saith he, “always to stand still, with his feet together, till he had finished that mystical work, so that the moisture of his footsteps deciphered the place of his standing, and might be seen by those who were at a considerable distance.”

It is but too visible here, that St. Epiphanius and Ennodius knew nothing of those prostrations which now are used before the Sacrament; because the one of them prescribed this constant form to himself, in celebrating the Eucharist; and the other commends him for it, as a mark of his piety.

At the end of the said Life, Ennodius gives us an account of the death of St. Epiphanius, much like that of a Protestant Bishop. He had only this word in his mouth, *Mihi vivere Christus est, et mori lucrum;*

“To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.”

He was heard to repeat nothing but Psalms of consolation, such as the eighty-eighth Psalm; and he breathed his last in these words, *In manus tuas, Domine, commendo spiritum meum;*

“Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit;”

taken out of Psalm 30. He tells us in plain terms, that his soul returned to heaven, *ad sedem suam coelestis anima remeavit;*

“his heavenly soul returned to its own place.”

All which serves to make out, that prayer for the dead had not as yet the belief of purgatory for its foundation, as it hath at this day.

And it was in the same mind that he composed the epitaph of St. Victor, Bishop of Noarre, where we read these verses:

*Hic reddens tumulis cineres, ad celsa vocatus
Spiritus, aetherea congaudet lucidus arce.*

*“Having bequeath’d his dust to dust,
His soul is call’d on high;
There bright and glorious, to partake
Those joys which never die.”*

And forasmuch as we see that he in diverse places; commends St. Ambrose and his successors for orthodox Bishops, I shall not trouble myself to quote any more of his writings; and the rather, because the most part of his works were letters or poems, relating rather to outward affairs than any matters of religion.

I know they are wont to cite a passage of Ennodius, to prove that the Pope cannot be judged by any one but God. We find nothing more frequent since the time of Gratian and the canonists, than to quote these words of his Apology for Symmachus; *Aliorum horninure causas Deus voluit per homines terminari, sed Romanos sedis prossulem, suo, sine qucestione, reservavit arbitrio.*

“Other men’s cases God was willing should be determined by men, but as for the Bishop of Rome, he has reserved his case for his own cognizance, without exposing it to a judicial trial.”

But they signify nothing less, than what they seem to express thus separate from the rest of the discourse. What Ennodius by these terms would declare, is simply this; that Pope Symmachus’s adversaries, not having been able to convince him of the horrible crimes whereof they had accused him before king Theodoric, and afterwards before the synod assembled by Theodoric, for examining his accusation, his case had been remitted to the judgment of God, as was customary, when persons could not be convicted by the ordinary course of judiciary proceedings. De Launoy hath so solidly proved that this was Ennodius’s meaning, though of a long time it hath been disguised, that there is no need to insist further upon it. *T. 1. Epist. 9.*

Dacius, Bishop of Milan, has left so little in writing, that it may seem needless to speak of it; only it may be to the purpose to observe the carriage of Justinian towards him, who, finding him at Constantinople, would make him (as well as the Pope’s referendary) subscribe the edict which he had published: which shows that he looked upon himself as the head of a diocese, which was as exempt and separate from the Pope of Rome’s jurisdiction, as the dioceses of the Patriarchs of the East were. *Baronius ad annum 546. Section. 46.*

In the year 590 the Bishops of Italy and of the Grisons, to the number of nine, rejected the Communion of the Pope, as of an heretic, who had consented to the abolishing of the Council of Chalcedon, consenting under Justinian to the condemnation of the three chapters, as may be seen from their letter to the Emperor Mauritius, set down by Baronius, *ad h. annum, n. 29.* That Emperor having ordered them to be present at the Council of Rome, they were dispensed with by the same Emperor, upon their

protesting that they could not communicate with Pope Gregory the First. This schism had already continued from the year 553, and lasted near as long after; so little were they persuaded at that time of the Pope's infallibility, that to lose communion with them was to lose the communion of the Church, or that they held their ordinations from the hand of the Popes, and from the Bishops, subjected to their jurisdiction. Let us proceed now to the belief of the following century.

CHAPTER 6

Opinions of the diocese of Italy during the seventh century.

I Know only of two or three authors that can instruct us in this matter; the one is Maurus, Bishop of Ravenna, who flourished in the midst of the seventh century; the other Mansuetus, Bishop of Milan, who flourished towards the end of it, *viz.* from the year 677. Of the first of these we have an Epistle against the Monothelites, which has been inserted in the Council of Lateran, under Martin the First, in the year 649. *Act. I.* Of the second we: have an Epistle to the Emperor Constantine, set down in the same Council. The union of them both with the Bishops of Rome, for the defense of the faith against the Monothelites, is a strong assurance of their purity in the faith. Their opinions are these that follow.

Maurus, who styles himself *Servus servorum Dei*, precisely observes, that the Pope had invited him to be present at Rome at the council, but as a Bishop without his diocese; for otherwise he might, as being one of his suffragans, by his authority have summoned him thither. And indeed, instead of going to Rome in person, he sent in his place Maurus, Bishop of Cesena, with one of the Priests of Milan. *ibid* p. 601. He declares that the only means of preserving the purity of the faith is, to keep to the doctrine of the Apostles, which the Fathers had followed, with respect had to the fifth general Council. The words he useth are these, *T. 6. Conc. p. 96.*

Unicum omnibus et singulare est Redemptoris Dei, et Domini nostri Jesu Christi concessum remedium ad animarum nostrarum salutem, ut ea quae per Apostolorum prcedicationem percepimus, et Patrum doctrinam, proculdubio teneamus.

“The only and particular remedy granted to all for the salvation of our souls, by God our Redeemer, and the Lord Jesus Christ, is, that, without all doubt, we hold fast the things we have received by the preaching of the Apostles, and the doctrine of the Fathers.”

He declares that he owns and admits the five general Councils, and that he condemns that which was held at Constantinople in favor of the Monothelites, being supported by the credit of the emperors.

Maximus, Bishop of Aquileia, expresseth the same opinions; and moreover expressly condemns by name the Monothelite Bishops, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, p. 97.

Mansuetus, in his Epistle to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, declares, first, that it was Constantine the Great who convened the Council of Nice, which at this day is very stiffly contested by the Church of Rome; that the Emperor Theodosius called together the second Council of Constantinople; and that the Emperor Martianus did the same with regard to the Council of Chalcedon, and Justinian to the fifth general Council.

He declares, that the whole faith of his Church is contained in the Apostles' Creed; whereof the confession of faith by him sent to the Emperor is only an explication. Which makes it evident, that the Church of Milan, and his diocese, under the reigns of Pertharit and Cunibert, kings of the Lombards, did not own any other doctrine to belong to the faith and of necessary belief, save only what was contained in the Apostles' Creed; much less did his Church own that heap of doctrines which Pius the Fourth thought good of his own head to superadd to it.

True it is that he praiseth the ancient doctors of the Church, Leo I. St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Basil, etc. *Quicquid hi docuerunt, saith he, sapuerunt, prosdicaverunt, vel defensores extiterunt, nos eorum acta vel statuta omni devotione suscipimus.*

“Whatsoever they have taught, judged, preached, or defended, all that we received with all devotion.”

Yet however this is not so general as it seems to be, because his words have a particular reference to their explications concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, against the heresies of the fourth and fifth century, which was the only matter in question then.

It is worth our while to take notice of the singular elogy he gives to St. Ambrose, whom he calls *Veneranda Corona Christi Confessor dembrosius Mediolanensis Ecclesios Preesul;*

“The venerable Crown of Christ, Ambrosius the Confessor, Bishop of the Church of Milan.”

What I have here mentioned of Mansuetus is the more considerable, because it was done by him presiding in the synod of his diocese.

Lastly, We may observe that the deputies of Mansuetus condemned Honorius, Bishop of Rome, *Act.* 13. for being a Monothelite; and the matter at this time is no longer questioned, notwithstanding Baronius, and some after him, have endeavored to make it pass for doubtful: whence it appears that in Italy they held it for an inviolable maxim:

First, That the Pope was liable to become an heretic.

Secondly, That none were to continue in communion with him, save only so thr as he continued united to Jesus Christ, as a true believer; so far were they from supposing themselves bound to cleave to the Church of Rome, as they would continue in the communion of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But though we have but few particular authors that might inform us of the opinions and worship that took place in that diocese; yet have we something that seems more authentic, *viz.* the Liturgy which bears the name of St. Ambrose. And forasmuch as this piece was made use of before this century, and that since that time it has served for a model of the devotion of that diocese, it will be of some importance carefully to examine the same, and the rather, because though I speak of it only in this place, yet the observations drawn from thence may and ought to be applied to the foregoing ages, as well as those that follow after.

CHAPTER 7

Some Reflections upon the Liturgy of this Diocese, called the Ambrosian Liturgy.

ONE of the most certain ways to be informed concerning the faith of a Church, is to consult her Liturgy. I am not ignorant that what Josephus Vicecomes tells us concerning the antiquity of the Ambrosian Liturgy, *viz.* that St. Barnabas was the author of it, that it was afterwards augmented by Merocles; and lastly, having been revised by St. Ambrose, it obtained the name of Ambrosian, is absolutely false, and so ridiculous a conceit, that it is wholly rejected by Cardinal Bona. Neither am I ignorant that the miracle related by Durandus, *Rational. Offic.* 1. v. c. 2. as of the life of St. Eugenius, concerning the Ambrosian Office, is just such another story, which deserves no manner of credit, notwithstanding that Ripomontius has endeavored to maintain it. But however we cannot deny the truth of what follows.

First, That this Liturgy has the Psalms, and diverse other texts of Scripture of the ancient version called the Italic.

Secondly, That Walafrius Strabo, who lived in the midst of the ninth century, has cited this Liturgy under the name of the Liturgy of St. Ambrose.

Indeed it seems very probable, that as several centuries before the ninth they had in diverse dioceses fixed a form of Divine service, to be observed in the respective Churches of the same diocese; whereas before, *viz.* in the fourth and fifth century, every Bishop had the liberty of prescribing the form himself; so that of Milan conformed to the same rule, and the name of St. Ambrose was made use of by posterity, as being so very famous, and because that St. Ambrose had probably dictated several of the Collects therein contained; much in the same manner as in the east they have given the name of the Liturgy of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom to the Liturgies which were made use of in the dioceses where these great men once flourished.

It is true, we have not this Liturgy now, preserved to us exactly as it was used in the primitive centuries: it has been variously changed by the rashness of those who succeeded those primitive authors, which has also happened to the greatest part of these works; as is acknowledged by Cardinal Bona and Mabillon. It is likewise true, that since the Popes have been sovereigns of the west, they have, by themselves or by their creatures, brought in a vast number of variations in the books of the public Offices; which changes have been introduced with more ease, since the Latin began to be looked upon as a barbarous language.

We have an illustrious proof hereof in the Ambrosian Office for Good Friday, where we find a prayer for the consecrating of a cross, precedent to its adoration. For it is certain that Pope Adrian the First, who lived towards the end of the eighth century, declares that the Church did not consecrate any images; this being a practice that was introduced long after: and we find in the life of St. Lewis a complaint of that prince concerning this subject; whence it appears that these prayers must needs have been of a very late date.

We have another example hereof, which cannot be disputed; it is in the Canon, where we find at present., these words, *pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel qui tibi offerunt.*, whereas those words *pro quibus tibi offerimus* were foisted in the thirteenth century, as Hugo Menardus doth ingenuously acknowledge upon the book of the Sacraments of St. Gregory. This addition was made after that the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass was received; and indeed it was altogether necessary, since without it there could be no oblation made by the Priest in that pretended sacrifice, which was looked upon as a capital inconvenience.

A third proof hereof we have in the feast of St. Barnabas, who is accounted the first Bishop of Milan, and to whom they attribute the cursing of the heathen temple at Milan, whereupon a part thereof fell down, and crushed several of the idolaters under its ruins, which is a story drawn from legends of no ancient standing.

But after all it is easy to prove that this Liturgy was not at first tainted with any of those errors, wherewith it was filled in the following ages, and in particular since the twelfth century, towards the end of which the Popes took care to change or abrogate all Liturgies whatsoever, that

instead thereof that of Rome might be introduced; following therein the spirit of Pope Adrian, who had begun this work, being supported therein by the favor of the Emperor Charles the Great, who first introduced this spirit of change.

First of all then I maintain that this Liturgy had none of the *Confiteor* of the Priest, as we find it at this day in the Roman missal, which *Confiteor* is at this day made to the blessed Virgin, angels and saints, as well as to God. Now it is certain that this custom is only of late ages: we have an undoubted proof hereof in the *Confiteor* set down by Chrodegandus, Bishop of Metz, who lived in the time of Pepin, father of Charles the Great. *Regube Canonorum*, cap. 18. *Ad primam Clero congregato donant confessiones, suas vicissim dicentes, Confiteor Domino et tibi frater quod peccavi.*

“At the first canonical hour the Clergy being assembled, they make their mutual confessions, saying, I confess to the Lord, and thee my brother, that I have sinned.”

It is necessary to observe here,

1st, That this rule, for the most part of it, is borrowed from that of St. Bennet, who lived in the Pope’s diocese.

Secondly, That the same has been almost wholly transcribed in the Acts of the Council of Aix la Chapelle, in the year 816.

Thirdly, That these confessions to the Virgin, the angels and saints, are not found in any of the ancient forms of confession, whereof we have a considerable number, which may be seen in the notes of Hugo Menardus upon the book of the Sacrament of St. Gregory, p. 224. et seq.

Secondly, I maintain that there was nothing in this Liturgy which implied any direct invocation of the saints, but only it supposeth that they intercede for the Church. We own, that since the fourth century the Church has avowedly demanded several favors of God by the intercession of saints; but we do not find that they prayed directly to them. It is true there are several passages in this Liturgy, wherein favors are begged of God *per preces et merita sanctorum*, by the prayers and merits of the

saints. But the word *merit*, then, contains nothing that can offend us, if we take it in the sense of the primitive Church, as signifying nothing else but godliness. There are a thousand passages that prove this invincibly, as well in St. Ambrose, as in those authors that have succeeded him: and in this Liturgy by *merit* and *to merit* the Church did not pretend to obtain by way of justice, but only to obtain in general, as when we read in the Roman office, *O felix culpa, quoe tantam recruit sattem!*

“O happy fault, which procured so great salvation!”

Thirdly, I maintain that we find therein no other oblation of the bread and wine to God in the action of the Sacrament, but the oblation of the bread and wine to the Priest who officiated, which even to this day is yet practiced by some men and women at Milan, according to the account given us thereof by Cardinal Bona and Mabillon; for otherwise this was absolutely impossible, because the expression of *pro quibus offerimus*, p. 301. made use of by the Priest to denote his action, was never put into the Roman missal until the thirteenth century, as Menardus, a learned Benedictine, doth own. Secondly, Because this notion of offering the Sacrament for a propitiatory sacrifice, is a thing even unknown to the most ancient of the Schoolmen, as our Divines have sufficiently proved from their silence on that question. And certainly this is so strange a notion, that in consequence of it we must hold, that Jesus Christ is sacrificed and offered up to himself; for we find in the prayers of St. Anselm, falsely attributed to St. Ambrose, these expressions, which are very singular, p. 175. *Ut offeram tibi sacrificium quod instituisti, et offerri praecepisti in commemorationem tui pro salute nostra: suscipe vero istud, quaeso, summe Deus, dilectissime Jesu Christe, pro Ecclesia tua sancta.*

“That I may offer to thee the sacrifice thou hast instituted, and commanded to be offered in remembrance of thee, for our salvation: receive it, most high God, dearest Jesus Christ, we beseech thee, for thy holy Church.”

It was necessary for them to change their words, after they had changed their opinion. It was only the belief of transubstantiation, that made way for the belief of a sacrifice properly so called, as the Church of Rome believes at this day. Now it is commonly enough known, that the Romish

Church has hatched that article herself; and the history of this change is so exactly set down, that it is needless to make any stop at it.

Fourthly, This innovation can be demonstratively proved, from this Ambrosian Liturgy alone. And not to mention now, that it contained no office for the Fridays in Lent, which shows, that at that time they believed that the receiving of the Sacrament was a breaking of the fast; upon which account also they call it *vitalia alimenta*,

“food of life,”

and wholly overthrows the notion of transubstantiation.

We find there also this prayer for the Post communion, p. 310. *Pignus vitae aeternae capientes, humiliter to, Dominc, imploramus, ut apostolicis fulti patrociniis, guod in imagine contigimus Sacramenti, manifesta perceptione sumamus.*

“Having received this pledge of eternal life, we humbly beseech thee, O Lord, that being assisted with apostolical suffrages, what we have now touched in the image of the Sacrament, we may by manifest perception take and receive.”

This prayer is found in the missal of Gelasius, and in other ancient missals. Now, according to the observation of Ratramnus, that which is a pledge and image, is so of another thing different from itself.

We find there the Communion under both kinds, p. 207. as well as the preservation of those two inds, and their mixture, p. 304. in such a manner as quite overthrows the notion of concomitance received in the Church of Rome.

We meet there also with this prayer, *Hanc oblationera suscipias in sublimi altari tuo, per manus angelorum tuorum, sicut suscipere dignatus es munerera pueri tuijusti Abel*, etc.

“Receive this offering on thy high altar, from the hands of thy angels, as thou wast pleased to receive the gifts of thy servant righteous Abel.”

p. 302, 303. Which clauses have made the Schoolmen to sweat blood and water, in endeavoring to reconcile them with the notion of the real presence.

We find there also this prayer, which absolutely decides the question, *Aeterne Deus, suppliciter implorantes, ut Filius tuus Jesus Christus, qui se in fine seculi suis promisit fidelibus affuturum, et praesentiae corporalis mysteriis, non deserat quos redemit, et majestatis sure beneficiis non relinquat.*

“Beseeching thee, O eternal God, that thy Son Jesus Christ, who has promised to be with believers to the end of the world, may not forsake those he has redeemed, with respect of the myteries; he may not deprive those whom he has redeemed, of the mysteries of his corporal presenee, nor leave them destitute of the blessings of his majesty.”

It seems evident, that these words,

“the mysteries of his bodily presence,”

signify plainly, that Jesus Christ is absent, with respect to his flesh, though his body be present in its image, which represents it to us.

It is commonly supposed, from the testimony oft the books of the Sacraments attributed to St. Ambrose, that the Ambrosian Liturgy had this clause: *Fac nobis hanc oblationera adscriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.*

“Make this offering to be imputed to us, reasonable and acceptable, which is a figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

And indeed, though the word figure be not found now in Pamelius’s edition of the Ambrosian Liturgy; nevertheless, first, we find, that by a marginal note he refers his reader to St. Ambrose himself, *de Sacram. lib. 5. cap. 5.* Secondly, Pamelius, in his 60th title, where he sets down the words of consecration, cites the place of St. Ambrose with the word *Sgura*. Thirdly, we find it so in the edition of St. Ambrose, printed at Paris in the year 1529. The words are these: *Vis scire quia verbis*

crelestibus consecratur, accipe quae sunt verba. Dicit sacerdos, Fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationera adscriptam, rationabilem et acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi. This passage has been corrupted in other editions; but Paschasius's quoting of it in the year 835, in his treatise of the body and blood of our Lord, confounds the authors of this falsification. But to speak the truth, as I do not believe that these books of the Sacraments were written by St. Ambrose, though Mabillon assures us that they have been found at St. Gal, under his name; so neither have I any certainty that tills prayer was taken out of the Office or Liturgy of St. Ambrose. What passages I have already cited are sufficient to show, that the carnal presence was not then believed by the diocese of Italy. They who are willing to examine the said Liturgy will find many other passages in it, that do invincibly confirm the same truth.

By this we may judge what likelihood there is of finding any thing in this Liturgy concerning the adoration of the Host after consecration: indeed, we are so far from finding any such thing there, that we meet with no hint thereof even in the ages after Paschasius; of which we can give a demonstrative proof, *viz.* that whereas at this day use is made of the adoration of the Host to prove the real presence, none of those that disputed against Berengarius for almost an hundred years together, did mention one word of that proof, which should clearly make out, that Berengarius and Scotus were innovators, by opposing themselves to a belief, which served for a foundation to establish a worship, which the Church had publicly owned and practiced.

I say nothing here concerning that clause made use of in the Ambrosian Liturgy, wherein they pray for the dead, that "sleep the sleep of peace." Thus much is evident, that that prayer is as contrary to the notion of purgatory, as those we find in the Roman Liturgy; as our authors, and Blondel in particular, have showed. The *prayer for the dead*, p. 298. which that Liturgy contains, was founded upon other principles than those which the doctors of Rome at this day admit of; as hath been made out from the confessions of the learned men of that communion themselves. The substance of these prayers is, *that fidelibus vita mutatur, non tollitur, et in timoris Dei obserratione defunctis domicilium perpetuae foelicitatis acquiritur.*

“As to believers, their life [by death] is only changed, not taken away, and that the deceased, who have lived in the observance of the fear of God, do acquire a mansion of perpetual felicity,”

as we find the words in the prayer for many souls, p. 451. Not to insist now, that in the next following prayer the bosom of Abraham is taken for the state of glory; which the Church of Rome contradicts and rejects at present.

I own, that in the Ambrosian Liturgy, p. 341. we find the anointing of the sick and possessed persons mentioned, but only with reference to the obtaining the remission of their sins, and their cure; which cannot be the Roman unction. We find there this clause: *Concede infusione Sancti Spiritus, olim tibi placitam, praesentis old confirmes, nobilitesque substantiam, ut quicquid ex eo in humano genere tacturn fuerit, ad naturam transeat mox supernam.*

“Grant by the infusion of the Holy Spirit, so to strengthen and enrich the substance of this present oil, formerly accepted of by thee, that whosoever of the race of mankind shall therewith be touched, may immediately be exalted to the nature that is from on high.”

What we meet with there likewise concerning the consecration of the chrism used in Confirmation, contains nothing that can give us much trouble. We acknowledge that it is a ceremony which has been practiced since the fourth century, as an appendix to Baptism; neither do we look upon that ceremony as blameworthy, but only so far as the Church of Rome has pretended to make a sacrament of it, properly so called, and thereby to make a ceremony, introduced by men, equal to that which was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ himself. And I have the same thing to say concerning the benediction of the fire and the wax candles at Easter, the benediction of the fonts, and some other ceremonies we meet with there.

Moreover, we find there, as well as in the Roman Liturgy, a prayer wherein remission of sins is begged of God, calling him *non estimator meriti, sed venice donator*;

“not a regarder of merit, but a giver of pardon?”

which expression one of the most famous Schoolmen has looked upon as absolutely contrary to the doctrine of merit, as it is held at present. So likewise, p. 298. we find these words, *Iniquitates meas ne vespexeris, sed sola tua misericordia mihi prosit indigno;*

“Do not thou regard mine iniquities, but let thy alone mercy help me unworthy.”

After all, we must continually remember, that this piece comes from very suspected hands. Pamelius, who is the first that has printed it, confesseth himself to have cut off a great part of it, which he pretends *indeed* to have done only to avoid repetition: but it is well known, that these sort of works must be very exactly inspected, to be well assured of the force of the expressions tilerein contained, and to be able to pass a certain judgment concerning them. I return now to the method I have prescribed to myself.

CHAPTER 8

Opinions of the Churches of Italy during the eighth century.

WE may be informed concerning the state of these Churches, first by the Council of Forojulio, wherein no other Creed is prescribed to the people, but that of the Apostles, nor any other prayer, but the Lord's Prayer; by which, in abstaining from wicked works, men may certainly arrive at salvation. Secondly, by their Bishops assisting at the Council of Francfort, in the year 794. which was a synod of the western Church. Paulinus, Bishop of Aquileia, who was present there, wrote at the same time a book against the doctrine of Foelix, Bishop of Urgel, and Elipandus, Bishop of Toledo, who maintained the opinions of Nestorius. It appears, that he wrote this book by the order of Charles the Great, during the session of that council. He plainly asserts, in this writing, first, that the Bishops were convened there by the orders of Charles the Great; he knew not that it belonged to the Pope alone to regulate matters of faith, and assemble councils. Secondly, that what he attributes to the Church, that she cannot be overcome by heresies, which are the gates of hell, has reference only to the universal Church, very far from attributing this privilege to the Popes, as being the successors of St. Peter. Thirdly, that this Council did not expect their authority from the Pope's confirmation; since they maintain, that Felix and Elipandus ought to be excommunicated *post plenariae synodi judicium*,

“upon judgment passed by a full council.”

I acknowledge, that he seems to give great deference to the authority of Pope Adrian, when he saith, that the followers of Foelix and Elipandus ought to be excommunicated with their masters, *Reservato per omnia juris privilegio summi pontificis domini et patris nostri, Adriani, primis sedis beatissimi Papae;*

“The rightful privileges of the high priest our lord and father Adrian, the most blessed Pope of the principal see, being always reserved entire.”

But it is plain, that he makes use of this condescension for no other reason, but because Charles the Great had desired him to consult Pope Adrian upon so important a question; though indeed, the excommunication being already pronounced, this, after all, could be nothing more than a ceremony, or at the most a wise precaution, to hinder the Pope from engaging himself with a bad party.

We have a certain proof hereof, from the manner how Paulinus and the Bishops of Italy did agree to condemn the definitions of the second Council of Nice, in the year 787, as idolatrous definitions, notwithstanding that Pope Adrian had assisted at that Council by his legates, and though he did his utmost endeavors to maintain them. All authors of the ninth century, and next following, do unanimously testify, that the Council of Francfort, where Paulinus and his fellow deputies of the diocese of Italy were present, did condemn the second Council of Nice, notwithstanding that Theophylact and Stephen, the Pope's legates, assisted at it. We may easily conceive from hence what was the judgment of the Bishops of Italy, with reference to the Pope, and those that joined with him: if they held any communion with the Pope, they did it only with design to bring him back again to the truth; so that they acted conformably to the opinion of the Bishops of France, which is expressed by Jonas, Bishop of Orleans, upon the same occasion, lib. 1. p. 539. and 540. notwithstanding Jonas pronounceth anathema against those that worship images.

I shall say nothing concerning the exhortation which St. Paulinus addresseth to the Bishops, towards the end of his book, that they would pray to God, by the intercession of the holy Virgin and St. Peter, the first pastor of the Church, and of all saints, and by the suffrages of the Council, to defend the Emperor; for we find, after all, that this is only a wish founded on this supposal, that saints, after death, may pray for the welfare of the living; which seems probable enough.

We find also what was the doctrine of Paulinus, Bishop of Aquileia, in the book he wrote against Felix, Bishop of Urgel, at the request of Charles the Great. See how he expresseth himself concerning the Eucharist, in his dedication to Charles the Great, p. 1766, etc. *initio*. He affirms, that the Eucharist consists of bread; he calls it, *buccella et particula panis*,

“a morsel and bit of bread,”

he maintains, that it is either death or life in the mouth of him that eats it, according as he hath or hath not faith: than which nothing could be spoke more clear, to prove that the Eucharist is nothing but bread and substance, and that faith or incredulity makes all the difference that is found amongst communicants.

He refers and applies the character of *priest*, according to the order of Melchizedeck, to the incarnation and cross of Jesus Christ, and not to the sacrifice of the Mass. He thunders out anathemas against all human satisfactions; maintaining, that the blood of none of those that have been redeemed themselves is capable to blot out the least sin, and that that is the privilege of our Savior Jesus Christ alone, p. 1792.

He lays it down as a rule, that the human nature, in Christ is so circumscribed, as to be only in one place, p. 1833. *Natura namque altera, hoc est hominis, erat in terra tanturnmodo; altera ubique in caelo et in terra, hoc est divina. Potuit ergo, quod duo erant, divinum sc. et humanurn, aliud in caelo et ubique esse, et aliud in terra solummodo. Non tamen potuit ille qui unus erat, Filius videlicet Dei et hominis, non torus ubique esse, in caelo pariter et in terra. Ubique sane torus quia unus est et omnipotens Deus; unus idemque omnipotentis Dei, et heminis Filius. Humana namque natura non descendit, nec fuit ibi priusquam, in Deum assumpta, ascenderet corporaliter in coelum. Filius autem hominis quia unus idemque ipse est Filius Dei, et de caelo descendit, unde nunquam discesserat, et in caelo erat, cure loqueretur in terra; et in terram venit ubi erat, et in coelum ascensurus erat per id quod homo est, et ibi ascendit ubi erat prius, per id quod Deus est. Domini namque sunt verba dicentis, Nemo ascendit in coelum, nisi qui descendit de caelo, Filius hominis qui est in caelo.*

“One of his natures, the human, was only upon earth: the other, that is, the Divine nature, was every where, both in heaven and on earth: wherefore, because these were two natures, *viz.* the Divine and human, the one of them could be in heaven, and every where, and the other only on earth. Yet notwithstanding, he who was the only Son both of God and man, could not but be wholly every where, both in heaven and on earth; whole every where, because he is the one and omnipotent God; one and God Almighty, and the

one Son of Almighty God and man. For the human nature did not come down from heaven, neither was it there, till being taken up to God, it ascended corporally into heaven. And because the Son of man is one and the same with the Son of God, therefore he came down from heaven, from whence he never departed, and was in heaven while he spoke here upon earth; and he came down to the earth, where he was before, and was to ascend into heaven, as he was man, and as he was God, he ascended where he was before; for they are the words of our Lord, No man ascends up into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, who is in heaven.”

Which is the same opinion we find expressed in the Council of Forojulio, in the year 791. in which Paulinus Bishop of Aquileia presided. *T. 7. Conc. p. 1001.*

He asserts, that in celebrating the Eucharist we feed upon the Divine nature of Jesus Christ, which cannot be said, but only with respect to believers, and must be understood metaphorically; which plainly shows what his belief was concerning the oral manducation of the body of Jesus Christ, p. 1836. *Vel qua ratione si adoptivus filius est, qui non manducat carnero Filii hominis, et non bibit ejus sanguinere, non habet vitam aeternam? Oui manducat, et bibit, meam carnem, et bibit meum sanguinere, habet vitam aeternam, et ego resuscitabo eum in novissimo die. Caro mea vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus. Resuscitandi in novissimo die potestas nulli alio nisi veto permanet Deo. Cato namque et sanguis ad humanam, per quam Filius hominis est, non ad Divinam referri potest naturam. Et tamen si ille Filius hominis cui haec caro et sanguis est, pro eo quod unus idemque sit Dei et hominis Filius, si Deus verus non esset, caro ejus et sanguis manducantibus et bibentibus se, nullo modo vitam praestaret aeternam. Unde et Johannes Evangelista ait, Et sanguis Filii ejus lavat nos ab omni peccato. Aut cujus caro et sanguis dat vitam manducantibus et bibentibus se, nisi Filii hominis, quem Deus signavit Pater, qui est verus et omnipotens Filius Dei? Nam et panis vivus pro nobis descendit de coelo, qui dat vitam mundo; qui ex eo manducaverit non moritur in aeternum: ipse enim dicit, Ego sum panis vivus, qui de coelo descendi. Sic quippe descendit panis vivus de coelo, qui*

semper manebat in coelo, sicut Filius hominis descendit de coelo, qui quoniam unus idemque erat Filius Dei, nunquam deseruit coelum.

“Or how, if he be an adopted son only, is it said, that he who doth not eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, hath not eternal life? He that eats, saith he, my flesh, and drinks my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. The power of raising up at the last day belongs to none, but the true God; for the flesh and blood cannot be referred to his Divine, but to his human nature, by which he is the Son of man: and yet, if that Son of man, whose this flesh and blood is, (for that one and the same person is both the Son of God and the Son of man,) were not true God, his flesh and blood could not procure eternal life to those that eat them. And therefore John the Evangelist saith, And the blood of his Son cleanseth us from all sin. Or, whose flesh and blood gives life to those that eat and drink them, but the Son of man’s, whom God the Father hath sealed, who is the true and Almighty Son of God; for He, the bread of life, is come down from heaven for us, who gives life unto the world, and whosoever eats thereof shall live for ever: for he himself saith, I am the bread of life that came down from heaven: for this bread of life came down from heaven, which also always stayed in heaven, in the same manner as the Son of man came down from heaven, who, because he is also the Son of God, never left heaven.”

We cannot meet with a more orthodox explication of the office of Mediator and Advocate, than that is which he sets down, or a greater precaution than he gives us, not to look upon the saints as mediators, *p. 1790 Mediator igitur ab eo, quod medius sit intra utrasque dissidentium partes, et reconciliet ambos in unum*, etc. *Denique non Paulus mediator, sed legatus fidelis Mediatoris; Legationera, inquit, fungimur pro Christo, reconciliamini Deo. Advocatus namque est, qui jam pro reconciliatis interpellat, quemadmodum idem Redemptor noster facit, cum humanam Deo Patti, in unitate Dei, hominisque personae, naturam ostendit, Hoc est enim Deum Pattern pro nobis interpellare. Joannes non interpellate, sed ipsum etiam esse propitiationera pro peccatis nostris declarat.*

“Wherefore he is called the Mediator, because he is a middle person between both the disagreeing parties, and reconciles them together in one,” etc.

“Lastly, Paul is not a mediator, but a faithful ambassador of the Mediator. We are ambassadors for Christ, and the sum of our embassy is, Be ye reconciled to God. An advocate is one that intercedes for those that are already reconciled, even as our Redeemer doth, when he shows his human nature to God the Father, in the unity of his Person, who is God-man; for this is truly to intercede with God the Father for us. John doth not say, that he intercedes for us, but declares him to be a propitiation for our sins.”

He clearly shows in the same place, p. 1792. that he did not look upon the saints as redeemers, but Jesus Christ alone, according to the signification of his name; since none of them, who have been redeemed themselves, are able to blot out sin. *Erehim omnipotentis Dei Filius, omnipotent Dominus noster, quia pretio sanguinis sui nos redemit, jure Redemptor, verus omnium redemptorum vocibus predicatur. Non, inquam, ille redemptus, quia nunquam captivus; nos veto redempti, quia fuimus captivi, venditi sub peccato, obligati nimirum in eo chirographo decreti, quod ipse tulit de medio, delens sanguine suo, quod nullius alius redemptorum deletere potuit sanguis, addixit illud, palam triumphans in semetipso.*

“For the Son of the Almighty God, our Almighty Lord, because he has redeemed us with the price of his blood, is justly called the true Redeemer, by all that are redeemed by him. He, I say, was not redeemed, because he was never captive; but we are redeemed, who were captives, sold under sin, and bound by the handwriting that was against us, which he took away, blotting it out with his blood, which the blood of no other redeemer could do, and fixed it to his cross, openly triumphing over it in himself.”

It plainly appears, that he had no other notion concerning the obscurity of Scripture than we have, by his reproaching Foelix, that he had done according to St. Peter’s discourse concerning the writings of St. Paul. p. 1795, and 1796.

He doth not own, that the Church was founded on St. Peter, but on Jesus Christ, p. 1800 and 1801. *Et licet esset primus in ordine Apostolorum, ideo tamen diu siluit, quia non Dominus quid illi, pro quibus solus Petrus responsurus erat, sed quid homines de Filio hominis aestimarent, explorare dignatus est.*

“And though he were the first amongst the Apostles, yet he did not speak for some time, because the Lord did not inquire what they, for whom only Peter was to answer, but what men thought of the Son of man.”

He lays it down as an inviolable maxim of Christianity, that we cannot believe but in God only, in opposition to that which is taught by the Church of Rome.

He wholly overthrows the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin, p. 1808. ad finem. *Ipse quippe solus et singulariter de Spiritu Sancto conceptus, et natus ex Virgine, a vulva sine peccato prodit Deus et homo.*

“For he alone being in a singular manner, conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin, came forth from the womb without sin, both God and man.”

If any one will take the pains to examine the opinions of this Bishop, he will find it an hard thing not to take notice, that he denies what the Church of Rome affirms, with relation to all these articles; and that he affirms what the Church of Rome denies: and whatever colourable arts may be employed, it will be very hard not to perceive this opposition through them all.

I join with St. Paulinus of Aquileia, Paulus Diaconus of the same Church, who, forasmuch as he was very famous towards the end of the eighth, and about the beginning of the ninth century, we have reason not to pass over his opinions without some notice taken of them; and the rather doth his judgment deserve a more particular consideration, because he was born in Lombardy, was Deacon of the Church of Aquileia, whence he was removed by Charles the Great, after his having taken Desiderius, the last king of the Lombards, prisoner, and was honored with the favor of Charles the Great. We have several of his pieces, but I shall content myself with two of his treatises, the one whereof is the Life of St. Gregory the Great,

because the Papists believe they have found in that book an invincible proof for transubstantiation; the other is, the collection of homilies he made for all the festival days of the year, by the order of Charles the Great, and which that Emperor authorized by his approbation.

He tells us, in the Life of St. Gregory, that a Roman lady, who was used to make the bread herself which she offered for the Communion, smiling when St. Gregory offered a piece of it to her in the Eucharist, St. Gregory perceiving it, took back the piece of bread, and gave it to the Deacon, to keep it till the Communion was over, at which time he demanded of her why she had laughed to which she answered, that it was because he called that the body of our Lord, which she knew to be a piece of the same bread she had offered. Whereupon St. Gregory made a sermon to the people, exhorting them to beg of God, that he would be pleased to manifest that to them, which that unbelieving woman could not see with the eyes of faith. After prayer, he draws near to the altar, lifts up the corporal pall that covered the piece of bread, and shows them the top of his little finger stained with blood, *ac mulieri dixit, Disce, inquam, veritati vel modo jam credere contestant, Panis, quem ego do, caro mea est, et sanguis meus vere est potus. Sed prcescius Conditor noster infirmitatis nostree, ea potestate, qua cunctaecit exnihilo, et corpus sibi, ex carne semper Virginis, operante Sancto Spiritu fabricavit, panera et vinum aqua mixturn, mancute propria specie in carnero et sanguinem suum, ad Catholicam precem, ob reparatioem nostram, Spiritus Sancti sancticatione convertit.*

“and said to the woman, Learn, I say, from henceforward, at least to believe Truth itself, which saith, *The bread which I give is my flesh, and my blood is drink indeed.* But our Creator foreseeing our weakness, by the same power by which he made the world of nothing, and made himself a body; by the operation of the Holy Ghost, of the flesh of the ever Virgin, has by the sanctification of the Holy Spirit converted the bread and wine mixed with water, still remaining under their own kind, into his flesh and blood, at the catholic prayer, for our salvation.”

This done, he commanded all the people to beg of God, *ut in formam pristinam sacrosancturn reformaret mysterium, quatenus mulieri ad sumendure fuisset possibile*; that he would change that

holy mystery into the form it had before, so as the woman might be able to take it; which happening accordingly, strengthened the faith of that lady, and of all the people that were present.”

I shall not examine at present, whether this history be a fable or not: sure it is, that most of the particulars it contains seem to be of that character, or at least we find none there, whose truth is attested by witnesses that lived at the time of St. Gregory, or soon after. But let this be as it will, I deny that these miracles, whereof we have some other instances in the book entitled, *Vitae Patrum*, can be of any use to confirm the doctrine of transubstantiation, as Mabillon pretends in the margin of this relation; and that consequently Paulus Diaconus, who relates the same, did not believe transubstantiation.

First, I deny, that by the word *species* ever any one, speaking of bread, understood any other thing than the substance of bread. Let them prove to us, that the word *species* did ever heretofore signify the accidents only; this being a notion which transubstantiation gave birth to some ages after that wherein Paulus Diaconus lived.

Secondly, I deny, that from this apparition we can infer the real presence; we may indeed from thence conclude a virtual presence, but nothing more. The consequence is so clear, that it hath been acknowledged by the Schoolmen, whilst they were inquiring, what might be concluded from these kind of apparitions of the flesh of a child, of blood in the Eucharist.

And indeed, if any such thing were to be inferred from these apparitions, we ought also to conclude the contrary; for there have been miracles quite opposite to these now related. I will instance in a very notable one. A SeverJan heretic having locked up the Eucharist, that his servant, who was a Catholic, had put in his trunk, as Moschus tells us, c. 79. he found ears of corn in the stead of it. Was the substance of bread here returned again, and did it afterwards bring forth ears of corn? Those of the Romish Church are very far from believing any such tiling. We read also in the Life of Melanius Bishop of Rhennes, that the Eucharist was changed into a serpent, to punish the superstition of Marsus, who had preferred the keeping of a fast to the receiving of the Communion, and that afterwards

the said serpent was changed into the Eucharist again at the prayer of Melanias, and was then received by Marsus.

Besides, Paulus Diaconus himself shows us in his following relation, what he would have us to conclude from this sort of miracles. He tells us, that a great lord having sent his ambassadors to Rome, to obtain some relics of the Apostles and Martyrs, that St. Gregory, instead of the relics they desired, gave them only some pieces of consecrated cloth, which he severally put up into boxes, and delivered them unto the ambassadors, having first sealed the boxes with his own seal. And adds, that the ambassadors being seized with a curiosity, on their journey homeward, to know what those boxes contained, they had been strangely surprised, upon opening of them, to find nothing there but some scraps of cloth, which made them return back to Rome, to make their complaint, that, instead of the bones of Martyrs or Apostles, they had given them nothing but some bits of cloth. Upon these complaints made by the ambassadors to the Archdeacon, St. Gregory commandeth them to come to church, and exhorted the people to pray to God; *Quatenus in hac re dignetur apertissime sic suam potentiam patefacere, ut quid mereatur fides, evidentius minus eruditi et ignorantes possint cognoscere, let data oratione accepit cultellum qui temeraverat signa, et super altare corporis sancti Petri, acceptam unam panni portionera per medium pungens secuit, ex qua statim sanguis decurrit, et omnem candem portiunculam cruentavit. Videntes autem suprascripti legatarii, et omnes populi, stupendum et arcanum fidei sacræ miraculum, ceciderunt proni in terrain, adorantes Dominum, dicentes, Mirabilis Deus in sanctis suis, Deus Israel, ipse dabit virtutem et firmitudinem plebisuræ, benedictus Deus. Et facto silentio, inter alia fidei documenta, dixit ad eos beatus Gregorius, qui ante has venerandas reliquias parvi duxerant, Scitote, fratres, quia in consecratione corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu, cum ob sanctificationem reliquiarum in honore Apostolorum vel Martyrum ipsius quibus specialiter assignabantur; supra sacrosanctum altare libamina offerebantur, semper illorum sanguis hos pannos intravit qui effusus est pro nomine Christi Domini nostri.*

“That he would be pleased so openly to declare his power on this occasion, that the unbelievers and the ignorant might know what faith is able to effect. And prayer being ended, he took the knife

wherewith the seals had been broke open, and laying one of those pieces of cloth upon the holy altar of St. Peter, he struck the knife through it, from whence immediately blood gushed forth, which stained the whole piece of cloth: whereupon the ambassadors and all the people beholding this astonishing and mysterious miracle of holy faith, fell flat down with their faces to the ground, and worshipped the Lord, saying, Wonderful is the Lord in his saints, the God of Israel, he shall give virtue and strength to his people, blessed be God. And after silence was made, amongst other instructions in the faith, St. Gregory said unto them, who before had undervalued these venerable relics, Know ye, brethren, that in consecrating the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, when for the sanctification of relics in honor of the Apostles or Martyrs, whose they were, drink offerings were offereft on the holy altar, their blood, which was shed for the name of Jesus Christ, always entered these pieces of cloth.”

This is that they call *Brandcure*, mentioned by Sigebert, upon the year 441, when he says, that St. Leo had brought it into request. True it is, that this fable is of a sort unknown to all antiquity; but, however, it proves thus much, that these apparitions of blood in the Host suppose no more than the virtue of the blood of Jesus Christ.

As to the homilies of the primitive Fathers, whereof Paulus Diaconus made a collection, it is very surprising to find not so much as one inserted amongst them, whence we can pick this doctrine of the real presence, if he with the Church of his time had conceived this to have been the doctrine of the primitive Church. We find indeed in this his collection some homilies of St. Leo, *Feriae* 2, 3, 4. and some others, which treat of the sacrament of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ substituted instead of the Passover: but we find this matter so drily handled in them, that it is hard to conceive how these expressions of antiquity could satisfy a man who had been tinged with the doctrine of Paschasius.

As for those other Romish doctrines, which at this day are made the leading points of religion, we may boldly say, that we can find nothing of them in this collection of homilies, amongst which there are many of St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, and Maximus, Bishop of Turin, whose belief

we have already given a sufficient account of: the rest of this collection consists for the most part of the homilies of Origen, St. Jerome, St. Austin, St. Chrysostom, and venerable Bede, whose opinions are well known; there being scarce any of these authors, whose belief has not been represented in particular, to make it appear how far they were from concurring with the opinions of the Church of Rome about the principal doctrines, which at this day are the causes of the separation of the Protestants from that Church.

CHAPTER 9

Opinions of the Church of Italy during the ninth century.

WE are now come to the ninth century, wherein after this diocese had been subject to several princes it came into the hands of Charles the Great and his successors. We have already seen how the Prelates of this diocese, at the Council of Francfort, opposed themselves to superstition, which then began to gather strength. But we shall perceive this more clearly in the sequel of this discourse. It cannot be denied, but that the state of the Church in general was, as it were, wholly overthrown. Angilbertus, Bishop of Milan, gives us a most sad representation of it, in the relation which he gives to Ludovicus Pius.

“To our great sorrow,” saith he, “we have found, that scarce ought of holiness or sincerity is left in the Church, and the corruptions are crept into it;”

which afterwards he instanceth in particular: and I doubt not but Italy had her share of the infection. Indeed superstition could not but increase under the shelter of so profound a negligence of the pastors, as did then obtain: but the Divine providence was pleased to provide a remedy against it by means of Claudius, Bishop of Turin. And since Claudius had a great share in defending of the truth in this diocese of Italy, where God had placed him, and that by this means he has been extremely exposed to the calumnies of the Romish party; it will be very well worth our pains, to represent here these three things, his character, his writings, and his opinions.

This Claudius was born in Spain; he had been a disciple of Foelix, Bishop of Urgel; he was for some years in the court of Ludovicus Pius amongst his Chaplains; and being endowed with great talents for a preacher, when Lewis was advanced to the empire, he caused him to be ordained Bishop of Turin. It will probably be imagined, that he had borrowed from Foelix, Bishop of Urgel, the companion of Elipandus, the opinions of Nestorianism: but whosoever thinks so, will find himself mistaken; for his character of a great preacher, which had procured him the esteem of the Emperor, and his long continuance in Lewis’s court, during the life of

Charles the Great, a court where that opinion, since the condemnation of Foelix and Elipandus, at Francfort, in 794, was very much had in detestation, are sufficient to purge him from any such suspicion. But over and above all this, his writings upon the Scripture show him to have been very far from that opinion; for we find in several passages unquestionable evidences of his orthodox judgment in this point. What he saith upon the 25th of St. Matthew, verse 31. is decisive in this matter; and yet he expresseth himself more strongly, if it be possible, on Matthew 22. verse 2. Neither is it less easy to purge him of another calumny, which was east upon him after his death, by Jonas, Bishop of Orleans, who, in his preface to king Charles the Bald, accuseth him for having endeavored to revive the sect of Arius. I thought at first, that this was only a fault of the transcriber, who had writ Arius for Aerijs; but the manner of Jonas's expressing himself has made me retract my first conjecture: however, it is no less easy to refute this calumny, than it was to clear him from the first suspicion. In a word, we do not find any thing like it in so many books writ by him, and we find that which is contrary to it on Matthew 12. verse 25. Let them make out to us, that any such thing was found amongst his papers after his death, as Jonas seems to insinuate, and we shall believe that Jonas was not over apt to give credit to those men, whose only aim was to bespatter the reputation of Claudius, and to make it odious and detestable to posterity, because he cried down their superstition and idolatry. Except they perform this, we must still look upon this accusation as a mere calumny.

As for the works of this great man, we may affirm, there were few in his time who took so much pains to explain the Scripture, or to oppose themselves against the torrent of superstition.

He wrote three books upon Genesis in the year 815. He made a commentary on St. Matthew, which he published the same year, dedicating it to Justus, Abbot of Charroux.

He published a commentary upon the Epistle to the Galatians in the year 816, and dedicated it to Dructeramnus, a famous abbot, who had exhorted him to write comments upon all St. Paul's Epistles.

He wrote a commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians, which he dedicated to Ludovicus Plus, who commanded him to comment upon St.

Paul's Epistles; which dedicatory epistle of his has been published by Mabillon.

He made a commentary upon Exodus, in four books, which he published in the year 821, dedicating them to the Abbot Theodemirus.

He made also another on Leviticus, which he published in the year 823, and dedicated it to the same Abbot. Oudin tells us, he hath seen a commentary of his on the Book of Ruth, in a library in Hainault.

Of all these his works, there is nothing printed but his commentary upon the Epistle to the Galatians. The monks of St. Germain have his commentary upon all the Epistles in MS. in two volumes, which were found in the library of the abbey of Fleury, near Orleans. They have also his MS. commentaries on Leviticus, which formerly belonged to the library of St. Remy at Rheims. As for his commentary on St. Matthew, there are several MS. copies of it in England, as well as elsewhere.

We may judge in what credit and esteem the doctrine of Claudius was at that time, by the earnestness wherewith the Emperor Ludovicus Plus, and the most famous Abbots of those times, pressed him to explain the holy Scripture in his writings. We may also conclude the same, from his being promoted to the episcopal dignity in a place where the superstition in reference to images obliged the Emperor to provide them with a Bishop that was both learned and vigorous; for Jonas of Orleans cannot dissemble, but that it was upon this very consideration, that the Emperor made a particular choice of Claudius to be consecrated Bishop of Turin. Moreover, this see was not an ordinary bishopric, but a very considerable metropolis in the diocese of Italy; but it was not till some time after, that the title of Archbishops was bestowed upon Metropolitans.

The time wherein he was advanced to the episcopal dignity is not certainly known. Father Le Cointe conjectures, very probably, that it was in the year 817. But whether that be so or no, sure it is, that Claudius, in his illustration of the Scripture, plainly showed himself to be very free from those errors which at this day are in vogue in Romish communion.

We need only read his commentary upon the Epistle to the Galatians, to assure us, that he every where asserts the equality of all the Apostles with St. Peter, though the occasions seemed naturally to engage him to establish

the primacy of St. Peter, and that of his pretended successors. This we find in ten several passages of that commentary; he only declares the primacy of St. Peter to consist in the honor he had of founding the Church both amongst the Jews and Gentiles, p. 810. And indeed every where throughout his writings he maintains, that Jesus Christ is the only Head of the Church.

He overthrows the doctrine of merits in such a manner as overthrows all the nice distinctions of the Papists on that subject.

He pronounces anathemas against traditions in matter of religion: so far was he from giving occasion to others to suspect, that he made them a part of the object of his faith, as the Church of Rome at present doth.

He maintains, that faith alone saves us, which is the point that so extremely provoked the Church of Rome against Luther, who asserted the same thing.

He holds the Church to be subject to error, opposite to what at this day the Romanists pretend in so unreasonable a manner.

He denies, that prayers after death may be of any use to those that have demanded them.

He very smartly lashed the superstition and idolatry, which then began to be renewed, being supported by the authority of the Roman see.

These things we find in his commentary upon the Epistle to the Galatians; but the other writings of this great man, manuscript and printed, show us yet more of his mind. Indeed, we find him giving very public marks of his zeal for the purity of religion in several points. First, he proposeth the doctrine of the Church, in reference to the Eucharist, in a manner altogether conformable to the judgment of antiquity, following therein the most illustrious doctors of the Christian Church, and showing that he was, as to that matter, at the farthest distance from the opinions which Paschasius Radbertus advanced eighteen or nineteen years after that Claudius had writ his commentary upon St. Matthew. Claudius's own words, as they were taken from a MS. of M. Theyet, are these:

Coenantibus autem eis, accepit Jesus panem, et benedixit ac fregit, deditque discipulis suis, et ait, Accipite et comedite, hoc est corpus meum. Finitis

paschac veteris solenniis, qua in commemorationem antiqua de AEGypto libemtionis populi Dei agebantur, translit ad novum, quod in sure redemptionis memoriam Ecclesiam frequentare volebat : ut videlicet etpro came agni ac sanguine sui corpotis sanguinisque sacramentum substitueret, ipsumque se esse monstraret, cui juravit Dominus, et non poenitebit eum, Tu es sacerdos in actemum secundum ordinem Melchisedec. Frangit autem ipse panem quem discipulis porrigit, ut ostendat corporis sui fractionem non absque sua sponte ac procuratione venturam; sed sicut alibi dicit, potestatem se habere ponendi animam suam, et potestatem se habere irerum sumendi eam. Quem videlicet panem certi quoque gratia sacramenti, priusquam frangeret benedixit. Quia naturam humanam quam passurus assumpsit, ipse una cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto gratia divince virtutis implevit. Benedixit panem, et fregit, quia hominem assumptum ita morti subdere dignatus est, ut et divince immortalitatis vemiciter inesse potentJam demonstraret, Ideoque velocius eum a morte resuscitandum esse doceret. Et accipiens calicem, gratias egit, et dedit illis, dicens, Bibire ex hoc omnes. Cum appropinquare passioni dicitur, accepto pane et calice, gratiam egisse perhibetur, gratias itaque egit qui flagella alienoe iniquitatis suscepit. Et qui nihil dighum percussioni exhibuit, humiliter in percussione benedixit. Ut hinc videlicet ostendat, fuid unusquisque in fagello culpac propriac facere debeat. si ipse acquamiter flagella culpac portat alienoe; ut hinc ostendat, quid in correptione faciat subditus, si in dqagello positus Patti gratias agit aqualis. Hic est enim sanguis meus novi testamenti, qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Quia panis corpus confirmat, vinum vero sanguinem opemtur in came; hic ad corpus Christi mystice, illud refertur ad sanguinem. Verum quia et nos in Christo, et in nobis Christum manere oportet, vinum Dominici calicis aqua miscetur. Attestante enim Johanne, aquae populi sunt. Et neque aquam solam, neque solum vinum, sicut nec granum frumenti solum sine admixtione aquae et confectione, in panem cuiquam licet offerre, ne videlicet oblatio talis quasi caput a membro secemendum esse significet, et vel Christum sine nostrac redemptionis amore pati potuisse, vel nos sine illius passione salvari ac Patri offerri posse confingat. Quod autem dicit, Hic est sanguis meus novi testamenti, ad distinctionem respicit veteris testamenti, quod hircorum et vitulorum est sanguine dedicatum; dicente inter aspergendum legislatore, Hic est sanguis testamenti, quod mandavit ad vos Deus. Necesse est enim exemplaria

quidem verorum his mundari; ipsa autem coelestia melioribus hostiis quam istis, juxta quod Apostolus per totam ad Hebracos Epistolam, inter Legem distinguens et Evangelium, pulcherrima expositione ac plenaria ratione declarat. Dicto autem vobis, Non bibam amodo de hoc genimine vitis usque in diem illum cum illud bibam vobiscum novum in regno Patris mei. Vitem sive vineam Domini appellatam esse synagogam, et omnis sparsim Scriptura et apertius testatur Isaias in cantico de illo cantato, Vineam, inquiens, Domini Sabaoth, domus Israel est. De qua nimirum vinea Dominus multo tempore bibebat, quamvis pluribus ramis in amaritudinem vitis alienae conversis, quod tamen etsi multis in illa plebe exorbitantibus a recto fidei itinere, non defuere plurimi toto Legis tempore, quorum piis cogitationibus summisque virtutibus delectaretur Deus. Verum passo in carne Domino, ac resurgente a mortuis, tempus fuit ut legalis illa et figuralis observatio cessaret, atque ea quae secundum litteram gerebantur, in spiritalem translata sensum, melius in novum testamentum, juvante Sancti Spiritus gratia, tenerentur. Iturus igitur ad passionem Dominus ait, Jam non bibam de hoc genimine vitis usque in diem illum cum illud bibam vobiscum novum in regno Patris mei. Ac si aperte dicat, Non ultra carnalibus synagogae ceremoniis delectabor, in quibus etiam ista paschalis agni sacra locum tenuere praecipuum: aderit enim tempus meae resurrectionis: aderit dies ille cum ipse in regno Dei positus, id est, gloria vitae immortalis sublimatus, de salute populi ejusdem fonte gratiae spiritualis regenemti, novo vobiscum gaudio perfundat. **Item** quod ait, Non bibam amodo de hoc genimine vitis usque in diem illum cum illud bibam vobiscum novum in regno Patris mei, vult intelligi hoc vetus esse, cum illud novum dicit; quia ergo de propagine Adam, quivetus homo appellatur, corpus suscepit, quod in passione morti traditurus erat: unde etiam per vini sacramentum commendat sanguinem suum, quid aliud novum vinum nisi immortalitatem renovatorum corporum intelligere debemus? Quod cum dicit, Vobiscum bibam, etiam ipsis resurrectionem corporum ad induendam immortalitatem promittit. Vobiscum enim non ad idem tempus, sed ad eandem innovationem dictum, accipiendum est. Nam et nos dicit Apostolus resurrexisse cum Christo, ut spe rei futurae iam lactitiam praesentem afferat. quod autem de hoc genimine vitis etiam illud novum esse dicit, significat utique eadem corpora resurrectura secundum innovationem coelestem, quae nunc secundum vetustatem moritura sunt. Si hanc vitem de cujus vetustate nunc passionis calicem bibit, ipsos Judaeos

intellexeris, significatum est etiam ipsam gentem ad corpus Christi per invitatem vitæ accessuram; cum ingressa plenitudine gentium, omnis Israel salvus fiet. Et hymno dicto exierunt in montem Oliveti; hoc est quod in Psalmo legimus, Edent pauperes, et saturabuntur; et laudabunt Dominum qui requirunt eum: Potest autem et hymnus etiam ille intelligi quem Dominus secundum Johannem Patri gratias agens decantabat, in quo et pro seipso, et pro discipulis, et pro eis qui per verbum eorum credituri erant, elevatis oculis sursum precabatur. Et pulchre discipulos sacramentis sui coporis ac sanguinis imbutos, et hymno piæ intercessionis Patri commendatos, in montem educit Olivarum, ut typice designet nos per acceptionem sacramentorum suorum, perque open suæ intercessionis, ad altiora virtutum, ut carismate Sancti Spiritus in corde pergungamur, conscendere debere.

“The Apostles being sate down at table, Jesus Christ took bread, blessed and brake it, and gave of it to his disciples, saying to them, Take this and eat it, this is my body. The ancient ceremonies of the ancient Passover, which were used in memory of the deliverance of the people of Israel, being finished, he passeth on to the new, because he would have the same to be celebrated in his Church in commemoration of the mystery of her redemption, and to substitute the Sacrament of his body and of his blood, instead of the flesh and blood of the paschal lamb, and to show that it was he himself to whom God had sworn, and shall never repent of it; Thou art the eternal Priest according to the order of Melchizedeck. Moreover, he himself breaks the bread which he gives to his disciples, that he might represent and make it appear, that the breaking of his body would not be contrary to his inclination, or without his willingness to die: but, as he saith elsewhere that he had power to give his life, and to deliver it up himself, as well as to take it again, and raise himself from the dead. He blessed the bread before he broke it, to assure us, that he intended to make a Sacrament of it; and forasmuch as he had taken human nature upon him, that he might suffer, he with his Father and the Holy Spirit filled the same with the grace of a virtue which was altogether divine; and because he was pleased to submit the human nature he had taken upon him, to death, he would make it appear, that the

said humanity was possessed of a true and natural power to raise itself: whereby he taught us, that the same would rise more readily from the dead. And taking the cup, he gave thanks to his Father, and gave it them to drink, saying, *Drink ye all of it.* When he drew near to the time of his death and passion, it is said, that having taken the bread and the cup, he gave thanks to his eternal Father. He therefore who had taken upon him to expiate the iniquities of others, gave thanks to his Father, without having done any thing that was worthy of death: he blesseth it with a profound humility, at the very time that he saw himself loaden with stripes; without doubt to instruct us, what every one of us ought to do when we find ourselves lashed with the whip and sting of our conscience: for, if he who was innocent endured with meekness and tranquillity the stripes due to the iniquity of others; this was to teach and instruct us what he ought to do that is obnoxious, when he is corrected for his own transgressions. If he suffered with an equal mind the scourge due for the sins of others, this teaches us what a subject ought to do when under the Divine corrections; when he who is equal to the Father gave thanks to him when under his scourges: *For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for you all, for the remission of sin;* because he assures us, that the bread becomes his body, and that the wine doth operate and produce his blood in the flesh. The bread represents to us his mystical body, and the wine is the symbol of his blood. But, because we must abide in Christ, and Christ must abide in us, we mingle water with the wine in the cup of the Lord. And, as St. John witnesseth, the people are water, and it is not permitted to any body to offer water alone, no more than the wine alone; in like manner as it is forbidden to offer the grains of wheat, without their being mingled with water, and so reduced to bread, for fear lest such an oblation might signify, that the Head ought to be separated from its members, and that Jesus Christ could have suffered, without an extreme love and desire of our redemption; or that this oblation did not give us ground to believe, that we might be saved, or offered up to his Father without the mystery of his passion. As for his saying, *This is my blood of the new testament,* it is that we might make a distinction between the new covenant and the old,

which was consecrated with the effusion of the blood of goats and oxen, as the Lawgiver said at the sprinkling of it; *This is the blood of the covenant which God has commanded you*: for it is necessary that the patterns of true things should be purified by these; but that the heavenly places should be purified with more excellent sacrifices, according to what the Apostle St. Paul declares throughout his whole Epistle to the Hebrews, where he makes a distinction between the Law and the Gospel. He declares, by an excellent and ample explication, *Verily, verily, this I say unto you, I will drink no more of the vine, till I shall drink it new in the kingdom of my Father*. The whole Scripture openly declares, that the synagogue is called the Vine of the Lord; the Prophet Isaiah openly sets this forth in his song, where he speaks of it in these words; *The house of Israel is the Lord's Vine*. It is indeed of this vine that the Lord drank large draughts, though many branches thereof were infected with the bitterness of a strange Vine; and though in the mean time many of the people are gone astray from the true way of the faith, yet there were still found a great many, during the whole time of the Law, who glorified God by their holy and godly thoughts, and by the practice of their heroical virtues. But Jesus Christ having suffered in the flesh that was capable of suffering, and being raised from the dead, the time is come that hath put an end to these legal and figurative observations: all those things that were observed according to the letter, have been changed into a spiritual sense, and have been confirmed in the new testament by the grace of the Holy Ghost. Jesus Christ then going to suffer, saith, *I shall drink no more of this juice of the vine, until the day that I shall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father*. As if he had plainly said, I will no longer take delight in the carnal ceremonies of the synagogue amongst the number of which the great festival of the paschal lamb was one of the chiefs for this shall be the time of my resurrection; that very day I shall be lifted up to the kingdom of heaven, that is to say, to the kingdom of a new life of immortality; I shall be filled together with you with a new joy for the salvation of my people, which shall be born again in the spring of one and the same grace. In like manner also when he saith, *I shall not drink of this juice of the vine, until the day that I*

shall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father, he would be understood of the old testament, when he calls it the new: and therefore since he had taken a body from the family of Adam, who is called the old man, and that this his body was now to be exposed to death; *it is for this reason that by the sacrament of wine he recommends to us his blood*. What are we to understand by this new wine but the immortality of our renewed bodies? For when he saith, I will drink it with you, he promiseth to them also the resurrection of their bodies, in order to their being clothed with immortality. For this word *vobiscum* (with you) must not be taken as spoken of the same time, but as importing that the disciples should in time to come be renewed, as well as he. For doth not the Apostle say, that we are all raised again with Christ, that our future resurrection might afford us present joy? And whereas he saith, of this juice of *the vine*, and calls it also new, this for certain signifies, that the same bodies must be raised again, according to the rules of an altogether heavenly renovation, though at present they must die, according to the old man. If you understand the Jews by this vine, from the oldness of which he at present now drinks the cup of his passion; it hath also been signified to us, that that nation must approach to the body of Jesus Christ by the change of a new life: *The whole house of Israel shall be saved, together with all its company, which shall enter with them*. After they had sung a hymn, they went to the mount of Olives. This is that which we read in the Psalmist, *The poor shall eat and be filled; and they that seek the Lord shall praise him*. This hymn may be also understood, according to the account St. John gives of it, to be that which Jesus Christ sang, when he gave thanks to his eternal Father, wherein he prayed for himself, for his disciples, and for all those who should believe at their preaching. And it is not without cause that he leads his disciples to the mount of Olives, after having fed them with the sacraments of his body and his blood, and after his having recommended them to his Father by the hymn of a tender intercession to inform us, without doubt, that it is by receiving of the sacraments, and by the assistance of his prayer, that we must come to the possession of heroical virtues, and that it

is by this means alone, that we shall receive in our hearts the unctions of the Holy Spirit.”

We find by this extract, that he followed the notions of the primitive Church closely on this subject, and that the Church which bordered upon the mountains of the Alps did not entertain any opinions like those of Paschasius. We ought to observe here, as a thing natural and obvious, that if he endured some contradiction upon other articles, yet he never was impeached about that of the Eucharist; which shows that that truth, at that time, was yet in possession of its own rights, and that those who quarreled with him about other articles, as Jonas, Bishop of Orleans, Dungalus, and the Abbot Theodemirus, were of his opinion about the matter of the Eucharist. For seeing his commentary upon St. Matthew was published in the year 815, and that Theodemirus continued still his friend in 823, pressing him to write on the Old Testament, it is evident, that till then nothing had interrupted the good correspondence that was between them.

Mabillon has published an extract from the end of his work upon Leviticus, dedicated to Abbot Theodemirus, which shows the great care that he took to withdraw those of his diocese from the hankering they had after the worship of creatures, and the troubles and crosses he had met with from those who were willing to defend their superstitions.

“Because you have commanded me to write these things, I have undertaken it, not as for your instruction, but for your satisfaction. But it is your duty to judge of it with more truth, and to stir up yourself by your examples, to the practice of a true charity, which is the most excellent of all virtues. And I assure myself, that I may more easily attain to the possession of that virtue by means of your prayers than by any strength of my own. See here, my dear brother, what I have here answered, as well as I could, to certain demands you have made of me. And I earnestly desire you on this occasion, that if you have discovered, or can find for time to come, any thing better, concerning the things about which you command me to write unto you, we shall take it very kindly, if you shall be pleased to communicate the same to us; for I am naturally more inclined to learn, than to teach others. For this beauty of the eternal

Truth and Wisdom God grant I may always have a constant will to enjoy her, for the love of whom we have also undertaken this work doth not exclude those that come unto her, because of the great number of hearers she hath; she grows not old by length of time; she minds not places; she does not suffer herself to be overtaken by night; she does not shut up herself in shadows, and doth not expose herself to our bodily senses: she is near unto all those that turn themselves to her froth all parts of the world, and who love her indeed; she is eternal to all; she is not limited by any places, she is every where; she advertiseth abroad, she instructs within, she changes and converts those that behold her; she doth not suffer herself to be violated by any person; no man can judge of her, nobody can judge well without her. In this idea of my faith, I separate all change and alteration from eternity; and in this eternity I discover no space of time, for the spaces of time are made up of future and past motions of things: now there is nothing past or future in eternity; for that which passeth ceaseth to be, and that which is to come has not yet begun to be: but as for eternity, it is that which is always present, nor ever has been, so as not to be present still; nor ever shall be, but so as still to continue present; because it is she alone that can say to the spirit of man, It is I who am the Lord; and it is of her alone we can say with truth, lie who is eternal has sent me.

“And since this is the case, we are not commanded to go to the creature, that we may be happy, but to the Creator, who alone can constitute our bliss; of whom if we entertain other opinions than we ought to have, we involve ourselves in a very pernicious error. For as long as we shall endeavor to come to that which is not, or which, supposing it to be, yet doth not make us happy, we shall never be able to arrive at a happy life. A man doth not become happy because another is so; but when a man imitates another, that he may become such as he is, he desires immediately to become happy by the same means he finds another is become so, that is, by the enjoyment of this universal and unchangeable Truth. Neither can a man become prudent by the prudence of another, or valiant by the valor, or temperate by the temperance, or just by the

justice of another; but by forming and fashioning his mind by the immutable rules and splendors of those virtues, which without alteration shine forth in this common universal truth and wisdom: in imitation of whom he formed and squared his manners whom we propose to ourselves as a pattern to imitate, and whom we look upon as a living copy of that eternal Wisdom. Our will fastening itself, and cleaving to this unchangeable and common good, affords the first, and great good things man is capable of, because she is a certain mean good. But when the will of man separates itself from this unchangeable and common good, and seeks her own particular good, or directs herself to any outward or inferior good, she sins.”

After this he quotes an excellent passage of St. Austin, from his treatise concerning the True Religion.

“Wherefore we owe no religious worship to those who are departed this life, because thee have lived religiously; we must not look upon them as persons that require our adorations and homage, but they desire that he may be worthy of our respect, by whom they being enlightened rejoice to see us made partakers of their piety. We must therefore honor them, because they deserve to be imitated; but we must not worship them with an act of religion. And if they have lived wickedly, we do not owe them any respect at all, in what part soever of the world they be. That then which is honored by the highest angel must also be honored by the lowest of men, because the nature of man is become the lowest, for not having honored him. For an angel takes not his wisdom elsewhere than man does. The truth of an angel and that of man are both derived from the same fountain, that is, from one and the same eternal Truth and Wisdom. For by a pure effect of that eternal Wisdom it comes to pass, that the power of God, and that unchangeable Wisdom consubstantial and coeternal with the Father, hath vouchsafed, in order to the accomplishment of the adorable mystery of our salvation, to take our human nature upon him, that he might teach us, that we owe our adorations to him who alone deserves to be worshipped by all intelligent and rational creatures. We ought also to believe, that those good angels, which are the most excellent ministers of God, would have us to worship

one only God together with them, by the alone vision of whom they are happy. For we are not happy in beholding the angels, neither can that vision ever make us so; but we shall be happy by beholding the Truth, by means of which we love the angels, and congratulate them. Neither do we envy their happiness, because they are more active than we, and because they enjoy the vision of God, without being molested with any trouble; but rather love them so much the more, because our hope puts us upon expecting something answerable to these their excellencies, from him who is the God of us both. Wherefore we honor them with our charitable respects, but not like slaves: we build no temples to them, neither will they be honored by us in any such manner, because they know that we, whilst we are good, are the temples of the living God.”

After his quoting of this passage, see how he concludes his work.

“These things are the highest and strongest mysteries of our faith, and characters most deeply imprinted in our hearts. In standing up for the confirmation and defense of which truth, I am become a reproach to my neighbors to that degree, that those who see us do not only scoff at us, but point at us, one to another: but God, the father of mercies and author of all consolations, has comforted us in all our afflictions, that we might be able, in like manner, to comfort those that are pressed with sorrow and affliction: we rely upon the protection of Him who has armed and fortified us with the armor of righteousness and of faith, which is the tried shield for our eternal salvation.”

He seems in these words to allude to the complaints that had been made against him, at Ludovicius Pius’s court, for having broke down images throughout his diocese, and for writing, in defense of himself, a treatise against the adoration of images, the worship of saints, pilgrimages, the worship of relics, with other such like superstitions. And since the cruel diligence of the Inquisitors has destroyed this piece, we must guess at the time wherein he wrote it, from the account his adversaries give us thereof, *viz.* Theodemirus, Dungalus, and Jonas of Orleans, and search in their books for his true opinions, and the arguments he made use of against the defenders of superstition.

Dungalus wrote in the year 828, as appears clearly from what he mentions of the decree passed in Ludovicus Pius's palace, after the assembly of Paris in the year 825, about the matter of images, as a tiling which happened two years before. In his book he accuseth Claudius for taking upon him, after eight hundred and twenty years and more, to reprove those things that were passed in continual use, as if there had been none before him that ever had any zeal for religion; from whence it is evident, that Claudius wrote since the year 820. It seems indeed as if he had answered the Abbot Theodemirus after the year 823, who had intimated to him the offense that was taken at his behavior and opinions, which he did so effectually as not to have any need to write aliother treatise upon the same subject.

However it is Dungalus himself who has preserved the extracts of the apologetical answer, which Claudius made about that time, to the Abbot Theodemirus; which apologetic he begins in this manner:

“I have received,” saith he to Theodemirus, “by a particular bearer thy letter, with the articles, wholly stuffed with babbling and fooleries. You declare in these articles, that you have been troubled that my fame was spread, not only throughout all Italy, but also in Spain, and elsewhere; as if I had formerly, and still do preach a new sect, contrary to the rules of the ancient Catholic faith, which is most absolutely false: neither is it any wonder at all, if the members of Satan talk of me at this rate, who have also called our Head a deceiver, one that hath a devil, etc. For I teach no new sect, as keeping myself to the pure truth, preaching and publishing nothing but that; but on the contrary, as far as in me lies, I have repressed, opposed, cast down, and destroyed, and do still repress, oppose, and destroy, to the utmost of my power, all sects, schisms, superstitions, and heresies, and shall never cease so to do, by the assistance of God, as far as I am able: for since it is expressly said, *Thou shalt not make to thyself the resemblance of any thing, either in heaven or on earth*, etc., this is not alone to be understood of the images and resemblances of strange gods, but also of those of celestial creatures.

“These kind of people, against whom we have undertaken to defend the Church of God, tell us, If thou write upon the wall, or drawest the images of Peter or of Paul, of Jupiter, Saturn, or of Mercury; neither are the one of these gods, nor the other apostles, and neither the one nor the other of them are men, and therefore the name is changed: and in the mean time, both then and now, the same ever continues still. Surely, if we ought to worship them, we ought rather to worship them alive, than as thou hast represented them as the portraitures of beasts, or (what is yet more true) of stone or wood, which have neither life, nor feeling, nor reason: for if we may neither worship nor serve the works of God’s hand, how much less may we worship the works of men’s hands, and adore them in honor of those whose resemblances we say they are? for if the image you worship is not God, (for not only he who serves and honors visible images, but also whatsoever creature else, whether heavenly or earthly, whether spiritual or corporal, he serves the same instead of God, and from it he looks for the salvation of his soul, which he ought to look for from God alone, and is of the number of those, of whom the Apostle saith, that they worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator,) wherefore dost thou bow to false images, and wherefore like a slave dost thou bend thy body to pitiful shrines, and to the work of men’s hands?

“But mark what the followers of the false religion and superstition do allege: they say, it is in commemoration and in honor of our Savior, that we serve, honor, and adore the cross, whom nothing pleaseth in our Savior, but that which was pleasing to the ungodly, *viz.* the reproach of his passion, and the token of his death. They witness hereby, that they perceive only of him what the wicked saw and perceived of him, whether Jews or Heathens, who do not see his resurrection, and do not consider him, but as altogether swallowed up of death, without minding what the Apostle saith, We know Jesus Christ no longer according to the flesh.

“God commands one thing, and these people do quite the contrary; God commands us to bear our cross, and not to worship it; but these are all for worshipping it; whereas they do not bear it at all,

neither will they bear it either corporally or spiritually: to serve God after this manner is to go a whoring from him. For if we ought to adore the cross, because Christ was fastened to it, how many other things are there which touched Jesus Christ, and which he made according to the flesh? Did not he continue nine months in the womb of the Virgin? Why do not they then on the same score worship all that are virgins, because a virgin brought forth Jesus Christ? Why do not they adore mangers and old clouts, because he was laid in a manger, and wrapped in swaddling clothes? Why do not they adore fisher-boats, because he slept in one of them, and preached to the multitudes, and caused a net to be cast out, wherewith was caught a miraculous quantity of fish? Let them adore asses, because he entered into Jerusalem upon the foal of an ass; and lambs, because it is written of him, *Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world*. But these sort of men would rather eat live lambs than worship their images. Why do not they worship lions, because he is called the Lion of the tribe of Judah? Or rocks, because it is said, *And the Rock was Christ?* or thorns, because he was crowned with them? or lances, because one of them pierced his side?

“All these things are ridiculous, rather to be lamented, than set forth in writing: but we are forced to set them down, in opposition to fools, and to declaim against those hearts of stone, whom the arrows and sentences of the word of God cannot pierce; and therefore we are fain to fling such stones at them. Come to yourselves again, ye miserable transgressors; why are you gone astray from truth, and why, being become vain, are ye fallen in love with vanity. Why do you crucify again the Son of God, and expose him to open shame; and by this means make souls by troops to become the companions of devils, estranging them from their Creator by the horrible sacrilege of your images and likenesses, and precipitating them into everlasting damnation?

“And as for your reproaching me, that I hinder men from running in pilgrimage to Rome; I will first demand of you yourself, whether thou knowest, that to go to Rome is to repent or do penance? If it be so indeed, why then hast thou for so long a time damned so

many souls, whom thou hast kept up in thy monastery, and whom thou hast taken into it, that they might there do penance, obliging them to serve thee, instead of sending them to Rome, if it be so that the way to do penance be to go to Rome, and yet thou hast hindered them? What have you to say against this sentence, That, whosoever shall lay a stone of stumbling before any of these little ones, it were better for him that a millstone were hung about his neck, and he east into the bottom of the sea?

“We know very well, that this passage of the Gospel is very ill understood; *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven:* under the pretense of which words the stupid and ignorant common people, destitute of all spiritual knowledge betake themselves to Rome, in hopes of acquiring eternal life: for the ministry does belong to all the true superintendants and pastors of the Church, who discharge the same, as long as they are in this world; and when they have paid the debt of death, others succeed in their places, who enjoy the same authority and power.

“Return O ye blind, to your light; return to him who enlightens every man that cometh into the world: all of you, as many as you be, who do not keep only to this light, you walk in darkness, and know not whither you go; for the darkness has put out your eyes. If we must believe God when he promiseth how much more when he swears, and saith, that if Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, (that is, if the saints whom you call upon were endowed with as great holiness, as great righteousness, and as much merit, as these were,) they shall neither deliver son nor daughter: and it is for this end he makes this declaration, *viz.* that none might put their confidence either in the merits or the intercession of saints. Understand ye this, ye people without understanding? Ye fools, when will ye be wise? ye who run to Rome, to seek there for the intercession of an Apostle. What think you would St. Augustin say of you, whom we have already so often quoted,” etc.

“The fifth thing you reproach me for is, that it displeaseth thee that the Apostolic Lord (for so you are pleased to call the late

Pope Pasehal deceased) had honored me with this charge; but forasmuch as the word *Apostolicus dicitur quasi Apostoli custos*, may intimate as much as the Apostle's keeper, know thou, that he only is apostolic, who is the keeper and guardian of the Apostle's doctrine, and not he who boasts himself to be seated in the chair of the Apostle, and in the mean time doth not acquit himself of the charge of the Apostle; for the Lord saith, that the Scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses's chair."

Now, because Jonas of Orleans had no other extracts out of the book of Claudius, besides those that had been already refuted by Dungalus, a recluse of the abbey of St. Denys, therefore he confines himself to refute the same opinions of Claudius, which he did only in the year 840, about a year after Claudius's death; whereupon I desire the reader to consider,

First, that notwithstanding Dungalus and Jonas did both write by the order of kings, and that they make mention of a condemnation of Claudius passed in the palace, yet nothing of all this was able to shake the reputation of Claudius. He wrote against all these superstitions from the year 823, and did not die till the year 839; so that for sixteen years together he was only set upon by some particular persons, by an obscure and recluse Monk, who was a stranger to France, and who probably being an Italian took part with the Church of Rome, at that time engaged for the worshippets of idols.

Secondly, That the Fathers of the Assembly of Paris, in the year 825, had justified most of the principles maintained by Claudius, this great man having been only engaged to carry the matter farther than they; for being nearer to the diocese of Rome, he saw the danger so much the nearer, in which his flock were, of failing into idolatry.

Thirdly, That to go to the bottom of the matter, Agobardus, Archbishop of Lyons, pushed that point as far as Claudius himself; as appears from his treatise against pictures. It is a pleasure to see how Father Raynaud torments himself to justify Agobardus, whom the Church of Lyons honors as a saint, though he has made use of the same arguments that Claudius did, and given large testimonies of his being as vigorous an *iconoclast* as ever Claudius was. We may therefore assert, without rashness, that either all the fetches of

Baronius and of F. Raynaud are not sufficient to keep Agobardus in the martyrology of Lyons; or, that they serve very profitably, at the same time, to enrol Claudius in that of the Church at Turin, as a most holy and most illustrious Bishop, because of his doctrine, his ardent piety, and the great care he took to oppose the spirit of superstition, which reigned so much at that time.

Fourthly, After all, we may say, that neither Dungalus nor Jonas of Orleans maintained the opinion of the Church of Rome that was then: Jonas makes mention of the Pope's party., as a party not wholly cut off from the communion of the Church; but his expressions are so sharp, that it appears he had little better opinion of them. They condemn all manner of worship of images, and stick close to the decisions of Francfort, in the year 794, and of Paris, 826, which were diametrically opposite to the definitions of the *iconolatrae*, or worshippers of images, and to the pretensions of the Bishop of Rome, who had admitted of them.

It was worth our while to take notice of these opinions of Claudius, and of the manner of his reforming his diocese, that we might make it appear, that he laid solid principles of the Reformation in those parts, as to several points. And this was the more necessary, because the Papists, as Genebrard, in his Chronology, and Rorengo, have owned, that the valleys of Piedmont, which did belong to the bishopric of Turin, preserved the opinions of Claudius in the ninth and tenth century.

We ought to observe two things, which very well deserve an exact reflection; the first is, that Angilbertus, Bishop of Milan, is constantly represented to us by Ripamontius, by Ughellus, and those who have wrote the history of that diocese, as one who began to separate himself from the Pope by a kind of schism, which they highly lament, as bordering upon rebellion, which they own to have lasted above two hundred years. But the case is not so as they are pleased to represent it to us: the truth is, that that Prelate preserved his liberty against all the Pope's endeavors, wherein he was imitated by his successors, who seem to have had no more value than he had for the Decretals of the ancient Popes, which were foisted in by the care and emissaries of the Roman see, in order to submit the rights and privileges of other Churches to her.

The second is, that though the emulation which was between the Bishops of Milan and Aquileia was an occasion of great contests between them, yet we find, that the diocese of Aquileia was no more united with that of the Pope, during the time of the controversy concerning the Procession, *ex utroque* [from both] under Nicolaus the First, and under Photius. This appears evidently from a letter of Photius, who having received at Constantinople a Bishop Legate from the Archbishop of Aquileia, wrote an answer to him, as to a man who was wholly of his opinion. Father Combefts has published this letter.

CHAPTER 10

The faith of the Churches of Italy in the tenth century.

FORASMUCH as this century was generally devoted to ignorance and debauchery, and very barren of authors, it will be hard for us to inform ourselves any thing in particular concerning the Churches of Italy, except only so far as we make our conjectures of it by considering the condition of other western Churches, which was as deplorable as can well be imagined. This is owned by the Papists themselves, by Caranza, Genebrard, Baronins, and many more, who describe this tenth century as a monstrous age. Indeed, we can scarce expect that it should have been better at that time, if we consider the furious wars that wasted this diocese, as well by reason of the invasion of the Huns, as by the divisions happening between several princes, who endeavored to make themselves masters of that part of Italy, after the death of Charles the Great.

But Providence has preserved us two authors of this diocese; the one is RATHERIUS, who alone might have been sufficient to inform us very exactly about the state of Italy. This Ratherins, Bishop of Verona, who, from being a monk in the abbey of Lobe, near to Liege, was advanced to the see of Verona, in the year 928, and being chased from thence in 932, was made Bishop of Liege in the year 954, and died in 974; so that he was Bishop during the most part of the tenth century.

SIGEBERTUS informs us that the heresy of the Anthropomorphites began to appear again in the diocese of Italy during his pontificate, and that he was obliged to write against them. And indeed we find a large digression of Ratheflus upon this occasion in his first sermon of Lent. He observes, that the Priests of the diocese of Vicenza were of this opinion, which they grounded upon the following passages of Scripture, Psalm 33:16. Job 10:8. and Genesis 1:26. He acknowledges, that other people of his diocese were of the same opinion, and that they could no otherwise conceive the existence of God. He ingenuously confesseth, that this belief was grown in the minds of the people, because in the pictures and images they saw God seated like a king, on a throne, and the angels, in the shape of men with wings, arrayed in white. Behold here the happy effect of images upon an

ignorant people, and what may be expected from these sort of books, which the Prophet Habakkuk so justly calls *the teachers of lies*.

He gives us an account in the same sermon of a very pleasant fancy of the people of his diocese: they believed that St. Michael the archangel celebrated the Mass of the *second feria*; whence they were persuaded, that the Mass of St. Michael, called the second *feria*, was far more excellent than any other Mass whatsoever. It is worth our observing, how he confutes this fantastical opinion. First, he maintains from Revelation 21:22 that there is no temple in heaven. Secondly, he proves, that the angels cannot celebrate Mass, because we ought not to believe, that the angels eat or drink corporeal bread and wine; and that Jesus Christ is only called the Bread of angels, because they are nourished with his praises, as with food. Be it as it will, it appears very plainly, that neither this gross people, nor their Bishops, who endeavored to disabuse them, were very well informed of the mysteries of the Church of Rome; for otherwise, why doth not this good Bishop tell his people, that the angels were not capable of the character of Priesthood? How could he object to them, that the angels cannot eat or drink corporeal bread and wine, but the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, which exist therein in the manner of a spirit? Is it any contradiction to suppose, that spirits may truly receive a body which exists after the manner of a spirit? It is very plain, that though, may be, he might have embraced some of the hypotheses of Paschasius, which, through the stupidity of that people, were swallowed down by little and little, yet he did not know the whole of it. It was necessary, that Lan-franc, Guitmond, and Alger should make an end of licking this bear into some shape, as being but half formed by its author, when at first it was brought forth.

But not to insist longer on this, I observe two things: the first is, that this author, who had been brought up in a strange country, and who probably had brought along with him his notions from thence, seems in diverse points to follow the doctrine of Paschasius upon this question. The second is, that notwithstanding that, he doth up and down make use of a number of notions and expressions, which directly oppose and overthrow it.

On the one hand he tells the Priests of his diocese, in his Synodical Epistle, *Paranda cordium nostrorum habitacula, ventufo ad nos, per corporis et sanguinis sui substantiam, Christo* : We ought to prepare the habitations of our heart for Christ, who is to come into us, by the substance of his body and blood.”

And on the other hand he tells us, that wicked Priests eat the goat, and not the lamb; which is also the expression of Odo Cluniacensis, who lived at the same time. An altogether incomprehensible expression in the mouth of a man that believes transubstantiation.

In his treatise of the Contempt of the Canons, *par.* 1. he quotes a passage of Zeno, Bishop of Verona, which overthrows transubstantiation. It is found in a sermon concerning Judah and Tamar, in these words: *Omniurn corrupte viventium Diabolus pater est; et O quam non manducat verendam camera Domini, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, in quo Diabolus per tria ista vitia, hoc est, superbiam, hypocrisin, atque luxuriam requiescit, licet communicate cum Sdelibus videatur, Domino dicente, Qui manducat meam carnere, et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, et ego in eo. Cure et per conversionem ira hoc possit resolvi ; Qui in me manet, et ego in eo, ipsc manducat camera meam, et bibit sanguinem meum. In quo enim Deus manet, et ipse in Deo, quomodo in eo Diabolus dormire possit non video: dormit veto in eo qui per hypocrisin vel elationem umbrosus et vacuus, per luxuriam existit humectus. Quid ergo manducat, quando communicat. Judicium si respondes, Apostolo connives, et intelligere me pariter communes, quia pro eo judicabitur, id est, damnabitur, quia cum indignus existeret, Christi est ausus carnem manducare, et sanguinem bibere; ac propterea quod debuerat illi fore salvatio, est factum damnatio. De substantia vero corporali quam sumit, cure sit mea nunc quxstio, mihi nunc quoque ipsi loquar, ira succumbo; cure sit enim digne sumenti vera caro, panis licet quod dim ruerat videatur, et sanguis, quod vinum; indigne sumenti, id est, non in Deo manenti, quid sit, nedurn dicibile, incogitabile, fateor, mihi; et, Altiora to ne quaesieris,*

“The Devil is the father of all those that live wickedly: and O how far is he from eating the venerable body of our Lord, and drinking his blood, in whom the Devil rests, by means of these three vices, *pride, hypocrisy, and luxury*, though he may seem to communicate

with the faithful? Our Lord telling us, *He who eats my flesh, and drinks my blood, abides in me, and I in him*: which words may be translated thus; He who abides in me, and I in him, he it is that eats my flesh and drinks my blood. For he in whom God abides, and he in God, how the Devil can take up his rest in such an one, I see not: but the Devil doth rest in him, who by reason of hypocrisy and pride is shadowy and empty, and dissolved by luxury. What then doth such an one eat, when he communicates? If thou *answerest, judgment*, thou agreest with the Apostle, and puttest me in mind to understand, that he shall therefore be judged that is, condemned, because, being unworthy he durst venture to eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood; and therefore that which was to have been his salvation, is become his damnation. But whereas my inquiry at present is concerning the bodily substance he rectayes, I must now answer myself, and own that here I am at a loss; for since it is true flesh to the worthy receiver, though it be the bread it was before, and blood, which yet is wine; what it is to the unworthy receiver, that is, to him who abides not in God, is so far, I confess from being expressible, that it is altogether inconceivable by me; and therefore in this case I ought to take that word as spoke to me, Do not seek after things too high for thee, nor search out things too deep for thee."

This seems to be very full; and yet, p. 182, he seems to believe with Paschasius, that it is the flesh of Jesus Christ, whosoever he be that receives it. But after all, the good man refers himself to the belief of St. Chrysostom, who calls the Sacrament a spiritual food, and to that of St. Austin, *Tract. 61 et 62 in Johan. vid. p. 304*.

Thus in his first Easter sermon, he supposeth, that the flesh of Jesus Christ is not received by the wicked, p. 310; and in his fourth sermon on the same subject, he asserts the contrary, p. 322.

Whatsoever may be his opinion in this matter in those writings I have before produced, he seems to have spoken more plainly in favor of the real change of the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, in his Epistle published by D'Achery, in the twelfth tome of his *Spicilegium*: but at the same time he gives this advantage, that he furnisheth us with a new

defender of that figurative sense in the words of the Eucharist; for he clearly attributes to his friend, to whom he wrote, that he took the words in no other sense than as they are understood by the Protestants; upon which it is natural to take notice of two things; the first, that the disciples of Pas-chasius have had great trouble to oppose directly the opinion of St. Austin, who lays it down always, that only the faithful receive the body of Jesus Christ. The other is, that Gaufridus Vindocinensis is perhaps the first who taught clearly (about the year 1100) that the wicked receive the body of Christ, as well as the faithful, against the constant doctrine of St. Austin, *Tract. 26. in Johan.*

We ought not to forget, that in his Perpendicular Volume, p. 183, he attributes the force of the consecration to prayer; which the Church of Rome at present condemns.

We may easily judge, that the Communion under both kinds was in vogue at that time; as appears from several places of his works.

But we are to observe, concerning this matter,

First, that he expressly forbids private masses.

Secondly, That they kept still the custom, not to communicate on fast days, except in the afternoon, because the Communion broke the fast; so little were they of opinion at that time, that the substance of the bread and wine was lost and vanished by means of the consecration.

Thirdly, That the custom of giving the Eucharist to laics, in order to carry it to the sick, was not yet abolished, though it began then to be condemned.

It is evident enough how much these articles oppose the belief of the Church of Rome. We may see, that the Church at that time did not take the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, since she believed that it could not be celebrated without communicants. The Church did not believe it to be only an heap of accidents, because she believed, that the taking of the Sacrament did break the fast. The Church of Rome could not leave the Sacrament in the hands of laics, after she had once made it the object of her adoration.

But let us proceed to other articles about the Sacraments: seeing that RATHERIUS lays down eight deadly sins, we may guess from thence, that he

was not acquainted with the seven Sacraments of the Church of Rome, which have a reference to the seven sins, as the modern Divines of that communion assure us.

True it is, that he speaks of anointing the sick but as of an unction which was administered before the Communion of dying men, which has been prudently altered in the *Pontificale Romanum*, since they have thought fit to own Extreme Unction for the last of their Sacraments.

As to Baptism, and its necessity, it appears by his Synodical Epistle, that he was against having the custom abrogated of baptizing only on Easter-day and Whitsunday, except in case of necessity, that is, danger of death.

As to the matter of penance, he would have the Priests invite the people to it, and that they may impose penances upon those who commit some secret sins; but he reserves to himself the power to impose penance upon public sinners; which shows that the ancient discipline was yet in practice: and he would have the Priests of his diocese to be furnished with a *Paenitential*, that they might follow the Canons thereof: so far was he from owning them for absolute judges, who could pronounce without appeal.

He did indeed believe *Purgatory*, but after another manner than the Church of Rome doth: for he saith expressly, that it is only for slighter sins; whereas, according to the Papists, it is also appointed for the temporal pain of mortal sins: *Purgatovii poena non est statuta pro criminibus, sed pro peccatis levioribus, quae utique per lignum, faenum, et stipulam designantur*:

“The punishment of purgatory is not appointed for crimes, but for lighter sins, which are intimated by wood, hay, and stubble.”

We shall now proceed to the examining of some other points, the better to inform ourselves of the state of this Church of Italy during the tenth century.

First, They believed that all Bishops in general were St. Peter’s successors. RATHERIUS is very express in this case: *Petri omnes Episcopi vicera tonent in Ecclesiis*;

“All Bishops are Peter’s vicegerents in their Churches,” and p. 168, 169, 173, and 229.

Secondly, They did not believe that the Pope had power to remove Bishops from one bishopric to another. The translation of RATHERIUS from the see of Liege was done by order from the Emperor, and of a Council of Italy, assembled at Verona.

Thirdly, They were very sensible of the inconvenience of the sovereignty which the Pope endeavored to usurp over the Church. See what RATHERIUS speaks of it: *Si Papa fit nequam, perjurus, adulter, venator, ebriosus, quid fiet de quaerimoniis ad ipsum delatis? Ridebit guerulos, favebit sibi similibus:*

“If the Pope should prove a wicked man, perjured, an adulterer, a hunter, a drunkard, what will become of the complaints made to him? He will laugh at those that complain, and favor those that are like himself.”

Fourthly, They without fear laughed at the Pope’s excommunications and His anathemas, of which he began already to be very liberal. RATHERIUS gives us an instance of it in his Apologetic; *De quodam Clericis venalera illam, ut ait Salustius, adiens urbem, pretio, ut omnia antiquitus, ibi emptas quasi apostolicas dejarens chartas anathematis tam me, quam successores omnimodis meos mulctavit mucrone; ut fuivis abhinc Episcoporum si de Clericorum se infra mit teret rebus, perpetuo, ut aiunt, anathemate foret damnatus:*

“Concerning one of the Clergy, who going to that city where all things were to be sold, as Salust expresses it, and bringing along with him the apostolical letters, bought for money, as of old, he smote me, as well as all my successors, with the edge of the anathematical sword; so that any Bishop from henceforward, that shall meddle with any matters concerning the Clergy, must expect to be condemned by a perpetual anathema.”

We may see how he refutes this piece of folly.

Fifthly, They were yet in a doubt whether the title of Universal did of right belong to the Bishop of Rome: *Vestrae Paternitatis provolvens genius, Domine venerandissime, Archipraesul, Archiepiscopo, et, si de ullo mortalium jure dici possit, Universalis Papa nominande:*

“Prostrating myself at the knees of your Paternity, most reverend Lord, Archprelate Archbishop, and if it may of right be said of any mortal, Universal Pope.”

Ratherius being banished from his Church, gives us a very ludicrous notion of it: *Ait, Taedet me esse Universalera Episcopure, id est, gyrovagum, et sine sede;*

“It troubles me,” saith he, “to be an Universal Bishop, that is, a wanderer about, without a see.”

Sixthly, He appealed indeed to the Pope, concerning the unjust oppression he endured; but he appealed also at the same time to the Councils of Gaul, of Italy, and of Germany.

Seventhly, He takes notice that he did not go to Rome out of devotion, because it is said, John 4:21.

The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain,
nor yet at Jerusalem, etc.

but that he might be present at the Synod.

Some other points worth our observing are,

First, He deplores the general contempt of the Canons of the Church; a neglect which reigned from the Pope to the meanest of the people; *Luget generalera contempturn Canonurn a laico ad Summum (pro nef asi) Pontifcem.*

He chargeth the Italians with being the most corrupt of all, by reason of their greater proneness to debauchery and vice; that the Doctors there neglected all discipline, insomuch as the Clergy did in nothing differ from the laity, but in their habits.

Secondly, He observes, that most of the Clergy were either sodomites or adulterers: *Ouam perdita tonsatorum universitas tota, si nemo in els qui non adulter aut sit aut arsenoquita!*

“How profligate is the whole crew of shavelings, when there is none among them that is not either an adulterer or a sodomite!”

Thirdly, As for simony, it was so common, that he writes to the Bishop of Parma, to desire him to confer orders upon children for money no more, as he was wont to do. Manasses, Bishop of Milan, who had five bishoprics, sold that of Verona, and turned out Ratherius.

Fourthly, He takes notice of such extreme ignorance in the Priests of his diocese, that they could not so much as say the Apostles' Creed. And he chargeth his Priests, in his Synodical Epistle, to be able to say it without book, together with that of St. Athanasius.

Fifthly, He observes, that both Priests and people were Anthropomorphites.

Sixthly, He cannot dissemble the way which some of his Priests took to deceive souls, by maintaining that none that had been baptized could ever be damned.

Seventhly, Lastly he exclaims, that Christianity was perished and gone: *Vera quo evasisti Christianitas?*

“True Christianity, whither art thou fled?”

And he declares, that his time was that of which the Apostle spoke when he said, *that many should depart from theathith.*

This good Ratherius, in truth, had his share of the ignorance that reigned in his time, as well as of the superstition that had already seized upon many in Italy. Which ignorance of his appears,

1. In that he admits for true the false Decretals, which the Popes had foisted in, to subject all the world to themselves.
2. By his finding fault with the ordination of those persons who had been married more than once, as supposing they were forbid by the Apostle.
3. By his lamenting the liberty which was given to the Clergy to marry.
4. In that he joins the married Bishops with the most corrupt and profligate of that order.

5. By his charging the Clergy with a great crime, for having refused to obey the edict of the Emperor, which condemned the marriage of Ecclesiastics.
6. From his falsely pretending that marriage had been forbid to Ministers by the third Canon of the Council of Nice; whereas they maintained that they ought to use matrimony, to avoid falling into those enormous crimes which St. Paul hath set down in his first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.
7. From his expelling the married Monks out of his abbey, and placing Canons in their place.
8. From his prescribing some fasts to a woman that had married a Priest, without dissolving the marriage, or declaring it void.
9. From his commanding laics to abstain from their wives, and from flesh, twenty-eight days before Advent, and twenty days before Christmas.
10. From his severely blaming those who, instead of fasting forty days, fasted only twenty.

The second author that can give us any information concerning the state of the diocese of Italy, is Atto, Bishop of Verceil, who, as Ughellus tells us, flourished about the middle of the tenth century. D'Achery has published several of his pieces in his *Spicilegium*, tom. viii.

We find in the Capitulary, which he addressed to the Priests of his diocese, almost all borrowed from that of Theodulphus, who was an Italian born, that he charged them to learn Athanasius's Creed, as a short compendium of the faith, upon pain of interdiction from wine for forty days; and to explain the Apostles' Creed to those that demanded Baptism; but doth not speak to them at all of other doctrines taught at present, as another part of religion.

He forbids the celebration of Masses without any communicants, and shows them that this is contrary to the Canon of the Liturgy.

He very severely condemns the custom of burying in churches; as likewise that of selling places to bury the dead in: though this custom was at first

introduced by an opinion, that the dead received some help from the prayers of their relations.

He absolutely forbids the ordination of Priests without title; which shows that he did not look upon the trade of sacrificing the body of Jesus Christ to be so necessary and authorized, that for it he ought to dispense with the Canons, which are now laid aside, since the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass is come in request.

He commands the Clergy to work with their hands, after reading and prayer; which some ages after was condemned in the Waldenses; though therein he follows Theodulphus and the Rule of St. Bennet.

He will not have any thing read in the church, save the books of the Old and New Testament, and permits the passions of the martyrs to be read only on their anniversaries.

He condemns the custom of making baths of holy water, which was introduced into that country.

He hath one chapter about the case of the Eucharist that is fallen down, and concerning him that vomits again after three days; which plainly shows, that they supposed it to nourish really and truly, notwithstanding that it was consecrated bread.

It appears evidently, that public penance had not yet given place to the prattoe of confession to Priests; which has wholly abolished all the discipline of the Church of Rome.

He makes an extract of the Rule of St. Bennet, concerning the moral part of the Gospel; to which there is no Protestant but would be very willing to subscribe, as containing nothing of the spirit of monkery or of superstition.

He reduceth the matters of faith, which believers ought to know, to the Lord's Prayer, according to the Council of Forojulio, which I have already cited.

He maintains, according to the Canons of the Church of Rome, that the Scriptures are the foundation of religion, and doth not admit of the writings of the Fathers, but with this caution; *Try all things, hold fast that*

which is good: and according to the Canon of Gelasius I. he ranks several books amongst the apocryphal writings, from whence the Church of Rome, some ages after, has borrowed diverse shreds to stuff out her Breviary, and their lives of saints.

We may now take a view of his doctrine in his treatise of the Judgments of Bishops. He maintains, that the Church is founded on the confession of the apostolic faith, and that she subsists by the faith and love of Jesus Christ, by the receiving of the Sacraments, and by the observation of our Savior's precepts. All the rest of that discourse, wherein he highly exalts the power of the Pope of Rome, is a plain sign that he was trepanned into the snare, which had been set a hundred and fifty years before, by a supposititious obtrusion of the false Decretals of ancient Popes, the end of which was to appropriate the cognizance of the trials of Bishops to the Pope, under pretense of preventing their oppression. In particular, he shows himself very angry against those who obliged the Bishops to terminate the quarrels they had with laies, by providing a champion to fight it out for them.

He pretends that the Scripture of the New Testament does absolutely forbid Christians to swear; which constitutes one of the errors of the Waldenses.

He maintains, according to the doctrine of St. Ambrose, that it is not lawful for Bishops to take up arms, no, not for the Church's interest; which the Popes have practiced but very badly.

He seems to suppose, that the order of Bishops, and that of Presbyters, were not two different orders in St. Paul's time, and that they were distinguished afterwards.

He asserts, that laies have right to judge of the behavior of Bishops, as it is their right to have a share in their election.

He employs a whole treatise to confound the disorder which reigned at that time in the election of Bishops, as having no regard either to their charity or faith, but to the nobleness of their blood, and electing many that were yet mere children.

He declares in one of his letters, that some heresies were already crept into his diocese, which he had already hinted in the forty-eighth chapter of his Capitulary; and he seems to point at a branch of the Manichean heresy.

He shows, that in his diocese they would not fast on Saturdays; which he finds fault with, notwithstanding the Saturday's fast was not known in St. Ambrose's time, in the diocese of Milan.

He quotes a law of the Lombards, to show that the marriage of a godson with his godmother was unlawful; and the definition he afterwards gives of marriage shows that he knew nothing of its being a sacrament.

He maintains, that the she-priests, of whom mention is made in the Canons, were the primitive Deaconesses, that they had power to teach in public, and that formerly they were employed to baptize maids or women; which Priests had married wives before they had received Orders, from whom they were to abstain afterwards.

Whoever will reflect upon what I have here said, and upon several other matters that might be observed, will easily judge, that both truth and piety began to decrease in this diocese, and that error and superstition, by little and little, began to take their places, in spite of the opposition of those whom God had raised up to stop their progress: however, the essentials of religion still continued there, notwithstanding these growing corruptions.

CHAPTER 11

*An inquiry into the opinions of Gundulphus and his followers,
before the year 1026.*

D'ACHERY has published a Synod, which was held at Arras, by Gerard, Bishop of Cambray and Arras, in the year of our Lord 1025; by which it doth appear, that Gundulphus had taught several doctrines in Italy, which had been carried by his disciples into the diocese of Liege and of Cambray in the Low Countries. This Synod having been held in the year 1025, we may easily judge that Gundulphus had a great number of disciples in Italy. The account Gerard gives to Reginaldus, Bishop of Liege, concerning the examination of these Italians, takes notice, First, That they had appeared before Reginaldus, who had examined them about their opinions, and had sent them back without condemning them. Secondly, That even then they employed the terror of punishments, against those who were suspected of heresy, to which Gerard attributes the seeming piety those Italians made show of: we may also gather this from Glaber, 1.4. c. 2. where he speaks of a certain heresy discovered in Italy, and cruelly persecuted by the Bishops and the nobility of that country. Thirdly, That they sent their disciples up and down to multiply the number of their followers, and that indeed they had withdrawn many from the opinions of Paschasius Ratbertus, which insensibly began to be established. Fourthly, That Gerard did in vain make use of violence, to make them confess their belief; and that he could not come to know it, but by those who had been gained by them. Fifthly, That he only gives an account in part of their opinions. What may be gathered from Gerard's preface to Reginaldus, is this:

First. They own themselves to be the disciples of one Gundulphus, who had instructed them concerning the evangelical and apostolical doctrine; that they received no other doctrine, and that they practiced the same *verbo et opere*, "in word and deed."

But since it had been reported to Gerard, that they abhorred Baptism, that they rejected the Sacrament of the body and blood of our Savior, that they denied the use of penance after sin, that they made void the Church, that they detested lawful marriages, that they owned no virtue in the holy

confessors, and that they pretended that the Apostles only and Martyrs were to be revered; we find, that being interrogated upon these heads by Gerard, they answered distinctly, as follows:

First, To that which the Bishop told them, that Jesus Christ had established the necessity of Baptism, John in. *Except a man be born again*, etc. they answer, *Lex et disciplina nostra quam a magistro accepimus, nec evangelicis decretis, nec apostolicis sanctionibus contra ire videbitur, si quis eam diligenter velit intueri. Haec namque hujusmodi est, roundurn relinquere, carnero a concupiscentiis frenare, de laboribus manuum suarum victum parare, nulli loesionem queerere, charitatem cunctis quos zelus hujus nostri propositi teneat, exhibere. Setrata igitur haec justitia, nullurn opus esse Baptismi; prevaricata vero ista, Baptismurn ad nullam procere salutere. Haec est nostra justificationis summa, ad quam nihil est quod Baptismi usus superaddere possit, cure omnis apostolica et evange-lica institutio hujusmodi fne claudatur. Si quis autem in Baptismate aliquod dicat latere Sacramenturn, hoc tribus ex causis evacuatur: Una, quia vita reprobata Ainistrorum baptizandis nullurn potest praeberere salutis remedium. Atltera, quia quidquid vitiorum in fonte renuntiatur, postmodum in vita repetitur. Tertia, quia ad parvulum non volentem, neque currentem, fdei nescium, suxque salutis atque utilitatis ignarum, in quem nulla regenerationis petitio, nulla fdei potest inesse confessio, aliena voluntas, aliena fdes, aliena confessio nequaquam pertinere videtur:*

“The law and discipline we have received from our master will not appear contrary either to the Gospel decrees or apostolical institutions, if carefully looked into. This discipline consists in leaving the world, in bridling carnal concupiscence, in providing a livelihood by the labor of our hands, in hurting nobody, and affording our charity to all who are zealous in the prosecution of this our design. Now if this righteousness be observed, there will be no need of Baptism; and if broken, Baptism cannot avail to salvation. This is the sum of our justification, to which the use of Baptism can superadd nothing, since this is the end of all apostolical and evangelical institutions. But if any shall say, that some sacrament lies hid in Baptism, the force of that is taken off by these three causes: the first is, Because the reprobate life of

Ministers can afford no saving remedy to the persons to be baptized. The second, Because whatsoever sins are renounced at the font, are afterwards taken up again in life and practice. The third, Because a strange will, a strange faith, and a strange confession do not seem to belong to, or be of any advantage to a little child, who neither wills nor runs, who knows nothing of faith, and is altogether ignorant of his own good and salvation in whom there can be no desire of regeneration, and from whom no confession of faith can be expected.”

It appears by the Bishop's answer, wherein there are some good arguments to establish the necessity of Baptism, that these Italians were fallen upon these opinions, to put themselves at a greater distance from the maxims of their Priests, which I have taken notice of where I mention the belief of Ra-therins. There is one thing observable about their other reasons; which is, that the Bishop objects to them, in order to persuade them of the necessity of Baptism, the custom of washing one another's feet, which they called *mandatum*; whence it is easy to judge, that they looked upon Baptism only as a mystical ceremony, the end of which was, to express the engagement of him who is baptized, and the vow he makes to live holily; which made them not to set any great value upon it, and to oppose themselves against the notion of the absolute necessity of Baptism, without which, the Priests of those times believed there was no attaining to salvation; as well as against the pretended efficacy of Baptism, so that whosoever received it could not fail of salvation.

The second head, upon which Gerard examined them, was the article of the carnal presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist; he refutes their objections, which he makes to himself. The one is, That the body of Jesus Christ is in heaven since his ascension. The other, That the bodily eating of the body of Jesus Christ cannot profit, because Jesus Christ himself hath declared in the sixth of St. John, *that the flesh profiteth nothing*. The third is, That the body of Jesus Christ would no longer continue to be one entire body, being divided through so many places, and found in so many churches.

The chief heads of his answers to these objections are made up of apparitions, which he had extracted out of Paschasius's book; which

plainly shows, that the Italians did not reject the sacrament of the Eucharist, but the doctrine of Paschasius, which began then to be established, though it met with great contradictions in the diocese of Italy, where Abbot Gezo had revived it, by publishing a book upon that subject; whereof Mabillon has given us an extract in his *Iter Italicurn*.

The third article concerns the consecration of churches: it appears, that they *believed nothing* of these sanctifications, which were attributed to sacred edifices and altars; but pretended that the prayers they made in the houses were no less agreeable to God, than if they had been made in the churches. The reason of this shyness they expressed to churches is evident, from their reproaching the idolatry that was practiced in them in point of images and other matters.

The fourth is about the altar, to which they refused to bow, or show any reverence, as the practice was then, after it was consecrated with holy oil; which is an evident sign that the thing they struck at was these consecrations, which they accused as superstitious: so far were they from looking upon them as a just motive to exhibit any honor or respect to the material things that had received them.

The fifth is of the same kind, concerning those unctions which were then used in imitation of the ceremonies of the Mosaical law; the unction with oil, practiced upon those that were possessed, sick persons, and *Catechumeni*; and the anointing of bishops and Priests at their consecration.

The sixth is about bells; they finding fault with the virtue which was attributed to their sound, *viz.* of driving away tempests and the Devil's power.

The seventh article concerns the different orders of Ministers; these Italians being accused of rejecting them, because they gave the imposition of hands in private, and blamed the Ministry, such as it was received in the western Church; and that by this means they took upon them ecclesiastical functions, being themselves secular persons.

The eighth is about burial in consecrated places, which these Italians looked upon only as an effect of the covetousness of Priests, who could imagine no other advantage in being buried in holy places, but that of

selling them the dearer to the people, whom they had abused by this notion of holiness inherent in one place more than another.

The ninth respects penance after Baptism, which, according to Gerard's accusation of them, they rejected; which seems to agree with the opinion of the Novatians: but we may easily judge that the thing they chiefly struck at were those penal works which began then to be imposed, as in order to satisfy the Divine justice.

This appears more clearly from **the tenth article**, which shows that what they struck at were customs and usages of the Church of Rome. Thus he accuses them of asserting, that penance was of no use after death; whereas Gerard maintains, that the works of the living, alms, masses, and the satisfactions which persons imposed upon themselves for the dead, were indeed of great efficacy for the salvation of the deceased. It appears clearly, from the proofs of Gerard, that they struck at the doctrine of purgatory, and those practices which this belief had introduced into the Church.

The eleventh article accuseth them for looking upon lawful marriage as an abomination, and a state wherein it was impossible to be saved.

The twelfth article accuseth them for refusing to give any veneration to confessors, and reserving it only for Apostles and Martyrs; and for maintaining, that there was no virtue in the dead bodies of saints, after they are once returned to dust; which Gerard refutes by an examination of the miracles performed by every Bishop of his diocese, before the people brought to the tombs the marks of their veneration of any confessors.

The thirteenth article accuseth them for finding fault with the singing of Psalms, which was then received in the Church, under a pretense that those that so made use of them were thereby obliged sometimes to curse themselves, by their repeating the imprecations contained in the said Psalms.

The fourteenth article was about their refusing to reverence the cross, maintaining that it had no virtue at all, as being only a work of men's hands.

The fifteenth article concerned the image of our Savior on the cross, that of the blessed Virgin, and those of the saints and angels, etc. which they refused to worship.

The sixteenth respects the obedience which they were said to refuse to the Ministers of the Church, to Bishops, Archdeacons, Deans, and *Praepositi*; the model of which government they pretended to derive from the angelical hierarchy treated of by Dionysius the Areopagite.

The seventeenth concerns the righteousness they arrogated to themselves because of their good works, as if they had renewed the doctrine of Pelagius; to which Gerard opposeth the notions of St. Austin, and the necessity of adhering to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as being that which St. Peter preached at Rome, and which his successors have propagated throughout all the west.

These are the opinions which Gerard made these Italians abjure, who, as the Acts of the Synod tell us, were convinced and confounded by the refutation he had made of their errors. The Acts of the Synod contain the abjuration of these opinions. They acquaint us moreover, that these Italians, pretending not to understand the contents of this excommunication, because it was writ in Latin, it was explained to them in Italian, and they were made to sign it, and to set a sign of the cross before their names.

It is worth our observing,

First, That what they were made to own was not subscribed by them, till after they had been three days in prison; having been committed by order of the Bishop.

Secondly, That all this confession was extorted by fear of punishment, wherewith they had been threatened at Liege, and afterwards at Arras.

Thirdly, That it seems not altogether improbable, that they differed about some of these opinions amongst themselves, as may be very naturally gathered from the history of the following ages, and yet they are all involved in the same excommunication: thus without fear did

they treat people who did not understand Latin, and who were obliged to express their mind by interpreters.

Fourthly, That they were not made to confess any thing that savours of Manicheism, except the matter of marriage.

Fifthly, That the errors whereof they were accused seem to take their birth from an inclination very natural to the mind of man, who is very prone to cast himself upon the opposite extremity, whilst he endeavours to separate himself from errors. St. Cyprian rebaptized those who had been baptized by heretics; Stephen received the Baptism of all heretics without distinction. Several dioceses were divided amongst themselves, by reason of these contrary practices above eighty years, until the convening of the first Council of Arles, which yet was not able wholly to compose this difference.

Gundulphus seeing them assert, that whosoever was baptized could never be damned, falls to an indifference for Baptism, thinking it sufficient to keep to the essentials of that sacrament. And the same we are to suppose of their Anabaptism, and some other of their articles.

Sixthly, That we find in this their doctrine the substance of those articles, which the Waldenses have condemned in the faith and worship of the Church of Rome.

Seventhly, And as to the imputation of their finding fault with the hierarchy of the Church, this proceeded indeed from nothing else, but from the abuse which was then so customary in the western Churches, and of Italy in particular, as I have just now made out concerning the tenth century; and the multiplication of ecclesiastical offices into so many different orders appeared to them to be very opposite to the institutions of the primitive Church.

This being laid down, I say we have already found a body of men in Italy, before the year 1026, who believed contrary to the opinions of the Church of Rome, and who highly condemned their errors; a body of men which sent its members about into divers places, to oppose themselves to the superstitions that reigned throughout all the west.

I shall, in the sequel of this discourse, show the reason why they were accused of being mere seculars; and shall make it appear, that at the bottom this was nothing else but a pure calumny, founded upon an unjust prejudice.

CHAPTER 12

Reflections upon some practices of the Churches of the diocese of Italy.

WHAT I have already represented in the foregoing chapters makes it evident, as far as can be desired, that the diocese of Italy, in faith as well as worship, had the purity necessary to constitute a true Christian Church. I own that we find in it some errors and some superstitions; the account I have already given being a full proof thereof. But I have farther to observe,

First, That their Liturgy contains nothing that favors these errors or superstitions; now we know, that we ought to judge of a Church by the public writings of religion.

Secondly, That though several private men, or even some of the Clergy, were involved in these errors or superstitions, this must not be made use of to the prejudice of the whole diocese.

Thirdly, We find that at that very time the ablest and learnedest men amongst them did vigorously set themselves against these errors and these superstitions of a blind people and an ignorant Clergy.

These general remarks ought in particular to be applied to these following articles.

The **first** is, Prayer for the Dead.

2. Doting on the relies of saints.

3. The custom of praying to saints.

4. The too rigorous injunction of fasts, fixed to certain days.

5. The too great esteem they had of the celibacy imposed upon Ecclesiastics.

These are the most ancient of their superstitions. We find also, that in process of time the use of images, and some gross notions of the carnal presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, were introduced into this diocese.

I own that prayer for the dead was used in this diocese even before the fourth century; but withal I find it was practiced there under another notion than it is in the Church of Rome, which since Gregory I. has founded the belief of it wholly upon the doctrine of purgatory, is unknown to all the Churches of the East.

First, They prayed to God in general, that he would be pleased to make those partakers of the resurrection whom he had taken out of this world, which we approve of, and which we do as often, as by the kingdom of God, the coming of which we pray for, we understand the kingdom of glory, which is to destroy death, the last enemy of believers.

Secondly, They begged of God another kind of resurrection, which they conceived that God had promised to some believers, who particularly had the privilege of being admitted into the kingdom of Jesus Christ upon earth. This was nothing else but a consequence of the opinion of the most ancient Christians concerning the millennium.

Thirdly, They joined to this, the notion of the deliverance from the fire of the last judgment, through which many of the ancients were of opinion that all believers, the blessed Virgin and Apostles not excepted, were to pass.

The state of souls before the resurrection being very uncertain in ancient times, and the Fathers taking unto themselves the liberty to philosophize upon that subject, in a very different manner, as the learned of the Romish Church do confess: these things have given occasion to the rise of prayers for the dead; and though their opinions in this matter have been very different, yet they are all of them furnished with essential marks to distinguish them from those of the Church of Rome, in respect of their opinions; as those of the Church of Rome differ much in regard of their opinions from the words of the ancients which they make use of on this occasion, and which are, for the most part, of a considerable antiquity.

I own likewise, that the veneration of relics appeared in this diocese from before the end of the fourth century, and since that, by little and little, got strength there, as it is customary for human inventions to attain to their full growth by degrees. The piety of the primitive Christians contented

themselves with burying the bodies of believers and martyrs, and at their internment solemnly blessed God that he had taken them to his peace and refreshment. When the Church found themselves under persecution, they met together in the churchyards, or burying-places which gave occasion to the Pastors to discourse to the faithful, concerning the constancy of the martyrs: afterwards they celebrated the Eucharist upon their very tombs: and some time after, towards the end of the fourth century, they brought in a custom, not to consecrate any church, without putting first some relics of martyrs under the altar. This is what we find was practiced by St. Ambrose, with so much pomp, in reference to the relics of St. Gervasius and St. Pro-tasius, and which he believed founded upon a revelation. In process of time, they took care to fill the churches with the bodies of martyrs, those of whom no relics were to be found being in a manner quite forgot. They followed herein a Pagan opinion, which supposeth the souls of the deceased to be tied to their graves. They took occasion to consider the prayers made to God in the presence of these tombs, as being made in the communion of the martyrs there present. They wished that these believers, being delivered from temptations, might intercede, together with them, by an act of their first charity: and so, by little and little, they began to address their prayers to them themselves. Matters stood thus, when the famous Bishop of Turin set himself against these innovations with a great deal of vigor and zeal, founded upon the doctrine of Scripture, and upon the opinions of St. Austin.

As for what concerns their fasts, I do own, that besides that fast which was anciently observed before Easter, from the fourth century, there have been some other fasts fixed to certain days, as were those that were kept on the same account with the former, for the solemn Baptism of the *Catechumeni*; those which accompanied the ordination of the Ministers of the Church, and some others. But, first, we are to observe, that the Church in those times did not make a meritorious and satisfactory work of fasting, as it has been made some ages since. Secondly, We cannot deny but that they were kept then in good earnest, they consisting in a total abstinence from eating or drinking; whereas at present they consist only in a distinction of meats. Thirdly, That after all that can be said, the Church then considered fasting only as an indifferent action, which was to be backed and seconded by the motion of a true contrition and humility,

without which it could not be well pleasing to God; which is quite contrary to what has been conceived of it in these later times.

We cannot deny, but that a single state was observed by the Clergy of Milan, in the time of St. Ambrose: this appears from his first Book of Offices, chap. 50, where he expressly tells us, that those to whom he speaks had received Orders, *being, alieni ab ipso consortio conjugali,*

“strangers to conjugal fellowship.”

But we are to take notice, first, that in the same place he owns, that in most other places of less renown, the Priests and Bishops were married, and had children. Secondly, that they maintained this custom in imitation of the Priests under the law, who were not bound to forbear the company of their wives, save only during the time of their ministry. Thirdly, That they maintained, that the people of old were also obliged to abstain from their wives for some few days, in order to their partaking of the sacrifices. The words of St. Ambrose on this occasion are these: *Ouod eo non praeterii, fuia in plerisque abditiotibus locis, cure mi-nisterium gererent, vel etiam sacerdotium, flios susceperunt, et id tanquam usu veteri defndunt, quando per intervalla dierum sacrificium offerebatur. et tamen castigabatur etiam populus per biduum vel triduum, ut ad sacrificetum purus accederet, ut in Feteri Testamento leglinus, et lavabat vestimenta sua. Si in Sgura tanta observantia, quanta in veritate,*

“Which, therefore I did not pass by, because in more retired places, those that discharged the office of Levites or Priests did beget children; and this they maintain from what was in use under the old law, when they offered sacrifices with some intervening distance of time; and yet even the people themselves were to use abstinence for two or three days, that they might with the greater purity come to the sacrifice, according as we read in the Old Testament, and to wash their garments. If so strict an observance were used in the figure, how much more in the truth itself!”

Whence it appears, first, That the greater part of the Clergy of the diocese of Milan were not bound to observe the law of *celibacy*, which Paphnutius had hindered the Council of Nice from imposing upon the Bishopshand other ministers. Secondly, That though the Clergy of Milan lived in a

single state, yet this was not by virtue of any law, but of their own thrace, and without any necessity. Thirdly, That the cause of St. Ambrose's so highly recommending the celibacy of ministers, was the high esteem he had for the single state. Fourthly, That it was a gross imposture of Petrus Damianus, to maintain, as he did before the Clergy of Milan, that St. Ambrose not being able to reduce his Clergy to a single state, had been obliged to implore the assistance of Syriecius, to bring it about, and that he had declared he would follow the Church of Rome in that particular, as being his mistress. I know very well that he cites for this the book *De Sacerdotali Dignitate*; which he attributes to St. Ambrose, but with so little justice, that that alone is sufficient to lay open the impudence wherewith he abused the credulity of the people of Milan.

This we may clearly gather from his 82nd Epistle, written to the Church of Verceil, where alter having given the sense of the words of St. Paul, which concern the virtues of Mirlisters, he adds, *Haec posui quae cavenda acceperim. Virtutum autem magister Apostolus est, qui cure patientia redarguendos doeeat contradicentes, qui unius uxoris virum prcipiat esse, non quo ewsortem excludat conjugii, ham hoc supra legem precepti est, sed ut conjugali castimonia server ablutionis suae grafJam. Neque irerum ut flios ereare Apostolica invitefur auctoritate, habentern enim dixit flios, non facientem.*

“I have here set down what I understand ought to be avoided. Now the Apostle is a master of virtue, who teacheth, that gainsayers ought to be reprov'd with patience, who commands a Presbyter to be husband of one wife, not as if he would thereby exclude those that live in a single state; for that is something above the command of the law; but that in conjugal chastity he might preserve the grace received in Baptism; nor, as if thereby the Apostle would invite him by his authority to beget children, for the words of the Apostle are, *having children, not begetting them.*”

Which expressly proves, first, That the Bishop or Priest, who continues with his wife in the conjugal band, does not therefore cease to keep his baptismal purity. Secondly, That, according to him, the Apostle did no more deny Bishops the liberty of marrying, than he granted it to them.

It is difficult to determine what were the opinions of Servatianus and Barbatianus, of whom St. Ambrose makes mention in that 82nd Epistle. He tells us, that they came out of the monastery of Milan, whence they betook themselves to Vetceil; he accuseth them for asserting, that virginity and fasting did not deserve any greater praise than the state of marriage and the ordinary way of living. He aggravates this indictment, by accusing them of permitting fornication, and asserting it not to be inferior to the state of virginity or lawful marriage; whereupon he endeavours to prove the contrary, as being the doctrine of the Church, and of the Scripture.

But in all this we may perceive something of immoderate zeal, wherewith the love of *celibacy* is apt to inspire those that maintain it. I will not accuse St. Ambrose for imitating the extravagance of Syricius, in his Epistle to Himerius, Bishop of Tarragon, writ in 385, where he makes use of these words of St. Paul, *Those who are in the flesh cannot please God*. As if all married people, were in the flesh, according to the Apostle's meaning. But I cannot avoid observing, first, That St. Ambrose seems to have imputed to Servatianus and Barbatianus, as their true opinions, the consequences which he himself had drawn from them, this being a method which an ungoverned zeal does often put men upon, against those whom they believe to be out of the way. Secondly, I say, that if the case were otherwise, St. Ambrose would scarce have been excusable, for having acted so mildly against Servatianus and Barbatianus. How could he have done less than excommunicate them, and represent them to the Church of Verceil, as such who ought to be excommunicated, for opposing the principles of Christianity, or as those who ought to be rejected, for having been justly excommunicated at Milan. Indeed, whosoever shall be pleased to make an unprejudiced reflection upon this history, will hardly be able to persuade themselves otherwise, but that there is a great deal said only to aggravate, in this discourse of St. Ambrose; but at the same time, whatsoever he might have alleged, they will conceive, that these Monks were offended to see men begin to set too high an esteem upon the state of virginity and abstinence, and that this had obliged them to speak of them with a kind of undervaluing and indifference, and to oppose themselves against the prejudice that was then beginning to take root and be established.

I say, that this prejudice began then to be established; for we find that the Council of Turin, celebrated a little after St. Ambrose's death, doth absolutely forbid the promoting of a married Deacon to the priestly office, or a married Priest to that of a Bishop. True it is, that it seems that this Canon was not exactly observed; for we find several examples of Priests and Bishops, who probably had passed through these first orders, their marriage proving no obstacle to their promotion.

However it be, in process of time, this rigor, which concerned only the Clergy, was slackened in this diocese, as I have made it appear. As also there happened no considerable change, till about the tenth century, when the barbarous nations having overwhelmed that diocese, as well as the greatest part of the west, the Bishops were found to be stupid enough to admit the false Decretals of the Pope, which some impostor had published as a means to overthrow the ancient discipline, and to subject the west to the Romish see. In the time of Alexander II. and Gregory VII. who could afford no better names to married Priests than that of Nicolaitans, Servatianus and Barbatianus would have been handled quite after another manner than they were by St. Ambrose; which makes it evident enough, what the opinion of the Church was at the time when this question first appeared. It is well known, that in succeeding times the Monks that had broken their vows and renounced their oath were obliged to do penance; but we find nothing like this in St. Ambrose's time. The reason is, because a convent at that time was a matter of choice, which might be quitted without any other punishment, but the imputation of imprudence, for not having sufficiently considered fully of that kind of life, before they engaged themselves therein.

Furthermore it is good to observe, that the rashness and imprudence of those, who thus quitted this state, seemed the less pardonable, because they did not admit persons to sacred Orders that were very young, as we do now, but only men of an age sufficient to know their own constitution, and to know whether they were able to observe that kind of life which they voluntarily had taken upon them.

But what I have already observed may suffice to make it evident, that the state of religion in the diocese of Italy was not so far corrupted, but that we may own it to be a Church pure enough, and which, in respect of the

most understanding of its members, and that in public too, had preserved the true faith and the true worship which the Christian religion prescribes to us.

Our business at present is to show, that this Church was independent on the power of the Pope of Rome; after which, we shall consider its separation from the Pope, when he endeavored to subject it to his authority.

CHAPTER 13

*That the diocese of Italy was an independent diocese,
till after the midst of the eleventh century.*

IN order to the thorough establishing of this truth, I intend to make it appear, that this is not only certain with respect to those times when the Popes were not very considerable, but also with respect to that time when the Popes began to lift up themselves by the favor of Gratian, and after him of Valentinian III.

To this purpose it will be of use to set forth, as well the constitution of the Church, as the manner in which the diocese of Milan did continue independent until the midst of the eleventh century, at which time the Waldenses were obliged more openly to testify their aversion for the Church of Rome as an Antichristian Church. It will be easy enough for me to perform what I have proposed to myself, in following the history of the Church.

Before the Council of Nice, we find the diocese of Italy very distinct from that of Rome, which contained the suburbleazy Churches: of this we have two unquestionable proofs; the one of which we find in the case of Paulus Samosatenus, Bishop of Antioch, where the Emperor Aurelian distinguisheth the Bishops of Italy from those of Rome, by his referring equally to them the decision of Samosatenus's opinions, whether they were to be looked upon as orthodox or not.

The other we meet with in the business of the Donatists; where Constantine, to put an end to the differences which divided the African Churches, appointed them judges as well from Rome as from Italy: Meroeles, Bishop of Milan, as head of his diocese, being nominated by the Emperor, as well as Melehiades.

The Council of Nice confirmed this ancient custom of the Metropolitans, who had enjoyed the right of convening the synods of their diocese, and ordaining the Bishops belonging to the same. This we see in the sixth Canon: each diocese then formed a council, which was called by the Metropolitan. Every Metropolitan ordered the affairs of his diocese, all

matters were regulated by this council, and there was no appeal from their judgments. So that the Canon of the Council of Nice served instead of a law, as well in the east as the west; and which might have served so still, if the ambition of the Bishops of Constantinople and of Rome had not overthrown this so wise a regulation. Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus, maintains, that this Canon did also constitute every diocese so far independent on any of its neighbouts, that they could not take any cognizance of matters that were without their limits. This we find in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus.

We find that since that time, the thing continued on the same foot: many proofs might be given of it, but I shall content myself with these following:

1. St. Athanasius distinguisheth Milan and Rome as two independent Churches.
2. The election of St. Ambrose is related to us by Theodoret, lib. 4. cap. 5, 6. as done without any consent of the Bishop of Rome; which could not have been so, had he been the Patriarch of Italy.

The business of the Priscillianists, who had recourse to St. Ambrose as well as to Damasus, after that they had been rejected by the Spanish Bishops at Coesaraugusta, is a certain proof hereoff

If we read the history of the following centuries, we shall not find that ever any Bishops of Italy' were ordained by the Popes, or were subject to their councils, till the eleventh century.

We find that the Council of Italy, in which St. Ambrose presided, approve, in their letter sent to Theodosius, the proceedings about the election of Maximus, in opposition to the opinion of Damasus and his council: so far were they from depending on the Pope as their Patriarch.

We find the same thing also acknowledged by those of Africa, who sent Legates as well to the Bishop of Milan, as to the Bishop of Rome. We find the same thing in the year 431; Theodoret addressing himself to the Bishops of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna, against the Chapters of Cyril, which Pope Celestine had approved.

We find in the year 451. Pope Leo I. so fully owning this truth, that he writes to the Bishop of Milan, that he would be pleased to approve in his synod the letter which the said Pope wrote to Flavianus, upon the incarnation of the Word, against the errors of Eutyches. We find Flavianus appealing to the Pope and the Bishop of Milan by name, as well as to the rest of the western Metropolitans.

We find in the year 556 that the diocese of Milan, and its Bishops, stood resolutely to the party that rejected the Fifth General Council; and though Pope Pelagius strongly solicited Narses to reduce them to his opinion by violence, yet he could never obtain his desire, as may be seen by St. Gregory's Epistles: and the Church of Aquileia, and some others of Italy, above an hundred years after, had no communion with the Church of Rome, as Baronius himself ingenuously confesseth.

We find in the year 679 a Council of Italy assembled upon occasion of the Monothelites, wherein the Bishops of this diocese alone writ to Constantine the Emperor; which showeth their independence on the Pope, who wrote also in particular with his Council.

And last of all, we do not find that since the seventh century the Church of Rome has had that authority over the diocese of Italy, which she artogated to herself over other Churches, where she had already gained some preeminence by means of her Vicars.

We have an unquestionable proof of what I here allege in the *Diurnus Romanus*. All the Bishops that belonged to the Pope's jurisdiction, by reason of their being in his diocese, were obliged to swear, at their ordination, that they would follow the rites and the divine service of the Church of Rome. Now we know that the Church of Milan had its own peculiar Liturgy, called the Ambrosian. It is true, they pretend that after Charles the Great had made himself master of the kingdom of the Lombards, he endeavored to abolish the same; and some think it received a great change at that time: but this is only conjecture without ground; for, excepting some slight alterations caused by time, at a juncture when Popery had well nigh got the mastery there, that Liturgy continued much the same as it was before.

We find the same independence of the Church of Milan in the ninth and tenth century acknowledged by Ughellus in the Life of Angilbertus: *Angilbertus Pustrella ejusdem nominis superiori successit 827. Hic ille Angilbertus est, quem tantae dignitatis corrupit foelicitas, cum aliquamdiu moderatione antea usus, prudenter Mediolanensem administrasset Ecclesiam: suffultus enim (ut quidam narrant) Magni Caroli privilegiis et gratiis, charusque Ludovico Pio Imperatori, Lotharioque ijusdem filio, a Romana Ecclesia ita defecit, ut, perinauditam superbiam, cum Romano Pontifice de potestate deque dignitate decertare non verecundaretur. Pessimum exemplum ita ad successores pertransiit, ut per ducentos ipsos annos ea contumacia illos abduxrit infeceritque.*

“Angilbertus Pustrella succeeded his predecessor, of the same name, in the year 827. This is that Angilbert, whom the splendor of so high a dignity corrupted after having used moderation for some time, he had prudently governed that Church: for being upheld (as some tell us) by the privileges and favors of Charles the Great, and being dear to the Emperor Ludovicus Pius, and Lotharius his son he made a defection from the Roman Church, as not being ashamed to contend with the Pope of Rome about power and dignity. This bad example of his passed over to his successor: so that for two hundred years together they were led astray and infected by this contumacy.”

We are not to admit that which Ughellus would fain insinuate, that this was a rebelling against his Patriarch. This is a mere illusion. It was only a resistance of the enterprises of the Popes, who, being encouraged by the easiness and ignorance of divers western Prelates, did boldly invade those rights which did not at all belong unto them. For we find that, eight years after his election, Angilbert assisted at the Council of Mantua with the Pope’s Legates, without their preferring any complaint against him, which they would not have failed to have done, especially being supported by the authority of Lotharius the Emperor, if Angilbert’s right had not been evident.

And indeed it was not till the year 1059, that Nicolas II. under pretense of putting a stop to the simony in that diocese, and to condemn the Nicolaitanism, (for this was the name which at that time was bestowed on the

marriage of Priests,) sent Petrus Damianus, and Anselre, Bishop of Lucca, to Milan, who subjected that diocese, obliging them to receive the laws of the Pope's synod, whereas before they had only owned the laws of the (Ecumenical Councils, wherein they had assisted by their deputies, according to the protestation of Maurus, Bishop of Ravenna.

We have a certain proof hereof in the discourse of the Clergy of Milan with Petrus Damianus; for they maintain,

“That the Ambrosian Church, according to the ancient institutions of the Fathers, was always free, without being subject to the laws of Rome; and that the Pope of Rome had no jurisdiction over their Church, as to the government or constitution of it.”

We may here take notice how Claudius, Bishop of Turin, behaved himself with respect to Pope Paschal, with whose being offended at him Theodemirus had reproached him, willing to recommend to him the Pope's authority.

The matter was so clear and evident, that Pope Honorius II. being desirous to make Anselm, Archbishop of Milan, own his authority, who was chosen in the year 1123, and to give him the pail, he refused it, in the year 1125, for fear of subjecting his Church to that of Rome. See how Landulphus, c. 38, relates the matter, as we find it set down by Ughellus:

Anselmus Pustrella, hujus nominis quintus Archiepiscopus, adlectus est anno 1123. De profectioe ejusdem Roman ad Honorium II. Anno 1125, ac de iis quae ibi peregit, haec Landulphus, capitulo 38: Sed cum idem Archiepiscopus, sectus consilium quorundam Capellanorum et Primicerii, Petri vero Terdonesis Episcopi, contra publicum interdictum Cleri et populi Medialanensis, Romam ivit: mihi quidem non sedit... Veruntamen ipse, ceu vir prudens et sapiens, cum papa Honorio et Cardinalibus ejus multa contulit, et conferendo ecclesiasticas consuetudines Ambrosianae Ecclesiae, et honores ejus archiepiscopatus et urbis, vivis et bonis rationibus defendit. Unde ipse Papa huic prudenti viro dixit, Frater, mediatatus et Episcopus venisti: sed si vis frui autoritate Archiepiscopi in temporibus meis, necesse est ut stolam suscipias e manibus meis, aut, sicut dgo suscepi, ad altare Sancti Petri. Hinc dominus iste Mediolanensis Roboaldum Albensem adjuravit, ut sibi consuleret. Tunc Roboaldus ille

Albensis sic ait, quod prius sustineret nasum suum scindi usque ad oculos, quam daret sibi consilium ut susciperet Romae stolam, et Ecclesiae Mediolanesi praeparet hanc novam et gravissimam, quam Honorius Papa dicebat sibi, imponere mensuram. Mediolanum igitur ipse Archiepiscopus sine stola rediit, et eundem Albensem Episcopum secum reduxit. Verum Archiepiscopalem sedem non ascendit, donec Ubertus de Meregnano, ejus scriba, juravit quod ipse dominus suus Anselmus nulli minuimento honoris Ecclesiae Mediolanensis consensit, et quod ipsum Albensis ille Episcopus Roboaldus auctoritate sua confirmavit. Diende Pontifex iste Anselmus sedem et castella archiepiscopatus in beneficio Cleri et populi recuperavit.

“Anselmus Pustrella, the fifth of that name, was chosen Archbishop in the year 1123. Concerning whose journey to Rome, to Honorius II. in the year 1125, and what he did there, Landulfus gives us this account, chapter 38: But when the said Archbishop, following the counsel of some of his chaplains, and of his *Primicerius*, and of Peter, Bishop of Terdon contrary to the public prohibition of the Clergy and people of Milan, was gone to Rome.... However he, as a prudent and wise man, conferred at large with Pope Honorius II. and his Cardinals in which conference he with brisk and good arguments asserted the customs of the Ambrosian Church, with the prerogatives of that archbishopsic and city. Whereupon the Pope said to this prudent man, Brother, you that are a Bishop come hither well provided with arguments; but if you have a mind to enjoy the archiepiscopal dignity during my time, it is needful that you receive the pall from my hands, or, as I myself have received it, at the altar of St. Peter. Then the Bishop of Milan conjured Roboaldus, Bishop of Alba, to advise him in this ease; whereupon the Bishop answered, that he would rather suffer his nose to be slit up to his eyes, than advise him to receive his pall at Rome, and thereby subject the Church of Milan to that new anthard measure which Pope Honorius designed to impose upon her. Wherefore the Archbishop Anselm returned to Milan without his pall, and brought the Bishop of Alba back with him. Nevertheless he did not place himself in the archiepiscopal scat, until Ubertus de Meregnano, his secretary, had sworn that his lord Anselm had not consented to the least diminution of the

prerogatives of the Church of Milan; and the same also Roboaldus, Bishop of Alba, confirmed by his authority. And after this Archbishop Anselm recovered his seat, and the castles of his archbishopric, which were at the disposal of the Clergy and people.”

I know only of two or three objections about this matter, which deserve to be considered. The one is, the prejudice the Popes have endeavored to foment, some ages since, as if they were the Patriarchs of all the West; in consequence whereof their flatterers have endeavored to make the world believe, that the suburbicary Churches, whereof mention is made in the sixth Canon of the Council of Nice, do signify the Churches of all the West. But this is so foolish an imagination, that it is strange that men of any learning should suffer themselves to be imposed upon by it. The second is, that we find that sometimes the Bishops of the diocese of Milan have met in synods with the Pope and his council, as if they had belonged to his patriarchate. The third is, that Ughellus relates, from time to time, in the catalogue he has given us of the Bishops of Milan, that such and such a one were confirmed by the Pope, and received the pall at his hands. But it will be easy to refute all these objections fully. First, as for that conceit, that the Pope was Patriarch of the West; it is a thing unheard of by all antiquity: and indeed, if Leo the First, on the one hand, had known himself invested with this right, he would never have ingenuously confessed, as he has done in his Epistles, that he did not pretend to ordain the Bishops that were amongst the Gauls, which notwithstanding would have belonged to his jurisdiction, in case he had been Patriarch of the West; and on the other hand he would have made use of this prerogative, in his request to the younger Valentinian, when he endeavored to procure for himself the right of appeals, which was contested with him, as being an unjust and novel right.

As for what concerns the union which sometimes has been made between the Synod of Italy and that of Rome, this cannot be made use of as an argument in this case; for the Prelates of Italy have assisted at the synods that have been held amongst the Gauls, without subjecting themselves to the Gauls in the least thereby, or without subjecting the Gauls to Italy. We have an example hereof in the Synod of Turin, in the year 397, where the Gauls assisted, because the business of that synod was to remedy the

common disorders, which equally reigned in the neighboring dioceses, which maintained ecclesiastical communion one with another.

And as for that which Ughellus saith, that several Bishops of Milan have received the pall, and been confirmed by the Popes of Rome; I confess that Ripamontius cites a letter of St. Gregory's to Lawrence, Bishop of Milan, by which he sends the pall to him. But without entering into the examination of what this concession did import, we are to observe, first, that this pall was no more than a politic subtilty of the Court of Rome, to establish amongst the barbarous and stupid western people the edict of Valentinian the Third, in favor of appealing to the see of Rome; an edict which could be no longer of force after the dissipation of the Roman empire. Secondly, that at the bottom, this concession signifies little else, as Hinemar has very well observed with respect to all the Pope's privileges, save that the Pope did not take away a right, whereof those to whom he granted the privilege were already in full possession. Thirdly, that though the thing should be really so, yet it took place so little, by reason of the condition wherein that diocese has been since the Popes have made use of this snare, that the ecclesiastical liberty of that diocese has been little or nothing concerned in it. We know, in the fourth place, that this granting of the pall has not taken place, save only with some ambitious Bishops, and not with all, as Ughellus assures us, but without any proof; as likewise when he asserts, that it was Gregory the First who granted to them the right of crowning the kings of Italy. This Ughellus was indeed nothing else but a relater of fables, who does not deserve any credit amongst learned men, though the pains he has taken may be, in other things, of very good use.

Last of all, That which I here assert concerning the independence of the diocese of Italy is so clear, that after a hundred treatises of the learned of the Church of Rome, who have maintained, that by the suburbleafy Churches (whereof mention is made in the sixth Canon of the Council of Nice) all the western Churches were to be understood; M. Dupin, Doctor of the Sorbonne, has laid down the cudgels; confessing that the diocese of the Pope consisted only of the ten provinces about Rome, and that Italy, composed of seven provinces, was not in the least subject to it.

To conclude, Christianus Lupus owns, with all his reasons, that the diocese of Milan, in the midst of the ninth century, pretended to be independent, as we find it in his notes upon the Council of Pavia, under Leo IX. He very expressly observes, that this diocese did not own the laws which the Popes published in their councils, as pretending not to depend upon their regulations.

CHAPTER 14

Concerning the separation of the Churches of the diocese of Italy from the Church of Rome, and of the faith of the Patetines.

WHAT I have already related concerning the independence of the diocese of Italy on the Pope, was a thing very displeasing and troublesome to the Church of Rome. She could not, without regret, see a diocese so near to her preserve its liberty, whilst a great number of other dioceses, at a farther distance, had quitted their rights, and acknowledged her jurisdiction. Nicolas II. having undertaken this business, made choice of Petrus Damianus, and Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, to be his Legates, making the difference which was risen between the people and the Clergy, upon occasion of two pretended heresies, that of the Simoniacs, and that of the Nicolaitans, who did not believe themselves bound to observe *celibacy* by a mere human authority. They began also to question the ordinations that had been made by order of the Emperors and other princes, as if it were no better than pure simony to get into the Church by this means. Moreover, there was also a kind of tax imposed upon those who were newly ordained, for the use of the Bishops and Archbishops, and without paying which there was scarcely any ordination to be had.

Petrus Damianus himself tells us, that upon his arrival at Milan, the Clergy stirred up the people to express their discontent against the design of this legation: *Non debere Ambrosianam Ecclesiam Romanis legibus subjacere, nullumque judicandi vet disponendi jus Romano Pontidfici in illa sede competere. Nimis indignum ut qux sub progenitoribus nostris SEMPER extitit libera, ad nostrae confusionis opprobrium, nunc alteri, quod absit, Ecclesiste sit subjecta.*

“That the Ambrosian Church ought not to be subjected to the laws of Rome; and that the Pope of Rome had no right at all of judging or disposing any thing there. It was a shame, said they, that she who has been ALWAYS free in the time of our forefathers, should now, to our great reproach and confusion, be forced to truckle, which God forbid, under another Church.”

The people got together at the ringing of the bells, and went to the palace of the Archbishop, and put Cardinal Peter in danger of his life, as his friends told him. They express their indignation, because in the Synod of the Priests of that metro-polls he had had the boldness to sit above the Archbishop.

What does this wise Legate in this encounter? He gets up into the pulpit, and preacheth to them concerning the dignity of the Roman Church; that the prerogatives of other sees had been granted them by the Emperors, but that she only was beholden for her primacy to Jesus Christ; that those who refused to render obedience to her, did thereby make themselves heretics. In the sequel of his sermon he impudently asserts three palpable falsities: the one, that Nazarius and Celsus had been sent by St. Peter from Rome to Milan; the other, that St. Paul had sent thither St. Protasius and St. Gervasius; and the third, that St. Ambrose had recourse to the authority of Syricius, to purge his diocese from the heresy of the Nicolaitans, which began to spread itself there. These are the arguments he makes use of, and adds a passage out of a book, *De Sacerdotali Dignitate*, falsely attributed to St. Ambrose; wherein the author makes profession of his following the Church of Rome in all things, as his mistress.

It is pleasant to see this impostor congratulating himself, that he had asserted the prerogative of the Church of Rome to so good a purpose. This so very evangelical sermon smoothed all the rubs he met with at first. He examines the Clergy, and finds almost all of them guilty of simony. What is to be done in this case? There is no way left but a dispensation; and this way he takes: he makes the Archbishop and his Clergy to promise, never for the time to come to exact any thing, either directly or indirectly, of those whom he ordained; he chargeth him to anathematize the heresy of the Nicolaitans; he makes him promise, upon the Gospel, to exterminate them to the utmost of his power; he imposeth penance upon him and all his Clergy, and afterwards restores to them the ornaments of their orders, in the midst of mass, confirming them in the same, after he had made them swear to receive the seven General Councils, the last of which was the second of Nice, concerning the worshipping of images, which, it appears, that diocese had before rejected, as well as France, Germany, and Spain, at the Council of Francfort, in the year 794: nor can any body read, without being ashamed, the pleasant penances he imposed on them, and the means

he put into their hands of buying them off; it being one of the ways the Church of Rome had found out to make sins cheap.

However, this business did not go off so successfully as Petrus Damianus did expect: for soon after his departure, the Archbishop Wido, and his Clergy, became sensible of the false step they had made: Wido, supported by the nobility, called a council, and therein confirmed the right that Priests had to marry. The story is told by Bonizo, Bishop of Sutrium, in his Chronicle of the Popes, which is in the Emperor's library at Vienna, as Lambenius tells us, lib. 2. *Comment. Bibliothecae Vindobonensis*, p. 790. *Et de Stephano Godefredi, regis germano, et qualiter ejus temporibus Patarea apud Mediolanum exorta est, et de Nicolao Papa;*

“And concerning Stephen Godfrey the king's brother, and how in his time the Patarea began at Milan, and concerning Pope Nicolas.”

Whence Mr. Ducange has very well concluded that Patarea, in the sense of this Bishop, signifies the pretended heresy of the Patarines.

The account which Sigonius gives us of this matter is this: *Cum multae aliae Ecclesiae nova de Simoniacorum atque Nicolaitarum haerisi decreta repudiarent, tum maxime Mediolanensis, ut quae jampridem, Romanae Ecclesiae auctoritate relicta, praeceptis ejus haudquaquam obtemperaret, et tamen siqua alia retro hujusmodi veneno infecta esset: hanc rem cum per se gravem, tum Mediolanensium Clericorum nomine turpem esse Arialdus, ex Alciata, ut fertur, familia, Clericus decumanus, ratus, Landulfo Cottae, populi Praefecto, auctor fuit ut eam palam oppugnandam aggrediretur. Id vero cum facere, secundis populi auribus animisque, coepisset, Wido, Archiepiscopus, contrariam parte suscepti, favore maxime nobilitatis innixus. Itaque res eo usque infamiae mutuis altercationibus jurgisque deducta fuit, ut sacerdotes qui uxores haberent prae pudore separatim a caeteris rem divinam facere cogentur in loco qui Patria dicitur, unde vulgo a pueris Patarini ad contumeliam dicebantur.*

“Whereas many other Churches rejected the new decrees made against the heresy of Simoniacs and Nicolaitans, yet none more than the Church of Milan, who now for some time having renounced the authority of the Church of Rome, was no longer obedient to its precepts and yet was rather more infected with the

poison of these heresies than any other: therefore one Arialdus, as was said, of the family of the *Alciati*, and one of the chief Clerks, conceiving this a matter as well heinous in itself as reproachful to the repute of the Clergy of Milan, he persuades Landulfus Cotta, the Prefect of the people, openly and with force to oppose himself against the same: which when he had undertaken, upon the people's appearing in favor of his design, Wido the Archbishop takes upon him the defense of the contrary party, relying chiefly upon the favor of the nobility so that this matter was carried to that infamous excess by their quarrels and wranglings, that the Priests who had wives were forced for shame to say mass separate from others, in a place called *Patria*, [or rather *Pataria*,] whence the boys, by way of reproach, afterwards gave them the name of Patarines."

Which is a very distinct account of the original of the name of *Patarines*. I shall in the sequel observe, first, That they have given this nickname of Patarines to the Waldenses, because the Waldenses were those *Subalpini* in Peter Damian, who at the same time maintained the same doctrines in the archbishopric of Turin. Secondly, that the Waldenses have always constantly maintained, that the Church could not deprive Ministers of the liberty of marrying, forasmuch as God had never deprived them of it, neither in the Old nor New Testament. What we are to observe here is, that these Patarines, being separated from the Church of Rome, were for the most part of the same opinions that were afterwards asserted by the Waldenses; which has been the reason why the Patarines and Waldenses have been taken for one and the same sort of heretics.

This we may know several ways:

First, Because since the Romans drove these out of their communion, which happened in the year 1059, it is natural to conceive, that those Patarines had raked together with care all the articles that might any way justify their separation.

Secondly, Because the disputes of Leo IX. with Michael Cerularius, Bishop of Constantinople, gave way to the strengthening of that separation; that dispute having given occasion to examine several

articles which the Church of Rome proposed as necessary, which the Greeks rejected with an high hand.

Thirdly, Because we find that the Church of Milan, and those of that diocese, had now for some time testified a great aversion for the idolatry of Rome, and by rejecting the submission to the Church of Rome, procured by Petrus Damianus, they rejected also the second Council of Nice, as favoring idolatry, according to the definition of their ancestors at Francfort.

Fourthly, Because it appears by the book of Lanfranc against Berengarius, that some schismatics maintained his opinion, for so he expresseth himself in the account he gives us of the condemnation of Berengarius, in the Council of Rome. This probably would pass for no more than a conjecture, if the thing were not formally avowed by Matthew of Westminster, who saith upon the year, 1087, that Berengarius of Tours, being fallen into heresy, had already almost corrupted all the French, Italians, and English. When he speaks of a corruption in these dioceses about this matter, it is evident, that he means that they treated the Popes as innovators and Pesehasians, and that they kept to the primitive faith of the Church, which the Popes had endeavored to condemn by their definitions.

Fifthly, Because it appears, that the Berengarians, who were of the same stamp with the Patarines, did discourse much at the same rate as the Waldenses did afterwards: this is evident from Lanfranc, where he tells us, that they accused the Church to have erred, by reason of ignorance, and that the Church remained in their party alone, and they with Berengarius called the Church of Rome, *The congregation of the wicked, and the seat of Satan*.

Sixthly, Because we find the Berengarians exposed to the same ealumnies which were afterward imputed to the Patarines and Waldenses. This is evident from the discourse of Guimondus, Bishop of Aversa, lib. 1. *contra Bereng.* where he accuseth them of overthrowing, as much as in them lay, lawful marriages, and the baptism of infants.

Seventhly, Because it appears from what is left us of the writings of Bonizo, Bishop of Sutrium, who took pen in hand in defense of the Pope's pretensions over this diocese, that his aim was to assert the self-same Roman doctrines, which in process of time we find constantly opposed by the Waldenses in that diocese. See here one of his notes, taken out of his Paradise of St. Austin, *De Baptismi sacramento, et de corporis et sanguinis Domini Eucharistia scrutare viriliter.*

In his **eighth** Abridgment he treats about, *Quid sit infernus, et utrum in inferno mall tanturn, an etiam boni mansuri sint, et an corpora possint esse in ustione ignis perpetua, et quibus sacrificium prorit post mortera, et qualiter mortui in sorenils viventibus appareant, et de oblatione vel eleemosyna pro defunctis, et quod Adam morte Dominica ab inferno sit liberatus.*

“What hell is, and whether the wicked only, or the good also, are to remain there: whether bodies can continue in everlasting burnings; and to whom the sacrifice of the mass is available after death; and how the dead may appear to the living in their dreams; and about offerings; and alms for the dead; and that Adam was delivered out of hell by the death of our Lord.”

An understanding reader will easily judge, that these kind of questions are such as could not be discussed, without entering into those controversies that at this day we have with the Church of Rome.

This Bonizo was killed by those of Placenza, in the year 1089, as he was defending the cause of the Popes of Rome against the Emperors, whom he cruelly abused in his writings. He has given us an account in writing of the first rise of Patarea at Milan, under Pope Stephen II.

Two things more may be added to what I have already observed: the first is, that it is apparent, that though the Abbot Gezo had endeavored to confirm his Monks in the opinions of Paschasius, by copying almost his whole book, to make it more common in Italy, yet notwithstanding, that of John Scot continued still in being, and was the shield which Berengarius and his party made use of, to oppose the opinions of Paschasius. He was not condemned till the year 1059, in the Council of Verceil, under Leo IX.

and the Italians almost immediately thereupon separated themselves from the communion of the Pope of Rome.

The second is, that there was such a great number of these Berengarians, who did not hold their doctrine from Berengarius, but from John Scot and others, that this became the subject of a great contest: this is evident from the life of the Abbot Wolfelmus. The same is likewise hinted to us by Sige-bert, *ad an.* 1081, in the edition of Miraeus, in the year 1608. *Istis diebus Francia turbabatur per Berengarium Turonensem, qui asserebat Eucharistiam, quam sumlinus in altari, non esse revera corpus et sanguinem Christi: unclé contra eum et pro eo multum a multiset verbis et scriptis disputatum est.*

“In those days there were disturbances in France, by means of Berengarius of Tours, who maintained that the Eucharist which we receive on the altar is not the true body and blood of Christ: which occasioned great disputes both for and against him, as well by writing books as by public disputations.”

We may gather the same truth we here set down from the compendious account we find in the Councils, in the place of the acts of the Council of Rome in the year 1079, under Gregory VII. against Berengarius. This account, which we find likewise in the Chronicle of Verdun, written by Hugo, Abbot of Flavigny, contains these express words; *Omnibus igitur in ecclesia Servatoris congregatis, habitus est sermo de corpore et sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, multis haec, nonnullis illa [aprius] sentientibus. Maxima siquidem pars panera et vinum per sacrae orationis verba, et sacerdotis consecrationem, Spiritu Sancto invisibiliter operante, converti substantialiter in corpus Dominicurn de Virgine naturn, quod et in cruce pendit, et in sangui-nere, qui de ejus latere militis effusus est lancea, asserebat, [atque autoritatibus orthodoxorum Patrum, tam Grcecoritm, quam Latinorum defendebat.] Quidam vero caecitate nimia et longa perculti figura tantum substantiale illud corpus in dextera Pa-tris sedens esse, seque et alios decipientes, quibusdam cavillationibus conabantur adstruere, rerum ubi coepit res agi, prius etiam quam tertia die ventura jherit in c synodo, defecit contra veritatem niti pars altera, nempe Spiritus Sancti ignis emolu menta apalearum consumens, et fulgore suo fal sam lucem diverberando obtenebrans, noctis cahlig nem vettit in lucem.*

“All of them therefore being met together in St. Savior’s church, they discoursed the matter about the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, many of them being of one, some [at first] of another opinion. For the greatest part of them maintained that the bread, and wine, by means of the sacred words and the Priest’s consecration, through an invisible operation of the Spirit, were changed substantially into the body of our Lord, born of the Virgin, and which hung on the cross; and into the blood which gushed from his side when pierced with the soldier’s spear. It was fully confirmed the same with the authorities of orthodox Greek and Latin Fathers. But some being smitten with an over great and long continued blindness, endeavored to prove, by sophistical cavillation, that it was figuratively only, a substantial body sitting at the right hand of the Father, deceiving themselves and others. But when the matter began to be handled even before they had met the third day in council together, this party ceased any longer to oppose the truth; the fire of the Holy Ghost consuming these chaffy emoluments, and by his brightness dispersing the false light and darkening it, changed the darkness of the night into light.”

This is the account of what passed in the council, and is found in the MS. of the councils which I have consulted; though they who have published the councils have changed it at their pleasure. But whatever pains they may have taken herein, it appears,

1. That Berengarius was not the author of that opinion in Italy, the greatest part of whose Bishops were summoned to that council by Gregory VII.
2. That this council was at first much divided, and that this division continued two days, and was not ended till the third day.
3. That the words, *of a long blindness*, which the author uses, cannot be spoken with reference to the disciples of Berengarius, but must refer to those who maintained the same doctrine which he did, from the time wherein this question, having been first started by Paschasius Radbertus, had occasioned that division; whereof the book of John Scot, which was burnt at Veteuil, was an authentic testimony.

But I believe I have sufficiently made out in the foregoing chapters, that the diocese of Italy did always enjoy a light of doctrine of competent purity; as likewise, that the purity of divine worship ever continued amongst them, notwithstanding they had a little sprinkling of that ignorance and spirit of superstition, which had overflowed the Romish Church, and the greatest part of the western Churches. We had also a particular information, in what manner Italy separated itself from the Church of Rome, when she undertook to invade her rights, and to impose upon her her own errors and superstitions. We have seen that a party as well of the superior as inferior Clergy, and the sounder part of the people, formed a distinct body, to secure themselves from that corruption.

This separation of the Clergy of Milan from the party of Landulphus Cotta, and of Arialdus, Deacon of Milan, who favored the interests and pretensions of the Pope, and the separation of those Subalpini in the bishopric of Turin, deserves, as we see, an extraordinary consideration. And forasmuch as this separation happened at the same time that the Council of Verceil condemned Berengarius and Johannes Scotus, we may easily conceive that the Clergy of Milan, and those Clergymen under the Alps, had no great esteem for that Papal condemnation: and the interest of Wido being embraced by many of the Bishops of his diocese, we cannot but conclude, that they had as little regard for that council, as they had for all the rest, that was derived from an authority, whose design was to invade these rights, as well as those of all the Bishops of the west.

To show to what excess this division was carried, it is not necessary to set down here the bloody death of the Deacon Arialdus, which Andrew the Monk has described in a very tragical manner, as we find it in Baronius, upon the year 1066, thereby to expose Wido, and make him odious. It is evident, that what that Monk wrote is composed in such a legendary manner, that it renders all his relation suspicious; though if it were true indeed, yet could it scarcely more defame Wido, than so many Popes, who have destroyed their opposers, by the way of arms, that being the custom of these barbarous ages.

But we are to make our observation upon the endeavors which the Popes have used ever since this separation, to reconcile to themselves this part of the Clergy of Milan and Italy, who had separated themselves from the

communion of the Church of Rome. Alexander II. in the year 1067, sent two Legates to Milan, who confirming what Petrus Damjanus, Cardinal of Ostia, had done, passed the same into orders and regulations that were to be strictly observed, as being pronounced in the name of God, St. Peter, and St. Ambrose, under pain of the same anathemas to the impenitent as were incurred by Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, and by Judas, Pilate, and Caiaphas, which are the very words of their order. But we find by the Epistles of Gregory VII. to the Lombards, that the Clergy of Milan only laughed at these regulations, having chosen Godfrey for their Bishop. And the said Gregory seems on this account to look upon them as the great enemies of the Christian religion, and that he did not think himself secure amongst them in the year 1077, above all; because they took part with Henry IV. against Gregory, whom they looked upon as justly deposed.

We find the same Gregory endeavoring to strengthen his party against the Bishops of Lombardy, in opposing to them the authority of the Countess Beatrix, and her daughter Mathilda, who called those Bishops the forerunners of Antichrist. He endeavours to draw away the Bishop of Pavia from taking part with those of Milan. He immediately excommunicated Godfrey, Bishop of Milan, and successor of Wido, and orders the said excommunication to be published throughout the whole earth. He engages the Emperor Henry IV. to abandon the cause of those of Milan and Lombardy, who were called Simoniacs, only because they were willing to maintain the Emperor's rights, in reference to investitures, against the enterprises of some Popes that were before him.

The following year he summons the Suffragans of the bishopric of Milan, and the Abbots of that diocese, to come up to Rome, and to be present at the council.

In short, we meet with nothing in the sequel but reiterated endeavours to destroy the party of Italy that opposed them.

Our business now should be to show, that this body or party has continued ever since until the Reformation, under the name of Patarines, and afterwards of Waldenses. But before we come to this, we are bound to prevent the slanders, which the malice of the Romish party has raised against these separators. They have accused them to be an assembly of Cathari, that is, a sect of Manichees. This is the notion the authors of the

eleventh and following centuries give us of them. Gitaldus Cambrensis, who wrote in the year 1200, accuseth the Patareans and Cathari with rejecting the carnal presence. Dist. 1. cap. 2. Gemma Ecclesiastes MS. Lambethani. Vincentius Belluacensis Specul. History 30. cap. 7. attributes several heresies to these Milanese.

CHAPTER 15

Concerning the belief of the Manichees, of their rise in Italy, their growth and their establishment.

I CONCEIVE that the account I have given of the state of the Church of Italy is sufficient to make out, that as they enjoyed a sound knowledge in that diocese, so withal there was a great disposition amongst them, as well as in other western parts, to embrace the grossest of errors. Christians and Priests that are become Anthropomorphites, and who know nothing of religion but what they have learnt from images, which were justly called the books of the ignorant, have a great inclination to suffer themselves to be imposed upon by impostures. Of this we have a double proof. It was especially in the tenth century that the opinion of Paschasius attained strength and authority; an opinion, which we may well look upon as the most extravagant folly that ever any man dreamed of whilst awake. It was at the end of the same century, and the beginning of the next, that Manicheism, the most wild heresy the Devil could ever suggest, found many followers in Italy and Aquitaine, which were inhabited by the Waldenses and Albigenses. And forasmuch as in the sequel it will prove of great use to know this matter of fact, for the justification of the Waldenses and Albigenses, and those who, before they ever got these names, did in both these dioceses defend the interests of truth, by distinguishing them from those who adopted the sentiments of the Manichees, we can by no means pass it by here.

Bishop Usher indeed has already sufficiently done this, in his Treatise of the succession of the Protestant Churches, where he relates the arrival of the Manicheans into the west. But because probably the Bishop of Meaux had never seen this book, he was pleased to look upon the distinction which the Protestants make of the Albigenses and Waldenses, from the Manichees, as an evasion of some late Ministers; it lies upon us, to prove it to that degree of evidence, as that no doubt or difficulty may remain in the case.

I know well enough that this would seem not necessary with reference to the Waldenses, whom the Bishop of Meaux only terms schismatics: but

though the Bishop be of this opinion, yet there may be others found of his communion, as there have been many before him, who will be little swayed by his authority; and therefore the matter is well worth our consideration.

In the **first** place I shall lay down the substance of their belief.

Secondly, I shall show that about the year of our Savior 1000, some of these Manichees began to spread in the west. And shall,

Thirdly, take notice in what particular places they abounded.

In pursuing this matter on further, I shall make it evidently appear, that the party of the Church of Rome have made great use of the name of these heretics, to persecute those who set themselves against the errors and superstitions of that Church, though indeed they had nothing in common with the Manichees.

1. Then the Manichees held, that there were two principles opposite to each other, and equally eternal, the one good, and the other evil; and that consequently there were two natures, the one of that which was good, the other of that which was evil.
2. They looked upon matter as the effect of the evil God, and took the flesh to be wholly evil; and therefore they abhorred the begetting of children, and hindered it to the utmost of their power, by condemning marriage.
3. They rejected the Old Testament, maintaining, that he who spake to Moses was the Prince of darkness.
4. They maintained, that the creation of man was performed by the same author, and that there were two souls in every man, the one good, and the other bad; the one proceeding from God, and the other from the Prince of darkness. Thus it was they understood the conflict between the flesh and the spirit, whereof St. Paul speaks.
5. They denied free will, because otherwise God would be the author of sin.

- 6.** They maintained, that the New Testament had been falsified, and under this pretense they admitted only of so much of it as pleased them.
- 7.** They denied that Jesus Christ had any true flesh, maintaining, that he had only the figure and appearance of it, to delude the eyes. They denied his death and resurrection, and fasted on Sundays, as in opposition and contradiction to our Savior's resurrection.
- 8.** They asserted, that he was not come to save the bodies, but only the souls of men; and they absolutely denied the resurrection of the body.
- 9.** They believed, that Jesus Christ was in the sun and the moon, and the Holy Ghost throughout the whole air. When they worshipped, they turned themselves towards the sun, and worshipped the sun and moon, as containing Jesus Christ.
- 10.** They rejected Baptism, as unnecessary to salvation.
- 11.** As for the Eucharist, they asserted, according to the account St. Augustin gives us of them, that the Holy Ghost did beget Jesus Christ of the earth, subject to suffering, who was, as it were, bound in the ears of corn, and in the vine, but who by the digestion of the stomach was set loose and at liberty; yet they maintained withal, that wine was the gall of the Prince of darkness, and therefore rejected the use of wine in the Communion.

St. Augustin ascribes to these heretics a continual contradiction in their opinions; and above all, he sets forth their Eucharist as a thing so abominable, as the very notion of it is sufficient to strike one with horror, notwithstanding that they boasted themselves of keeping their mouths pure from any blasphemy against God, of never eating any flesh, or drinking wine; of having their hands clean from murder, and their bosoms pure and chaste, because their elect gloried in their observing perpetual chastity, and rejecting the use of marriage.

As for his attributing to them, that they had an aversion for the relics of the saints, this seems to be a consequence of their opinions concerning the

original of the body, which they looked upon as proceeding from the evil principle.

12. They condemned husbandry, attributing to trees and plants a sensitive life.

13. They maintained, that war was altogether unlawful.

These were their principal heresies. As for the discipline of their sect, it consisted of two orders, *viz.* the *elect* and *auditors*.

The hearers had leave to marry, if they pleased; to eat flesh, and till the ground; all which was forbidden to the elect.

The elect had the power of the imposing of hands on their hearers, who kneeled before them, in order to receive the said imposition.

There were twelve principal elect, who were called the masters, who had a thirteenth that was over them.

They had seventy-two Bishops, who were created by those masters we have just now mentioned, and the Bishops ordained the Priests and Deacons. This is the account St. Augustin gives us of their hierarchy.

Petrus Diaconus of Sicily, who wrote against them about the year 870, makes it appear that he was acquainted with them, as having been with them at Tibrica in Armenia, and conferred with them. He dedicates his book to the Archbishop of Bulgaria, advertising him, that the Paulitiani or Manichees of Tibrica were resolved to send some of their people into Bulgaria, to seduce those who had newly embraced the Christian religion in that kingdom. This was that which put him upon writing this treatise, to forearm that Prelate against their enterprises.

He accuseth them of dissembling their errors, and of making such a profession of faith, as was sufficiently orthodox, though indeed, and at the bottom, they opposed it; and makes a very exact description of them and their errors.

He tells us, that they in appearance admit of the whole Gospel, and all the Epistles of St. Paul; that they confess the Trinity and Incarnation, but that they elude these their confessions by equivocations, till they have got an entrance into the spirit of those who listen to them, and judge them

susceptible of their impieties, which then they freely discover to them. He compriseth their opinions in six articles:

- I.** That there is a good God and an evil God; the first, the Creator of the world to come; and the second, the Creator of the world.
- II.** That they do not own the Virgin Mary to have been the mother of Jesus Christ, whose body, according to them, was brought down from heaven.
- III.** That they reject the Eucharist, denying that Jesus Christ ever consecrated the symbols of bread and wine; but they explain those words in a mystical sense, with reference to his actions.
- IV.** That they deny the cross of Jesus Christ.
- V.** That they reject the Old Testament, receiving nothing besides the Gospels, and the Epistles of St. Paul, to which they add the Epistles of one Sergius, one of the heads of their sect.
- VI.** That they removed Priests from the ministry of the Church. In a word, he sets forth their heresies much according to the account we find of them in St. Cyril, Bishop of Hierusalem, *Cateches.* 6. out of whom he has transcribed many long passages.

I will not trouble myself at present to set down the account which later authors have given of the Manichees. Emericus, in his *Directory of the Inquisitors*, has made an abridgment of the opinions of those amongst them, which he pretends appeared in Italy, under the popedom of Innocent the Third, who had for their master a person called Manes, who lived then in the diocese of Milan. This good inquisitor, as we see by this, was not over-well acquainted with Church history. However, he takes notice of some articles, which it may be worth while to observe here. Of the fourteen articles he ascribes to them, these following may serve to clear some things we have already set down concerning the belief and conduct of the Manichees.

The second article is, That they supposed two sorts of Churches, the one kind and meek, which they said was their sect, and the Church of Jesus Christ; the other malicious, which they said was the Church of

Rome, and very impudently called her a Mother of Fornications, the great Babylon, a Whore, the Devil's Cathedral, and the Synagogue of Satan.

The third article is, That they condemned all the degrees, orders, and ordinations of the Holy Church, as well as her ordinances, which they corrupted; they called all those heretics that were of her communion, and publicly taught that they could not be saved in the communion of Rome.

The fourth article is, That all the Sacraments of the Church of Rome, which were instituted by our Savior Jesus Christ, *viz.* the Eucharist, Baptism, which is celebrated with material water, Confirmation, Orders, Extreme Unction, Penance, and Matrimony between man and wife, were all of them vain and frivolous; and that like apes they reigned certain other outward ceremonies, which had some resemblance with them.

The fifth article is, That, instead of holy Baptism, they fancied another spiritual Baptism, which they called the comfort of the Holy Ghost; that is to say, when they received any person, whether sick or in health, into their sect, or ordained them by imposition of hands, according to their execrable ceremonies.

The sixth article is, That instead of consecrated bread, or the Sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, they supposed another sort of bread, which they called Blessed Bread, or the Bread of Holy Prayer, which they took in their hands, at the beginning of their meals, blessing it, breaking and distributing it to those that were present, of their belief, according to their ordinary custom.

The seventh article is, That, instead of the sacrament of Penance, they said, that the true exercise of penance did consist in following their orders, and being of their sect: and maintained, that all those who, being sick or in health, did keep the laws of their sect, and their ordinances, did thereby obtain the pardon of their sins, without any other satisfaction; yea, even without making restitution of those things which they had unjustly got; affirming, moreover, that hereirr they had the same power that St. Peter and St. Paul, with the other Apostles of our Savior Jesus Christ, had. They said also, that the confession of sins that is made to Priests of the Romish communion is not of any use to salvation; and that neither the

Pope, nor any other person of that communion, had the power of forgiving sins.

The eighth article is, That, instead of the carnal sacrament of marriage between man and wife, they supposed that there was another spiritual marriage between God and the soul of man; when being perfect heretics, or in the abundance of consolations, they received any one into their sect, and incorporated them into their order.

The ninth article is, That they denied the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ in the womb of the most holy Virgin. They asserted, that he did not take upon him a true human body, nor the true flesh of man, as other men take it from human nature; that he never truly suffered or died on the tree of the cross; that he never truly rose again, nor ascended into heaven with a body of human flesh; but that all these things were only done in appearance.

The tenth article is, That the Blessed Virgin Mary was not the mother of our Savior Jesus Christ: they deny also that she was a carnal woman, but maintained, that their sect was that Mary, that Virgin, the true penance; that she was chaste, and a virgin who begat children to God, as often as any were received into their order and sect.

The eleventh article is, That they denied the resurrection of our bodies, and, instead thereof, supposed certain spiritual bodies, or a kind of inward men, in which they said the future resurrection was to be celebrated.

The twelfth article is, They said and believed that all those spirits that departed out of human bodies went into the bodies of beasts and birds, if they were not received into their sect, or incorporated into their order, by the imposition of their hands, according to the customary form of their ceremonies; that all these souls passed continually from one body into another; for which reason they did not eat the flesh of any living creature, nor ever killed any birds.

The thirteenth article is, That they held, that man ought never to eat flesh, no, not so much as touch it, nor cheese, nor eggs, nor any thing proceeding from flesh by way of generation or carnal conjunction: which they also observed.

These are the heresics of the Manichees, which Emericus sets down after another manner than they are described by Archclaus, St. Cyril, St. Epiphanius, St. Augustin, Theodoretus, and Petrus Diaconus of Sicily. It is visible that some part of these here-sics were only chimeras, occasioned by some allegorical expressions of those who then preached against the Romish Church, but, however, most maliciously and falsely attributed to the Waldenses and Albigenses.

Notwithstanding this Emericus's mistake in the account he gives us of the original of this sect, sure it is, that it owes its birth to one called Scythianus, who probably had been familiar with the Marcionites. He left his doctrine to one named Terebinthus; after whose death it came into the hands of Manes, who mixed something of the Gospel with it, and who gave the name to his followers.

This sect spread itself in Africa, Asia, Spain, and Italy; and notwithstanding that in process of time the Christian Emperors published several laws for their extirpation, yet we find that there still continued a considerable body of them in the east. Theophanes tells us, that there were some of this sect amongst the Syrians and Armenians in the eighth century, whom the Emperor Constantine transported into Thrace from Theodosiopolis and Melitene, who spread abroad the heresics of the Pauliciani, (or Publicani,) for so Anastasius calls them.

We find in the ninth century, an. 811, that the Emperor Nicephorus favored the Manichees, called Pauliciani and Acingani, who lived in Phrygia and Lyeaonia. Michael Ranga being Emperor persecuted them, killed some, and banished the rest.

We find in the tenth century, that Theodorus, Bishop of Antioch, obliged the Emperor John Zimisces to banish the Manichees into the west, that had spread themselves throughout all the east, and had infected all places with their heresies; which he accordingly did, as we find it reported by Zobaras.

We find, since that time, that they spread themselves from Bulgaria (being thence called Bulgari, and in the French tongue Boulgres) into Dalmatia, and from thence into the western provinces, where they were called Cattari, and thence by mistake Cathari or Catharini, the Germans calling

them Keters. And it is probable that from this school came those Manichees that appeared in Italy, as well as those that appeared at Orleans, in the year 1017, and afterwards in Languedoc. Vignier has published a fragment of an ancient author, who calls them Catharini, and who sets forth their settling of themselves in Lombardy, Tuscany, and in the Marchia; that about the year 1023 their first Bishop was called Marc, who derived his ordination from Bulgaria, who afterwards, at the solicitation of one Nicetas, Pope, come from Constantinople, he took orders of him, and entered into the order of Druncaria. Afterwards he represents the different parties and different opinions amongst them. We find also, that Ravnerus, who in the thirteenth century gives us a description of their Churches, makes three sorts of Cathari in Lombardy; observing that those who had settled themselves at Thoulouse were of the same opinion with those who called themselves Albanenses, or of Senzano in Lombardy.

Now, that we may make some use of this description of the Manichees and their errors, it will be needful to observe,

First, That since they began to punish the Manichees with death, it was very natural for those who had a mind to destroy those they called heretics, to charge them with their errors: so that we may here very easily be mistaken between the true Manichees and those to whom their errors were falsely imputed.

Secondly, That since they had represented to the people, that one of the characters of the Manichees was, to dissemble their errors, and exactly to conceal their abominations, they had a very good pretense to condemn those pretended heretics for half Manichees, who, according to the principles of the Manichees, concealed their true opinions, though they did so upon another ground, as the rigour of their persecutors.

Thirdly, That in those barbarous and cruel ages, a small conformity of opinions with the Manichees was a sufficient ground to accuse them of Manicheism, who opposed any doctrines received by the Church of Rome. Thus would they have taken the Anabaptists for downright Manichees, because they condemned the baptism of infants.

Fourthly, And indeed we shall find the prejudices conceived on this account were so strong, that it has made them to be accused of Manicheism, whose opinions evidenced that their principles were directly opposite to those of the Manichees, with as much ground as if we should accuse the Church of Rome of Manicheism, upon pretense of her forbidding the use of the cup with reference to the people, which formerly was a note of Manicheism, as we find it mentioned in the Decrees of the Popes, Leo and Gelasius.

They accused those of Manicheism, that denied the substantial conversion of the bread into the body of Jesus Christ. They called those Manichees, that would not worship the Virgin or the cross; as if, forsooth, they had denied that Jesus Christ took a true body in the womb of the Virgin, or that he had been truly crucified.

CHAPTER 16

*Concerning the Catbari spoken of by Evervinus and St. Bernard,
and their distinction from the Patarines.*

WE are obliged to Mabillon for having communicated to us the letter of Evervinus, Praepositus of Steinfield, in the diocese of Cologne. It is evident, that he has fiescribed the same heretics whereof Egbertus, Monk of Schonauge, makes mention in his sermons. Only he distinguishes them into two orders, the one whereof he sets forth to us as Manichees; the others, whom he does not accuse of any thing like what they were charged with. He makes so great a distinction between them, that it is very strange the Bishop of Meaux should confound them as he does, as if they had been but one and the same body of men.

Now, since it is very probable, according to the judgment of Mabillon, that this letter of Evervinus to St. Bernard furnished this famous Abbot with an occasion of handling those controversies, which he has touched upon in his sermons upon the Canticles, it will be worth the while to set down the said letter of Evervinus, as to its principal points; and the rather, because it serves to set forth the sincerity of Petrus Cluniacensis in the manner he has taken to treat those controversies, following therein very exactly the notions of Evervinus, and carefully distinguishing those two sorts of opinions he opposeth; whereas St. Bernard seems to have much more confounded them.

Now what Evervinus writes to St. Bernard, a little before the year 1140, is this:

“There have been lately some heretics discovered: amongst us, near Cologne, whereof some with satisfaction returned again to the Church: two of these, *viz.* one that was a Bishop amongst them, and his companions, openly opposed us in the assembly of the Clergy and laity, the Lord Archbishop himself being present, with many of the nobility maintaining their heresy from the words of Christ and the Apostles. But when they saw they could go no further, they desired that a day might be appointed for them, upon which they might bring along with them men skillful in their belief,

promising to return to. the Church, provided they should find their masters defective in answering what was opposed to them; but that otherwise they would rather die than depart from their judgment. Upon this their declaration, after that for three days together they had been admonished, and found unwilling to repent, they were seized by the people, being incited by overmuch zeal, and put into the fire, and burnt; and (what is most wonderful) they entered to the stake, and bare the torment of the fire, not only with patience, but with joy and gladness. In this case, O holy Father, were I present with you, I should be glad to have your answer, how these members of the Devil could with such courage and constancy persist in their heresy, as is scarcely to be found in the most religious in the faith of Christ.

“Their heresy is this: They say that the Church is only amongst them, because they alone follow the steps of Christ, and continue in the imitation of the true apostolic life, not seeking the things of this world, possessing neither house, lands, nor any thing in propriety, according as Christ did, who neither possessed any himself, nor gave leave to his disciples to possess any thing. Whereas ye (say they to us) join house to house, and field to field, seeking the things of this world; so that even they also, who are looked upon as most perfect amongst you, such as are your Monks and Regular Canons, though they do not possess these things as proper, but as common, yet do they possess all these things. And of themselves they say, We the poor of Christ, who have no certain abode, fleeing from one city to another, like sheep in the midst of wolves, do endure persecution with the Apostles and Martyrs: notwithstanding that we lead an holy and strict life in fasting and abstinence, persevering day and night in prayers and labors, and seeking only from thence what is necessary to support our lives, we maintain ourselves thereby because we are not of the world. But as for you lovers of the world, ye have peace with the world, because ye are of the world. False Apostles, who adulterate the word of Christ, seeking their own, have misled you and your forefathers; whereas we and our fathers, being born *Apostles*, have continued in the grace of Christ, and, shall continue so to the end of

the world. To distinguish us from one another, Christ saith, *By their fruits ye shall know them*: our fruits are the footsteps of Christ. In their diet they forbid all manner of milk, and whatsoever is made of it, and all that is procreated by copulation. This is that which they oppose to us concerning their conversation. As to the Sacraments, they conceal themselves; yet did they openly confess to us, that daily at their tables, when they take their meals, they, according to the form of Christ and his Apostles, do consecrate their meat and drink into the body and blood of Christ, by the Lord's Prayer, to nourish themselves therewith, as being the members and body of Christ. But as for us, they say we hold not the truth in the Sacraments, but only a kind of shadow, and tradition of men. They also openly confess, that besides water, they baptized also with fire and the Holy Ghost, and had been so baptized themselves; alleging to this purpose the testimony of St. John the Baptist baptizing with water, and saying concerning Christ, *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire*: and in another place, *I indeed baptize you with water, but there stands one in the midst of you, whom you know not, who shall baptize you with another baptism besides that of water*. And that this other baptism was to be performed by the imposition of hands, they endeavored to make out by the testimony of St. Luke, who, in the Acts of the Apostles, describing Paul's baptism, which he received from Ananias at the command of Christ, makes no mention of water, but only of the laying on of hands; and whatsoever else we find, whether in the Acts of the Apostles or in St. Paul's Epistles, they apply to this baptism; and they say, that every elect (for so they call all those that are baptized amongst them) hath power to baptize others whom they find worthy, and to consecrate the body and blood of Christ at their meals. For first, by their laying on of hands they receive some of their auditors into the number of believers, and then they have leave to be present at their prayers, until that, after having had sufficient trial of them, they make them elect. They contemn our baptism, condemn marriage; but the reason why, I could not get out of them, either because they durst not own it, or rather because they knew none."

We have here a very exact and circumstantiate description of a sect of Manichees, if we please to compare it with the account that has already been given concerning them. And though we find these persons somewhat different in their opinions from the Cathari, yet, notwithstanding that, they have put their name upon them, as if they also had been Manichees.

But Evervinus goes on further in these words:

“There are also some other heretics in our country, who are altogether different from these, by whose mutual discord and contests they were both of them discovered to us. These deny that the body of Christ is made on the altar, because all the Priests of the Church are not consecrated. For the apostolical dignity, say they, is corrupted, by engaging itself in secular affairs, and the sitting in the chair of Peter; yet because it does not wage God’s warfare as Peter did, it has deprived itself of the power of consecrating, which was so great in Peter; and what it has not itself, the Archbishops and Bishops, who live like men of the world, cannot receive from it, *viz.* the power of consecrating others: to this purpose alleging these words of Christ, *The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’s chair; what therefore they bid you do, that do.* As if such as these had only the power of preaching and commanding, but nothing more. Thus they make void the Priesthood of the Church, and condemn the Sacraments besides Baptism only; and this only in those who are come to age, who, they say, are baptized by Christ himself, whosoever be the Minister of the Sacraments. They do not believe infant baptism; alleging that place of the Gospel, *Whosoever shall believe, and be baptized, shall be saved.* All marriage they call fornication, besides that which is between two virgins, male and female; quoting for this the words of our Savior, wherewith he answers the Pharisees, *What God hath joined let no man separate;* as if God did only join such together, as he did our first parents: as likewise those words of our Savior, which he speaks to the Jews, in answer to what they objected to him about the bill of divorce, *From the beginning it was not so;* and the following words, *whosoever marrieth her that is divorced, commits adultery,* and that of the Apostle, *Let marriage be honorable to all, and the bed underled.*

“They put no confidence in the intercession of the saints; they maintain that fasting, and other afflictions which are undertaken for sin, are not necessary to the just, nor to sinners; because at what time soever the sinner repents of his sin, they are all forgiven to him; and all other things observed in the Church, which have not been established by Christ himself or his Apostles, they call superstitions. They do not admit of any purgatory fire after death; but that the souls, as soon as they depart out of the bodies, do enter into rest or punishment; proving it from that place of Solomon, *Which way soever the tree falls, whether to the south or to the north, there it lies*: by which means they make void all the prayers and oblations of believers for the deceased.

“We therefore desire you, holy Father, to employ your care and watchfulness against these manifold mischiefs, and that you would be pleased to direct your pen against these wild beasts of the reeds; not thinking it sufficient to answer us, that the tower of David, to which we may take our refuge, is sufficiently fortified with bulwarks, that a thousand bucklers hang on the walls of it, all shields of mighty men. For we desire, Father, that for the sake of us simple ones, and that are slow of understanding, you would be pleased by your study to gather all these arms in one place, that they may be the more ready to be found, and more powerful to resist these monsters. I let you know also, that those of them who have returned to our Church, told us, that they had great numbers of their persuasion scattered almost every where and that amongst them were many of our Clergy and Monks. And as for those who were burnt, they, in the defense they made for themselves, told us, that this their heresy had been concealed from the time of the martyrs until these times; and that it had been preserved in Greece, and some other countries. These are those heretics who call themselves Apostles, having a Pope of their own; whereas the other despise our Pope, and yet own themselves to have no other besides him. These Aposties of Satan have amongst them continent women, (as they call them,) widows, virgins, their wives, some of which are amongst the number of their elect, others of their

believers; as in imitation of the Apostles, who had power to lead about women with them. Farewell in the Lord.”

This is the letter of Evervinus, whence St. Bernard took occasion to refute these heretics in his 65th and 66th sermons upon the Song of Solomon. And indeed we find that the beginning of his 65th sermon contains a manifest allusion to the beginning of this letter of Evervinus. St. Bernard chargeth them in that sermon, that though they believed the Gospel, yet did forbid swearing altogether; and that notwithstanding this prohibition, yet they suffered their disciples to forswear themselves, to preserve the secret of their religion, p. 759.

2. He supposeth that their endeavor to hide their religion was a sufficient token of its impurity with respect to manners.

3. He accuseth them for rejecting the authority of the Old Testament; though he seem to express himself doubtfully on that point, *ibid.* 1.

4. He accuseth them of rejecting St. Paul; though he confesseth that this was not the judgment of them all, but only of some of them: *K. Anforte nec Paulurn recipitis? De quibusdam ita audivi; non enim inter vos omnes per omnia concordatis, etsi a nobis omnes dissentiat:*

“Probably you reject Paul also: for so I have heard of some of you; for neither do you all agree amongst yourselves, though you all differ from us.”

5. He accuseth them for falsely boasting themselves of their chastity, as having wives with whom they lived in the same house, without being married with them, *ibid.* M. and without being either their wives, daughters, sisters, or otherwise of kin to them. St. Bernard, who sets them forth as a sort of people who were unblameable in their carriage and behavior, yet triumphs over them in this point; accusing them of giving offense to their neighbour, p. 761.

That which is very singular in this refutation of St. Bernard is,

1. That at the end of his first sermon he gives a description of them from p. 762. B. in these terms: *File nempe hoc genus et rusticanum, ac sine literis, et prorsus irabelle;* he relates their different opinions as not

certainly known; and after that, he undertakes to refute them, as if they deserved to be refuted.

2. That he *asserts* they were divided; and yet owns that he knew nothing about them, but from the answers they had given to some Catholics, or what he had learnt from those who were entered again into the Church. In all his first sermon therefore he insists on these two points: the first is, that they concealed their opinions, which was contrary to the behavior of the Apostles. The other, that their dwelling with women not married was a proof of their impurity. The good Father, whilst he discoursed thus, did not consider the rigour of the persecution they were under; and he had forgot that Robertus of Arbrissel had practiced the like continence with women.

In his second sermon he lays down some part of their opinions; and this he does like a declamator; his first sermon having been spent in invectives against them.

1. He chargeth them with condemning marriage.

2. He sets them forth as idiots, and an ignorant sort of people, but withal dangerous, as introducing again the heresies condemned by St. Paul, 1 Timothy 4.

3. He sets upon their title of Apostolical, as pretending that they had no authors; and he only suspects them of Manicheism, though he seems to have freed them from that imputation before, when he says, *Quare cum illius sectae authorem neminem dabunt:*

“Wherefore since they can produce no author of their sect.”

4. He saith, that some amongst them allowed marriage only where both the parties were virgins.

5. He chargeth them with abstaining from meats: *Horrent lac, et quicquid ex eo conficitur; postremo, quicquid ex coitu generatur:*

“They abhor milk, and all that is made of it; and last of all, whatsoever is generated by copulation.”

In which point he suspects them of Manicheism.

- 6.** He accuseth them of consecrating the body and blood of Jesus Christ at their common tables: *Ad nutriendum se in corpus Christi et membra*, to feed themselves into the body of Christ and members.
- 7.** He accuseth them of looking upon themselves as the only successors of the Apostles.
- 8.** He accuseth them of mocking at infant baptism, prayer for the dead, and the invocation of saints.
- 9.** He accuseth them of detracting and slandering ecclesiastical Orders, of rejecting Church ordinances, contemning the Sacraments, and disobeying her commands, under pretense that the Popes, the Archbishops, the Bishops, and Priests were sinners incapable of administering or receiving the Sacraments.
- 110.** Here he stops, as asserting that nobody knows all their opinions, and that there is no way of convincing them, because they will not admit the authorities which they do not understand.
- 11.** He confesseth that they had been examined by water, and found guilty. *Quaesitifidem (N. B.) cum de quibus suspecti videbantur, omnia prorsus suo more negarent, examinati aquos judicio, mendaces inventi sunt: cumque jam negare non possent, quippe deprehensi, aqua eos non recipiente.*

“When as they, after their manner, denied all things whereof they were suspected, being examined by the judgment of water, they were found liars: and being no longer able to deny it, because they were found guilty, by the water not admitting of them, they confessed their crimes, offered themselves to defend them to the death, and were knocked on the head by the people;”

which St. Bernard finds fault with, as desiring rather that the magistrate might have put them to death by law.

- 12.** He removes the scandal which their constancy occasioned, they dying like true martyrs.
- 13.** He pretends that the means of convincing them, is to oblige them to quit the women they have with them, or else to leave the Church.

14. But for all this he observes, that they were supported by Princes, Bishops, and others, propter *qutestum*, for their interest sake, and who alleged it as reason, that they could not condemn persons that were neither convict, nor confess their crimes.

We may make these following reflections on what St. Bernard saith concerning them.

- 1.** That he speaks of the same of whom Evervinus doth.
- 2.** That he confounds them together, whereas Evervinus distinguishes them.
- 3.** That the reason of their being reduced to dissemble their true opinions, was for fear of torments, and of being torn to pieces by the people.
- 4.** That the judgment of water having been employed against them, they had very just cause of fear.
- 5.** That their distinction is evident enough from what St. Bernard himself saith of them, and that he confounded them by malice or by mistake.
- 6.** That their confessions did not satisfy the Princes, nor the Bishops themselves.
- 7.** That the Manicheism, which he objected to them all, was not a true imputation to all of them, since it is true the Maniehees drank not wine.
- 8.** That at last St. Bernard reduceth all to this, that he would have them punish by excommunication, in case they did not renounce the company of the women they had with them.

Petrus Cluniacensis has handled five questions against the Petrobusians, which bear a great resemblance with the belief of the Cathari of Italy: but since the disciples of Peter de Bruis were seated in the country of the Albigenes, we should confound matters by treating of them here.

CHAPTER 17

A continuation of the History of the Cathari in Italy, as elsewhere, and their distinction from the Patarines.

MY design is not to abuse my reader's patience, by setting, down here all that I could observe relating to the history of the Cathari, from the writings of several authors of the twelfth and thirteenth century, as of Egbert, Abbot of Schonauge, Alanus of Lisle, Giraldus Cambrensis, and Bonacursius, who gives us an account of their opinions, and of their settlement in the dioceses of Cologne, Gallia Narbonensis, Flanders, and the diocese of Milan. Yet I cannot but represent to the reader, that the malice or imprudence of these authors makes them ordinarily to confound those whom Evervinus, in his forementioned Epistle to St. Bernard, had with more care and honesty distinguished, and that whilst they writ the history of the Cathari, they had an eye to the Patarines, who had spread their belief through all those places, and whom they designed to make odious, by confounding them with the Cathari, that is to say, with the new upstart Manichees.

Egbert, a Monk, and afterwards Abbot of Schonauge, tells us, that he had as often disputed with these heretics as any of them were discovered amongst the people, so that he seems to be a witness well informed in the case, though he owns that he had learned more of their opinions from those who had renounced them, that is, from those who by the force of torments, and threats of being burnt, had abandoned their belief.

He sets them forth as men famous by their errors;

“These are they who are commonly called Cathari a sort of people very pernicious to the Catholic faith, which like moths they corrupt and destroy.”

And yet he adds, that they were divided into several sects, and maintained their opinions by the authority of Scripture.

“They are armed with the words of holy Scripture which any ways do seem to favor their opinions, and with these they know

how to defend their errors, and to oppose the Catholic truth; though indeed they be altogether ignorant of the right understanding that is couched in those words, and which cannot be discovered without great judgment.”

We may observe here, that this title of Egbert’s book doth not answer to the account Trithemius gives us of it in his catalogue, who sets down only these two words, *adversum hereses*, lib. 1. *Prophetatum dudurn tempora*; whereas the title of it contains a long description of these Manichean heresics: *jid, ersus pestiferos fosedissimosque Catharorum (qui Manichosorum hwresim innovarunt) damnatos errores ac hereses, Egberti Presbyteri, primo Ecclesiae Collegiate Bunnensis, Coloniensis dioeceseos Canonici, demure vero professi monachi Schonaugiensis monasterii, utilissimi sermones, ex penentralibus Evangelicis, et aliarum divinarum Scripturarum atmario deprompti. Esc quibus proculdubio fructum plurimum metet diligens lector et candidus. Breve ex dugustino de Manicheis excerptum, per eundem Ecbertum*. Possibly Trithemius had no mind to trouble himself with quoting so prolix a title; but certain it is, that neither Reginald’s Epistle, nor the first Sermon of Egbert, have the beginning which Trithemius ascribes to it: which may give us just cause of suspicion, that either the list they give us under Egbert’s name is none of his; or, that some part of it has been suppressed, according to the laudable custom which is in vogue with the Roman party in their publishing of authors. Nor is it without reason they make use of this way, their zeal for the Romish faith frequently obliging them to make use of pious frauds, by hiding or disguising the true sentiments of those authors they publish.

But not to insist upon this, he represents to us, first, the extent and spreading of the doctrine of the Cathari throughout several places, as well as their different names.

“They are increased to those multitudes throughout all countries, that the Church of God is in great danger of the poison they scatter every where against her; for their words spread like a cancer, and, like a flying leprosy, runs every way, infecting the precious members of Christ. These in our Germany we call *Catharini*, in Flanders they call them *Piphles*, and in French, Tisserands, from the art of weaving, because a great many of them are of that

occupation. And as our Lord has foretold concerning them, they say Christ is in the inward rooms; for they declare that the true faith and worship of Christ is no where to be found but in their meetings, which they keep in their cellars and weaving rooms and in such like dwellings under ground, they say, they lead the lives of Apostles.”

Secondly, He sets forth to us their opinions, and the desire they have to multiply their disciples; in which regard we must own that he describes them as true Manichees, who absolutely forbade marriage, and all eating of flesh; who rejected baptism with water, and instead thereof substituted a false one, *in Spiritu Sancto et igne*,

“with the Holy Ghost and with fire;”

and who concerning the Eucharist entertained the notions of the Manichees, and who in particular maintained that souls were fallen angels. But withal we are to observe, that he attributes opinions to them that are very different from any thing of Manicheism, and which Evervinus attributes to another sort of heretics, of whom he makes mention.

De animabus mortuorum, talem sententiamr habent, quod in ipsa hora exitus sui, vel transeunt ad aeternam beatitudinem, vel ad aeternam damnationem. Non enim recipiunt, quod credit universalis Ecclesia, viz. esse quasdam purgatorias paenas, in quibus animx quorundam electorum, ad ternpus examinantur pro peccatis suis, de quibus in hac vita per con-dignam satiJactionem ad plenum purgatx non sunt: propterea ergo arbitrantur superfluum et vanum esse pro mortuis eleemosynas dare, missas celebrare, et irrident pulsationes campanarum, quas facimus, quos tamen pia ratlone in ecclesias funt, ut videlicet vivi ad orandum pro mortuis commoneantur, et ad memoriam proprix mortis excitentur. Missas qux in ecclesiis celebrantur, omnino spernunt, et pro nihilo ducunt. Nam si forte cum populo, in quo habitant, ad audiendure missas, sive etiam ad perci: piendam Eucharistiam accedunt, omnino hoc simulatorie faciunt, ne indqdelitas eorum possit notari. Ordinem quippe sacerdotii in Romans Ecclesia, et cunctis Ecclesiis Catholicae fidei, omnino periisse dicunt, nec usquam nisi in secta eorum veros sacerdotes inveniri.

“Concerning the souls of the dead, they hold this opinion; that at the very instant of their departure out of the body, they go to eternal bliss, or eternal damnation: for they receive not the belief of the universal Church, *viz.* that there are some purgatory punishments, wherewith the souls of some of the elect are tried, for some time for those sins from which they have not been purged by a plenary satisfaction in this life. Wherefore also they account it superfluous and vain to give alms for the dead, and celebrate masses; and they scoff at our ringing of bells, which yet for pious reasons are used in our churches, to give others warning that they may pray for the dead, and to put them in mind of their own death. As for masses, they altogether despise them, and look on them as nothing worth; for if ever they accompany the people they dwell with to hear Mass, or to receive the Sacrament, they do this only dissemblingly, that their infidelity might not be taken notice of; for they maintain that the sacerdotal order is altogether perished in the Church of Rome, and all other Catholic Churches, and that true priests are only to be found in their sect.”

Thirdly, He sets forth to us the original of these Cathari, which he pretends they derive from the Manichees, notwithstanding that he himself observes, that they were not all of the same opinions. These are his words; *Multa tamen permixta habent doctrine magistri sui, quae inter haereses illius non inveniuntur. Divisi etiam sunt contra semetipsos, quia nonnulla quoe ob alifuibus eorum dicuntur, ab allis negantur:*

“Yet have they also many things mingled with their Master’s doctrine, which we do not find amongst his heresics. They are also divided amongst themselves; so what some of them I say again denied by others.”

We may see from hence, whether our author herein deals with that candor as he ought to do, when, without distinguishing between the different sects whereof he treats, he endeavors to prove them all to be Manichees.

1. From the conformity of their discipline with that which authors tell us was amongst the Manichees.
2. From the conformity of their opinions.

3. From the account he gives us of some extracts out of St. Augustin's discourse on this subject, with design to draw a comparison between the opinions of these new Cathari and those of old.

It seems to me to be very evident, either that this author did out of malice confound these two parties, against whom he disputes, which was avoided by Evervinus; or that he jumbled them together out of ignorance, upon pretense, that there was something of conformity in their opinions, though they differed in their principles, on which they founded their opinions, the one drawing them as consequences from Manicheism, the other maintaining them upon other principles opposite to the Church of Rome.

We ought to make this observation with respect to those authors, who in the twelfth century have made mention of the Cathari with this kind of confusion.

Ughellus tells us, in the Life of Galdinus, Arch'bishop of Milan, that after he had persecuted them, during the eight or nine years of his episcopacy, he died in the year 1173, by his over-vehement preaching against them. Ripamontius, in his History of Milan, gives us the sermon of Galdinus against the Cathari, whom he calls Manichees and Arians. But an indifferent judgment will be able to discover, that that piece is of Ripamontius's own forging, and consequently deserves no credit at all.

D'Achery has published the writing of an author, who pretends to discover the doctrine of the Ca-thari, of which he had been surely informed by the conversion of one Bonacursus to the Roman faith, who had been one of their Bishops, and had abjured their doctrine. This author makes three sorts of heretics, the Cathari, the Passagii, and the Arnoldistae whose doctrines he refutes: but a wise reader will easily discern a great deal either of ignorance or malice in this author.

He accuseth some of these Cathari of maintaining doctrines that are plain Manicheism; but then he jumbles others with them that are pure Arianism, and others again which seem to have been defended by the Paterines. I shall pass by those doctrines that are wholly Manichean, as, that the Devil created the elements; that he made Adam; that the old Law was given by the Devil, etc., as also those that are Arian, as, that Jesus Christ is not equal with the Father. It is evident, that amongst these he has mingled

some which were maintained by the Paterines, who were enemies to the Romish idolatry: as for example, that the Cathari maintained *erucem esse characterem bestice, quæ in Apocalypsi esse legitur, et abominationera stantem in loco sancto. Beatum Sylvestrum dicunt Antichristurn fuisse, de quo legitur in Epistolis, dælius perditionis est, qui extollitur super omne quod dicitur Deus; a tempore illo dicunt Ecclesiam esse perditare:*

“That the cross is the mark of the beast, whereof we read in the Revelation and *the abomination standing in the holy place*. They say that blessed Pope Sylvester was the Antichrist, of whom mention is made in the Epistles of St. Paul, as being the son of perdition, who extols himself above everything that is called God; for, from that time, they say, the Church perished.”

We see clearly from this passage, that he confounds the Paterines, or Waldenses, with the Manichees, that having been an opinion of the Wadenses, and not of the Manichees, as the Papists themselves own.

He lays it down also as one of their opinions,

“That the Law of Moses is to be kept according to the letter, and that the keeping of the Sabbath, Circumcision, and other legal observances, ought to take place. They hold also, that Christ the Son of God is not equal with the Father, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, these three Persons are not one God and one substance; and, as a surplus to these their errors, they judge and condemn all the doctors of the Church, and universally the whole Roman Church. Now, since they endeavor to defend this their error by testimonies drawn from the New Testament and Prophets, I shall, with assistance of the grace of Christ, stop their mouths, as David did Goliah’s, with their own sword.”

He in particular sets down their cleaving to the old Law, in his first chapter, wherein he seems better to understand the Scripture than the Church of Rome did, whose Popes, several ages before this, imposed great penances on those who had eaten the flesh of beasts dying of themselves, or of hens drowned in a pit; as we may see in the Penitential Canons.

He does not so much as once mention the Arnoldists; and we may take notice that his reason was, because their opinions as to many articles were

the same with those he had refuted in the Cathari. What I have already said concerning this matter may suffice; neither is it necessary to repeat the same here.

It is difficult to determine the time wherein this author lived. D'Achery supposeth that he lived towards the end of the twelfth century: but the manner of his speaking concerning the four doctors of the Church, of St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Gregory, and St. Augustin, makes me judge that he wrote later.

But not to insist on this, we find, that Alanus at, tributes to the Cathari almost the very same opinions, in his first book against heretics, which he wrote about the year 1192; and that under that general name which he gives them, he comprehends a great number of sects, who differed from one another in their principles, some of them being Manichees, others Arians, and others again holding the opinions of the Reformed or Protestants. Some of the opinions of these latter you may see in what follows.

He affirms, that some of these heretics believed that Baptism is of no use to infants, because they were not guilty of any sin. And that others of them held, that it was of no use, but only to those who were of age. Others again, that it could not be of any advantage to either of them both. He says that some of them held, that that Sacrament was of no use without the imposition of hands.

I have, in one of the foregoing chapters, made appear upon what occasion some of the diocese of Milan fell into these opinions concerning Baptism; which it is not needful to repeat in this place.

He tells us, that some of them believed, that penance was of no use after Baptism, and that they banished all those from their assemblies that sinned after they had been baptized. And that others were of opinion, that penance is of no use for the remission of sins, because that is a work of grace.

He gives us an account of the opinion of others of them, who maintained it was sufficient for them to confess their sins to God.

He takes notice, that they rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation; and that they condemned it, as being an article that was not to be found in any Creed of the Church.

He saith, there were others amongst them that rejected Confirmation, Orders, and Extreme Unction, pretending that they were no sacraments of the Gospel.

That there were others of them that had no regard for churches, and refused to own them for the house of God.

That they rejected the invocation of saints, and prayers for the dead.

I have given this account of the imputations wherewith Alanus blindly chargeth the Cathari, for so he calls them, in his 63rd chapter, to evidence the sottishness or malice of this author: of his sottishness we may take a scantling by the etymology he gives us of the name *Catbari*, for he maintains that they got that name from their *kissing the hinder part of a cat* in their assemblies, the Devil appearing unto them under that form. We may judge of his stupidity by the contrary and contradictory opinions which he heaps up together in the same book, as if they had all of them been defended by the same persons. Valentinians, Marcionites, Manichees, Arians, all comes alike to him, as being names very proper to render his adversaries whatsoever odious, whom he had a design to blacken to the utmost.

We may judge of his malice by his jumbling so different parties together, with design thereby to make a greater impression upon the mind of his reader. It is easy to perceive, that he sets forth the errors of the Cathari, with allusion to the opinions of the Church of Rome: she believed the absolute necessity of Baptism, and she held it for an error either to defer Baptism, as formerly had been practiced, till they were grown up, as well as the opinion of those who condemn her excess in raising it to such a degree of necessity as she does.

She believed the absolute necessity of the Eucharist, as we may see in the synod of Arras, in the life of heretics, and in Alanus; and he calls those heretics who deny this article of faith concerning the Communion.

They were at that time setting up the necessity of confession, and Innocent III. soon after established it by the Canon, *Omni, utriusque sexus, etc.* and yet in the mean time the doctrine of contrition, as restoring a sinner to grace and favor, was still in use. This is that which is owned by *Mathoud in Pullurn Cardinalera*, and by Boileau in his Treatise of Attrition; and in the mean time they charge this belief upon the Cathari as a crime.

The power of declaring remission of sin by a laic is of the same nature; the Church of Rome admitted of it, and there have been a thousand examples of it in shipwrecks; and yet in them this is censured by Alanus as an error, because they made use of it as an argument against the absolute authority of the Priests.

It may be some will imagine, that it was Alanus's design to set upon the Albigenes in his first book, as he makes it his business to attack the Waldenses in his second. And probably the Bishop of Meaux would not be wanting to make his observation, that consequently the Albigenes were mere Maniehees; which will appear the more probable to him, first, because he chargeth the Waldenses only with some controversies of less importance, which they had with the Church of Rome, concerning discipline. Secondly, that writing to the Earl of Montpellier, he seems rather to have had an eye to the Albigenes, than to the Waldenses, whom he distinguisheth from them, and sets upon in his secondbook.

But here, first of all, we are to take notice, that the Waldenses and Albigenes had both of them the same belief, as I shall be able to justify with God's assistance. Secondly, we are to observe, that his design being to set forth the Cathari in their colors, without distinguishing them, as Evervinus and Petrus Cluniacensis have done, he raked together all the discourses that had been made against them, without troubling himself about the examining of them. Thirdly, that since there were some Maniehees in the country of the Albigenes, he made it his business to confound them with the true Albigenes, in order to render them the more odious, and to draw down upon them the aversion and horror of his readers, who were not of sufficient capacity to search into the nature of the opinions which he attributed to them, nor into their connection and incompatibility. Fourthly, we are to observe, that though he lays nothing

to the charge of the Waldenses, but controversies of lesser importance in his second book, his reason for that was, because he had already sufficiently comprised them in the first book.

However, I shall presently make it appear, that the difference between the Waldenses and the Church of Rome was not so small, that they could be looked upon only as schismatics, as the Bishop of Meaux has been pleased to imagine; and that the reason why this author thus divided his book, was not to evince, that the Waldenses held no other opinions differing from those of the Church of Rome, but that he might range the questions he designed to treat of under different titles, whosoever they might be whom he was resolved to write against. And for an evident proof that this observation is well grounded, we may take notice, that Gyraldus Cam-brensis saith, that the errors of the Paterines, or Cathari, were principally about the Eucharist. It is in a MS. treatise of his, entitled, *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, where we find these words; *Deus itaque qui in omnibus operibus suis magnus est, et merito magnificandus, in duobus hic praecepit se magnificum ostendit; quod in illis mundi partibus, in quibus haeretici illi nostri temporis, qui Patari seu Catari dicuntur, et circa hunc praecipue articulum, scilicet de corpore Christi conociendo, errare noscuntur, scilicet in Handrice Snibus, magis abundant, hoc declaravit.*

“God therefore, who in all his works is great, and worthily to be magnified, has in these two particulars chiefly glorified himself by declaring this in those parts of the world, *viz.* on the borders of Flanders, in which those heretics of our time who are called Patetines and *Catharines*, and who are known chiefly to err about this article of making the body of Christ, do most abound.”

CHAPTER 18

That the Patetines and Subalpini were not Manichees, as is evident from their writings, and from their opinions in the twelfth century.

AFTER this that I have said concerning the Manichees and the Cathari, it is the easiest thing in the world to justify those called Paterines and those Subalpini, that in the diocese of Turin separated themselves from the favorers of the Roman party, in imitation of the Clergy of Milan, who had their meetings at Pateria.

It is clear enough, that all those authors I have cited to inform us of the opinions of the Cathari, as of a sort of Manichees, had in their prospect many other pretended heresics, which they confounded purposely with the Cathari or Manichees, as soon as they perceived the least conformity between their opinions and those of the Cathari, to make them odious to the people, by insinuating to them that those other, who were separated from the Church of Rome, agreed in all, or almost in all, with the Manichees.

But beyond that, we have a piece dated after the year 1100. of our Lord, entitled, The Noble Lesson; which is in the public library of the University of Cambridge, given by Sir Sam. Motland in the year 1658. This MS. is very ancient; and in the body of this old Noble Lesson we find these words:

*Ben ha mil é cent ans compli entierament
Che fu scritta loro che son al' derrier temp.*

That is,

“Eleven hundred years are already past since it was writ, that we are in the last times.”

Sir Samuel Morland gives it us at large in his History of the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont.

Those who shall take the pains to read it will find so much piety and purity as to matter of faith in it, that they will hardly be able to suppose a

Manichean the author of it. The author, upon supposal that the world was drawing to an end, exhorts his brethren to prayer to watchfulness, to a renouncing of all worldly goods: he enforceth this consideration by the uncertainty of life, and the certainty of death; by representing to them the day of judgment, wherein every one shall receive according to his deeds, either good or evil. He lays down the belief of two ways, the one to glory, for the good, the other to torment, for the wicked, as an article of faith; and he proves it from a review of the whole Scripture, beginning at the history of the creation; concluding, that small is the number of those who shall be saved.

He asserts, that the first principle of those who desire to do good works, is to honor God the Father, to implore the assistance of his glorious Son, and the Holy Ghost, who enlightens us in the true way. He saith, that these three are the Holy Trinity, full of all power, wisdom, and goodness. He bids us pray unto them for necessary assistance to overcome the world, the Devil, and the flesh, to the end we may be able to keep our bodies and souls in the way of charity.

He lays down, that to the love of God we are to join that of our neighbor, which comprehends the love of our enemies.

He speaks of the hope the believer hath of being received up into glory.

He explains the original of evil and sin, which reigns in the world, with reference to the sin of Adam, which brought forth death.

From whence he saith Christ hath redeemed us by his death.

He tells us, that men do imitate Adam in forsaking God, to believe in idols.

He condemns the adulteries, the divisions, and pride, that reign in the world.

He rejects the opinion of those who say, that we ought not to believe that God created man to let him perish, and proves the contrary; maintaining From the Old and New Testament, that only the good shall be saved.

He sets down all the judgments of God in the Old Testament, as the effects of a just and good God; and in particular the Deecalogue, as a law given by the Lord of the whole world.

He repeats the several articles of the Law, not forgetting that which respects idols.

After having showed the judgments of God against the wicked Israelites, and his favor towards those that were good amongst them, he sets forth the sending of the Savior into the world; the angel's message to the Virgin; the conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost; the Virgin's being betrothed; her virginity; and lastly, the miracles at his birth.

He proceeds to the law of Jesus Christ, which he declares to be nothing else but a renewal and perfecting of the old Law; that the Law only forbade fornication and adultery, but that the Gospel forbids even wanton looks; that the Law gave way to divorce, whereas the Gospel forbids the marrying of one that is divorced, and forbids divorce itself; that the Law cursed those who were barren, whereas the Gospel counsels the keeping in a single state; that the Law forbade all forswearing of one's self, whereas the Gospel forbids us to swear at all, and that our words must be yea and nay. To this purpose he repeats almost all the precepts of Jesus Christ on the mountain, wherein he hath explained the Law, and rendered it more perfect.

He had spoken before of the institution of Baptism by Jesus Christ, and of the order given to his Apostles of baptizing all nations. Afterwards he speaks of the ministry of Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles, of their poverty, sufferings, doctrine, etc.

He exhorts to the reading of holy Scripture, to know the laws of Jesus Christ; as likewise to be informed that he was only persecuted for his good works.

He observes, that his persecutors were the Pharisees, Herod's men, and the Clergy; that he was betrayed by the avarice of Judas; and that he died on the cross to save men by the bitterness of his sufferings.

He describes the circumstances of the death of our Savior, his wounds, his burial, his resurrection, his showing of himself to his disciples, his ascension into heaven, his promise to his disciples of being with them till the end of the world. He sets forth the miracle of Pentecost, the preaching of the Apostles after they had received the gift of tongues, the manner of their baptizing believers, and the persecution of the apostolical Church.

He compares the persecutors of old, who had not the faith, with those of his time. He denies that ever any of the saints did persecute, but that they were persecuted by others.

He takes notice of the small number of the Apostles, who were the only true doctors, and compares their fewness with the small number of the believers and ministers of his time.

He gives a character of the Waldenses, which is very remarkable:

“If a man,” saith he, “who loves those that desire to love God and Jesus Christ; if he will neither curse, nor swear, nor lie, nor whore, nor kill, nor deceive his neighbor, nor avenge himself of his enemies, they presently say, He is a Vaudes; he deserves to be punished: and by lies and forging, ways are found to take away from him what he has got by his lawful industry. In the mean time,” saith he, “such a one comforts himself in the hope and expectation of eternal salvation.”

He mocks at the malice of those who supposed, that people whose life and behavior was contrary to that of the Waldenses, might notwithstanding be good men and true believers. He threatens them with damnation; representing to them, that a deathbed repentance, and the absolution of a Priest, who does not cause restitution to be made, but who goes snacks with the penitent, promising him to say a Mass for him, and for his ancestors, is of no avail.

He exposeth such confessions and absolutions which were in vogue at that time.

He precisely asserts, that from the time of Sylvester, all the Popes, Cardinals, Bishops, Abbots, etc. have falsely usurped the power of pardoning sin, which belongs to God alone. He expresseth himself in terms of so much energy, that I think myself obliged to give the reader a view of them.

*For I dare say, and it is very true,
 That all the Popes which have been from Sylvester to this present,
 And all Cardinals, Bishops, Abbots, and the like,
 Have no power to absolve or pardon Any creature so much as one mortal sin;
 It is God alone who pardons, and no other.
 But this ought they to do who are pastors,
 They ought to preach to the people, and pray with them,
 And feed them often with divine doctrine;
 And chastise the sinners with discipline,
 Viz. By declaring that they ought to repent,
 First, that they confess their sins freely and fully,
 And that they repent in this present life,
 That they fast, and give alms, and pray with a fervent heart;
 For by these things the soul finds salvation:
 Wherefore we Christians, that have sinned,
 And forsaken the law of Jesus Christ,
 Having neither fear, faith, nor love,
 We must confess our sins without any delay,
 We must amend with weeping and repentance
 The offenses which we have committed, and for those three mortal sins,
 To wit, for the lust of the eye, the lusts of the flesh, and the pride of life,
 through which we have done evil;
 We must keep this way.
 If we will love and follow Jesus Christ,
 We must have spiritual poverty of heart,
 And love chastity, and serve God humbly,
 For so we may follow the way of Jesus Christ,
 And thus we may overcome our enemies.
 There is a brief rehearsal in this lesson
 Of three laws which God gave to the world;
 The first law directeth men who have judgment and reason,
 Viz. To know God, and to pray to his Creator.
 For he that hath judgment may well think with himself,
 That he formed not himself, nor any thing else:
 Then here, he who hath judgment and reason may know,
 That there is one Lord God, who created all the world,
 And knowing him he ought much to honor him;
 For they were damned that would not do it.
 The second law, which God gave to Moses,
 Teacheth us to fear God, and to serve him with all our strength;
 For he condemneth and punisheth every one that offends.
 But the third law, which is at this present time,
 Teacheth us to love God, and to serve him purely:
 For he waiteth for the sinner, and giveth him time,
 That he may repent in this present life.
 As for any law to come after, we shall have none,*

*Save only to imitate Jesus Christ, and to do his will,
 And keep fast that which he commands us,
 And to be well forewarned when Antichrist shall come;
 That we may believe neither his words nor his works;
 Now, according to the Scripture, there are already many Antichrists.
 Many signs and great wonders
 Shall be from this time forward until the day of judgment;
 The heaven and the earth shall burn, and all the living die:
 After which all shall arise to everlasting life,
 And all building shall be laid flat.
 Then shall be the last judgment,
 When God shall separate his people according as it is written,
 To the wicked he shall say,
 Depart ye from me into hell fire, which never shall be quenched;
 With grievous punishments there to be straitened;
 By multitude of pains, and sharp torment:
 For you shall be damned without remedy.
 From which God deliver us, if it be his blessed will,
 And give us to hear that which he shall say to his elect without delay,
 Come hither, ye blessed of my Father,
 Inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world,
 Where you shall have pleasure, riches, and honor.
 May it please the Lord which formed the world,
 That we may be of the number of his elect, to dwell in his court for ever.
 Praised be God. Amen.*

Now I defy the impudence of the Devil himself to find therein the least shadow of Manicheism. This poem contains such excellent and Christian lessons, taken out of the Old and New Testament, concerning faith, prayer, charity, chastity, and all parts of morality, that it may well be called a plain extract of scriptural doctrine, suited to persons of mean capacity. We find therein also a refutation of some errors of the Church of Rome, performed with so much exactness and solidity for a work of that nature, that no Papist can imagine it to be any thing else but the work of a true Christian and Protestant: but since every one that will may read it, it being translated into English, without which, by reason of the obsolete language, it would be difficult to be understood, I do not think it necessary to set down more of it here.

Only I think myself bound to make some remarks on this tract, to prevent any difficulties that might possibly arise in the mind of the reader.

We may observe, first, that this poem, entitled, The Noble Lesson, hath these words,

“That if there be an honest man, who desires to love God and fear Jesus Christ, who will neither slander, nor swear, nor lie, nor commit adultery, nor kill, nor steal, nor avenge himself of his enemies; they presently say of such a one, He is a Vaudes, and worthy of death.”

This name of Waldensis was given to the disciples of Peter Waldo, as Peter Vailis Cernaii expressly tells us in his history of the Albigenses; which being so, how can we suppose that this piece was wrote about the year 1100, which is above seventy years before the time wherein Waldo first appeared. This is the first objection will be made against the antiquity of this poem.

The second is, that the Waldenses, or disciples of Waldo, having been particularly famous for their refusing to swear, it seems that this discourse cannot be attributed to any but them; which if so, it would be concluded, that this discourse bears a false date, and is not of that antiquity we pretend.

But it is easy enough to give a satisfactory answer to both these objections. As to the first, we have this to say, that it is not true, that Waldo gave this name to the inhabitants of the valleys: they were called Waldenses, or Vaudds, before his time, from the valleys in which they dwell. This we find in P. Damian’s letters, who calls them Subalpini, that is, the same as Waldenses, and in Ebrardus de Bethune, who wrote in the year 1212, where he asserts, that they called themselves Wallenses, *quia in valle lachrymarum manerent*;

“because they abode in the valley of tears:”

so that we see that this etymology rather has respect to the place where they lived, which was in the valleys of Piedmont, than to the name of Peter Waldo.

For the second, I confess it would have been of some strength, in case the disciples of Waldo had been the first that in the diocese of Italy had declared their aversion from oaths: but we have clearly showed from

Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, and others, that this opinion took place in that diocese long before Peter Waldo was born; and besides this, we know that it was an ordinary thing amongst the primitive Christians to forbid swearing upon any account whatsoever. There are some passages of Scripture, which seem so express as to this point, that we need not wonder if the Christians of that diocese were led by them, especially before they had examined the whole Scripture throughout; which was not an easy matter for them to do, the whole body of Scripture being not yet translated, that we know, but only some parts of it, and that by the labor and care of Peter Waldo.

I find nothing more that can rationally be objected against so express a testimony, which carries the date of the time inserted in the body of the treatise, but only this, which the Bishop of Meaux seems to have had an eye to, *viz.* that the language in which that piece is written seems to bespeak it of a later date than the beginning of the twelfth century; the style of it wholly agreeing with those treatises that are confessedly of a more modern date, though they have been published as written in the year 1120, or, at least, within the compass of the twelfth century.

To which I have two things to answer; the first is, that it cannot be thought so strange a thing, that some have attributed to the pieces I have rejected a greater antiquity than really they had, as being found in MS. joined to a piece which signifies the date of its composure. This is a mistake very incident to such who are not perfectly well versed in the critical examination of MSS. But however, this cannot prejudice the authority of a book that bears its own date.

The second thing I have to say in favor of the antiquity of the Noble Lesson is this; that though I cannot judge of the style of that piece by comparing it with other Italian monuments of the beginning of the twelfth century, as having no MS. of that age, nor compare it with the style of those ages that immediately followed it, in order to discern the difference between them; nevertheless thus much we may assert,

First, That if they yet spake Latin in Italy at the beginning of the twelfth century, as may be judged from this, that St. Bernard, who was a Frenchman, spake without an interpreter in the churches of Pisa, Milan, and other Italian churches, though indeed the case of Italy was like that of

other places; where, though the Latin tongue were understood by most, yet the people had their particular language they used amongst themselves: for Peter Waldo's translating of the Bible, which must have been done before the year 1180, shows, that in France there was already a language different from the Latin tongue, and which was more commonly and generally understood: and it would be easy for us to prove, that in like manner they had at that time in Italy a language different from the Roman, distinguished into several dialects, according to the distinct provinces thereof, and much resembling the language spoken in Provence, which owes its original to the Limosine tongue, which is a corruption of the Latin. The gentlemen of the University of Cambridge, who have in their custody the MSS. of divers pieces of the Waldenses, and amongst them an old MS. of some books of the Old and New Testament, gives me a fair occasion to help the reader to make this comparison; though I must confess it to be a thing of difficulty to accomplish, because, although those MSS. of some parts of the Bible are very ancient, it ordinarily happens, that in these sort of books, which are for the use of the people, men from time to time reform and alter the style, that so they may not sound uncouth and barbarous to the people; which cannot so well be done in a piece of poetry, wilein nothing can be easily changed, without spoiling the whole composure.

I do not intend here, in order to prove the opinions of the diocese of Italy, to make use of a Catechism published by Sir Sam. Morland, and by Leger, as written about the year 1100, nor of another treatise of the Invocation of Saints, which they pretend was written about the year 1120; my reason is, because it seems to me that that Catechism quotes the Scripture, as distinguished into chapters, which was not till after the midst of the thirteenth century. And as for the treatise concerning the Invocation of Saints, it quotes the *Milleloquium* of St. Austin, which was not composed by Ft. Bartholomeus of Urbin till about the midst of the fourteenth century. So that it seems these gentlemen founded their judgments of the antiquity of these pieces on too weak grounds.

However, it will be easy for us to make out, without the assistance of any doubtful authorities, that the twelfth century did not only preserve the opinions of the Paterines, but also made them more clear and distinct; which will appear, if we examine the opinions of Arnoldus Brixiensis, as

well as the writings of zealous Papists, against those whom they nicknamed Cathari, with design to make them pass for Manichees.

We may truly say, that scarcely any man was ever so defamed and torn, because of his doctrine, as was this. Arnoldus Brixiensis' would we know the reason of it? It was because with all his power he opposed the tyranny and usurpation which the Popes began to establish at Rome, over the temporal jurisdiction of the Emperor. He was the man who by his counsel renewed the design of reestablishing the authority of the senate in Rome, and of obliging the Pope not to meddle with any thing but what concerned the government of the Church, without invading the temporal jurisdiction. He it was that made the senate and people of Rome send to the Emperor Frederic, to know his resolution in the point, and to acquaint him with the proceedings they had already begun against the King of Sicily and the Pope, in order to restore Rome to the Emperors, and to make it the head of the empire, as it had been of old, without abandoning it to the power of the Pope and his Clergy. This letter is set down by Otho Frisingensis.

This was his crime; and this indeed is such a one as is unpardonable with the Popes, if there be any such.

As for the qualifications of this Arnold, the same Bishop Otho sets him forth to us as a man who, being but a simple reader of the Church of Breseia, for the love he bare to learning, traveled into France, to be an auditor of Abelardus, who at that time was the common master of learned men. He tells us, that upon his return to Italy, being endowed with happy natural parts, and a great easiness of expressing himself, he behaved himself very regularly as to his manners, and took upon him the habit of a Monk, as a mark of the love he had for piety. This truth cannot be acknowledged more plainly and distinctly than it is by St. Bernard. Otho sets him forth as a man loving singularity and novelty, and gives him a character very proper and agreeable to a schismatic and heretical ringleader. He grounds his judgment upon this, because upon his return into Italy, he began to censure the Clergy, the Bishops, and the Monks, and to seek the favor of laymen. *Dicebat enim, nec Clericos proprietatem, nec Episcopos regalia, nec Monaehos possessiones habentes, aliqua ratione posse salvari. Cuncta haec Principis esse, ab ejusque beneScientia in usum tantum Clericorum cadere oportere.*

“For, he maintained, that no Clergymen enjoying propriety, nor Bishops having regal jurisdiction, nor Monks having any possessions, could possibly be saved: that all these things belonged to the Prince; and that it was only from his beneficence the Clergy were to partake of them.”

This same thing St. Bernard also I reproacheth him with.

Those who have been a little conversant in the history of the eleventh century and the beginning of the twelfth, and who know the horrid dissoluteness that then reigned amongst the Clergy, and in monasteries, will find no great fault with him for these his opinions. Those who shall be pleased only to peruse the books of St. Bernard, *De Consideratione*, to Pope Eugenius II. will easily acquit him of the accusations laid to his charge by Otho Frisingensis.

But there was yet a more heinous thing laid to his charge, which was this: *Propter haec, de sacramento altaris, baptismo parvulorum, non sane dicitur sensisse:*

“Besides this, it was said of him, that he was unsound in his judgment about the sacrament of the altar and infant baptism.”

And this was matter enough to condemn him; for as he thus industriously set himself to oppose the growing errors in the Church of Brescia, where he was born, being supported by Maifredus, Consul of that city; as Ughellus assures us, he was set upon by the Bishop of Brescia, and some other religious persons, who accused him to the Council of Rome, under Innocent II. who imposed silence upon him, lest such a pernicious doctrine should spread itself any farther. Otho tells us, that hereupon he retired out of Italy, and settled himself in a place of Germany called ‘Furego, or Zurich, belonging to the diocese of Constance; as may be gathered from the 195th Epistle of St. Bernard to the Bishop of Constance, where he continued to disseminate his doctrine. Otho tells us, that he continued there till the death of Innocent II. and that he came to Rome at the beginning of the papacy of Eugenius II. which shows, that the letter which St. Bernard writ to the Bishop of Constance did not much lessen his credit, or do him any great prejudice.

But we proceed to the upshot of his history, which take as follows, from the relation of the aforesaid Otho.

“Being entered into the city, and finding it altogether in a seditious uproar against the Pope, he was so far from following the advice of the Wise Man, not to add fuel to the fire, that he greatly increased it, propounding to the multitude the examples of the ancient Romans, who by the maturity of their senators’ counsels, and the valor and integrity of their youth, made the whole world their own. Wherefore he persuaded them to rebuild the Capitol, to restore the dignity of the Senate, to reform the order of Knights. He maintained, that nothing of the government of the city did belong to the Pope, who ought to content himself only with his ecclesiastical censures. And so far did the mischief of this infectious doctrine prevail, not only to the pulling down of several of the Roman nobility and Cardinals’ houses, but also to the personal abuse of some of the reverend Cardinals, who were wounded by the raging mobile.”

He could not think to escape long, after committing so heinous a crime against persons extremely jealous of their tyranny.

“And as he for many days, that is, from Caelistine’s death to these times, incessantly and irreverently proceeded in these and such like enterprises, contemning the sentence of the Clergy, justly and canonically pronounced against him, as altogether void, and of no authority; he fell at last into the hands of some, on the borders of Tuscany, who took him prisoner, and being preserved for the Prince’s trial, he was at last, by the Prefect of the city, hanged, and his body burnt to ashes, (to prevent the foolish rabble from expressing any veneration for his body,) and the ashes of it cast into the Tybur.”

This was the end of this great man, which was a sufficient evidence of the veneration which the people of Rome had for him, whose interests he had so courageously undertaken to maintain against the tyranny of the Popes, who without any title or right, except that of their ambition, endeavored to subject Rome to their power, and to set up themselves for sovereigns there.

We find a confirmation of all this in Guntherus, who in verse has described the life of Frederick. Those who are never so little acquainted with history cannot be ignorant how furiously, for almost a whole century, the Popes and their partisans were engaged about the right of investitures, whereof they had a mind to deprive the Emperors; so that we cannot conceive a greater occasion of hatred in the Popes against any man, than was that which had set them against this Arnold, who stood up for the Emperor's rights. But the sovereignty of Rome, which they so much affected, and he so briskly opposed, filled up the measure of his crimes, and some of the Emperor's men having taken him, probably out of complaisance to the Pope, sacrificed him to the ambition of the papacy.

However thus much is certain, that this bloody execution was very far from pleasing all men; as we may see from the complaints Gebehardus makes upon that account, who looked upon it as a crying piece of injustice, the guilt whereof did lie upon the Bishop of Rome, and his Clergy, who were the procurers thereof. The good man, it seems, was not over-well informed, that the Church of Rome had studied the art of ruling, according to which, crimes are not so narrowly to be sifted, as long as they do but serve to confirm the pretensions of ambition to the sovereign power.

Neither did this Arnold want followers, who upon this occasion separated themselves from the Church of Rome; as may be seen by a writing published soon after by Bonacursus, Bishop of the Cathari of Milan; for this author concludes his work with a long chapter against the Arnoldists, after he became a convert.

In short, the pretended error of Arnoldus Brixiensis was evidently against the definitions of the Church of Rome: he had for a long time been the disciple and companion of Abelardus, whence we may conjecture, that he had also espoused his opinions in the point of the Eucharist, and consequently, that he was very far removed from the belief of Rome.

Indeed, we find that St. Bernard, sending to Pope Innocent II. a catalogue of the errors of Abelardus, accuseth him of teaching concerning the Eucharist, that the accidents subsisted in the air, but not without a subject, and that when a rat doth eat the Sacrament, God withdraws whither he pleaseth, and preserves where he pleases the body of Jesus Christ. This is

found in a MS. of one of St. Bernard's Epistles, and has been suppressed by those who caused his works to be printed. But perhaps it will seem more probable, that this was rather a piece of raillery, or consequence from the doctrine of transubstantiation, objected by Abelardus, than any positive opinion of his. Those who are acquainted with his genius, and have read his works, will judge hereof as I do.

After all, we have good ground 'to believe, that Arnoldus Brixiensis held the opinions of Berengarius, as those of Italy did, who renounced the Pope's communion; for he absolutely condemned the ministry of the Church of Rome, as appears from the book of Bonacursus already quoted. Indeed it seems difficult to believe, that he should have quitted the opinion of his country about the Eucharist, whilst he continued to be of their opinion in that which was the most important and capital article of all.

CHAPTER 19

That the Churches of Italy were not founded by Peter Waldo.

AFTER all that I have before observed concerning the original of the Paterines, of their opposite opinions to those of the Church of Rome, the spreading of their disciples through several countries of Europe, it appears very evident, that the keeping of the truth in the diocese of Italy, and particularly in the diocese of Turin, and in the valleys thereabout, was the work of these Paterines and Subalpini, and that we cannot, with any show of justice, attribute the same to Peter Waldo. What kind of person this Waldo was, whether a simple laie, or a Manithe, will be of no concern to Churches which subsisted long before him, under a ministry distinguished from that of the Church of Rome. Yet so it has happened by the malice of the Papists, in calumniating these Churches, and the inadvertency of diverse Protestant authors, that it is scarce possible fully to satisfy our readers, without showing what share Waldo had in this reformation, which is ordinarily attributed to him, because it has pleased the Roman party to denominate these Churches from Waldo, as if it was he who had first founded them. Whereas I affirm, that we are wholly beholden for this notion to the Papists, who made it their business to persuade men, that before Waldo began to contradict the Bishop of Lyons, and to propound new doctrines, which happened a little before the end of the twelfth century, there was never a Church, either in Italy or elsewhere, that was of his belief. It is for this reason they so much affected to fix the name of *Waldenses* on those who were of his opinion. This we may see in Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, as well as in Alanus, who wrote before the end of the twelfth century. The polemical writers, of the past and foregoing ages, have made use of this mistake by a kind of prescription against the novelty of the reformation. And as it ordinarily happens that men suffer themselves to be caught by the sound of words, and by these kind of prejudices, which are set forth with so much affectation, it cannot be denied, but that some Protestants, on this occasion, have fallen into the snare that was set for them.

Wherefore, that I may once for all clear this matter, I say, first, that it is absolutely false, that these Churches were ever founded by Peter Waldo.

Let them show us any author of that time, who asserts, that Peter Waldo ever preached in the diocese of Italy, or that he founded any Church there. Let them produce any sure tradition of that people referring the original of their Churches to Peter Waldo. Those who wrote at that time do not tell us any thing like this, no more than they who lived after. Wherefore we must needs conclude it a pure forgery to look upon Waldo as the person who first brought the reformation into Italy we now find there. I own, indeed, that by Peter Waldo's taking care to have the holy Scripture translated into the vulgar tongue, the Churches of Italy reaped much benefit from that version, whereof we have to this day some old copies in the library of the University of Cambridge. But this does not in the least infer, that Waldo ought to be considered as the founder of them. I say further, that by the acknowledgment of the enemies themselves of the Waldenses, it is absolutely false, that these Churches are of no older standing than Peter Waldo. For this we have the confession of Raynerus, an inquisitor, who lived before the middle of the thirteenth century. He ingenuously acknowledgeth,

“That the heresy of those he calls Waudois, or poor people of Lyons, was of great antiquity. Amongst all sects, saith he, cap. 4. that either are or have been, there is none more dangerous to the Church than that of the Leonists, and that for three reasons: the first is, because it is the sect that is of the longest standing of any; for some say it hath been continued down ever since the time of Pope Sylvester, and others, ever since that of the Apostles. The second is, because it is the most general of all sects; for scarcely is there any country to be found, where this sect hath not spread itself.”

Now, it is clearer than the sun, that Raynerus would never have talked at this rate, if he had known, that the first rise of this sect was not above seventy years before he wrote this treatise; as we must acknowledge, if we suppose Waldo to be the founder of it. It is also unquestionably plain, that it was impossible for a sect to spread itself so far and wide in so short a space of time.

The Bishop of Meaux highly chargeth Beza for saying, that the *Waldenses*, time out of mind, had stiffly opposed the abuses of the

Romish Church, and that they held their doctrine from father to son, ever since the year 120, as they had heard and received it from their elders and ancestors. He tells us, that the first disciples of Waldo were content to allege for themselves, that they had separated themselves from the Romish Church, at the time when, under Pope Sylvester, she had accepted of temporal endowments and possessions: a pretension which the Bishop of Meaux calls ridiculous, as well as the former. The reader who has perused my observations will be able to judge whether the Waldenses did falsely boast of their apostolical antiquity. And as for that which was just now mentioned, that the first disciples of Waldo did distinctly determine the date of their separation from the Romish Church, to the pontificate of Pope Sylvester, I own, with him, that the tradition is not founded upon any sure proof. But however thus much may be said to justify the Waldenses, that as they had no exact knowledge of history, so it would be very unjust to charge this their ignorance upon them as some heinous crime, at a time especially when darkness covered the face of the Romish Church, and wherein the greatest doctors of that proud communion were no better than very children in that point. But if we search this matter to the bottom, who was it that first invented this fable, that the Church was fallen into a prodigious corruption, upon occasion of the temporal endowments bestowed upon her at the time of Pope Sylvester? Is it not notorious, that they were the Popes themselves who caused the false donation of Constantine to be published, which was made before the year 850, to give themselves by this forgery an antienter title to what they held in Italy, than those late donations of Pepin and Charles the Great, and thereby gave occasion to the dating the corruption of the Church from the time of Constantine? Are the Waldenses so unpardonably guilty for having made this the date of their reformation, since they never pretended to be great critics, and when they saw that the Church of Rome, and the Popes upon such a title, made it their only business to subject all the world to themselves, *per fasque nefasque*, right or wrong, which they pretended had been formerly bestowed upon them by Constantine?

After all, the Bishop of Meaux knows well enough that this donation was made use of in the time of Otho I. to lessen the acknowledgment which was due to him from the Church of Rome, and that the same was inserted by Gratian in his decree, before the middle of the twelfth century. Who are

they that allege this in their disputes? Is it not the Church of Rome and her partisans? If we doubt of it, we need only to read Ecbert's treatise against the Cathaft, and we shall be fully convinced of it. He wrote about the year 1160. And since the diocese of Italy was then already separated from the Church of Rome, their posterity being deceived by the fraudulent pretences of the Papists, gave occasion to these honest people to conceit that their ancestors first appeared in the time of Constantine. But pray, does not this pretension of theirs naturally suppose, that a long time before there was in Italy a body of men separated from the Church of Rome, though, for want of skill in history, they were ignorant of the exact time of their separation from the Romish party?

But in the mean time, will some say, sure it is, that Raynerus gives the name of Waldenses to those of Italy against whom he writes. I confess he has done so, when he calls them Leonists: but we are also to take notice, that a more ancient author, whom Raynerus quotes, *viz.* Tonson the Monk, calls them Patetines, *Rayner.* cap. 6; which is sufficient to justify their antiquity, according to what we have made out in the foregoing chapter.

I own, that sometimes the Churches of the Valleys have been denominated from Waldo, because he had a great number of disciples, who joined themselves with those who were already separated from the Romish Church; but I utterly deny once more, that ever they were absolutely called by the name of Waldenses, because he was the first founder of their sect. This is that which I undertake to make out beyond all possible contradiction.

1. These believers of the Valleys could not be so called from Valdo of Lyons, because he did not flourish at the soonest till the year 1160, according to Roger Hoveden, whereas the people of the Valleys of Lucerne and Angrogne had the name of Wallenses from the beginning of the twelfth century, I have already made it appear, that they separated themselves from the Church of Rome long before, and that the name of Wallenses, or Vaudois, was given them from the place of their abode, which the inhabitants called *les Vaus de Lucerne et Angrogne*, that is to say, *the Valleys of Lucerne and Angrogne*, from whence came the Latin name Vallenses, which was afterward changed

to Valdenses, when the design was laid to make men believe that Valdo was their first founder. This is that which I have made out from *Eberard de Betbune*, cap. 25. Moreover, that they were called Vaudois before Valdo, is evident from the poem which is called, The Noble Lesson, which is in the University library of Cambridge, which bears date anno 1100, where they are so called.

2. I say, that Waldo could not possibly give them his name, till after he had been condemned by the Archbishop of Lyons, which was not till about the year 1172, by John de Beauxmains; if so be it were he that persecuted them.

3. I say, that in the Council of Lateran, under Alexander III. in the year 1179, they are not called Vaudois, but Patetines. True it is, that Gualterus Mappes, who assisted at that council, where he disputed against them, calls them Valdesii, and speaks of them, as if they had got that name from Petrus Valdo, who had been very famous amongst them. But it is apparent that he did so only to abuse them.

Accordingly we find that the canon of the Lateran Council speaks only of the Albigenses, though it is evident he bestowed the several names upon them of Cathari, Paterines, and Publicans only, to render them the more odious; either as having been restorers of old heresies, or as corresponding with the heretics of the dioeese of Italy, or as being downright Manichees, which the term Publican implies, as we have had occasion to observe elsewhere.

It may possibly be objected against what I have now said, that divers authors have maintained, that Peter Valdo was the author of the opinions of those who were called Vaudois in the twelfth century. This is that which is maintained by Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, published by Gretser and by Alanus, in his book against the Vaudois, dedicated to William, Earl of Montpellier.

But I have two things to answer, sufficient to satisfy any equitable reader: the first is, that whereas this Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, who was of the order of the Premonstrd, entitles his book against the sect of the Vaudois and Arians, he did not speak so, pag. 1198. B. P. T. 6, but by wilful mistake: for, 1, he calls them Valcenses in his title, *Incipit Tractatus Bernardi contra Falenses et Arianos*. The title of Valenses was their

ancient name, taken from the place of their habitation, and not from the name of Waldo. 2. That the reason which he had to make them Waldo's disciples, was on purpose to have an advantage against them, from the condemnation of their doctrine by Pope Lucius III. We have this condemnation in that Canon, *cap. ad abolendurn Decret. Grego. lib. 5:tit. 7. c. 9.* Whence it appears, that the Pope thereby pretended to condemn two sorts of persons, who were equally opposite to the Church of Rome.

1. Those who were schismatics from that Church, and whom she had pretended to forbid the exercise of Orders, as judging that their ministry could be no longer lawful or valid after such prohibition.
2. Those whom she looked upon either as not ordained at all, or ill ordained; as deriving their mission from those whom the Church of Rome had condemned. The words are these:

Imprimis Catharos et Paterinos, et eos qui se humiliatos vel pauperes de Lugduno falso noraine, mentiuntur, Passaginos, Josepinos, Arnoldistus, perpetuo decernimus anathemati subjacere. Et quoniam nonnulli sub specie pietatis, virtutem edus, juxta quod ait Apostolus, denegantes, auctoritatem sibi vindicant praedicandi omnes qui vel prohibiti, vel non missi, prater auctoritatem ab apostolica sede, vel ab Episcopo loci susceptam, publice vel private praedicare praesumpserint; et universos qui de Sacramento corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vel de Baptismate, sen de Peccatorum Confessione, Matrimonio, vel reliquis Ecclesiasticis sacramentis aliter sentire aut docere non metuunt, quam sacrosancta Ecclesia Romana praedicat et observat vinculo perpetui anathematis innodamus.

“In the first place we decree and judge, that the Catbari and Patetines, and those who falsely take to themselves the name of the humble or poor of Lyons, lie under a perpetual anathema. And forasmuch as some, under the show of piety, but denying (as the Apostle saith) the power thereof, take upon themselves the authority of preaching whosoever are either prohibited or not sent, and nevertheless presume to preach, either privately or publicly, without any authority derived from the apostolic see, or from the Bishop of the diocese; as likewise all those who are not afraid to entertain different opinions, or teach otherwise concerning the

Sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, or of Baptism, or the Confession of sins, Matrimony, or other sacraments of the Church, than the holy Church of Rome teacheth and observes we do herewith bind under a perpetual anathema.”

What I assert doth further clearly appear from these other terms used by Pope Lucius, who, though he maintains that the heresics, which he mentions, were sprung up *modernis temporibus*, of late time, yet takes in with them the Arnoldists, whose rise was above sixty years before that: Arnoldus Brixienses having been burnt at Rome in the year of our Lord 1155, as appears from historians.

As for Alanus, it is apparent that he followed the same method.

1. He takes notice only of the Albigenses, against whom he writes, dedicating his book to the Earl of Montpellier, under the title of Waldo’s disciples; and he seems extremely pleased, that he had this their original to object to them, which, as he supposed, might serve for a prescription, his heresy having been condemned in the Lateran Council, anno 1179.

2. It is apparent that he pleased himself in confounding the disciples of Waldo, who had caused the Old and New Testament to be translated, and had writ explanations upon it, before the year 1179, with the Manichees, who, we know, rejected those books. I shall elsewhere lay open the first rise and injustice of this calumny.

So that all that can be said with any certainty in this matter is, that some of Waldo’s disciples did probably join themselves with the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, being constrained thereto by the persecution which dispersed them far and near. But withal it is most true,

1. That Waldo was not the founder of the Churches of the Valleys, which were in being long before him.

2. That it does not appear that he had any communion with them: the authors who speak of him telling us, that he retired into Flanders and Picardy.

3. That he died before the year 1179, as appears 1 from the account Gulielmus Mappedus gives us.
4. That the greatest part of his disciples spread themselves amongst the Albigenses, according to the testimony of historians, which Albigenses were in being before Waldo, as may be seen by the 65th Sermon of St. Bernard upon the Canticles.
5. That those of them that came into Italy did not give their name to the Churches of that country, who before that were called Wallenses, from the place of their abode, and that it was only the malice of their enemies that made them pass for the disciples of Peter Waldo.

CHAPTER 20

Whether the Waldenses were at first only Schismatics.

THE Bishop of Meaux maintains, that the Waldenses were a distinct sect from the Albigenes, whom he terms Manichees. He pretends that the separation of the Waldenses was for a long time no more than a schism;

“Because, saith he, when they first separated themselves from the Church of Rome, they had but very few opinions that were contrary to those of that Church, or, it may be, none at all.”

He pretends they owe their rise solely to Peter Waldo, a merchant of Lyons, wherein he follows Raynerus, cap. 5. That the said Waldo, following the motions of a pious zeal, but ill informed, and being touched with the words of the Gospel, where poverty is so highly commended, persuaded himself, that the apostolical life was no longer to be found on the earth, and therefore selling all that he had, resolved to restore and renew it again: that this his example was imitated by many, who were touched with compunction. He afterwards accuseth them in the same discourse, affecting to live upon alms, which made them at first to be taxed with ostentation and affectation of a proud and idle poverty. Afterwards he accuseth them, in imitation of Pilikdorff, that having considered that the Apostles were not only poor, but preachers also, they took upon them the office of preaching without mission, from which being barred by the Bishops and the holy, they thence took occasion to murmur against the Clergy, who opposed their doctrine, as they said, only out of jealousy, and because their doctrine and holy life cast shame and reproach upon their corrupt manners. This being the original of their schism, according to the Bishop of Meaux.

Moreover he maintains, that Waldo was not a man of learning, but that he had cunning enough to draw in persons as ignorant as himself. He observes, that this sect, which began now to increase, was condemned by Lucius III. as Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, asserts, who saw the beginnings of it, and who tells us, that this condemnation happened before the year 1185.

Lastly, he pretends that they denied none of the doctrines which the Church of Rome teacheth; so that the sect of the Waldenses is a kind of Donatism. This is that the Bishop of Meaux strongly endeavors to prove;

1. By making it appear, that the first conferences that were held with them were about the right they took to themselves of preaching without the authority of the Bishops, and against their prohibition, and upon some other questions of the like nature.
2. Because we do not find that ever they opposed either the real presence, or the sacrifice of the Mass, nor the Sacraments of the Romish Church, nor any other of those doctrines which the Protestants do reject. That it was only about the year 1532 that they joined themselves with the Protestants, and adopted the opinions of the Reformation.

Now, forasmuch as the Bishop of Meaux has taken a great deal of pains in this matter, and that he pretends to have cited all the authors that speak of the manner of their schism, and of the number of their errors, it will be necessary to make a nearer inspection into the matters he with so much confidence does assert.

And here it would be sufficient to observe,

1. That all this is little or nothing at all to our question. If the Bishop should prove that some of Waldo's disciples were only laics, yet would it not follow from thence, that the Churches of the Valleys, amongst whom they retired, were nothing else but assemblies of laymen. We have made out the contrary concerning the Paterines, whose separation from the Church of Rome laid the foundation of the Churches of the Valleys.
2. That it is very evident from the bull of Lucius III, whereof I have quoted some part in the foregoing chapter, that the Paterines had divided themselves from the Church of Rome, not only upon the questions of discipline, but also upon several other questions concerning the sacraments; and for which reason that Pope terms them heretics. So that it appears, that the Bishop of Meaux was so wholly bent to persuade his reader that Waldo was the founder of the Churches of Italy, that he has with all the care imaginable concealed

from him whatsoever might make him know that there were Churches in those Valleys before Waldo.

But without engaging any further at present in that question, whether the Waldenses were only laymen, it will be easy to convince the Bishop of the falseness of all his pretensions, from those very authors which himself has produced on this occasion.

I begin with the second article, because on its decision depends that of the first, *viz.* Whether the Waldenses did entertain any opinions contrary to those of the Church of Rome. It was not merely from a spirit of schism that they separated themselves from the Church of Rome, though they did set forth the corruption which reigned amongst the ministers of that communion; yet was it not this corruption alone that was the motive of their separation. But I do not intend to pass by the first article, as it is set down by the Bishop, because he took this way only to impose upon his reader, though probably he also may have been imposed upon, for want of due consideration.

I maintain therefore, that the notion which the Bishop of Meaux gives his reader concerning the Waldenses, as if they had been only schismatics, is one of the falsest notions imaginable. I have made out, as may be seen by solid proofs, that they opposed themselves against the errors of the Church of Rome, and that they made them the motive of their separation. Lucius III. was well informed of this, when he condemned them, *cap. ad abolendum, P. 97. Directorii*. Conrard. Abbot of Ursberg, speaking of this condemnation, acknowledgeth, *ad an.* 1212, that Pope Lucius

“put them into the catalog of heretics, because of some superstitious doctrines and observances.”

Which are the very words that the Bishop allegeth. The same thing appears from the edict of King Alphonsus, published in the year 1194, in execution of the bull of Lucius III.

Pope Innocent III. in his Epistle, writ in 1198, plainly declares, that he took them for heretics, speaking of the Waldenses and Albigenses, as being engaged in the same doctrine. This letter was directed to the Prelates of South France, and to the neighboring Bishops of Spain, where the Waldenses had a great number of followers.

The Bishop thinks to invalidate these proofs by two means, that seem very plausible; the one is, that Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, relates a conference held at Narbonne, at the end of the twelfth century, where only four articles were handled, which all of them referred to questions of schism. The other is, that in the year 1212. the Waldenses came to Rome, to obtain the approbation of their sect, which was refused them.

If the Bishop had seen the extract of Mappeus, published by the learned Bishop Usher, he would not have failed to have made the same reflections upon it; Mappeus observing that some of the Waldenses were come to Rome, under Alexander III. in 1179, to ask leave of the Pope to preach, which was refused them.

But as to the Bishop's first proof, he therein abuseth his reader; for we are to take notice, that this conference was only about the preliminaries, without entering upon the examination of the more fundamental articles. Indeed they were only some prejudices urged against them, on purpose to hinder them from coming to the main points in question; a method of prescription, whereof the Romish party have endeavored to serve themselves long time since, to stave off the examination of those articles which reproached and exposed their corruption.

We know with what impudence the polemical writers of the Church of Rome have employed this method against the Church of England, though they were sufficiently convinced of the validity of their ministry.

The other reflection of the Bishop of Meaux about the business of these Waldenses at Rome, under Alexander III. and afterwards under Innocent III. has no more ground than the former. The decree of Lucius III. exposed the disciples of Waldo to the persecution from the Emperor Frederick I. who at that time gave up his power to the Church of Rome. And the same was yet more rudely carried on under Innocent III. Whereupon some of this poor people looking upon the Pope as the cause of all their sufferings, thought they might either justify their innocence, by declaring their opinions in opposition to these their adversaries, who accused them of being no better than pure Manichees, or else be allowed to preach by the Pope's general consent; much like what we read often about those times, that persons that were already Priests went to the Pope to obtain the liberty of preaching and wearing sandals, which was then the mark of

preachers: but the refusal that was returned them, and the Pope's inciting princes to wage war against the Albigenes, and the proceedings afterwards of *Pope* Innocent against them in the Lateran Council, in the year 1215, are sufficient arguments that they did not agree in their doctrines about matters of faith.

Neither indeed have the Popish authors been backward in setting down the errors wherewith they pretended they were chargeable. St. Bernard, in his 63rd and 66th sermon upon the Canticles, speaking concerning the heretics, whom he calls Cathari, acknowledgeth, that they rejected prayers for the dead, as also those addressed to saints. Pamelius pretends, that he spake as plainly of the Waldenses as any of those that have written since against them. But possibly the Bishop may not think these to be matters of heresy; at least he speaks very favorably of them in his exposition of the Roman faith: wherefore we shall make it appear, that they differed from the Church of Rome on other articles.

Raynerius, a Jacobite, attributes to them thirty-three errors, whereof Coussord has published an extract in these words: *Hic fuit primus eorum error, contemptus ecclesiasticac potestatis. Ex hoc traditi sunt Sathanae, praccipatati ab ipso in errores innumeros, et antiquorum hacreticorum errores suis adinventionibus miscuerent. Et quia ejecti sunt ab Ecclesia Catholica, se solos Christi Ecclesiam esse, et Christi discipulos affirmant. Dicunt se Apostolorum successores, et habere auctoritatem apostolicam, ferunt esse meretricem Babylonem, omnesque illi obedientes damnari; maxime Clericos ei obedientes a tempore Sylvestri Papae. Nmulla miracula vem aiunt esse quae fiunt in Ecclesia, quia nullus eorum aliquando miracula fecit. Omnia Ecclesiae statuta post Christi asensionem dicunt non esse servanda, nec alicujus esse valoris; festa, feriarum jejunia, ordines, benedictiones, officia Ecclesiae, et similia, respuunt omnino. Ecclesias consecratas, coemeteria, ac omnia talia, infamant, et clamant ea pro avaritia solum a Clericis instituta, ut ea ad suum quaestum reducant, quo a subditis hac occasione pecuniam et oblationes exquirant. Tum primo hominem baptizari dicunt, cum in eorum sectam fuerit inductus. Quidam eorum baptismum parvulis non valere tradunt, eo quod nondum actualiter credere possunt. Confirmationiones sacramentum respuunt: sed eorum magistri manus imponunt discipulis vice illius sacramenti. Episcopos, Clericos, ac Religiosos Ecclesiae, Scribas et Pharisacos aiunt esse, et*

Apostolorum persecutores. Corpus Christi et sanguinem verum esse sacramentum non credunt, sed panem benedictum, qui in figura quadam dicitur corpus Christi, sicut dicitur, Petra autem erit Christus, et similia. Quisam autem hoc dicunt tantum per bonos fieri; alii, per omnes qui verba consecrationis sciunt: hoc in conventiculis suis celebrant, verba illa Evangelii recitantes in mensa sua, sibi que mutuo participantes, sicut in Coena christi. Dicunt quod peccator Sacerdos aliquem solvere aut ligare non possit, cum ipse sit ligatus peccator: et quod quilibet bonus et sciens laicus alium absolvere valeat, et poenitentiam injungere. Extremam unctionem respuunt, dicentes potius maledictiones esse quam sacramentum. Matrimonium, inquit, fornicatio est jurata, nisi continenter visvant; quaslibet enim immundicias magis licitas habent quam conjugalem copulam. Continentiam laudant quidem, sed inurent libidine concedunt ei satisfieri debere, quocunque modo turpi; exponentes illud Apostiol, Melius est nubere quam uri, quod melius sit quolibet actu turpi libidini satisfacere, quam in corde tentari: sed hoc valde tenent occultum, ne vilescant. Si aliqua honesta mulier, quae casta putatur, puerum peperit, occultant et tradunt eum alibi alendum, ne prodatur. Omne juramentum illicitum esse perhibent inde vero et mortale peccatum; sed dispensant, ut juret quis pro evandenda morte corporis, ne alios prodatur, aut secretum revelet perfidiae suae. Prodere haereticum, crimen esse dicunt inexpiabile, et peccatum in Spiritum Sanctum. Nec malefactores per seculare iudicium occidi lacere dicunt. Quidam eorum nec bruta animalia, veluti pisces et hujusmodi, occidenda esse putant: cum autem ea manducare volunt, super ignem et fenum suspendunt donec moriantur. Pulices et similia animalia excutiunt extra, aut vestem ipsam in aquam calidam intigunt; et tunc ea occidisse volunt, dicuntque ea per se mortua fuisse. Ita fictas habent conscientias, et in aliis suis observantiis, sicut et in hoc existimari potest, quia scilicet veritatem deserentes, falsis se figmentis illudunt. Nullum est, secundum eos, purgatorium. Omnes autem morientes statim vel in coelum vel in infemum transunt: ideoque et suffragia ab Ecclesia facta pro defunctis, nihil eis prodesse affirmant, cum in coelo non idigeant, et in infemo nullatenus adjuventur. Unde colligunt oblationes pro defunctis factas Clericis qui illas comedunt prodesse, non animabus quae hujusmodi non utuntur. Illorum dogma est, sanctos in coelo orationes fidelium non audire, neque venemtionem, quibus eos honoramus, attendere; quia cum corpora sanctorum hic mortua jaceant, et spiritus tam remoti

sint in coelo, orationes nostras nullo modo auditu percipere valeant vel visu. Adunt et sanctos non orare pro nobis, et ob id suffragia illorum non esse imploranda a nobis, quoniam coelesti gaudio absorpti, nobis intendere, aut quid aliud curare non possunt. Unde et solemnitates, quas in sanctorum venemtionem facimus, irridet, et alia quibus eos venemmur. In diebus autem festis (ubi possunt) occulte operantur, arguentes, quod cum opemri bonum sit, bona agere in die festo malum non est. In Quadragesima, et die jejuniorum Ecclesiae, non jejunant, sed comes comedunt, ubi audent, dicentes, quod Deus non delectetur in afflictionibus amicorum suorum, cum sine his potens sit eos salvare. Quidam autem hacritici affligunt se jejuniis, vigiliis, et hujusmodi, quia sine talibus sanctitatis nomen apud simplices acquirere non possunt, nec eos simulationis figmento dicere. Vetus Testamentum non habent vel recipiunt, sed Evangelia, ut per ea non impugnentur, et se defendant, dicentes, quod superveniente Evangelio, vetem omnia sing abjicienda. Sic et verba Sanctorum Augustini, Jovini, Gregorii, Chrisostimi, Isidori et auctoritates eorum truncatas decerpunt, ut per ea sua figmenta approbent, aut resistant, vel etiam simplices secuncant facilius, pulchris sanctorum sententiis doctrinam sacrilegam colorantes. Illas autem sanctorum sententias, quas sibi vident contrarias, quibusque error eorum destruitur, tacite praetermittunt. Dociles, inter alios complices et facundos, docent verba Evangelii dictaque Apostolorum et aliorum sanctorum in vulgari lingua corde formare, ut sciant et alios informare, et fideles allicere, ac demum suam sectam pulchris sanctorum verbis polire, quo salubria putentur quae persuadent: et ita per dulces sermones seducant corda innocentium. Non solum viri, sed et foeminae eorum apud eos docent, quia foeminis magis patet accessus ad foeminas pervertendas, ut per eas etiam viros ipsos subvertant, sicut per Evam serpens illudit Adam. Verbis coopertis loqui docent, ne pro veritate studeant loqui mendacium; ut cum de uno requiruntur, de alio oblique respondeant, et ita auditores versute deludant, praesertim ubi per confessionem veritatis errorem suum timent deprehendi. Eadem simulatione ecclesias nobiscum frequentant, intersunt divinis, offerunt ad altare, sacramenta percipiunt, confitentur Sacerdotibus, observant Ecclesiae jejunia, festa colunt, ac Sacerdotum benedictiones inclinato capite suscipiunt: quamvis haec omnia, et similia ecclesiasticae institutionis statuta irrideant, et profana judicent et damnosa. Aiunt sufficere ad salutem soli Deo, et non homini confiteri. Et eos qui sanctis

offerunt luminaria derident. Diende sequitur in eodem libro: Incoepit autem haec secta circa annum ab incarnatione Domini 1170. Sub Joanne Bellomains, Archiepiscopo Lugdunensi. Hacc sunt, candide lector, quae ex antiquo libro membraneo, manaque ante ducentos nonaginta sex annos per praedictum fratrem Raynerium conscripto, fideliter transcripsimus. Ex quibus videre est hanc Valdensium sectam, et praccipuas, peneque omnes (quae nunc vigent) hacresis, non recenter inventas fuisse, sed eas ante trecentos septuaginta sex annos venisse in usum. Quarum autores postea (ut sequitur) damnati fuerunt.

“This was their first error, a contempt of ecclesiastical power: and from thence they have been delivered up to Satan, and by him cast headlong into innumerable errors, mixing the erroneous doctrines of the heretics of old with their own inventions. And being cast out of the Catholic Church, they affirm that they alone are the Church of Christ, and his disciples. They declare themselves to be the Apostles’ successors, to have apostolical authority, and the keys of binding and loosing. They hold the Church of Rome to be the whore of Babylon, and that all that obey her are damned, especially the Clergy that are subject to her since the time of Pope Sylrester. They deny that any true miracles are wrought in the Church, because none of them did ever work any. They hold that none of the ordinances of the Church, that have been introduced since Christ’s ascension, ought to be observed, as being of no worth; the feasts, fasts, orders, blessings, offices of the Church, and the like, they utterly reject. They speak against consecrated churches, churchyards, and other things of like nature; declaring that they were the inventions of covetous Priests, to increase their gains by spunging the people by this means of their money and oblations. They say, that then first a man is baptized, when he is received into their sect. Some of them hold, that Baptism is of no advantage to infants, because they cannot actually believe. They reject the sacrament of Confirmation; but, instead of that sacrament, their teachers lay their hands upon their disciples. They say, that the Bishops, the Clergy, and other religious, are no better than Scribes and Pharisees, and persecutors of the Apostles. They do not believe the body and blood of Christ to be the true

sacrament, but only blessed bread, which by a figure only is called the body of Christ, in like manner as it is said, *and the rock was Christ*, and such like. Some of them hold that this sacrament can only be celebrated by those that are good; others again, by any that know the words of consecration. This sacrament they celebrate in their assemblies, repeating the words of the Gospel at their table, and participating together, in imitation of Christ's Supper. They say, that a Priest that is a sinner cannot bind or loose any one, as being himself bound: and that any good and knowing layman may absolve another, and impose penance. They reject extreme Unction, declaring it to be rather a curse than a sacrament.

Marriage, say they, is nothing else but sworn fornication, except the parties live continently; and account any filthiness more lawful than conjugal copulation. They praise continence indeed, but in the mean time give way to the satisfying of burning lust by any filthy means whatsoever, expounding that place of the Apostle, *it is better to marry than to burn*, thus, that it is better to satisfy one's lust by any filthy art, than to be tempted therewith in the heart. But this they conceal as much as possible, that they may not be reproached therewith. If any honest woman amongst them, that has the repute of chastity, is brought to bed of a child, they carefully conceal it, and send it abroad to be nursed, that it may not be known. They hold all oaths to be unlawful, and a mortal sin: yet they dispense with them, when it is done to avoid death, lest they should betray their complices, or the secret of their infidelity.

They hold it to be an unpardonable sin to betray an heretick, and the very sin against the Holy Ghost. They say, that malefactors ought not to be put to death by the secular power. Some of them hold it unlawful to kill brute animals, as fishes, or the like; but when they have a mind to eat them, they hang them over the fire or smoke till they die. Fleas and such sort of insects they shake off their clothes, or else dip their clothes in hot water, supposing them thus to be dead of themselves. Thus they cheat their own consciences in this and other observances. From whence we may see, that having forsaken truth, they deceive themselves with their own false notions. According to them there is no purgatory; and all that die do immediately pass either into heaven or hell. That

therefore the prayers of the Church for the dead are of no use, because those that are in heaven do not want them, neither can those that are in hell be relieved by them. And from hence they infer, that the offerings that are made for the dead are only of use to the Clergymen that eat them, and not to the deceased, who cannot be profited by them. They hold, that the saints in heaven do not hear the prayers of the faithful, or regard the honors which are done to them; because their bodies lie dead here beneath, and their spirits are at so great a distance from us in heaven, that they can neither hear our prayers, nor see the honors which we pay them. They add, that the saints do not pray for us, and that therefore we are to entreat their intercession, because, being swallowed up with heavenly joy, they cannot attend to us, or indeed to any thing else. Wherefore also they deride all the festivals which we celebrate in honor of the saints, and all other instances of our veneration for them. Accordingly, wherever they can do it, they secretly work upon holydays; arguing, that since working is good, it cannot be evil to do that which is good on a holyday. They do not observe Lent or other fasts of the Church; alleging, that God does not delight in the afflictions of his friends, as being able to save without them. Some heretics indeed afflict themselves with fastings, watchings, and the like; because without these they cannot obtain the reputation of holiness amongst the simple people, nor deceive them by their reigned hypocrisy. They do not receive the Old Testament; but the Gospel only, that they may not be overthrown by it, but rather be able to defend themselves therewith; pretending, that upon the coming of the Gospel, all old things are to be laid aside. In like manner they pick up the clipt words and authorities of the holy Fathers, Augustin, Ieronymus, Gregory, Chrysostome, and Isidore, that with them they may support their opinions, oppose others, or the more easily seduce the simple, by coloring over their sacrilegious doctrine with the good sentences of the saints; but at the same time they very quietly pass those places in the holy Fathers, which oppose and destroy their errors. Those who are teachable and eloquent amongst them, they instruct to get the words of the Gospel, as well as the sayings of the Apostles and other saints, by heart, that

they may be able to inform others, and draw in believers, and beautify their sect with goodly words of the saints; that the things they persuade and recommend may be thought to be sound and saving: thus by their sweet discourses deceiving the hearts of the innocent. Neither do the men only, but the women also teach amongst them; because women have an easier access to those of their own sex to pervert them, that afterwards by their means the men may be perverted also; as the serpent deceived Adam by Eve's means. They teach their disciples to speak in hid and dark words, and instead of speaking truth, to encourage to speak lies: that when they are asked about one thing, they might perversely answer about another, and thus craftily deceive their hearers, especially when they fear that by confessing the truth they should discover their errors. In the same dissembling manner they frequent our churches, are present at divine service, offer at the altar, receive the sacraments, confess to the Priests, observe the Church fasts, celebrate festivals, and receive the Priest's blessings, reverently bowing their heads; though in the mean time they scoff at all these institutions of the Church, and look upon them as profane and hurtfull. They say it is sufficient to salvation to confess to God alone, and not to man. After this, it follows in the same book: Now this sect began about the year of our Lord's incarnation 1170, under John Bellomains, Archbishop of Lyons.

“This is that, courteous reader, which I have transcribed out of an old MS. parchment book, written 296 years ago by Friar Rainerius. From whence it appears, that this sect of the Waldenses, and the chief, yea, almost all heresies, which are now in vogue, are not of late invention, but have continued already above 376 years. Whose authors afterwards (as appears in the sequel) were condemned.”

Ivonet, in his *Summa*, part. 2:cap. 2. accuseth them of above thirty errors, as we find it recorded by Pegna upon the Directory of the Inquisitors, page 280.

Aeneas Sylvius, who flourished in the year 1451, makes a vast catalog of them, in his original of those of Bohemia, who we know were a colony of the Waldenses, cap. 35.

Emerieus, who lived in 1370, in his Directory, sets down a list of twenty errors of the Waldenses, part 2:q. 14. p. 278. We find the same in Bernard of Luxemburg, who lived about the year 1520, *Poce Pauperes de Lugduno et Paterini*, and in *Alphonsus de Castro*, who lived in 1530.

Claudius Coussord, in the year 1548, sets down an extract of Raynerius, in *Summa de Catharis et Leonistis*; and he follows his text, in his confutation of the Waldenses and Protestants, as being almost the same.

So Albertus Cataneus represents the errors of the Waldenses, as agreeable to our opinions. *Hist. Caroli* 8. p. 291 ad 296.

Thus I have given, methinks, a sufficient number of witnesses, succeeding one another for five hundred years together, who all unanimously deposed, that the Waldenses were looked upon as heretics.

And yet notwithstanding all this, the Bishop of Meaux stiffly maintains, that the Waldenses never espoused the opinions of the Protestants, till after the year 1532, at which time they united themselves with them against the Church of Rome. Was there ever a more obstinate piece of illusion? Claudius Seysselius, Archbishop of Turin, wrote against the Waldenses before the year 1518. He began his pontificate by persecuting them according to the edicts of Francis I. and Charles Duke of Savoy. His book was printed at Paris, in the year 1520, in the first pages of which book he gives us an account of the sequel of their continual persecutions; he sets down their belief, which is almost wholly conformable to their confession of faith in 1532; and yet the Bishop will needs still confidently maintain, that all that Confession was only the fruit of their uniting with the Protestants.

But however, the Bishop tells us, that they did believe transubstantiation, and so they cannot be looked upon as schismatics, such as formerly were the Donatists. The monster of transubstantiation is so dear to the Romish party, that it goes very hard with them to disown those that own that. It seems as if at this day it was the mark of Christianity. Be accused of the worst of errors, yet if you do only believe transubstantiation, you shall only pass for a schismatic. Garnerius, the Jesuit, makes it as great a crime in Nestorius, that he denied transubstantiation, as he pretends he did, as if he had overthrown the mystery of the incarnation: and thus the Bishop of

Meaux seems only to consider the Waldenses as schismatics, because, as he saith, they owned that doctrine. However, we shall find that it will be very difficult for the Bishop to make out this his assertion by such proofs as may be able to satisfy his reader.

First, What has he to say against that multitude of witnesses of his own communion, who so plainly assert, that they rejected transubstantiation? I have but just now set down the passages themselves. If he accuse them of having suffered themselves to be deceived in so important an article, what credit can their testimonies deserve, when they form against them such horrid accusations upon other points? Truly we are obliged to the Bishop for furnishing us with so good an answer, and we want only his ingenuity to make use of it upon occasion.

Secondly, What can the Bishop say to the confessions of faith of the Waldenses, wherein they formally reject this doctrine.

The Bishop here offers two things which swayed him, so easy is he to be determined by appearances. The one is, that it appears from the first conferences that were held with the Waldenses, as that of Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, that they did not reject transubstantiation, because no mention is made of it throughout the whole dispute, which the said Bernard has penned very exactly. This he confirms by several trials of the Waldenses, whereof the proceedings are in Mr. Colbert's library.

The other is, that it seems very probable, that the Confession of Faith, printed in the History of Perrin, is a late thing, and drawn up since the reformation.

Nothing can be more impertinent than these answers. If this way of arguing be good, it must follow, either that the Waldenses have changed their belief since Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, that is since the end of the twelfth century, until the year 1250, or that Raynerius was a mere slanderer.

It must also follow, that the Inquisitors that examined them about this article, as about an article which the Waldenses constantly rejected, were very knaves, or blockheads who understood nothing of the business of the Inquisition.

But to speak freely, the Inquisitors deserve but small credit, if they speak otherwise than their Directory adviseth, which they are to follow, as the lesson that is given them, for their direction in the exercise of their office: and I shall make it appear, as I go on, by giving a scantling of their honesty and fair dealing, how little cause the Bishop had to rely upon them.

CHAPTER 21

Concerning the state of the Church of Rome at the time the separation of the Paterines or Waldenses; together with the accusations charged upon them by the said Church, and the idea they had conceived of her.

THE account I have but now given from Raynerius and other authors, who have made a catalogue of the errors of the Waldenses, is abundantly sufficient to refute the vain pretense of the Bishop of Meaux, who supposeth that the Waldenses were only schismatics. But forasmuch as it is not unlikely but the Papists will disown the Bishop in this particular, as well as they do in so many others, it is but natural to endeavor to obviate the objections they may frame against the Churches of Piedmont.

1. They will probably allege, that the Patetines never accused the Church of Rome of so great a number of errors as the Waldenses do.
2. They may say, that the Waldenses. were really guilty of a multitude of errors and heresics, which the authors that I have cited after Raynerius do unanimously charge them with.
3. They may probably take notice, that the Waldenses had an article in their belief, whereof we find no mention made in the reasons alleged by the Patetines in justification of their separating from the Church of Rome, *viz.* that the Waldenses declared the Pope to be antichrist, and the Church of Rome the whore of Babylon, spoken of in the Revelation, which does not appear to have been any part of the Paterines belief.

It will be an easy matter to satisfy any reasonable person about the first of these objections: and to this purpose it will be of importance to consider, what was the state of the Romish Church at the time when a part of the diocese of Milan, with diverse Bishops at the head of them, were obliged to separate themselves from it. There is a foolish persuasion entertained by the generality of those of the Romish communion, that their Church has ever continued in the same state; whence they naturally infer, as the Bishop of Meaux does, that since the Paterines or Waldenses did not at first reject all those doctrines of the Church of Rome, which in their later

Confessions they have condemned; it may well be supposed they owned and professed the same with that Church. How gross a delusion this is, will be easily made out by manifesting that the Church of Rome, ever since the time of this separation, has declined from bad to worse, and that the reason why the Waldenses did not at first oppose all those doctrines which we at this day reject, was because they were not as yet hatched, a great part of them being beholden to the subtilty of the School men for their original, who were not in being at the time of their separation; or because the said doctrines were not looked upon by the Church of Rome to be essential, as necessarily to require the profession or practice of them from those of her communion.

The state of the Church of Rome, with reference to her faith concerning the articles about which we contest with her at this day, will appear from the following particulars.

1. She did not impose a necessity of equalizing the authority of the Apocrypha with the canonical books of Scripture. This incontestably appears from the testimony of all her own authors that have been since the eleventh century, to the Council of Trent, which first imposed it. Accordingly we find the same distinction we make of apocryphal and canonical books, in the writings of Radulphus Giselbertus, Rupertus, Honorius Augustod. Peter, Abbot of Clugny, against the Petrobus. Hugo de Saneto Vietore, Richardus de Saneto Vietore, Petrus Comestor, Cardinal Hugo, Nicolaus de Lyra, Brito the Franciscan, Thomas Aquinas, Joannes Semeca, Ocham, Hervmus, St. Antoninus, Tostatus, Dionysius the Carthusian, Cardinal Ximenes, Cardinal Cajetan, Josse Clithou, and in the writings of all those who placed the *Prologus Galeatus* of St. Jerome before the Bible, though in divers copies the word *Hagiographi* was not instead of *Apocryphi*, which word St. Jerome had attributed to authors whose authority we reject, as some Papists have observed in their editions.

The Church of Rome did not believe that tradition was a sufficient ground to build articles of faith on, though the second Council of Nice supposed it was only to maintain the worship of idols, as appears from the account Thomas Aquinas has given us.

At that time indeed all the faith necessary to be believed by a Christian was reduced to the Apostles' Creed; Leo X. being the first who determined that the Popes had power to make new articles of faith, as well as a new rule of manners. *In bulla Exurge.*

The reading of the Scripture was not forbid to laymen until the year 1200. *Innocent III. Epist. ad Metenses.*

Councils were not believed to be infallible, though the Popes presided in them. The history of the ages succeeding the tenth century are filled with examples that put this out of doubt. To this purpose the reader may consult the treatise concerning the Unity of the Church, written by Venericus, Bishop of Verceil, the works of Ocham upon the deposition of the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria, of Peter d'Ailly, Aeneas Sylvius, and of many others; which will fully convince him of the truth I assert.

It was not believed that the Christians did merit any thing by their good works, but persons on their death-beds were obliged formally to profess the contrary, in their last or death-bed confessions, as appears by the form prescribed to that purpose by Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury.

Indulgences, which came into request some time after the separation of the diocese of Milan, were looked upon only as pious frauds. This was the notion Petrus Cantor gave of them; and it is apparent, that till the fourteenth century, that which at present is owned to be the ground of them, was rejected. Jubilees were never heard of until the time of Pope Boniface VIII. that is to say, in the year 1300.

It was not believed, that notwithstanding preceding contrition, absolution was necessarily required, to obtain remission of sins; but on the contrary, that contrition for sin was sufficient to restore the sinner to a state of grace.

It was not believed, that St. James, in the fifth chapter of his Epistle, speaks of auricular confession; neither indeed was there any use of confession, except in public penances, which by little and little began to wear out of use after the twelfth century. And the necessity of confessing once a year was not imposed till the year 1215, by Pope Innocent III. Neither was the necessity of the Priest's intention believed at that time, as

appears from the writings of Adelman of Brixia against Berengarius, as well as by those of Petrus Damianus and many others.

It was not believed that marriage was forbid to Priests, otherwise than only by human constitutions; as may be seen in the common canon law of Gratian.

The sacrament of the Eucharist was not believed to be .an object of adoration. We find nothing of it in all Berengarius's disputation: we read also, that Henry II. King of England, adored the cross on his death-bed, and that he received the Eucharist with reverence, but not a word of his worshipping of it. And indeed the decree whereby its adoration was enjoined, is of no longer standing than the thirteenth century. And even to this day the Deacon communicates standing, according to the ancient custom of the Greek and Latin Churches.

It was not believed, that the end and aim of the real presence was to offer up Jesus Christ in sacrifice to God, for the sins of the living and dead: Lombard, and the greatest part of the old Schoolmen, owning it to be no more than a commemoration.

At that time there were but very few Churches where they began to communicate under one kind only, *viz.* that of bread; neither was this castore authorized but by the Council of Constance in the year 1415, till which time almost all the reflections of Papists upon the two kinds are contrary to this abuse, which Henricus Gandavensis so highly exclaims against.

It is but since the tenth age that they began to place images on the altars, and indeed a good while after; and that in some Churches only.

It is but since Lewis the IXth's time that the consecration of images was brought in use, as may still be seen in the Pontifical. *Gaufidus de Bello loco de vita Ludovic.* IX. c. 36.

It is but since the tenth century, that the cross hath been set upon altars; and we find no instance to make us believe that the image of Jesus Christ was at that time fastened to it, as it is at this day. *Thiers, c. 18.*

The Office of the Virgin was not established in the western Church till the year 1195, by Pope Urban II. at Clermont, in a council assembled there by

him, as having been till then the effect only of a private or particular superstition.

Before the twelfth century, very few foundations of dirges or masses for the dead were heard of; but since that time the Mendicant Friars have brought into vogue the Office for the Dead, vowed masses, and dirges or masses for the deceased, and have multiplied them to that excess, that it is impossible for them to satisfy the obligations they take upon them of saying so many masses.

For the multiplication of new festivals of the saints we are beholden to the fifteenth century, as may be seen in Clamengis, lib. *De novis Festivitat. non instituendis*.

The confraternities are but a very late invention, as M. Thiers owns, p. 33. of his Dissertation concerning the quire of churches.

These are the articles that were either wholly unknown, or not yet received in the Church of Rome; whence it is evident, that the Patetines or Waldenses could not at first oppose them, and that it is no matter of wonder that they never set themselves against them, but as from time to time they were admitted of by the Church of Rome, whose corruptions increased daily; which they take notice of in their last confessions of faith.

The great controversies therefore at that time were these:

1. Whether the ministry of the Church of Rome was a lawful ministry, forasmuch as simony was the principal means of obtaining any ecclesiastical dignities in the western Church.
2. Whether it was necessary to be subject to the Pope, in order to be a member of the true Church; which the Popes absolutely pretended, having to that end invaded the authority of almost all Metropolitans, that naturally were *autocephali*, that is, subject to no Church-authority above themselves out of their diocese.
3. Whether the Popes had power to annul the ministry of the married Clergy.
4. Whether the worshipping of the saints, relics, images, and of the cross, were lawful.

5. Whether the belief of the Popes concerning the carnal presence of the body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist was a belief founded upon holy Scripture.
6. Whether the belief of the absolute necessity of Baptism was lawful.
7. Whether the doctrine of purgatory was evangelical.
8. Whether prayers for the dead were a religious performance.

Now, if we will take the pains to examine a little the questions that were agitated between the Waldenses and the Church of Rome, we shall find them to be the very same with those I have just now mentioned; except only, as I have before observed, that the said questions were afterwards multiplied proportionably to the increase of the Romish corruptions.

As to what concerns the calumnies wherewith some have endeavored to disfigure them, and to make them the horror and detestation of people, we may truly aver, that in this particular the Church of Rome has only consulted her passion and hatred, without the least regard had to truth, or their innocence.

The learned Usher, and diverse others have placed the innocence of the Waldenses in so clear a light, as to all the matters whereof they are accused, that I should abuse the patience of my reader, by endeavoring anew to make their apology. It shall suffice therefore to observe first, that the Doctors of the Romish Church have maliciously affected to fasten upon the Waldenses the belief of the Manichees, under pretense that the Manichees also opposed some of the Romish practices, as well as the Waldenses. Secondly, that to this purpose they have attributed to the Manichees several doctrines of the Waldenses, which do not in the least partake with Manicheism. This a judicious reader may easily perceive, by comparing the catalogue of the errors of the new Manichees, drawn up by Emericus, which I have set down in chapter 15 with their opinions, as they are reported to us by St. Epiphanius, St. Austin, Theodoret, and by Peter of Sicily, in the ninth century.

I acknowledge, it may seem strange to some, to find the Waldenses so constantly charged with such gross calumnies; but here I must desire the reader to consider,

1. That it is no great sin with the Church of Rome to spread lies concerning those that are enemies of the faith.
2. That the Church of Rome has been always desirous of preserving the reputation of her ancient authors, as being some of their greatest saints, which would visibly have been diminished, if not quite lost, in case their successors should have owned the innocence of the Vaudois Churches. No, it is a far more easy and convenient way to assert, that the Waldenses have changed their belief, than to accuse their saints of having been most infamous calumniators.
3. That the greatest part of those authors who have writ concerning the heresics of the Waldenses or Vaudois, have only followed their first leaders, *viz.* Alanus and others, without troubling themselves to inquire into the truth of the matter: which is the very character of those sort of compilers.
4. That after the account Emericus has given us in his Directory of the Inquisitors, they of the Church of Rome were no longer at liberty to embrace a different representation of their belief from what he had already given; people generally being so far engaged in an high esteem for the Inquisition, and their exactness in all proceedings, that they would have looked upon it as a great crime to change their judgment in a matter they had allowed of and established: neither indeed could it be done, without incurring the clanger of falling into their hands; for we may well suppose they would never suffer their credit and sincerity to be in the least questioned.
5. That there is nothing more common with the Romish party, than to make use of the most horrid calumnies to blacken and expose those who have renounced her communion. The Protestants in France were at first accused of committing the same impurities at their meetings, which the heathens objected to the primitive Christians, and the Papists since that to the Waldenses. And if we east an eye upon what Sigebert tells us concerning the Greeks of the eleventh century, we shall find that calumny is a trade the Romish party is perfectly well versed in. Leo IX. saith he, sent his Legates to Constantinople, to refute the heresics of the Greeks, who, like Simoniacs, sold the gift of God; like the Valesians, took their guests, and gelt them, and so

promoted them to bishoprics; like the Arians, they rebaptized the Latins, that had already been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity; in imitation of the Donatists, they boasted the orthodox Church to be only in Greece; like the Nicolaitans, they allowed marriage to Priests; like the Severians, they declared the Law of Moses to be accursed; like the Pneumatomachi, they cut off the belief of the Holy Ghost from the Creed; like the Nazarenes, they observed Judaism, forbidding little children, though at the point of death, to be baptized before the eighth day; and women in danger of life, by reason of their travail or courses, to communicate; or, if they were heathens, to be baptized: that they called the Latins *Azymitae*, and persecuting them, shut up their churches; that they sacrificed with leavened bread, and anathematized the Roman Church in her children, preferring the Constantinopolitan Church before her. But notwithstanding all this, if we will believe Leo Allatius, there was but a very little difference between the Roman and Greek Church at that time.

6. We are to take notice, that notwithstanding the fury and malice of the Romish party in wounding the reputation of the Vaudois, yet there have not been wanting some historians, in the bosom of that Church, who have been so generous as to own the truth. Paradin observes, in his *Annals of Burgundy*, that he had seen ancient histories that fully justified them from all the accusations laid to their charge, and made it appear, that their only crime was their declaiming against the profligate manners and conduct of the Roman Clergy. Thuanus has seconded him herein, as well as divers other authors of the Roman communion, who have wrote since the Reformation, and sufficiently acquitted them of all those horrid calumnies which for so long a time have been made use of to run them down.

I proceed now to the last article before mentioned, *viz.* the idea which the Vaudois had conceived of the Church of Rome: certainly it is a very surprising thing to see the Vaudois treating the Pope with the title of Antichrist, and of the Apocalyptical Beast, and the Church of Rome with that of the Great Whore, and Mystical Babylon. What ground had they to speak and write at this rate? for we find that this was the common style they made use of in their disputes with the Romish party. This is a matter well worth our consideration.

Emerick, in his Directory, attributes this opinion to those he calls the new Manichees: but to speak truth, he is wholly besides the matter, and either abuseth himself, or has a mind to deceive others; for it was the opinion of the Vaudois, and not of the Manichees: and they had the strongest motives so to do, that persons who made it their chief business to read the Scripture, could propose to themselves; motives, I say, which from time to time were fortified and confirmed by the continual increase of the corruptions of the Church of Rome.

1. There have not been wanting a great number, in the bosom of the Church of Rome, who conceived and publicly proposed this notion, since the time of Gregory VII. Wolffus has set down several of their writings on this subject, which it is not necessary to transcribe here.

2. We find that the Vaudois had with great exactness applied themselves to the study of the Revelation; and the treatise they have published about this matter, long time before the Reformation, sufficiently evidenceth that they had compared the characters St. John speaks of with those which they found in the Pope and his Church.

3. We find that in the said treatise they make a more particular reflection upon three things which stared in the eyes of all men since the twelfth century: the first was the idolatry of the Church of Rome; the other was the power the Popes had usurped over almost all the secular powers of Europe; and the third was the fury and violence of the persecution the Church of Rome employed to support her tyranny, her false doctrine and worship, and to crush whatsoever did in the least offer to oppose itself against her usurgation.

1. The idolatry of the Church of Rome, which had suffered a great shock at the Council of Franc-fort in 794, but notwithstanding that still increased every day, and more especially after that the darkness of the tenth century had forced piety to give way to idolatry and superstition. The violation of the second Commandment was very apparent, but could be no longer palliated or disguised after that some Popes in the twelfth century began to renew in their canonizations, which began about that time, the pattern of the Pagan apotheoses. This deification of men is so horrid an attempt against the Christian religion,

that it may well be looked upon as the top and highest degree of idolatry.

2. The method the Popes took to make themselves masters of all Europe, almost all the kings thereof subjecting their crowns to the Pontifical mitre. They who will take the pains to consult the Annals of Baronius about this point, will find, that scarcely was there so much as one state left in Europe, which had not declared itself the Pope's vassal before the year 1200. He endeavors to confirm this truth by the public acts he produceth concerning the kingdom of Arragon, Portugal, Castile, and all Spain, as also of Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, and the other provinces of Italy, of Provence, Low Britany, and whole France, of Denmark, Saxony, Bohemia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Hungary, Poland, Museovia, England, and Ireland. Hereupon we may make this obvious and natural reflection: the Christians allege against the Jews a very convincing argument. It was foretold of old, that the Messiah was to convert the nations to the worship of the God of Israel: this being accordingly accomplished by Jesus Christ, it follows that he indeed is the Messiah, to whom this character is given by the ancient oracles; and by an argument *a pari* we infer thus: the kings that were to succeed to the ruins of the Roman empire have given their kingdoms to the Pope; wherefore the Pope must needs be he whom St. John has marked out to us by the beast, to whom the kings were to submit their authority. Now, as the Jews must make all Christians to renounce the God of Israel, whom they own and acknowledge, before they can suppose that the Messiah is to convert all the heathens, and be known to be the Messiah by this distinguishing character; in like manner must the Papists snatch out of the Pope's hands all the kingdoms that he hath, and doth possess, at least, as lord paramount, in order to make way for the appearance of Antichrist, and for his being owned to be such.

3. The violence of the persecution she has managed throughout all the parts of Europe, and whereof the poor Vaudois always met with the greatest share. the Popes, who had enslaved to themselves all the western Churches, being masters of the temporal also, by the voluntary subjection of its emperors and princes, did no longer think of keeping any measures. The Bishops being almost generally subject

to them, they made them decide in their synods whatsoever they pleased. The new laws they made were only the fruit of their humours and interest; and the princes being now become their vassals, were the ready executioners of the Papal violence and fury against those they had anathematized.

Now it is certain, first, that since the tenth century, whereill Arnulphus, Bishop of Orleans, called the Pope Antichrist, in a full Council at Rheims, nothing has been more ordinary than to give him this title. The Antipopes of the eleventh century very lavishly bestowed it upon one another. This example was followed in the twelfth century, and has never since been discontinued till the time of the Reformation; a vast number of writers having set themselves against the Pope and the Papacy, openly proclaiming him to be the Antichrist, and his Church the Great Whore, and Mystical Babylon. Baleus takes notice of a great number of these in his Centuries, with reference to England; and Wolffus hath instanced in many others belonging to the other parts of the western empire: more especially we ought to take notice of what Rupertus, Abbot of Tuits, tells us, in his Commentary upon the Apocalypse, that cruelty and persecution were one of the most express characters of Antichrist. See here what he writ at the beginning of the twelfth century, upon these words of the Apocalypse, *find cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be put to death. Ira Christus non facit; neque Prophetce ejus, neque Apostoli docuerunt, neque reges Christiani jam facti hoc acceperunt, ut occiderent, et sanguine cumulandum existiment Christi servitium; vevus namque Deus non coacta sed spontanea servitia vult. Ergo et in hoc, in hoc maxime palam faciet sensum habentibus, fuod vere sit Antichristus, quod vere non Christus, sed secundum nomen suum Christo sit contrarius. Hic est Christus qui sanguinem suum fundit; hic est Antichristus qui sanguinem fundit alienum.* In Apoc. lib. 3. cap. 13.

“Christ does not do so, neither did his Prophets or Apostles teach so, neither have the kings that are Christians received any such instructions to kill men, or to make them think that the worship of Christ is to be stained with blood; for the true God doth not desire any forced, but voluntary service. Wherefore by this mark especially will he make it evident to all that have any understanding, that indeed he is the Antichrist; that indeed he is

not Christ, but, according to his name, opposite and contrary to Christ. He is Christ that sheds his own blood, he is Antichrist that sheds the blood of others.”

After all this, I leave it to any one to judge, whether it were an easy matter for the Patetines and Vaudois, being oppressed by the Pope and his instruments at the rate they were, not to form this idea of the Pope and his Church; and whether any can think it possible, they should not instruct their descendants to have that just horror for the Church of Rome, which has always hindered them from reuniting with her, notwithstanding all the ways of violence she has made use of to oblige them to it.

CHAPTER 22

Concerning the belief and conduct of the Waldenses in Bohemia.

Now, because the Waldenses being driven into Bohemia, have continued there several years, it is but reasonable for us with some attention to take a view of the state of those Churches. This, as on the one hand it will give us a just idea of the purity of that spring from whence this rivulet was supplied with water; so on the other hand, it will be useful to clear them from those calumnies wherewith the Bishop of Meaux has endeavored to overwhelm them, in his treatise concerning the Protestant variations. An equitable reader will be able to make his judgment from hence, whether the Protestants have any reason to be ashamed to own the ancient Waldenses to be their predecessors; and whether the Church of Rome did well in rejecting and despising the advices and remonstrances of these their censors.

We have two famous authors, who can inform us concerning the faith and conversation of the Waldenses in Bohemia; the one is an Inquisitor, who wrote in the fourteenth century, towards the end of it, "Who," saith he, "had an exact knowledge of the Waldenses," at whose trials he had often assisted; and that in several countries, as himself witnesseth.

The other is Aeneas Sylvius, who came to be Pope Pius II. in his History of Bohemia, chap. 35; where he gives us an exact description of them, as having been himself on the place, and had several conferences with them, and desiring to inform a Cardinal concerning them.

The first of these has borrowed a good part of Raynerus's treatise, who wrote in Lombardy about the year 1250; which shows, that they had the same opinions at the end of the fourteenth century, which their ancestors had in Lombardy about the middle of the thirteenth. The thing that is singular in this author is this, not only that he prosecutes the same way of calumniating them upon many heads, which is the way of Inquisitors against pretended heretics, but that he hath annexed to every article of the Waldensian opinions, concerning the doctrines or practices of the Church of Rome, the occasion that induced them to embrace such opinions; which is a thing well worth our consideration, since we shall learn hereby, that

the Waldenses had very exactly considered and weighed the doctrines and practices of that Church. I am resolved to lay down these their opinions; for as the proofs which the good Inquisitor allegeth to defend the opinions of his Church, they are for the most part so extravagant, that the meanest polemical writer of this age amongst Papists would think it an affront to his own judgment to make use of them.

The first general head of the errors of the Waldenses is said to be of *their blasphemies against the Church of Rome, her practice, statutes, and her whole Clergy*. Their errors (saith he) are distinguished into three parts; the first is, of their blasphemies, wherewith they blaspheme the Church of Rome, her practice, laws, and whole Clergy. The second part of their errors is about the Sacraments of the Church, and the saints. The third part is concerning their abhorrency of all the good and laudable customs of the Church.

Their first error, which comes under the first general head, is,

“That the Church of Rome is not the Church of Jesus Christ, but an assembly of ungodly men; and that she has ceased from being the true Church from the time of Pope Sylvester, at which time the poison of temporal advantages was east into the Church

2. “That all vices and sins reign in that Church; and that they alone live righteously.

3. “That there is scarce any one to be found in the Church, that lives according to the Gospel rule besides themselves.

4. “That they are the true *poor in spirit*, who suffer persecution for the faith, and righteousness sake.

5. “That they are the true Church of Christ.

6. “That the eastern Church doth not value or regard the Church of Rome; and that the Church of Rome is the whore in the Revelation.

7. “They despise and reject all ordinances and statutes of the Church, as being too many, and very burdensome.

8. “That the Pope is the head and captain of all error.

- 9.**“That the Prelates are the Scribes, and seeming religious Pharisees.
- 10.**“That the Pope and all his Bishops are murderers by reason of the wars they foment.
- 11.**“That we must not obey Prelates, but God alone. Acts 4.
- 12.**“That none in the Church ought to be greater than any of their brethren, according to that of St. Matthew, *But ye are all brethren.*
- 13.**“That no man ought to kneel to a Priest; Revelation the angel saith to St. John, *See thou do it not.*
- 14.**“That tithes are not to be given to Priests, because there was no use of them in the primitive Church.
- 15.**“That the Clergy ought not to enjoy any temporal possessions. Deuteronomy *Neither the priest, nor any of the tribe of Levi, shall have any inheritance with the children of Israel, the sacrifices being their portion.*
- 16.**“That neither the Clergy nor Religious ought to enjoy any prebends.
- 17.**“That the Bishops and Abbots ought not to enjoy any regalia.
- 18.**“That neither the land nor people ought to be divided into parishes.
- 19.** “That it is an evil thing to endow and found churches and monasteries; and that nothing ought to be left to churches by will; that there ought to be none a tenant to the Church. And they condemn all the Clergy for their idleness, telling them they ought to work with their hands, as the Apostles did. They reject all the titles of Prelates, as Pope, Bishop, etc. That no man ought to be compelled by force in matters of faith. They condemn all ecclesiastical offices, and look upon them as null and void. They despise the privileges of the Church, and disregard the immunity of the Church and of persons and things belonging to it. They contemn councils and synods, and say that all paroehial rights are only inventions; and that all the observances of the Beligious are nothing else but Pharisaical traditions.

“As to the second part of their errors, they condemn all the sacraments of the Church. Concerning the sacrament of Baptism, they say, that the Catechism signifies nothing; that the absolution pronounced over infants avails them nothing; that the godfathers and godmothers do not understand what they answer the Priest; that the oblation which is called *al wegen* is nothing but a mere invention. They reject all exorcisms and blessings: they wonder why none but the Bishops alone should have power to confirm. Concerning the sacrament of the Eucharist they say, that a Priest guilty of mortal sin, cannot celebrate that Sacrament; but that a good layman, yea, a woman, if she knows the sacramental words, may. That transubstantiation is not performed by the hands of him who celebrates unworthily, but in the mouth of the worthy receiver, and that it may be celebrated on our common tables. Malaeh. *In every place shall a pure offering be offered to my name.* They condemn the custom of believers *communicating* no more than once a year, whereas they communicate daily. That transubstantiation is performed by words uttered in the vulgar tongue. That the Mass signifies nothing; that the Apostles knew nothing of it, and that it is only done for gain. They reject the Canon of the Mass, and only make use of the words of Christ in their vulgar tongue. They declare the singing in the Church to be no better than hellish howling They despise canonical hours. That the offering made by the Priest in the Mass is of no value. They reject the kiss of peace, that of the altar of the Priest’s hands, and Pope’s feet. They say concerning the sacrament of Penance, that none can be absolved by a wicked Priest. That a good layman hath the power of absolving; and that they, by laying on of their hands, can forgive sins and confer the Holy Ghost. That it is much better to confess to a good laic, than to a wicked Priest. That no heavy penances ought to be imposed according to the example of Christ, who said to the woman taken in adultery, *Go thy way, and sin no more.* All public penances and chains they disapprove of, especially in women. That a general confession ought not to be made every year. They condemn the sacrament of Marriage, declaring, that those who enter into the state of marriage without hope of children are guilty of mortal sin. Compaternity, they say,

signifies nothing as to the hindering of marriage, neither have they any regard to the degrees of carnal or spiritual affinity, which the Church observes, nor to the impediments of order and public decency, or to the prohibition of the Church in that matter. That a woman after childbirth doth not stand in need of any blessing or churching. That it was an error of the Church to forbid the Clergy to marry; whereas the same is allowed of by the Eastern Church: that it is no sin in those who are continent, to kiss or embrace. They disallow of the sacrament of extreme Unction, because the same is only given to the rich, and because many Priests are necessary to administer it. They hold the sacrament of Orders to be of no use, because every good layman is a Priest, the Apostles themselves being all laymen. That the preaching of a wicked Priest cannot profit any body. That what is uttered in the Latin tongue can be of no use to laymen. They mock at the tonsure of Priests. *They* reproach the Church that she raiseth bas tards, boys, and notorious sinners, to high eclestiasical dignities. That every layman, yea, and woman too, may preach. Corinth. For you may all prophesy one by one, that all may be edified. Whatsoever is preached without Scripture proof, they account no better than fables. That the holy Scripture is of the same efficacy in the vulgar tongue as in Latin, and accordingly they communicate, and administer the sacraments in the vulgar tongue. They can say a great part of the Old and New Testament by heart. They despise the Decretals, and the sayings and expositions of holy men, and only cleave to the text of Scripture. They contemn excommunication, neither do they value absolution, which they expect from God alone. They reject the indulgences of the Church, deride dispensations, neither do they believe any irregularity. They admit none for saints, save only the Apostles; they pray to no saint. They contemn the canonization, translation, and the vigils of the saints. They laugh at those laymen who choose themselves saints at the altar. They never read the Litany. They give no credit to the legends of the saints, and make a mock of the saints' miracles. They despise the relics of the saints. They abhor the wood of the holy cross, because of Christ's suffering on it, neither do they sign themselves with it. That the doctrine of Christ and the

Apostles is sufficient to salvation, without any Church statutes and ordinances. That the traditions of the Church are no better than the traditions of the Pharisees; and that greater stress is laid on the observation of human traditions, than on the keeping of the law of God. Matthew *Why do ye transgress the law of God by your traditions?* They refute the mystical sense of Scripture, especially in sayings and actions traditionally delivered and published by the Church; as that the cock upon steeples signifies the pastor, and such like.

“Their errors of a third rank are these; they condemn all approved ecclesiastical customs, which they do not read of in the Gospel, as the observation of Candlemas, Palm Sunday, the reconciliation of penitents, the adoration of the cross on Good Friday. They despise the feast of Easter, and all other festivals of Christ and the saints, because of their being multiplied to that vast number, and say, that one day is as good as another, and work upon holydays, where they can do it, without being taken notice of. They disregard the Church fests, alleging that of Isaiah 58. *Is this the fast that I have chosen?* They deride and mock at all dedications, consecrations, and benedictions of candles, ashes, palm branches, oil, fire, wax-candles, *agnus Dei*, women after childbearing, strangers, holy places and persons, vestments, salt and water. They look upon the church, built of stone, to be no better than a common barn, and call it commonly *steinbaus*, neither do they believe that God dwells there; Acts 17. *God doth not dwell in temples made with hands:* and that prayer made in them is of no greater efficacy, than those which we offer up in our closets, Matthew 6. *But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet.* They have no value for the dedication of churches, and call the ornaments of the altar, *the sin of the Church*, and that it were much better to clothe the poor, than to deck walls. They say concerning the altar, that it is wastefulness to let so much cloth lie rotting upon stones, and that Christ never gave to his disciples vests, nor rockets, nor mitres. They celebrate the Eucharist in their household cups, and say, that the corporal, or cloth on which the Host is laid, is no holier than the cloth of their breeches. Concerning lights used

in the Church, they say, that God, who is the true light, doth not stand in need of light, and that it can have no further use in the Church, than to hinder the Priests from stumbling in the dark. They reject all censings. Holy water they esteem no better than common water. the images and pictures in the church they declare to be idolatry. They mock at the singing in churches, that the efficacy is only in words, and not in the music. They deride the cries of the laymen, and reject all festival processions, as those at Easter, as well as mournful processions in Rogation-week and at funerals. They say, that the singing by day and by night is a thing lately instituted by Gregory, which in former times was not used in the Church. They find fault, that the Priest suffers many masses to be sung the same day for several persons. They laugh at the custom of bringing sick persons on a bench before the altar to make their supplications there for health. They rejoice whenever there is a public interdict, because then they corrupt many, saying, that they are forced to go to church for outward gain's sake; for they themselves also go to church, and hypocritically offer, confess, and communicate. They dissuade people from going on pilgrimage to Rome, and other places beyond sea; though they themselves pretend to go on pilgrimage, whereas it is only with design to visit their Bishops, who live in Lombardy. They express no value for the Lord's sepulcher, as well as those of the saints; and condemn the burying in churches. *Matthew 23: Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, because ye build the tombs, etc.*; and would choose rather to be buried in the field than in the church-yard, were they not afraid of the Church. That the offices for the deceased, masses for the dead, offerings, funeral pomps, last wills, legacies, visiting of graves, the reading of vigils, anniversary masses, and other like suffrages, are of no advantage to the souls of the deceased. They condemn the watching with the dead by night, because of the follies and wickedness which are acted on these occasions. They disallow of the confraternities of clergymen and laymen, which is called zech; and declare that all these are only invented for lucre's sake."

“They hold all these errors, because they deny purgatory, saying, that there are no more than two ways, the one of the elect to heaven, the other of the damned to hell. Ecclesiastes 11: *Which way soever the tree falleth, there it must lie.* That a good man stands in no need of any intercessions, and that they cannot profit those that are wicked. That all sins are mortal, and none at all venial. That once praying of the Lord’s Prayer is of more efficacy than the ringing of ten bells, yea, than the Mass itself. That all swearing is a mortal sin; *Matthew: But I say unto you, Swear not at all; but let your communication be, Yea, yea, and Nay, nay.* They think it is an oath to say *verily* or certainly, thereby to excuse himself from sin; that he may not divulge secrets: yea, they account him worse than a murderer, that compels another to swear; as likewise he that confers confirmation, because he exacts an oath from the party that is confirmed, and a judge of witnesses in law; as likewise doth the Inquisitor and the Priest, that force men to abjure their sins, by which means many become perjured. They reprove those who assert, that he who breaks his promise or oath made to the Priest is guilty of seven perjuries. That all judges and princes are damned, and they declare, that malefactors ought not to be condemned; *Romans 12: Vengeance is mine, I will repay it, saith the Lord.* *Matthew 13 Suffer them both to grow together till the time of harvest.* They say, that all ecclesiastical courts, held by Clergymen, are not maintained for the correction of evil doers, but for the profit which they bring along with them.”

“AEneas Sylvius gives us the following account of the Waldenses of Bohemia, in his history of that kingdom: That the Pope of Rome is equal with other Bishops: that there is no difference amongst Priests: that priesthood is not a dignity, but that grace and virtue only give the preference: that the souls of the deceased are either immediately plunged into hell, or advanced to eternal joys: that there is no purgatory fire: that it is a vain thing to pray for the dead, and a mere invention of priestly covetousness: that the images of God and the saints ought to be destroyed: that the blessing of water and palm branches is ridiculous: that the religion of the Mendicants was invented by evil spirits: that priests ought

to be poor, and only content themselves with alms: that every one has liberty to preach: no capital sin ought to be tolerated upon pretense of avoiding a greater evil: that he who is guilty of mortal sin ought not to enjoy any secular or ecclesiastical dignity, or to be obeyed in any thing: that the confirmation which is celebrated with anointing, and extreme Unction, is none of the sacraments of the Church: that auricular Confession is a piece of foppery: that every one in his closet ought to confess his sins to God: that Baptism ought to be celebrated without the addition of holy oil: that the use of churchyards is vain, and nothing but a covetous invention: that it is all one what ground dead bodies be buried in: that the temple of the great God is the whole world, and that it is a limiting of the Divine Majesty, to build churches, monasteries, and oratories, as if the Divine Goodness could more favourably be found in them than elsewhere: that the priestly vestments, altar, ornaments, palls, corporals, chalices, patins, and other vessels, are of no efficacy: that a Priest may in any place consecrate the body of Christ, and give it to those who desire it, by reciting only. the sacramental words: that it is in vain to implore the suffrages of the saints reigning with Christ in heaven, because they cannot help us: that it is to no purpose to spend one's time in singing and saying the Canonical Hours: that we are to cease from working on no day except the Lord's day: that the holydays of saints are to be rejected; and that there is no merit in observing the fasts instituted by the Church."

I do believe that it is not too hard for any judicious reader to consider,

- 1.** The difference between those accounts given by these authors: it is too sensible not to be suddenly perceived.
- 2.** That the Dominican Friar has strangely increased the number of controversies, picking out all occasions to exasperate his reader against them.
- 3.** That he has represented those controversies in a very scurrilous manner, to make them the more ridiculous: from which way we do confess that Aeneas Sylvius was very far.

CHAPTER 23

Some instances of the arguments which the Waldenses of Bohemia waged in their disputes with the Church of Rome.

THE same Inquisitor, whose extract I have but now given, gives us an account of the manner how the Bohemians, who were a colony of the Waldenses, managed their controversies with the Church of Rome. I did not conceive it fitting to change any thing in his style, nor to make my reflections on the objections which he puts into their mouths; it being enough that I have given my reader notice, that it is an Inquisitor that makes them speak so.

“The first error, saith he, of the poor of Lyons, who are also called Leonists, is, that the Church of Rome is not the Church of Jesus Christ, but an assembly of wicked men, and the whore that sits upon the beast in the Revelation. And that the Church of Rome ceased to be the true Church under Pope Sylvester, at which time it was poisoned by temporal possessions and advantages. And that they are the Church of Jesus Christ, because they observe the doctrine of the Gospel and Aposties in their words and actions.

“To proceed to other of their errors: they contemn all the statutes of the Church, and prove them to be null and void, from Scripture and reason. *Levit. And Nadab and Abihu took their censers, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not.* Now he offers strange fire, who observes or teacheth other traditions contrary to the command of God, and such are all the traditions of the Church. Therefore, etc. they say, that the doctrine of the Gospel and the Apostles is sufficient to salvation, and that the canons are mere traditions. *Matthew Why do you transgress the command of God to establish your traditions?*

“They say, that the occasion of this their error is, because the statutes of the Church are burdensome and many, whereas those of Christ are few and easy. *Acts, Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, which neither we nor our Fathers were able to bear?* And that the multiplying of precepts

necessarily causeth an implication of transgressions. *Item*, That those statutes of the Church, which belong to church lands and possessions, are directly contrary to the commands of God. Deuteronomy The Priests shall have no inheritance with the people. *Item*, The laws of Christ are universal, and reach all those of the Church, particularly that of tithes, Deuteronomy That the Eastern Church doth not regard the statutes of the Church of Rome. *Item*, That they who make them do not observe them; Matthew *They bind heavy burdens on others.* *Item*, That the statutes of the Church are often changed, as may be seen in the case of degrees of consanguinity; whereas those of Christ do never change; Luke, *But my words shall not pass away.* That the Church ordains those things she thinks to be for her own advantage, as her immunity, etc.; that the laws of Christ are finite, whereas those of the Church are infinite.

“They declare the Pope to be head and ringleader of all errors. The Prelates they call blind, and the Religious, Pharisees. They are of opinion, that all Clergymen that do not work for their living are guilty of sin; and say they are full of pride, covetousness, envy. Of pride, *because they love the uppermost seats, and to be called of men, Rabbi.* Of covetousness, because they do all for filthy lucre sake; Jerem. *From the least to the greatest of them, they run after covetousness.* Of envy because they alone will be masters; Luke: *Woe unto you, Scribes, for ye have taken away the key of knowledge.* Wherefore they say, that every man, yea, and woman too, may preach; Numbers: *Moses said, Would to God that all the Lord’s people were prophets.* And the Apostle St. Paul, *For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may be edified.* Luke, *If these should hold their peace, the stones would cry out.* Revelations, *Let him that hears, say, Come.* And because the Apostles themselves were laymen, therefore because if a layman may preach for gain, much more may he preach for God.”

“They declare also, that God alone is to be obeyed, and not the Prelates or Pope. They say, the Church is guilty of idolatry, by suffering such doctrines as these to be preached; that the Pope is a God on earth, greater than men, equal with angels, and that he

cannot sin. They reproach us for calling the Pope Father, and the Monks for calling their Abbots so; *Matthew Call ye no man father upon earth, for One is your Father*, etc. They deny also, that they ought to be obeyed in whatsoever they command. They reject kneeling to Priests, alleging that of the angel forbidding John to kneel to him.”

“They condemn the sacraments of the Church, because of the undue and irreverent manner wherein they are celebrated by many Priests; and because they set them to sale, as also because of the wicked and scandalous lives of many Ministers. They declare the Pope and all Bishops to be murderers, by reason of the wars which they maintain and stir up against Christians, Pagans, and Heretics: and they condemn those that preach up the holy war, because they say the Turks and Pagans ought not to be forced to embrace the faith by the sword, but to be allured by preaching.”

“Some of them are in an error concerning Baptism, holding, that infants cannot be saved by it; *Matthew Whosoever shall believe, and be baptized, shall be saved*: but an infant does not believe, therefore is not saved. Some of them do baptize, others use imposition of hands instead of baptism. And the occasion of this their practice is, because they say the godfathers do not understand the questions put to them by the Priest.”

“They reject the Chrism; they slight Confirmation; yet some few amongst them do receive it, though they be fifty years of age.

“They find fault, that the Bishops only appropriate Confirmation to themselves; whereas the sacrament of the Lord’s body, which is much more worthy, is permitted to Priests.

“They hold, that a Priest in mortal sin cannot give the Eucharist, because Uzzah was struck dead for touching the ark, and John durst not touch the Lord’s head. They maintain, that a pious layman, yea, a woman, so she do but know the words, may give the Eucharist; and that transubstantiation is not made in the hands of him that celebrates, but in the mouth of the worthy receiver; *Psalms, The Lord hath heard the desire of the poor*. That which

gave occasion to this their error is, because the Levites ministered the body of the Lord; as Laurenflus and Tharsinus, who suffered at Rome. Some also receive the Eucharist in any form; some of wild grapes; some of bread dipped in wine; some take sorrel in a dish; some after they have cleansed their mouths communicate again; others receive it with vinegar; some keep the Eucharist in their chambers and in their gardens, as in Bavaria. The Subdeacons also administer the Lord's body to the sick. A Deacon that hath been gaining or drinking all night has been known to celebrate the Eucharist the next morning in his shirt. Witness Goth, one of the arch-heretics, that the Eucharist has been seen to crawl with vermin, according to Zuvetch; witness the Monks there. That they often trample under their feet the body and blood of the Lord. That it is also received and handled amongst them by those who are unworthy, and public sinners, and denied to the worthy, as to nuns and widows, except sometimes in the Lord's Supper. Also in the country it is seldom given by scholars without a price put upon it; the reason is, because the churches are let to the country curates at a dear rate, and the curates are not: able to give it to the scholars without price.

“They hold the Mass to be worth nothing, alleging, that neither Christ nor his Apostles ever sung Mass: that Christ was only offered up once for all, whereas the Priest offers him up twice in one day: that it is only for gain that so many Masses are sung; *Matthew Woe unto you that devour widows' houses, under a pretense of long prayers.* **Item,** Because they do not sing twice mattins or vigils. They hold them also guilty of sin who buy masses. They say, that the first mass of the new *minor* Priest is of no more efficacy than the hundredth: the occasion of this their error is, because some preach, that a sinful Priest is as clean from all sin as an angel, by putting on his casula. Some feign to celebrate the Eucharist without the Canon. They call the church-music infernal melody, and that all is done for gain; and that it is loss to men to be hindered from their work. They contemn canonical hours, and say, that one Pater Noster is better than the noise of ten bells. They hold all oblations to be of no use to the offerer, but

only to those who receive them; Luke, *I will have mercy, and not sacrifice*. That it is better to give to the poor, than to offer to the Priest. If that place be objected to them, *When thou offerest thy gift at the altar*, etc. they answer, that the word gift there is to be understood of an occasion, or a good work. The occasion that seems to have led them into this error is, because they see that the offerings are ill spent by some: and they detract from the Mass, because of the superfluous singing and tediousness of it, and because sometimes the Priest scolds whilst he is saying Mass, and being put into a passion, breaks off the Mass abruptly. They say, that the custom of buying masses is a kind of simony. Some call good customs lucriferous inventions; and these they compel men to observe, as that which they vulgarly call *Allwegen*.

“Concerning the sacrament of Penance, they hold, that a Priest bound in mortal sin cannot absolve any, and that a pious layman can do it much better; for who can expect to be made clean by him who is filthy himself? Malachi *I will curse your blessings*. Luke, *Physician, cure thyself* Matthew *Cast out first the beam that is*, etc. Isaiah *The bed is too narrow, so that one of the two must needs tumble down, and the cloak too short to cover both*. By the bed they understand the soul; by both the persons they understand God and the Devil. They hold, that a pious layman has power to absolve. That which a man has not, how can he give? That therefore it is much better to confess to a good layman, than to a wicked Priest. The occasion of this their error is, because they see that sometimes a Bohemian Priest takes the confession of a German, whereas neither of them understands the other; and because sometimes the confession of ten persons is heard together; and sometimes confession is made by an interpreter, because, say they, public confession is made by the damned themselves: also because some say that confession avails nothing without offering a gift; and that therefore they neglect to hear the confessions of the poor, which is a piece of Judaism. Also because it is the property of godly souls to acknowledge themselves many times in fault, when they are not; and that Priests do not compel mothers, who do not see their sick infants die, to undergo a public penance,

which is used to be imposed for the most common sin; and thus still crying, Tomorrow, tomorrow, they run headlong into sin. And that they are forced many times to bear the burden of many of these penances, that they may be restored again to the communion of the Church, whereas indeed they never had lost or forfeited it.

Item, Because they see that for manifest sins only pecuniary mulcts are imposed, and so no satisfaction is given to the Church; so that the easiness of obtaining pardon becomes an argument to the sinner to sin on: because for secret sins they irapose only such a number of masses. *Item*, Because some Confessors do indirectly betray their conressions, as by writing it down, that it may be read of others. Also a wife secretly procuring her own miscarriage, is scut to the Bishop, and being suspected, is worthily put to death.

“They condemn the sacrament of Marriage, saying, that it is a mortal sin to marry without the hope of children. Others of them look upon matrimony to be no better than fornication. The occasion of this their error is derived partly from marriage itself, because married persons neither observe time, nor the bounds of matrimony; and partly from the Priests, because they compel chaste wives to seek their fugitive husbands through many countries, who yet are not bound to cohabit with their husbands, except they please; and by this many of them are corrupted. *Item*, Because a bride that is a virgin is forbid entrance into the Church for eleven days, whereas she who has committed fornication is not so much as kept out one day. So in like manner, if she be brought to bed of a still-born child: whereas by the Canons she may enter the Church the first day after. *Item*, Because some preach, that a woman dying in childbed is damned; because they deny the blessing to poor women that have nothing to offer at their churthing; and that they who are ready to be brought to bed are forced to sin, and so miscarry.

“They say, that the sacrament of extreme Unction is the highest pride. The occasion hereof is, because this sacrament is given to none but those who can well pay for it; and the multitude of Priests is the cause of that: and though it be henourable to bring in more Priests, yet extreme Unction, as well as Baptism and

Confirmation, are always administered only by one. *Item*, Because some preach, that this sacrament ought not to be administered to any, except they be at least worth two cows; which is a great scandal to the poor. And because they say, that twelve lights are necessary at the celebrating of extreme Unction, whereas one light is accounted sufficient at the celebration of the Eucharist, which is the most worthy sacrament of all.

“They say, that the sacrament of Order is of no use, because the Apostles were laymen; and that Christ never gave them either roehers, mitres, hoods, rings, or any other ornament. They deride tonsure, because the Apostles knew nothing of it. The reason which they go upon is, because such who are unworthy both as to their life and knowledge, and bastards, are advanced to orders and dignities, scandalizing the Church of God both by their word and example.

“They say likewise, that the Church has greatly erred in forbidding the Clergy to marry, because as well the old Law as the Gospel do allow of it; and by their winking in the mean time at fornication.

Item, By her advancing of bastards to the highest promotions in the Church. *Item*, Some say, that whatever those who have vowed chastity, above the girdle, do by kissing, feeling, words, pressing of the breasts, embraces, is all done in charity.

“They condemn excommunication, and say, that it is nothing else but cursing. Genesis He who curseth thee, shall be cursed, etc.

Ecclesiastes When a wicked man curseth the Devil, he curseth his own soul: wherefore if he curseth a man, he curseth himself.

Cursers and evil-speakers shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

Some say, an unjust excommunication doth stand good. *Item*,

Whenever there is an interdict, the heretics rejoice, because then they have an opportunity to corrupt Christians, and make them undervalue the worship of God. That it is an ungodly thing to vex and punish the innocent, by denying them the sacraments, for the sins of others: that by this means the praise of God and of the court of heaven is taken away, and the souls in purgatory are deprived of the suffrages of the Church, and the devotion of living

believers lessened; and therefore they say, that then tenths ought not to be paid. The occasion of this their error is, because excommunications are multiplied upon any slight occasion, as, for the tenth penny; or if a man doth not come to church, in these and such like cases persons are excommunicated without any lawful order, and afterwards are again admitted to communicate without foregoing absolution; by which means he who gives the sacrament, as well as the excommunicated person, and the people, are in danger.

“They hold, that tithes ought not to be given, because they were never given in the primitive Church; and that if tithes ought not to be received, neither ought they to be paid. If you say, that they ought to be given, because the Jews gave them, by the same reason all other legal constitutions are to be observed. They allege also, that there are but few countries, though governed by Roman law, where tithes are paid. They say, it is sin to pay tithes; and that laymen who receive tithes do sin likewise, because they are so wickedly spent. They say, that the Clergy and Priests ought to have no propriety or possessions: *Deuteronomy Neither priests nor Levites, nor any that are of the tribe of Levi, shall have any inheritance with the people of Israel, because the sacrifices are their portion.* Acts, and they called nothing their own, of all that they possessed, but they had all things common. They do not believe indulgences; Luke, *Who can forgive sin, save God alone?* They despise the Church absolutions, and do not mind irregularity, nor have they any faith in the Church’s dispensations. That which led them into this error was the multiplying of indulgences, and because future punishment is bought off by the people; which they do not believe.

“They despise the feasts of the Church, saying, that one day is like another. If it be objected to them, that God has commanded the seventh day to be sanctified; they answer, that if for that reason the Sabbath-day is to be kept, that tireurnelson is to be kept for the same reason.

“They took offense at them, because there are no less than an hundred and twenty holy days in a year; because some say, that the feast of Easter and Pentecost are the feasts of St. Stephen and St. John: because fairs are kept on holydays: because holydays are transferred to Sundays for gain: because tailors and carriers are suffered to work then: because there be too many holydays, translations, inventions, and octaves, so that there is scarce a week which has not two or three of them: because they are introduced only for gain, which is a great scandal to the people: because workmen, by being hindered from their work, do thereby fall to poverty: because on those days more sins are committed than any other: because the primitive Church had very few feasts; wherefore also they secretly work on those days.

“They despise the fasts of the Church; for on Good Friday they eat flesh; *The kingdom of God is not meat*, etc. Isaiah, *Is this the fast that I have chosen?* Corinthians, *Let not him that eats not, judge him that eats*. The ground of their error was, because poor men and laborers are obliged in Lent to fast with bread and water; and also, because they can get no work, upon the account of these days of abstinence.

“The material edifice of the church they esteem to be no better than a barn, and nickname it commonly the stonehouse; Acts, *God doth not dwell in temples made with hands*: and that prayers made in them are of no more efficacy than if they were made in any other house; Luke, *But thou, when thou prayest, enter into*, etc. John, *Neither in this mountain nor at Jerusalem shall ye worship*, etc. Acts, *Lifting up pure hands in all places*. The occasion of their mistake was, because the Church makes men carnal; it being a place of their acting in masquerade, and making a show with their fine clothes.

“They contemn the dedication of churches: they call the altar an heap of stones; and that it is a piece of wastefulness to let cloth rot upon stones. The occasion; the prodigious expenses laid out upon churches, which might with far greater profit be bestowed upon the poor: Matthew *Do you see all these buildings? there shall not be*

left a stone, etc. As also, because some set up taverns in the church; and because some say, that as oft as a man goes round the church, so many mortal sins are forgiven him. Also because some say and preach, that to frequent a strange church is a committing of adultery: that it is better to preach in a stable than in the church. The ornaments of the church they say are sinful, and that it is better to clothe the poor than to hang walls. The corporal, they say, is no better than the cloth of their breeches. Concerning lights in the church, they say, that God, who is the true light, doth not stand in need of light; and that the cup used in the Sacrament doth not differ from a common household cup, because formerly they made use of glass chalices. They reject tensings: they value holy Water no more than common water: images and pictures, they say, are idolatry; Exodus 20: *Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image*, etc. These errors arose from the scandal which they took at the horrid wooden images and pictures which they daily saw, and which, in their opinion, rather strike a man with horror than devotion. They deride church-music, saying, that virtue and efficacy is in words, and not in the melody. This sprung originally from the tedious and superfluous singing in churches. They mock at the cries and shouts of the people. They condemn processions, because of the follies that are acted at them.

“They believe no saints, besides the Apostles, and such as are mentioned in the Gospels or Acts of the Apostles; they call upon no saint, no, not the blessed Virgin, but God alone. This proceeded from the many false saints, as Vivianus and others, whose names, lives, and merits, are unknown. They show no respect to spring, as in Drozo, where the Priest baptizeth the crucifix in the spring, and the people offer to the spring. *Item*, Holy trees, as those of St. Christopher, and the air in the fields. *Item*, They deride the names of the saints, as Erhardo, honoring them with oblations. *Item*, Because no devotion is expressed to the saints of the Old Testament: because the honor which ought to be given to God, is more exhibited to creatures than to God alone. Thus some fast every Wednesday in honor of St. Nicholas, who do not fast on Friday in honor of God; and so likewise when St. Nicholas is

named, all sigh; whereas when Jesus Christ is named, all hold their peace. They give no credit to the legends and sufferings of the saints. This arose from the contradiction about Constantine's baptism, and many things altogether incredible, as in the legend of St. Margaret and Julland, and the Seven Sleepers. They do not believe the miracles of the saints. This incredulity was occasioned by the many false miracles, as oil, blood, tears of images, and heavenly light. And by reason of those hypocrites, who are commonly called Sterzet, who, pretending themselves to be afflicted with divers sicknesses, declare they are suddenly recovered.

“They give no credit to the relics of saints. This was occasioned by the false relics which some carry about, as the milk of the blessed Virgin, who with a small quantity of milk suckled our Savior, and a salamander for the garment of the blessed Virgin, and the sweat of Christ, and the membrane in which our Savior was wrapt, and the relics of angels. Likewise because one of these relicmongers boasted, that he could make what saints he pleased; and being asked how, answered, that he often took the bone of an ox, and sawed it into small pieces, which he wrapt up in purple, writing about them the names of what saints he pleased: and because they baptize the milk of the blessed Virgin, and then give the water to drink. *Item*, Because they make merchandise of them, and are often eaten by mice; which thing was related to the people by this Priest, and the people much scandalized thereat. Because several churches quarrel and dispute about the bodies of saints, each maintaining that they have them, as about the body of St. Mark, St. Vitus, and the rest.

“They abhor the holy cross, because of Christ's suffering thereon. Their aversion seems to have been taken from the sermons of those who maintained, that the cross being taken away from Christ, returned of itself. They say, that the wood of the cross is no more than other wood: they do not arm themselves with the sign of the cross. They set no value upon the sepulcher of our Lord, nor of the saints; Matthew, *Woe to you, Pharisees, for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets*. They despise church burial, for they would rather

choose to be buried in a field than in a church-yard, but that they stand in fear of the Church. Their reason for this opinion is, because those who die without contrition are buried there, and they who kill themselves; and on the contrary, many times church burial is denied to those who die truly contrite: because money is demanded for every one, even for infants, who do not stand in need of any suffrages, and for lepers: because some saints were formerly buried in gardens, as our Savior; some in their own houses, some in the water, as St. Clemens. They reject the watching with the dead, because of the follies committed on those occasions; because the laws of the Church, from the beginning of the world, and the ecclesiastical canons, do allow every man to choose his burying-place where he pleaseth; because many quarrels and contests arise about dead bodies, and frequent scandals both to believers and unbelievers. They condemn all pilgrimages, because of those many abuses which they have given occasion to, as, that many women who go on pilgrimages have been debauched by the way; and because of the false and counterfeit pilgrims, which they call Stezzar. *Item*, Because they say, that Christ and his Apostles built his Church on the waters, and that to pilgrims all sins are forgiven, as much as in Baptism.

“They deny purgatory, and maintain that there are only two ways, the one of the elect to heaven, the other of the damned to hell; Which way soever *the tree falls, there it lies*. They say, that neither masses, nor anniversaries, nor offerings, nor other suffrages, are of any profit to the souls of the deceased, but that they are only done for the gain that comes by them to the Priests. To that place in the Corinthians, *If any build hay or stubble, he shall be saved, but so as by fire*; they answer, that by fire there, is to be understood the fire of tribulation and affliction. St. Aust. *He who prays for his mother, does his mother an injury*; therefore he who causeth masses to be said for his children, or prays for them, does rather injure than benefit them. If a man be good, he stands in no need of any suffrages; if wicked, they can do him no good; John, *I pray for them, not for the world*; that is, for worldly men. Now if we be not to pray for them whilst they are alive, much less when they are

dead. They say, that the prayers of a good layman are of more profit than those of a wicked Priest; and that one Lord's Prayer is of greater efficacy than many masses; John, *We know that God does not hear sinners*. Isaiah, *When you multiply your prayers, I will not hear*. Greg. *Cum is quibus displicet ad intercedendum mittitur, reati animus ad deteriora provocatur*.

“They say, that Latin prayers can be of no advantage to laymen. They hold three errors about purgatory: the first is, that no sin is venial, but all are mortal; the second is, that when the sin is forgiven, the punishment is also remitted; whence men take an occasion of sinning more freely, and making void the sacrament of Penance. Matthew Repent. Luke, *Bring forth fruits meet for repentance*. The third error is, that intercessions are unprofitable.

“They condemn judges and princes, saying, that malefactors ought not to be condemned; Matthew *Judge not, lest ye be judged*, etc. Genesis, *He that sheds man's blood, by man his blood shall be shed*. Exodus, *Thou shalt not kill*. Matthew, *Put up thy sword in the sheath, for he who smites with the sword*, etc. Matthew in the parable of the tares, *Suffer both of them to grow together till the harvest*. They seem to have been led into these mistakes, because judges and princes are generally unjust and tyrants; and because justice is set at a price in ecclesiastical as well as other courts of judicature. Isaiah, *Woe unto you that justify the wicked for a reward, and turn away the righteousness of the righteous; they do not judge the fatherless, and the cause of the widow will they not hear*.

“They say, that to swear is a mortal sin. Matthew, *But I say unto you, Swear not at all, neither by heaven, for it is God's throne*, etc. *but let your discourse be Yea, yea; and Nay, nay*. The frequent and continual swearing, upon the slightest causes, has given occasion to this error; as also because heretics by this means fall into perjury. They who never swear are like the Devil, of whom we do not read that he ever swore.”

These are the errors which he attributes to the Waldenses of Bohemia, many of them by mere calumny, some others by an ill construction of their doctrine, as our writers Perrin and Usserius have demonstrated.

As to their conduct, he gives this account of them:

“Heretics are known by their manners and words; for they are orderly and modest in their manners and behavior; they avoid all pride in their habits, as wearing neither very rich clothes, nor over mean and ragged ones. They keep up no commerce or trade, to avoid lies, swearing, and deceit, but only live by the labor of their own hands, as handicraftsmen and day laborers; and their teachers are weavers and tailors. They do not heap up riches, but are content with necessaries. They are also very ehaste. They are sparing and very temperate in eating and drinking; they do not frequent taverns or alehouses, neither do they go to balls or other vanities. They abstain from anger. When they work, they either learn or teach; and therefore pray but little. They hypocritically go to church, offer, confess, communicate, and hear sermons, to catch the preacher in his words. In like manner also their women are very modest, avoiding backbiting, foolish jesting, and levity of words, and especially abstaining from lies and swearing; not so much as making use of the common asseverations, In truth, For certain, or the like, because they look upon these to be oaths. They seldom answer directly to the questions demanded of them. So if you ask them, Are you acquainted with the Gospel or the Epistles? they answer, Who should have taught me them? Or else, *These are for them to learn who are of a great and deep understanding, or those who are fit for such things, and have leisure for them.* They commonly say only, Yea, yea; No, no; and say, *This is lawful for them, because Christ said to the Jews, Pull down this temple, though he meant it not concerning Solomon’s temple.*”

The manners and behavior of the Waldenses is as follows:

“They kneel down upon the ground, before a bench, or such like, and continue thus in all their prayers in silence, as long as one might repeat a Pater Noster thirty or forty times, and conclude their prayers by repeating the word Amen several times. And this

they do every day very reverently, amongst those of their own persuasion, without the company of any strangers, before noon, after noon, and at night when they go to bed; and in the mornings when they rise out of bed: besides some other times as well in the day, morning and at night. They say, teach, nor have any other prayer besides Our Father. They do not look upon the salutation of the angel to be a prayer, nor the Apostles' Creed; and say, that these were introduced by the Church of Rome, not by Christ. However they have drawn up a short draught of the seven articles concerning the Godhead, and as many concerning the human nature, the Ten Commandments, and the seven works of mercy, which they say and teach, and boast much of them, and readily offer themselves to answer any one that demands of them a reason of their faith. Before they set themselves down to table, they bless it, saying, *Bless the Lord. Lord have mercy upon us, Christ have mercy upon us, Lord have mercy upon us. Our Father*, etc. After which, the eldest of the company saith in the vulgar tongue, *God, who blessed the five barloot loaves and two fishes in the desert before his disciples, bless this table, and that which is upon it, and which shall be set upon it*, (and then make the sign of the cross,) *in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen.* And when they rise from table after dinner or supper, they give thanks in this manner; the eldest amongst them in the vulgar tongue repeating the doxology set down in the Revelation; *Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, honor, power, and might, be ascribed to God alone, for ever and ever. Amen.* And then adds, *God render a good reward and a plentiful return to all those who are our benefactors; and the God who hath given us corporal food vouchsafe us also the life of the Spirit; and God be with us, and we with him always:* and the company answer, Amen. Also when they bless the table, and when they return thanks, they fold their hands together, and lift them up towards heaven. And after dinner, when they have returned thanks, and prayed as beforesaid, they preach, teach, and exhort according to their way and doctrine.

In the year of our Lord 1391, the 4th of September, were underwritten the errors of the sect of the Waldenses. Then he gives an account of their Ministers.

First, Nicholas of Poland, the son of a husbandman; Conrad of Saxony, of the town of Dubun, near Wisseburg, the son of a husbandman; Walriek of Hardech, a tailor; Conrad of Gamundia, of the county of Suabia, the son of a husbandman; Simon of Salig, an Hungarian, a tailor; Herannus of Mistelgen, a Bavarian, by his trade a carpenter; John of Drena, a Bavarian, likewise a carpenter. These aforementioned are called amongst them apostles, masters, angels, and brethren.”

Their life and conversation is thus: first,

“they fast three or four days in a week, with bread and water, except they be obliged to work hard. After this they appear amongst those who are of the same faith with them, as their superiors. They pray seven times in a day. The eldest begins the prayer, and makes it either long or short, according as he thinks fitting, and the company goes along with him in his prayer. Their teachers go very meanly dressed; they walk two and two together, an old man with a young man, wherever they go, They are very wary in their words, and avoid lies, oaths, and all filthy things; and inform and exhort their auditory to do the same.”

CHAPTER 24

Concerning the government of the Churches of the Waldenses, and of the succession of their Ministers.

If we had a well continued history of the Churches of the Valleys, it would be easy for us to make it appear,

1. That they have always exactly preserved amongst them a church government, in the same manner as it was established in the midst of the eleventh century, after their separation from the Church of Rome, which happened in the time of Wido, Archbishop of Milan, in the year of our Lord 1059, and that they distinguished their Clergy into three orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.
2. That their Ministers exercised these holy functions, extraordinarily to the edification of their people.
3. That it is not true, that they gave leave to laymen to preach or administer the sacraments. But we own it to be a difficult thing to set down the succession of their Pastors, and to specify them by name, the persecutions they continually lay under having destroyed almost all their ancient records; in the mean time there are still some testimonies of their adversaries remaining, which evidently prove the first article.

First, Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, in his treatise against the sect of the Waldenses and Arians, chap. 6, accuseth only some of the Waldenses of having no Pastors; which shows, that the body of that Church had a fixed ministry before the end of the twelfth century; and whereas elsewhere he chargeth them with usurping the Church ministry, it is either a very false accusation, or which only respected some of Peter Waldo's disciples, who, being dispersed by the persecution, thought themselves in that state to have right to preach, and to oppose the errors of the Church of Rome.

Secondly, Raynerus, who lived in 1250, doth acknowledge, that they had their Bishops in Lombardy, cap. 5. *Lombardiam intrantes, visitant Episcopos suos*;

“When they come into Lombardy they visit their Bishops.”

Matthew Paris, ad ann. 1243, speaks of a Bishop of the Paterines in Cremona, who was deposed by them for fornication. Pilickdorff, whom the Bishop of Meaux quotes, shows, that they did not approve of a layman’s celebrating the Eucharist, chap. 1. which sufficiently proves, that they made a signal difference between the Clergy and the people; and that it is absolutely false, that they were only a company of laymen, who took to themselves the power of preaching and administering the sacraments, though nothing be more obvious in the writings of their adversaries than this charge.

If we cast our eyes upon the colonies they have sent to several places, we shall find the same discipline in use amongst them. Thus we see that in the kingdom of Naples they had a superior, who conferred Orders in the city of Aquila. We find the same thing in Bohemia, in the Confession of Faith they presented to Uladislaus, p. 836. *Ordinandi majoribus aut minoribus ordinibus, promovendi vita virtuosa, in Christifide*, etc. The same is observed in an ancient abridgment of the opinions of the Waldenses, recorded by Wolfius, *Lect. Memor. ad ann.* 1160. p. 380:

“They absolutely deny the Popes primacy over all Churches, and more especially his power over all policies, that is, his power of both swords; neither do they hold, that any other orders ought to be retained in the Church, but those of Priests, Deacons, and Bishops.”

Guido Carmelita attributes to them the same discipline, according to the report of Alphonsus a Castro, lib. 11. p. 337. And we find the same in Claudius Seysselius *adversus Errores Waldensium*, fol. 10

“Those whom they judge to be the best amongst them, they appoint to be their Priests, to whom, upon all occasions, they have recourse, as to the vicars and successors of the Apostles.”

We find their close adhering to this ancient constitution, from the history of Commenius, who was the only survivor of all the Bishops that escaped from the Bohemian persecution, in the history he has published concerning them, taken out of the Annals of that country, which he had saved from the fire, and which he carefully preserved at Amsterdam: in p. 70, and the

pages following, he tells us, that the believers of Bohemia and Moravia, who had separated themselves from the communion of the Papists and Calixtines, having created three Pastors from amongst themselves, found themselves greatly perplexed about their ordination; but having understood that there were Waldenses dwelling in the confines of Moravia and Austria, to the end they might fully satisfy the scruples, as well of their own consciences as of others, as well for that time as for all time to come, they resolved to send Michael Zambergius, one of their Pastors, (who formerly had received his orders from the Bishop of Rome himself,) with two others, to find out these Waldenses, and to give them an account of what passed amongst them; but above all, to ask counsel of them, concerning what they had to do in the matter they were scrupulous about: that they met with one Stephen, a Waldensian Bishop, who sent for allover, and some Ministers, in the presence of whom he made it appear to these deputies of Moravia and Bohemia, that his doctrine, as well as that of all other Waldenses, was the same that was in the time of Constantine: that the said Bishop explained to them their several articles, and related to them the horrible persecutions which his fellow-brethren had endured in Italy and in France; and that finally the said Stephen, with the other forementioned, conferred the vocation and ordination upon the said three Pastors that were sent to them by the imposition of hands, with power and authority to create others, as there should be occasion: that from that time those of Bohemia and Moravia desired to unite themselves into one body with the same Waldenses; whence it came to pass, that they themselves were afterwards called Waldenses. And, page 75, he further confirms, that the Churches of Bohemia and Moravia did never deny, but that they had received the authority of laying on of hands, and external succession, from the Waldenses.

The said Comenius, who published the Discipline of the Churches of Bohemia in 1644, gives us this account of the matter in the preface to his book:

“It is evident from history, godly reader, that the Bohemian nation, after that they above two hundred years ago had been happily enlightened with the light of the Gospel, by the ministry of John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, were by the deceit of Satan again enticed to the obedience of the apostate see, (only reserving to

themselves the cup, and some other superficials,) viz. in the Council of Basil, ann. 1433. The city Tabor only, grieving to see the lighted candle thus hid under a bushel, opposed themselves, for many years, defending the purity of their doctrine, and their constancy in the faith, with their swords, till at last they also were partly circumvented by fraud, and partly oppressed by violence. Whereupon all those who were yet left of Huss's followers, being inflamed with a divine zeal, took courage, and separating themselves from the Calixtines, or pretended Hussites, in the year 1457, they happily set up distinct meetings in several places, supported only by the Divine assistance, as also a distinct consistory; for a little before those times, some part of the Waldenses being driven out of France, came and settled themselves in the confines of Austria, with one or two of their Bishops, to whom these Bohemians sent deputies, who declared to them their intention, desiring their counsel, and a Christian union with them: the Waldenses on the other hand commending their purpose, advised them, that if they desired to have those assemblies that embraced the pure doctrine of the Gospel to be preserved from being dissipated, they ought to take care never to want faithful pastors.

“Wherefore that they ought not to expect till some who had their ordination from Rome, should by their love to truth be brought over to them, who might ordain pastors for them, but rather ordain them themselves, as occasion should offer. And forasmuch as the said Waldenses declared that they had lawful Bishops amongst them, and a lawful and uninterrupted succession from the Apostles themselves; they very solemnly created three of our Ministers Bishops, conferring upon them the power of ordaining Ministers, though they did not think fit to take upon them the name of Bishops, because of the Antichristian abuse of that name, contenting themselves with the name of Elders. As to their union with the Waldenses, before it could be brought about, the good Waldenses were again dissipated, their Bishop, Stephen, being burnt at Vienna.”

The Bishop of Meaux touches upon this history, and supposeth to have found in it an occasion of triumph, as believing that it clearly provcs, that the Waldenses had no ministry at all, because they were forced to take their ordination from the Church of Rome. He observes, that they sent those whom they designed to be Priests, to Popish Bishops, to receive their ordination from them. But this indeed proves just the contrary to what he pretends.

1. It appears from hence, that they made a great distinction between the Ministers of the Gospel and the rest of the people.
2. That they did not make use of the title of necessity, but in such circumstances as made out a real necessity.
3. That though they highly declaimed against the Church of Rome and its ministry, yet they nevertheless acknowledged, that the episcopal ministry in her was lawful, if separated only from the corruptions wherewith it was stained.

However, this action, which seems so irregular, is no stranger than that of the ancient believers of Lombardy, in the time of Gregory I. who finding themselves deprived of Ministers, by reason of the Arian persecution, which had scattered them, betook themselves to the Arian Priests to have their children baptized, though in other places the validity of the Arian ministry was so little owned, that they rebaptized the children who had been baptized by them.

Neither do I believe that the Bishop has cause to reproach this poor people for their carriage in this behalf, till after he shall have persuaded those of his communion to abolish the custom they have at Rome, to permit the Greeks, whom they have seduced, and bred up in their seminaries, to receive their ordination from Greek Bishops, though they account those Bishops both schismatics and heretics, and get themselves ordained by them, with design to oppose with all their might the Greek Churches, from whence they receive their Orders by the laying on of hands.

Lastly, This Order has continued until the year 1655, as we may see by the example of Leger, who was Moderator of the Churches of the Valleys twelve years. It appears from the. history of Leger, that the Moderator,

who was during life, had power to call synods, and to preside in them, and to celebrate the function of laying on of hands, p. 208. And lastly, we may see a proof of what I say, in the Churches of Bohemia and Moravia, who are a colony of the ancient Waldenses. See the account Commenius gives us in the year 1660, at which time he was one of their Bishops, in his preface to the book of the Discipline of Fratres Bohemi; and see p. 167 and 168 of Leger.

As for the manner of their discharging the function of the ministry, we can sufficiently lustily them if the testimony of their greatest enemies is worthy of any consideration.

Here is the testimony that Peter Damiani gives to the Clergy of the diocese of Turin, when he writes to Cunibert, Archbishop of Turin. He owns, that this Clergy was honest enough, and that they were sufficiently brought up in learning; that when they met with him, they seemed to be an angelic chorus, aquire of angels; and that they shined as a conspicuous senate of their Church. All that obliges him to change this good opinion is only that he was told those Clergymen were married. One cannot enough admire the fury with which he aggravates this pretended crime, neither the care he takes to bear them down with the authority of some Councils; yet after all, he is forced to confess, they defended themselves by the authority of the holy Scripture, and they opposed Councils to Councils, whose authority he could not elude, but by declaring that he acknowledged none for Councils, but those which agreed to the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs.

It is an easy matter to reflect upon the vehement accusations they constantly offered, since that time, against the Romish Clergy, with respect to several notorious crimes, in which they lived publicly, being authorized in them by the public custom, or the canons of this communion. Indeed they meet with many proofs of it in the writings of their adversaries, who never were more weak than when they undertake to repulse those reproaches offered to them with so much confidence by the Paterines or Waldenses. But one may be satisfied with the testimony Seisselius, one of the last of their adversaries, gives to them a little before the Reformation.

“They say,” saith Seisselius, fol. 14, “that we of the Roman Church open and point out a way to all manner of dissoluteness

and lust; they received the order of priesthood against their wills, and opposing themselves against it; whereas we either buy our priesthood with money, or obtain it by force, or by the favor of some temporal prince, and other sinister ways, and for no other end but to satisfy our lusts, to enrich our relations, and to acquire worldly pomp and glory. Moreover, they spent their whole lives in manifold watchings, fastings, and travels, being neither afrighted with labors or dangers, that so they might point out the way of salvation to the flock committed to them; whereas we spend all our time in idleness, lusts, and other earthly, yea, wicked and ungodly things. They wholly despising gold and silver, as they had freely received, did in like manner administer the divine grace to others; whereas we set all holy things, yea, the very treasures of God's Church, to sale. And in a word, (that I may not insist on all the particulars which, with a most most profligate confidence, they upbraid us with,) we confound all things, both human and divine; insomuch, as that this Church of Rome cannot be called the spouse of Christ, but rather that whore, and open prostitute, whom Isaiah, Jeremy, Ezekiel, and John in the Revelation, have set forth in her colors."

This without doubt will be sufficient to prove, that as they have preserved the faith that was committed to them; so have they been as careful to preserve entire amongst them the ancient discipline of the Church, which was in use in those times, which did most closely adhere to the observation of the Canons. But I will go further yet, and evidence,

1. That they derived this their ministry from the ancient Church of Italy.
2. That they never passed for laymen upon any better ground than that of some ridiculous prejudices, the falseness of which the Church of Rome doth at present acknowledge.

Whence it will Follow, in the third place, that nothing can be more false than what is pretended, viz. that they had no kind of lawful ministry amongst them, but that laymen took upon them the power of preaching, of ordaining Ministers, and administering the sacraments.

I say therefore, that these Churches had their ministry from the ancient Churches of the diocese of Italy. To make out this, we need only examine the cause of the separation which the Popes were the occasion of in this diocese, and the manner by which it was effected. It was a very ancient custom for the Clergy to give some money for their ordinations; the Popes had for a long time paid a certain sum of money for their instalment; and the eastern Patriarchs in like manner; a custom confirmed by the Novel 123. of Justinian, cap. 1. This custom reached all the Bishops and Priests, yea, the very meanest Clerks, who were obliged to pay a certain sum of money to the Bishop that had ordained them, for inserting their ordination in the registers of the: Church; as may be seen in the same Novel, chap. 3.

In process of time, when benefices were conferred separate from ordination, the Bishops and laymen that bestowed them introduced the custom of receiving considerable presents from those whom they named to those benefices. The Popes, whose aim was to get all benefices out of the hands of the lay-men, laid hold on this favorable occasion to execute their design. The pretense was very specious: they decried this custom for a real simony; yea, they pushed the matter yet further, by defining it to be an heresy, and maintaining that such ordinations were null and void. This is the notion Petrus Damjanus, Legate of Nicolaus II. gave publicly of this matter in the diocese of Italy, by reordaining, as if they had not been ordained at all, those who confessed themselves to have been ordained and admitted to their benefices after this manner: yea, matters were carried to that height, that they who were of the Pope's party trampled under their feet the sacraments that were administered by these simoniaes, to show their zeal for the Pope's definitions.

This is the first heresy the Popes formed by their definitions. The second heresy the Popes made bore the name of Nieolaitans: this heresy consisted in owning that the Ministers of the Church might be married, and that the celibacy which the Popes at that time endeavored to impose upon Ministers was unjust and tyrannical, directly opposite to the doctrine of the Gospel, and to the use of antiquity; notwithstanding that nothing could be more impure than the celibacy of Ecclesiastics was at that time, insomuch that Petrus Damianus himself, who was one of the great promoters of it, by the authority of Pope Leo IX. was obliged to write a thundering treatise against the sodomy of Ecclesiastics, which then reigned

in Italy, as it does still to this day. But notwithstanding all this, the Popes prevailed so against the western Churches, as to this point, that in the end they in a manner wholly carried it. The Clergy who refused to renounce their wives were driven from their benefices; and because they could not wholly obtain their aim by temporal authority, they employed their pretended spiritual one, by darting out excommunication upon excommunication against all married Ministers, and forbidding the people to own their ministry, and declaring the sacraments administered by them to be null and void, and in making them to be looked upon as mere laymen, notwithstanding they had the ordinary vocation that was then to be had.

We may easily imagine how many scruples these excommunications raised, which all of them returned upon the Popes themselves. This we may gather from an answer writ by St. Bruno, Bishop of Ast, which we find at the end of the Life of Leo IX. writ by St. Bruno. The difficulty was this:

“We have already told you, (saith he,) that even from the time of Leo, the Church was so corrupted, that scarcely was any one to be found, who was not either guilty of simony himself, or ordained by those that were so. Wherefore also at this day some are found, who, arguing falsely, and not well understanding the dispensation of the Church, contend, that from that very time the true priesthood has failed in the Church. For, say they, if all were such, that is, either guilty of simony, or ordained by those who were so, you who are now, whence came you, and by whom were you ordained? You must needs derive it from them, for there was no other way; and if so, then they who have ordained us must have received their ordination from them who were either simoniacs themselves, or ordained by such.

This is the question to which we must endeavor to give an answer. And how does he answer this difficulty?

1. He supposeth that the simoniacs no more than other heretics were able to confer the Holy Ghost; and that therefore those who were baptized by them must again pass under the imposition of hands, as if they had been baptized by Arians.

2. He maintains, that the sacraments conferred by simoniacs are null and void, and embraceth the opinion of those who in Gregory VII.'s time obstinately maintained this doctrine, in the case of simoniacs and married Priests.

3. He asserts, that there were always some or other that were not guilty of simony, though perhaps it was not known.

Maurus Marehisio, Dean of Mont Cassin, makes this observation upon the foregoing passage of St. Bruno, in the last page of his second tome, Number 12.

“You proceed (saith he) to the second reason of the deficiency of the book, which we endeavour to defend, which is concertling the sacraments administered by simoniacs and heretics, a which the author maintains to be null and void, and therefore determines, that they are not to be looked upon as good and valid, but ought to be repeated. The author indeed confesseth, that some sacraments of simoniacs and heretics are valid, and need not to be repeated, to wit, those which with a good intent are received from the hand of an unknown simoniae or heretic.”

By which means he obviates the calumnies of some, who, from this position, that the sacraments of simoniacs are void, would prove, that the priesthood had failed in the Church ever since the time of Leo IX. because, as he saith, in the life of the same Leo, where he mentions this calumny, that there was scarce one to be found in the Church who was not either a simoniac himself, or ordained by such as were: whence it followed, that if all simoniacal ordination was void, that there was not one true Bishop left in the Church that could confer good and valid Orders, nor any Priest that was duly and lawfully ordained: for they argued thus; If at the time of Leo IX. all were either simoniacs or ordained by such, whence then are you who now are? You must needs derive your ordination from these simoniaes; for there is no other way, for they who ordained you were ordained by them.

Now, to answer this objection, St. Bruno was unwilling to interrupt his narrative of the acts of Leo IX. but promised to do it in a treatise apart, which he accordingly made, and which we here endeavor to answer.

Towards the end of treatise he concludes, that these objectors were mistaken, because at that time there were many concealed simoniacs, of whom many received their ordination with a good intent, whose ordination consequently was not void, but valid. But he concludes the contrary, concerning orders conferred by a known simoniac; for those he maintains to be invalid, and that consequently they ought to be repeated. And such he supposeth that some (though not all the) ordinations then were.

Now this, though it were written without all doubt by the author, out of his great zeal against the simoniacs, is not to be admitted, except only in that sense wherein most laws declare simoniacal ordinations to be invalid. Which the doctors expound concerning the nullity of ordination, as to the function and execution of those orders; or as far as they can be made void by the Church, by denying a lawful exercise of orders to a simoniac; or with respect to right or jurisdiction, if the same be necessary to any function; and that it doth appear, that the Church was simoniacally robbed of the same; or lastly, with respect to the obtaining of a benefice, which the Church refuseth to allow as valid, if the same be simoniacally procured. Suarez exactly clears all these points, lib. de Simon. cap. 97. num. 2; but that ordination, though simoniacally conferred, and the Sacrament, though simoniacally administered, in itself considered, is valid, is not at all to be doubted of, as being at large confirmed, not only by Suarez in the same place, num. 3. and 4. but also long since by Bernaldus Presbyter, in his letter to Bernard, the master of the schools at Constance, who was afterwards Monk of Corby in Saxony, and was of the same opinion we here set down: and the same was also the judgment of the famous Guido, (of whom Baronius makes mention ad ann. 1022,) according to the testimony of the same Bernaldus, commending on the other hand Petrus Damianus, who in his book, which he entitles Gratissimus, demonstrates, that ordination may be conveyed by simoniacs and heretics, as well as by others.

Thus we see what pains we must take to make the opinions of the Popish Divines to accord with those of our modern Schoolmen; and if one should endeavor to do it, yet will it be impossible to avoid the consequences of those opinions. And indeed it was only from the sequel of these opinions, which reigned above two hundred years, that the Pope's creatures have pretended, that those who had been deposed in Italy by the unjust laws of

Popes were become laics, incapable of administering the sacraments, or imposing of hands; all this so extravagantly, that if once we admit of these principles, it will follow, first, that all those who were ordained by simoniacs were never made Priests; and that those who were ordained by married persons did not receive any sacred Orders: the first of these puts the Church of Rome into a terrible condition; for we defy the most able of their doctors to make it appear that their Popes were not simoniacs; they who have had a like ordination for divers ages, and holding it only from the approbation of the Emperors, either of the east or west. The other is confounded by the confession of the whole Church of Rome, who owns the ministry of the Greek Church to be lawful, as well as of other eastern Churches, where we know that the Ministers have been married, and are so still.

However, thus much is evident,

- 1.** That after the separation of the diocese of Italy, the Bishops, which Rome called heretics, because of their pretended simony, and their being married, continued still in the exercise of their functions, without troubling themselves about the Papal definitions or excommunications.
- 2.** That the reunion of the diocese of Italy with the Pope, about the year 1134, was at the best but very imperfect; they of Milan being very wavering, as may be seen from the 131st epistle of St. Bernard, who was the promoter of that reunion, in order to advance the interest of the Emperor Lotharius against Conrad, and those who took part with Conrad against Lotharius, and who continued in their aversion to the other Papal errors.
- 3.** That these ecclesiastics and people of Italy being thus reduced to a contemptible condition, by reason of their small number, in comparison of the body of the diocese, continued in that separated state, exercising their ministry as formerly they did.
- 4.** That they who had embraced the Papal party looked upon them only as mere laics, who had no authority either to preach the Gospel or administer the sacraments.
- 5.** That after once this charge had been advanced against them, the same was obstinately carried on and continued, upon very ridiculous

prejudices, which have been for a long time maintained by the greatest of the Schoolmen; as Morinus proves in his treatise of Ordinations, though at length they have: thought fit to quit them.

6. That this charge was fortified by the joining of some of Waldo's disciples with the Churches of Italy, as I have made it appear by the treatise of Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud.

I would conclude this chapter, if I were not aware only of two or three objections that may be made against what I have here alleged; and I think myself bound to prevent them, because they seem to carry some weight along with them.

The first is, that the Bishops of Italy, which by the court of Rome were called schismatics, for their adhering to the interest of the Archbishops of Milan, were so far from espousing the opinions of Berengarius, that the Council of Brixia, which deposed Gregory VII. in the year 1080, mentions this for one of the crimes whereof he was accused; that he was of Berengarius's opinion, as appears from the writings of Cardinal Benno against Gregory VII. and of Conradus Urspergensis.

The second is, that the question of schism being terminated at Milan, by the mediation of St. Bernard in 1134, we do not find that the Bishops of Italy, or of Lombardy in particular, did continue separate from the communion of Rome, it being on the contrary very probable, that they were all of them again reconciled to the same; so that none of them joined with the Patetines, or with those to whom that name was given in the diocese of Italy.

It will be an easy matter to satisfy these objections. As for the first, I own that the Council of Brixia accused Gregory VII. of Berengarianism; but I deny that those of the diocese of Italy constituted the body of that council; the greatest part of those who assisted at it were Germans, who made it their business to follow the footsteps of the Synod of nineteen Bishops, which was held at Mentz the year before upon the same account: neither can it be looked upon as a strange thing, that their business being to depose Gregory VII. who was the great enemy of the diocese of Italy, they should all of them equally concur, without opposition, to have him deposed, for several crimes mentioned in their judgment passed upon him;

though some Italians might at the same time believe, that he was unjustly accused of heresy, for embracing the sentiments of Berengarius, from which, as I have elsewhere made out from his commentary upon St. Matthew, he did not seem to be very averse.

Neither is the second difficulty any better grounded. I know well, that after that reunion, the Popes endeavored to their utmost to engage the Bishops of Italy to be of their party, as well as those of Milan, and other lords of the country, who began to disown the power of the Emperors. But they who are versed in the history of those times may easily observe, that the council which condemned Berengarius had been very probably on purpose convened at Verceil, in the diocese of Italy, because there were many Bishops in that country of Berengarius's opinion; Sigebert having taken notice that there were many that pleaded for him, though the overswaying number of his adversaries carried it at last.

They may conclude the same from the printed account we have in the council, instead of the acts of the Roman Council, its 1079, under Gregory VII. against Berengarius. This account we have also in the Chronicle of Verdun, written by Hugo Flaviniacensis, which hath these words:

Omnibus igitur in Ecclesia servatoris congregatis, habitus est sermo de corpore et sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, nullis hodie, nonnullis illa [prius] sentientibus. Maxima siquidem pars panem et vinum per sacra orationis verba et sacerdotis consecrationem, Spiritu Sancto invisibiliter operante, converti substantialiter in corpus Dominicum de Virgine nate, quod et in cruce pependit, et in sanguinem qui de ejus latere militis effusus est laca, asserebat, [atque auctoritatibus orthodoxorum patrum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum modis omnibus defendebat.] Quidam veto caecitate nimia et longa percussi figuram tantum substantiale illud corpus in dextera patris sedens esse, seque et alios decipientes quibusdam cavillationibus conabantur adstruere. Verum ubi coepit res agi, prius etiam quam tertia die ventura fuerit in Synodo, defuit contra veritatem niti pars altera, nempe Spiritus Sancti ignise emolumenta palearum consurnens, et fulgore suo falsam lucem diverberando obtenebrans noctis calliginem vertit in lucem.

This is the account of what was done in that council; and it appears from the MS. of the council which I have examined, that those who published it have altered it just as they pleased themselves.

Now, whatever pains they may have taken in this matter, yet it is manifest, first, that Berengarius was not the first author of this opinion in Italy, from whence the greatest part of those Bishops were summoned to the council by Gregory VII. Secondly, That this council was at first mightily divided, and that division lasted for two days, and was not taken up till the third day. Thirdly, That the word of long blindness, which the author of this account speaks of, could not be referred to the disciples of Berengarius, but to those who maintained the same doctrine with him in Italy, since the contrary doctrine being set forth by Paschasius Radbertus gave occasion to the division upon that matter, of which Joannes Scotus's book, that was burnt in Veteuil, was an authentic testimony.

Moreover, they cannot be ignorant how that diocese was laid waste by the forces of the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, which gave occasion to the Clergy to enjoy a greater liberty in their opinions, the four Anti-popes, who succeeded one another, troubling themselves about little else but who should have the mastery; and those who are looked upon as the true Popes being not in a condition to concern themselves with ought but what might be for their own defense against the Anti-popes, who were supported by that Emperor.

The third objection is this: that whatsoever has been said, we cannot point to those precisely who have succeeded to the Bishops, who separated themselves in this diocese of Italy from the communion with the Popes, since the year 1134, when the diocese of Milan was reconciled with them by the endeavors of St. Bernard.

But yet, as I remarked before, this is very clear, that there was nothing but an horrid disorder and confusion in that diocese, by the intrigues of the Popes, and by the resistance of the Emperors.

Whosoever will look only on the succession of the Bishops of Milan, in those times, will meet with so great uncertainty in their succession, many pretending to the same title, that there was nothing more common in that diocese, than questions upon elections of Bishops, or other clergymen.

Those who, as Ughellus, look upon the confirmation of the Pope as an essential thing to make an election lawful, are forced to look upon many of the Bishops of this diocese as intruders and schismatics, that gave occasion to the Popes to declare these ordinations null and void, and to deprive them of the name of Bishops, Priest, and Deacons.

As since that time those who favored the Popish interest declared war against those that were ordained against their consent, and had their ordination from those who were rejected by the Romish party as heretics and schismatics; we ought not to be surprised, if when Rome considered them as lay-men, they on the contrary may pretend to have a true ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, though in the consequence of time they thought fit to conceal their titles, to avoid, as well as they could, the hatred and persecution which those titles brought upon them from the Church of Rome and her Inquisitors.

It is known to all the world how careful the abettors of the Roman party have been to destroy the last monument of those Churches which they reduced under their yoke. If we reflect upon England only, we shall have too sensible instances of this care.

St. Asaph was Bishop of the church called by his name, and St. Daniel was Bishop of Bangor; we know that these lived in the time of Austin the Monk, and they do not doubt that they were two of the seven that opposed his usurpation; Bede, Hist. Ecclesiastes 2:2. But from that time till the English Conquest, (which was above five hundred years after,) they cannot find the name of any one of their successors, nor any name of any one Churchman in that diocese. The Bishop of Bangor cannot name three of his predecessors in that time. But of this we find sufficient proof, that all the records of these churches were destroyed by the English at the time of that conquest; and we do not doubt that they took especial care to extinguish all the memory of these Bishops' opposition to Popery, which we can plainly and certainly prove did not prevail in that country till the English Conquest.

CHAPTER 25

Concerning the persecutions which the Waldenses have suffered since the eleventh century.

WE have given an account of the true rise of the name of the Paterines and of the Waldenses; but that true original of the word was soon after thrust out by another: for, before the end of the twelfth century, the name Patefine passed for a word derived from the Latin word pati, because of the great sufferings to which the believers of Italy found themselves exposed by the violence of the Popes and Emperors, who had abandoned their power to the Popes, to exterminate and root out whatsoever opposed itself against their authority.

And the same happened to the word Vallenses, which signified no more than inhabitants of the valleys; which their enemies would needs derive from Waldo, and which at last they imposed upon the Vaudois, as living in the Valley of Tears, according to the derivation which Everard of Bethune gives us of that name. Indeed it must be acknowledged, that New Rome has carried the art of persecuting much beyond any thing that Old Rome ever arrived to, though she seemed to have attained the mastery of that art, after the ten persecutions which she carried on against the Christians.

To judge of this, we need only take notice of some laws which have served for a rule to the persecutors, how they were to behave themselves therein. The first law I have here set down is equally levelled against the Paterines and the Poor of Lyons, maliciously confounding them with the Manichees, that so they might appear the more execrable in the eyes of the people. It was published by Pope Lucius III. Cap. ad abolendam.

THE DECREE OF POPE LUCIUS III. AGAINST HERETICS.

“To abolish the malignity of diverse heresies, which of late time are sprung up in most parts of the world, it is but fitting that the power committed to the Church should be awakened, that by the concurring assistance of the imperial strength, both the insolence and impertence of the heretics, in their false designs, may be crushed, and the truth of catholic simplicity shining forth in the

holy Church, may demonstrate her pure and free from the execrableness of their false doctrines. Wherefore we, being supported by the presence and power of our most dear son Frederick, *the most illustrious Emperor of the Romans, always Increaser of the Empire*, with the common advice and counsel of our brethren, and other Patriarchs, Archbishops, and many princes, who from several parts of the world are met together, do set ourselves against these heretics, who have got different names from the several false doctrines they profess, by the sanction of this present general Decree, and by our apostolical authority, according to the tenor of these presents, we condemn all manner of heresy, by what name soever it may be denominated.

“More particularly we declare all Cathari, Paterines, and those who call themselves the Humbled, or Poor of Lyons, Passagines, Josephines, Arnoldists, to lie under a perpetual anathema: and because some under a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof, as the Apostle saith, assume to themselves the authority of preaching, whereas the same Apostle saith, How shall they preach, except they be sent? we therefore conclude under the same sentence of a perpetual anathema all those who either being forbid or not sent, do notwithstanding presume to preach publicly or privately, without any authority received either from the apostolic see, or from the Bishops of their respective dioceses; as likewise all those who are not afraid to hold or teach any opinions concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, baptism, the remission of sins, matrimony, or any other sacraments of the Church, differing from what the holy Church of Rome doth preach and observe; and generally all those who the same Church of Rome, or the several Bishops in their dioceses, with the advice of their Clergy, or the Clergy themselves, in case of a vacancy of the see, with the advice, if need be, of neighboring Bishops, shall judge to be heretics. And we likewise declare all entertainers and defenders of the said heretics, and those that have showed any favor, or given countenance to them, thereby strengthening them in their heresy, whether they be called Comforted, Bellowers, or Perfect, or with whatsoever

superstitious names they disguise themselves, to be liable to the same sentence.

“And though it sometimes happens, that the severity of ecclesiastical discipline, necessary to the coercion of sin, is condemned by those who do not understand the virtue of it, we notwithstanding by these presents decree, that whosoever shall be notoriously convicted of these errors, if a Clergyman, or one that endeavors to conceal himself under any religious order, he shall be immediately deprived of all prerogative of the Church orders, and so being divested of all office and benefice, be delivered up to the secular power, to be punished according to demerit, unless, immediately upon his being detected, he voluntarily returns to the truth of the Catholic faith, and submits publicly to abjure his errors, at the discretion of the Bishop of ‘the diocese, and to make suitable satisfaction. And as for a layman who shall be found guilty, either publicly or privately, of any of the aforesaid crimes, unless by abjuring his heresy, and making satisfaction, he immediately returns to the orthodox faith; we decree him to be left to the sentence of the secular judge, to receive condign punishment, according to the quality of his offense.

“And as for those who are taken notice of by the Church, as suspected of heresy, except at the Bishop’s command they give full evidence of their innocence, according to the degree of suspicion against them, and quality of their persons, they shall all be liable to the same sentence. But those who after having abjured their errors, or cleared themselves upon examination, to their Bishop, shall be found to have relapsed into their abjured heresy; we decree, that without any further hearing they be forthwith delivered up to the secular power, and their goods confiscated to the use of the Church.

“And we further decree, that this excommunication, in which our will is, that all heretics be included, be by all Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops, renewed and repeated in all the chief festivals, and on any public solemnity, or upon any other occasion, to the glory of God, and the putting a stop to all heretical pravity;

ordering by our apostolical authority, that if any Bishop be found wanting or slow herein, he be suspended for three years from his episcopal dignity and administration.

“Furthermore, with the counsel and advice of Bishops, and intimation of the Emperor and Princes of the empire, we do add, that every Archbishop or Bishop, either in his own person, or by his Archdeacon, or by other honest and fit persons, shall once or twice in the year visit the parish in which it is reported that heretics dwell, and there cause two or three men of good credit, or, if need be, the whole neighborhood, to swear, that if they know of any heretics there, or any that frequent private meetings, or differ from the common conversation of mankind, either in life or manners, they will signify the same to the Bishop or Archdeacon: the Bishop also or Archdeacon shall summon before them the parties accused, who, except they at their discretion, according to the custom of the country, do clear themselves of the guilt laid to their charge; or if, after having so cleared themselves, they relapse again to their former unbelief, shall be punished at the Bishop’s discretion. And if any of them, by a damnable superstition, shall refuse to swear, that alone shall suffice to make them heretics convict, and liable to the punishments before mentioned.

“We ordain further, that all earls, barons, governors, and consuls of cities, and other places, in pursuance of the commonition of the respective Archbishops and Bishops, shall promise upon oath, that in all these particulars, whenever they are thereto required, they will powerfully and effectually assist the Church against heretics and their complices, and endeavor faithfully, according to their office and power, to execute the ecclesiastical and imperial statutes concerning the matters herein mentioned.

“But if any of them shall refuse to observe this, they shall be deprived of their honors and charges, and be rendered incapable of receiving others, and moreover be involved in the sentence of excommunication, and their goods be confiscated to the use of the Church. And if any city shall refuse to yield obedience to these decretal constitutions; or that, contrary to the episcopal

cornmonition, they shall neglect to punish opposers; we ordain the same to be excluded from all commerce with other cities, and to be deprived of the episcopal dignity.

“We likewise decree, that all favorers of heretics, as men stigmatized with perpetual infamy, shall be incapable of being attorneys or witnesses, or of bearing any public office whatsoever. And as for those who are exempt from the law of diocesan jurisdiction, as being immediately under the jurisdiction of the apostolic see; nevertheless, as to these constitutions against heretics, we will, that they be subject to the judgment of the Archbishop and Bishops, and that in this case they yield obedience to them, as to the delegates of the apostolic see, the immunity of their privileges notwithstanding.”

Ildephonsus also, King of Arragon, testified his zeal against the Waldenses, by his edict published in the year 1194, which was printed by Pegna, in his notes upon the Directory of Inquisitors.

THE EDICT OF KING ILDEPHONSUS AGAINST THE WALDENSAN HERETICS, COMMANDING THEM TO DEPART HIS KINGDOM.

“Ildephonsus, by the grace of God, King of Arragon, Earl of Barcelona, Marquess of Provence, to all Archbishops, Bishops, and other Prelates of the Church of God, Earls, Viscounts, Knights, and to all people of his kingdom, or belonging to his dominions, wisheth health, and the sound observante of Christian religion.

“Forasmuch as it has pleased God to set us over his people, it is but fit and just, that according to our might we should be continually solicitous for the welfare and defense of the same; wherefore we, in imitation of our ancestors, and obedience to the Canons, which determine and ordain heretics, as persons east out from the sight of God and all Catholies, to be condemned and persecuted every where; do command and charge the Waldenses, Inzabbati, who otherwise are called the Poor of Lyons, and all other heretics, who cannot be humbered, being excommunicated from the holy Church, adversaries to the cross of Christ, riolaters and corrupters of the Christian religion, and the avowed enemies of

us and our kingdom, to depart out of our kingdom and all our dominions. Whosoever therefore from this day forwards shall presume to receive the said Waldenses and Zapatati, or any other heretics, of whatsoever profession, into their houses, or to be present at their pernicious sermons, or to afford them meat, or any other favour, shall incur thereby the indignation of Almighty God, as well as ours, and have his goods confiscated, without the remedy of an appeal, and be punished as if he were actually guilty of high treason. And we strictly charge and command, that this our edict and perpetual constitution be publicly read on the Lord's days by the Bishops and other Rectors of churches, in all the cities, castles, and towns of our kingdom, and throughout all our dominions: and that the same be observed by Vicars, Bailiffs, Justices, Merins, and Zenalroedins, and all the people in general; and the aforesaid punishment be inflicted upon all transgressors.

“We will further, that if any person, noble or ignoble, shall in any part of our dominions find any of these wicked wretches, who shall be known to have had three days' notice of this our edict, that do not forthwith depart, but rather obstinately staying or lingering, shall any way plague, despitefully use, or distress them, (wounding unto death, and maiming of them only excepted,) he will, in so doing, act nothing but what will be very grateful and pleasing to us, and shall be so far from fearing to incur any penalty thereby, that he may be sure rather to deserve our favor.

Furthermore, we do afford to these wicked miscreants respite (though this may in some sort seem contrary to our duty and reason) till the day after All Saints day; but that all those who either shall not be gone by that time, or at least preparing for their departure, shall be spoiled, beaten, cudgelled, and shamefully and ill entreated.

“The seal of Ildephonsus, King of Arragon, Earl of Barcelona, and Marquess of Provence. The seal of Peter, King of Arragon, and Earl of Barcelona, in the original of this paper. And the seal of Lord Regimund, Archbishop of Tarfacona, and Lord G. Bishop of Tirassona, and Lord R. Bishop of Jacca. This was copied at Ilerda

by William de Bastia, the King's notary, ann. Dom. 1194. and compared with the original; witness Martinus de Seribas, notary."

Innocent III. caused search to be made after them in all places. We have a letter of his, writ to those of Metz, where he ordains them to be driven out and persecuted with the extremest barbarity, because they took the liberty to read the Scripture translated by Peter Waldo into the vulgar tongue.

Honorius III. obliged the Emperor Frederick II. to publish that terrible law which we find at the end of the book *De Feudis*, in the civil law, and which has since served for a rule to the Inquisitors, as well as given them their authority. Which law is as follows:

"Frederick, by the grace of God, Emperor of the Romans, always Increaser of the Empire, to all Marquesses, Earls, and all people under our government, health and grace.

"Forasmuch as nothing can conduce more to the honor of the empire and praise of the Emperor, than by the purging away of error, and the abrogating of some unjust statutes, to procure the peaceable and flourishing state of the Church of God, and secure her liberty:

"We do condemn to perpetual infamy the Cathari, Paterines, Leonists, Speronists, Arnoldists, Circumcised, and all other heretics of both sexes, by what names soever they are called, tommanding their goods to be confiscated, so as never to return to them again, or by way of inheritance to devolve to their children; since it is a much more heinous crime to offend the majesty of the eternal God, than any temporal prince. And as for those who are only suspected of heresy, except at the command of the Church, according to the degree of suspicion and quality of the person, they make their innocence to appear by a sufficient vindication of themselves, shall be accounted infamous and outlawed; and if they continue so for a whole year, we condemn them for heretics.

"We also ordain by this perpetual edict, that all that are in authority, Consuls and Rectors, whatsoever their office may be, do publicly take an oath, for defense of the faith, that they will faithfully endeavor, to the utmost of their power, to exterminate all

heretics in the places subject to their jurisdiction; so that from henceforward, as soon as any one shall be taken into any place of power, either perpetual or temporary, he shall be obliged to swear to this article; and that in case of failure, they shall neither be accounted persons in power or consuls; and we from thenceforward declare all their acts and sentences null and void.

“And in case that any temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to purge his territories from heretical pravity, after a whole year elapsed from the time of his admonition, we giveleave to Catholics to possess themselves of his lands, who, after having rooted out the heretics, shall quietly possess the same, and preserve it in piety. Provided always that the rights of the principal lord of the fee be preserved but that the foresaid law shall be wholly in force against those who have no such superior lords of the fee.

“Moreover, we proscribe all heretics, entertainers and favorers of heretics, firmly ordaining, that as soon as any such, being excommunicated by the Church, shall contemptuously refuse to make satisfaction within a year’s time, that then he be made infamous by law, and incapable of any office, or of being a member of any council, or of having a voice in the choice of officers, or being a witness: that moreover he be deprived of the power of making a will, and of succeeding into an inheritance. Furthermore, that nobody shall be bound to answer to his complaint or charge, but he be obliged to answer the charge of others against him: and if he be a judge, that his sentence be of no force, and that no causes be brought before him; if he be a lawyer, that his pleading be not admitted; and if a scrivener, that the writings drawn up by him be invalid.

“And we Honorius, Bishop, servant of the serrants of God, do praise, approve, and confirm these laws, to continue for ever, which are made by Frederick, Emperor of the Romans, our dearest son, for the good of all Christians. And in case any man, by a presumptuous attempt, being instigated thereto by the enemy of mankind, shall any way endeavor the infraction of them, let him be

assured, that by so doing he will incur the indignation of Almighty God, and of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

We may take a guess from hence of the miseries these Christians have been exposed to, who from the time of these bloody edicts scarce enjoyed the least interval of rest. And we may add also the settling of the Inquisition, which was introduced with the title of an office by Gregory IX. They who will take the pains to consult the Annals of the Church of Rome will find, that from the thirteenth century her purple hath been dyed in the blood of the Waldenses and Paterines. The primitive Christian Church suffered ten persecutions, but most of them at considerable intervals, and their whole continuance was not at the most above two hundred and fifty years; and it hath been demonstrated, that the number of the martyrs was not excessive. But Rome now can vaunt itself to have almost continually maintained a persecution against these Churches of Italy, and to have carried it on to that degree, that there are none of them now to be found in their own country, except those she locks up in her dungeons, and reserves for capital punishments.

My design is not to draw the picture of these cruelties, since Rome has monopolized the trade of persecution; he that would undertake this, ought to be furnished with the registers of the Inquisitors, who have been the executioners of the bloody sentences of that tribunal, in all the places where the Churches of Piedmont have spread their faith, by planting of their colonies. I shall only make some few observations upon this matter, which may give us a compendious view of the horridness of the Inquisitors' proceedings.

First, They have not omitted any cruelty, whereby they might find a pretence of running them down, as persons of most abominable lives. They have put them to tortures in vast numbers, both men and women, to force them to confess, that in their assemblies they committed filthiness against nature. Hereof we have an illustrious example in Perrin, chapter 7 which is a pregnant proof that the spirit of Paganism is by transmigration passed into the Church of Rome.

Secondly, They have made use of a devilish cheat, to make people believe that they were guilty by their own confession. There is a memorable

example of this in the year 1487, recorded by Perrin, chapter 3 in these words:

“I took notice of an extraordinary piece of villainy in a process formed by the Monk Veiletty; for having the aforesaid process in my hand, we found the short billets in which the aforesaid commissary took the answers of the accused simply, as they came from his mouth; but we have found them afterwards enlarged in the process, and often quite contrary to what was taken from his mouth, by changing the intention of the accused, and making him say those things of which he never thought. As for example; when he was asked, whether he believes, that after the words in the sacrament of the Mass, pronounced by the Priest, the body of Christ was in the Host, large and extended, as it was upon the cross; and the Vaudois answered, that it was not; Veiletty framed his answer thus: That he had confessed that he did not believe in God; or at the least his scribe by his order. Also they asked him, if the saints were to be invocated; he answered, not: and they framed it in writing, that he had cursed and spoke evil of the saints. He was asked, if the Virgin Mary was to be worshipped, and to be prayed unto in our necessity; he answered, no: they write, that he had spoken blasphemy against the Virgin Mary.

Behold the fidelity of the aforesaid Monk’s Inquisitors, of so important an action.

This was not without a considerable providence of God, that the memory of these wickednesses have been preserved unto this present, that it may be seen with what spirit they were acted, who, having the power of killing and destroying, made use of such impostures, to make them more odious under the burden of such calamities.

Perrin gives an account how he was informed of those villainies; that when Ambrum was taken in the year 1588, by the Mareschal of Lesdiguieres, those processes that were kept in original in the house of the Bishop, were obtained from a famous man, Calignon, Chancellor of Navarra, and were put in the hands of M. Wulqon, Counsellot in the parliament of Grenoble, from whom he had a view of them.

Those processes were put afterwards in the hand of Mr. Morland, and are now in the public library of the University of Cambridge, from whence I thought fit to make an extract in the next chapter, and at the end of this book to justify what was asserted by Perrin with so much assurance.

The reader may compare the billet and the process, and thereby judge of the honesty of the Inquisitors, and whether I was obliged to review with concern such villainous and wicked calumnies.

Thirdly, They have employed the fury of soldiers, and the cruelty of executioners to root them out.

Fourthly, These great accusers of the Waldenses, as being unclean and filthy people, have made use of the Inquisition to ravish their wives and their daughters; as one may see in the history of Perrin, chapter 7.

Fifthly, They have exercised their cruelties even upon those whom the rage of the most barbarous wars is wont to spare, old men, women, and sucking children.

Sixthly, They have involved in the same punishments with them, all those who spoke the least word in favor of them: as may be seen in many instances.

Seventhly, They have obliged princes to break the treaties they had made with this poor people, when, forced by the extremity of their violences, they undertook their own defense, forcing their adversaries to come to a treaty with them.

Those that are desirous to be more particularly illformed concerning the behavior of the Inquisitors, need only peruse their Directory printed at Rome, 1593 by order of Gregory XIII. and from thence may easily judge how they behaved themselves in the persecution of these poor Christians in 1375 which Spondanus mentions; in that of 1380, stirred up by Borelli the Monk, mentioned by Leger; in that of 1400, set down by the same author; in that of 1160, which he mentions, which continued until the year 1487, under the conduct of the Franciscan Friar Veyletti; in that of 1488, under Innocent VIII. carried on by Albert de Capitaneis, and continued by Plorreri, a Franciscan, mentioned by Leger; in that of 1494 managed by Antonius Fabry; in that of 1506, under Lewis XII.; in that of 1532, by

Pantalcon Berser, mentioned by Leger; in the year 1540, and 1541, in which were involved those of Cabrieres, Merindol, and the neighboring places; in the years 1560, and 1561, and I do not know in how many more, which are mentioned by the Jacobins in the annals of their order.

But we may form a truer judgment of their sufferings, by four very memorable new instances, the first of which is, the desolation and destruction of the churches of Pragela in Dauphind, in the year 1545, under Francis I. The history of the destruction of Cabrieres and Merindol is as remarkable and notorious in France as the Parisian massacre. Sleidan hath writ the history of it in his book, and Thuanus has confirmed whatever he has writ concerning it. The speech of Monsieur Aubery de Maurier, attorney of the French King, touching the same matter, is still in being, which is capable of drawing tears from the eyes of cannibals themselves, and the most enraged dragoons.

The second is, the destruction of their churches in Bohemia, by Ferdinand II.; whereof we have an account printed in 1648.

The third is, the persecution, or rather desolation, which happened in 1655, in our days, and which is set down by Sir Samuel Morland, and Monsieur Leger, Pastor of those Valleys.

The fourth is, the business of 1686, which caused the total ruin of those churches, and the dispersion of the inhabitants of the Valleys: a short account whereof was printed at the Theatre at Oxford, in 1688.

CHAPTER 26

An instance of the calumnies of some Inquisitors.

THE account given by an Inquisitor, in one of the foregoing chapters, of the belief and conduct of the Waldenses, clearly proves the intolerable impudence of those who have charged them with horrid and detestable calumnies, both as to faith and manners. But because some may be imposed upon by the informations against the Waldenses, where their aim was to expose them, and to make them odious; I am willing to give here an instance of the honesty and upright dealing of those cruel Inquisitors, as of a second kind of persecution against them. And though these following informations, which I am to describe, were taken in Dauphind, yet they wholly respect the Waldenses, because it is an acknowledged truth, that the inhabitants of Dauphind were a colony of those of Piedmont; as was evident to the Sieur du Bellay Langey, when he went thither to take informations concerning the massacre committed by the president D'Opede, by order from Francis I.

See here an extract of two examinations taken in the year 1492; let the reader compare them, and judge if the Inquisitors have not perfectly imitated the way of the old persecutors, in calumniating the primitive Christians.

In the year of our Lord 1492, the 2nd of August, at Ulcy, the venerable Bartholomew Pasohal, Canon, and Pidancerius, and Vicar of the Reverend Travellis, Vicar General of the most Reverend Father in God, and Lord John Michael, by Divine mercy Bishop of Praeneste, Cardinal of St. Angelo, Administrator and Commendator of the famous monastery of Ulcy, in company of the worthy and worshipful Poncius, of Ponci, Counsellor to the Lord of Dauphind, and Orancius Eme, Judge of Embrun, did proceed to the examination of Francis de Girondino, of Spoleto, called Barba Martinus, at that time a prisoner in the prison of Ulcy in Dauphine.

First, he said, that about sixteen years ago, Girondinus, his father, taught him the faith and heresy of the Waldenses, and began to lead him up and down the countries.

Being asked through what countries he led him, he answered, through these several countries of Italy, Genoua, Bononia, Lucca, Monte Martio, and Ancona; and that his father himself, who was a Barba, went to teach and preach to the inhabitants of those mountains.

Being farther asked, with whom he associated, and in what places, and with whom he continued and conversed, he said, that after the second year he went to learn the said doctrine of the Waldenses, in company of another Barba, called Barnovo, who was originally of the country about the lake of Perugia, in the lordship of Camarino, who led him up and down the aforesaid places for two or three years together.

Being asked, whether after that the said Barnovo had left him he still followed the same doctrine, he said, that afterwards he kept company with another Barba, called Josue, of Saneto Loeo, in the said lordship of Camarino, about three miles distant from Charretto; saying further, that after he had accompanied the said Josue, to profess and preach the said sect in the aforesaid places, another Barba, called Andreas, led him to their great master, who was called John Anthony, who has his residence in the town of Cambro, belonging to the Pope's dominions.

Being asked what the said great master had said to him, saith, that he enjoined him to take an oath, according to their faith, and commanded him further, that he should not, for any thing of the world, reveal or manifest what he should say to him, telling him, that to manifest or reveal their faith was an unpardonable sin; adding, that if he would keep firm to that sect, and follow it, he would do much good.

Being asked, whether there were any more of those they called Barbae, he said, there were; and that their great master himself was called Barba, and said, that they all held the same sect, and that very secretly. And he flirther said, that their great master, who exhorted them to keep their faith, and they should be saved, also preached to them, that all who should follow their faith were saved; but that those who did not follow it were damned.

Being demanded which was the chief foundation of their sect, he said, that their great master declared, and that their Barbae found it so in wandering up and down the world; that because of the wicked and most profligate

lives of the Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, Priests, religious, and all other ecclesiastical persons, the Barbos follow this their faith, and meet with an infinite number of followers; because the said Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, and ecclesiastics are leaders, and the people follow them in avarice, luxury, pride, pomp, gluttony, and anger, and that this is the life of all ecclesiastics; and that the wicked and profligate lives of the Clergy was the chiefest motive of their separation.

Saying further, that the Clergy living thus in mortal sin, cannot administer the sacraments; and that whatever they do is of no efficacy; for when they are made Priests, they swear chastity, purity, and virginity; but committing the aforesaid sins, they break their faith and oath, and so become the enemies of faith, and lose all virtue and power; because, when a burning candle is put out and dead, it can no more enlighten and quicken another.

He saith further, that there is not a Pope, Cardinal, Bishop, or other Clergyman, that keeps not his miss, or his regesco, to lie with him.

Saying further, that his said great master charged them to preach and enlarge their faith, and to draw the people as much as in them lay to it, because in so doing they should gain eternal life, because all of their faith were saved, and the rest damned.

He saith, that when their great master, having called together the community, has made them Barbos, and given them power, he changeth their names; and that before that he was made a Barba by their aforesaid community, he was called Francis, but that afterwards he was called Martin.

He saith further, that the Barbos are made or constituted, and there is an office or charge belonging to them; and that as soon as any one dies, another is substituted in his room.

Being asked, whether they had any particular provinces in which they exercised their office, he answered, no; but that they go up and down the world preaching.

Being asked what further charge their great master laid upon them, and what the Barbos were used to preach in their journeyings up and down, he

answered, that he said, and they were wont to preach, that one God alone is to be worshipped, who created heaven and earth, the sun, moon, and stars, and water: and that

Being asked what their great master told them [the Barbrae] concerning the saints, and what they preach concerning them, he said, that they believe in St. Peter, and next him in St. Gregory, and St. Sylvester, and in St. John the Evangelist; but in St. Paul they do not believe, because he was an assassin.

Being asked why they rather believe in St. Peter than in St. Paul, he saith, because God hath made the said St. Peter his Vicar or Vicegerent, and given him the power of loosing and binding; and because St. Peter in his lifetime wrought miracles, therefore they believe in him amongst the rest.

Being asked what miracles St. Peter wrought, he saith, that when St. Peter caused the church of St. Peter to be built at Rome, the Devil came to him, and said, I will cause a fairer building to be built than you can, and in shorter time, and that he would do it by the next day; and a little while after, the Devil came to St. Peter, and said, Come to the house that I have made but when you enter, be sure you do not make the sign of the cross. And so St. Peter came to take a view of the said house, and when he was in sight of the said house, which is now called Sancta Maria de rotunda, with caution he made the sign of the cross, laying his hand on his beard, and saying, By this holy beard; and then laying his hand on his stomach, and saying, By this holy fountain; and then on his right and left arm, saying, By these shoulders, this is a fair building; and having, as was said just now, made the sign of the cross, the Devil would have destroyed the house, but St. Peter hindered him, and adjured him; and because St. Peter was got within the doors of the church, the Devil could not get out by the door, but striking his feet against the ground he left the mark of his footsteps, and went out by a hole which he made in the top of the church, which hole is there still, and could never since be closed: and for the said miracle, which he wrought openly to the eye, they believe in St. Peter, but do not believe in the other saints, because they were sinners, and because they have not seen any of their miracles.

Concerning St. John the Baptist, he said, that because he did not desire grace of the Lord, he is expected, and that in the day of judgment he shall

intercede for all; and that it is not known whether he be in heaven or on earth, but that he believed he was in the terrestrial paradise.

He saith further, that they believe in the angels, archangels, cherubims, and seraphims because they were created of God the Father in eternal life.

Concerning the Virgin Mary, he saith, that. because God alone is to be worshipped, and that we are not sure that the Virgin Mary hears our prayers, because she was a human creature, and because Hail Mary is not a prayer, but an annunciation and salutation, therefore they do not impose it for a penance on those who are of their sect. And, that the Lord's Prayer is the only true prayer, as being a prayer made by God himself.

Concerning purgatory, he saith, that there is no such place, but the Clergy, out of covetousness, have invented it, to extort money from the people for masses and prayers for the dead, which are of no profit, because as soon as a man is dead, he is either saved or damned.

Concerning holy water, he saith, that they do preach, say, and believe, that every year, in the month of May, on Ascension-day, God blesseth the heaven, earth, water, herbs, rivers, fountains, and all fruits; and that this blessing may be more securely relied on than that which proceeds from the Priest, because their blessing is of no force, except they be pure, and free from sin, and because for the most part Priests are sinners, as he said before. For these reasons they have no faith in the sacraments administered by Clergymen.

Saying moreover, that one may as well pray in a stable as in the church, because God is everywhere.

Concerning holydays, he saith, that such as are appointed by God, as the Lord's day, our Savior's Nativity, Easter, Ascension, and Whit-Sunday, are to be kept; but as for the feasts of the blessed Virgin, and of the saints, no man is obliged to observe them, except he please, because they are not enjoined by God: nor is any one bound to fast upon the vigils of those holydays.

Concerning the body of Christ, they say, that because the Clergy are wicked, of most profligate lives, and great sinners, they cannot consecrate the body of our Lord, nor is their consecration of any virtue. Therefore the

Barbie of their sect do not receive the Eucharist, but instead thereof, they bless the bread, and say, that this blessing is of greater virtue and efficacy than the consecration of the Priests, because as much goodness and holiness as a man hath, so much virtue and power he hath, and no more.

Concerning the sin of the flesh, he saith, that as they go up and down the world preaching, they frequent nocturnal meetings and assemblies, where, after that their Barbra have preached, they begin to feast and make merry, and dance, running up and down through one another, without holding hands together, and this by candlelight. That after their feasting and merriment, some one of the company, though it be not known who, puts out the candle; whereupon they all apply themselves to act filthiness with whomsoever they first meet with, without any regard had to father, mother, daughter, or any thing else. And they say, that in case in this filthy action any sons be begotten, that they will be the fitter to discharge the duty and function of Barbae, and of preachers and confessors, than others, as being begot in their assemblies. This done, every one leaves the assembly.

Saying moreover, that such assemblies as these are kept every year in every parish; and that the Barba, who is of the parish in which the meeting is held, is present at it, because his parents are of the same. But if he be not of the same parish, then he preacheth, and afterwards leaves them to make their synagogue between them, because he should not mingle with his parents, neither doth he settle himself in that parish, except his parents go away.

The rest I have not set down, as being very frivolous things; as, what he said concerning swearing, that nobody ought to swear, and that they never swear amongst themselves, neither truly nor falsely, as accounting it a mortal sin.

He saith moreover, that no man ought to be put to death for any fault, how great soever it may be, except for murder.

He saith further, that when their Barbae are created by their companions, the great master assembling the rest of the Barbae together, as was said before, they then take this oath as follows: *Thou (such an one) swear upon thy faith to maintain, multiply, and increase our law, and not to discover*

the same to any person in the world; and here promise that thou wilt not swear by God in any manner, but observe the Lord's day; and that thou wilt not do any thing to thy neighbor, which thou wouldest not have him do to thee; and that thou dost believe in, God, who has made the sun and moon, cherubim and seraphim, and all that thou seest, etc. I have put this whole interrogatory at the end of this book.

The other instance of the sincerity of those honest Inquisitors is to be seen in the process of Peironetta, a widow; of which I judged fit to give here this extract to the reader.

Peironetta, the relict of Peter Beraud, made her appearance before Anthony Fabri, Doctor of the Canon of Embrun, Inquisitor General after heresy throughout all Dauphine, and the counties of Vienne, Valence, and Die, specially thereto deputed by the holy apostolic see; and Christopher de Sabien, Doctor of Laws, Canon, Vicar, and Official of Valence, at the instance and prosecution of the worshipful Valetrinus de, Professor of Laws, Solicitor and Fiscal of Valence, being in this case a promoter in favor of the holy Catholic faith, and of the deputies of the office of Inquisition, against Peironetta, etc.

To the first interrogatory she answered nothings and therefore I have only set down what she answered to the second and third interrogatories.

To the second interrogatory she said and confessed,

“That about twenty-five years ago or thereabouts, there came to the house of Peter Fornerius, her husband, two strangers, in gray clothes, who, as it seemed to her, spake Italian, or the language of Lombardy, whom her husband received into his house for the love of God. That whilst they were there at night after supper, one of them began to read a godly book, which he carried about with him, saying, that therein were contained the Gospels, and other precepts of the law; and said, that he would expound and preach the same in the presence of all that were present; saying, that he was sent by God to reform the Catholic faith, going up and down the world, like the Apostles, to preach to good and simple people the manner and way how they ought to worship God, and live according to his commands. And that amongst other things they

declared, that nobody ought to do any thing to others, which he would not be willing they should do to him.”

“Also, That God alone is to be served, worshipped, and prayed to, because it is he alone that can help us.”

“That to swear upon any occasion whatsoever, whether for truth or falsehood, or any oath whatsoever, wherein the word *by* is used, was a great sin.”

“That the sacrament of matrimony was to be faithfully and firmly kept.”

“That the good works which are done before death, are of far greater profit and advantage, than those that are done after death.”

“That no saints whatever, whether men or women, were to be prayed to for help, because none could assist us in any thing, but God alone.”

“That the Lord’s day ought to be solemnly kept and observed above all other holydays, because all other holydays were enjoined by the Church, which therefore were not of absolute necessity to be observed; yea, that a man might work on them, except the festivals of the Apostles, and other greater saints, which they did not particularly express.”

“That the Clergy possessed money, riches, and goods, beyond what they ought to do, and that they committed many evils; and that by reason of the superfluity of their riches some of them were fornicators, others usurers, proud, and covetous; others again lived dissolutely and dishonestly, kept whores in their houses publicly and openly, and by this means gave a bad example to the people.”

“That these Priests, by reason of their wicked lives, had no greater power to absolve, than the preachers and masters of that sect had; yea, that their masters and preachers, though laymen, had as much power as the Priests.”

“That the holy Pope, because he did not observe the holiness he ought, had no power at all, saying of him, *that he was as bad as any of the rest, and consequently had no power at all.*”

“That there was no purgatory in the other world, saying, that when any one dies, his soul immediately goes to paradise, if he have lived well and justly; but if wickedly, to hell.”

“That consequently all prayers and intercessions for the dead were in vain; and that all that the Priests did, signified nothing; as their sprinkling holy water on the graves, and saying, *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison*; Lord have mercy upon us, Christ have mercy upon us.”

“That God, in the beginning of the world, blessed all waters, and all other things that he had made; and that therefore there was no need for the Priests to bless them a second time, which indeed was then no better than other water.”

“That the said Priests had invented purgatory, that by singing and praying for the dead, they might get store of money to maintain their dissolute and luxurious lives.”

“That it is better and more meritorious to give alms to the poor, sick, and leprous, than to offer it in the church to the Priests, who had too much already.”

“That it was as good, and equally advantageous, to pray to God in a house or elsewhere, as in the church, because God is everywhere.”

“That though holy men and women were for their good works placed in paradise, yet had they no power to assist or help us in any thing; and that therefore they ought not to be prayed unto to help us.”

“That it was a vain thing to have recourse to the images of the saints, by praying before them, as having no power at all, being only material things, or pictures made upon walls.”

“That for the same reason it was a vain thing to go on pilgrimage to Rome, or elsewhere, to pray there before the images of holy men and women, as not being able to help us.”

“That it was not necessary to fast upon the vigils of any holydays, except those of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, and some other greater festivals; and that on Fridays especially they ought to fast.”

“That the preachers, and masters of their sect, and the Priests, or Clergymen, were formerly of one and the same order and degree; but that when the Clergy began to follow after covetousness and the vanities of this world, and their preachers resolved to continue in their first poverty; by this means a division and separation happened amongst them, and the Clergy became their enemies. That therefore, because the number of their preachers, and others of their sect, was as yet but very small, they were obliged to walk up and down secretly, as Christ and his Apostles did, because if the preachers should not walk cautiously and obscurely, they would be in danger of being persecuted and ill entreated by others.”

It appears, that these processes were in the year 1494, which date is found at the beginning of these examinations.

“The foresaid process or examination was taken by me, notary, who have subscribed my name,

GOBAUD.”

This extract is faithfully transcribed out of a MS. in the public library of Cambridge, where it is to be seen in the original. But I thought fit to make it public at the end of this work, that the reader may compare those processes, in which the Inquisitors’ faithfulness is justly to be suspected, since we see that there is very little of the first *sumptum* from the mouth of the Barba, in the process that was written afterwards by the notary of the Inquisitors, according to their pleasure, to expose them to the hatred of all the world.

CHAPTER 27

That the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont have constantly persevered in the same faith, until the time of the Reformation.

THIS is a confession which truth hath extorted from Claudius Seisselius. The most cruel persecutions have not been able to abolish the Churches of Italy, or to hinder them from a constant defense of that truth, which they received from their ancestors, as a sacred *depositum*. “All sorts of people,” saith he, “have several times in vain endeavored to root them out, and yet, contrary to the opinion of all men, they have still continued conquerors, or at least wholly invincible.”

It is easy to judge what the opinions of these Churches were before the Reformation, from what Seisselius himself tells us concerning them, before ever they heard of any reformation.

First, They lay it down as an infallible maxim, that the Pastors of the Romish Church had lost all the lawful authority which they could once have received from God. There were two causes, say they, of the election of Peter and the rest of the Apostles; the first was, because Christ knew their faith and their charity; the other, that by means of them he might reap much fruit from the rest of mankind: as also, that it might appear, that in this choice there was no respect of persons, but only regard had to their piety; and this to that degree, that in case they departed from it, they should not only fall from his grace and favor, but also be deprived of the authority he had conferred upon them. He saith elsewhere; *I am the way, the truth, and the life; let him that serves me, follow me:* and in another place, *I am the vine, ye are the branches; he who abides in me, and I in him, brings forth much fruit. but he who abides not in me, shall be cut off, and cast into the fire.* So long then as the Apostles continued in Christ, (now they always continued, from the time that they first received the Spirit,) the foundation of the universal Church has without doubt continued firm and unshaken, as resting upon most strong pillars and bases; and so likewise continued under their successors, as long as they imitated the actions, life, manners, and faith of the Apostles. But as soon as these successors began to wander and go astray from the precepts and

doctrine of the Apostles, being seduced by divers lusts and sins, they no doubt departed also from Christ, and Christ from them, and consequently were cut off from his mystical body; for we cannot call them the Ministers of Christ, who are so far from following him, that they follow a quite contrary way. Whence it happens, that from a fruitful tree they are become the evil and unfruitful tree, which can bring forth no good fruit, except it be first made good itself; as our Savior himself witnesseth, saying, *The evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit*. So that the reason for which they were chosen ceasing, the effect of it must needs cease also. It is evident then that a wicked man, by his impiety, is cut off from the body of Christ, as a useless branch is cut off from the vine. Besides, he who is a child and slave of the Devil cannot have the same relation to Christ, seeing he-himself saith, *No man can serve two masters*; and elsewhere, *Ye are of your father the Devil, because ye do his works*. And besides, all those who offend God by enormous crimes, according to the testimony of the Prophet, are blotted out of the book of life, and consequently are rooted out from the kingdom of heaven, that is to say, the Church.

They maintain, that believers ought to separate themselves from the communion of the Church of Rome, because she has lost all her just authority, by the crimes of her Ministers, and her errors in matters of faith. Our Savior has warned us, say they, to beware of this sort of people; *Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves*: and that they might not be at a loss who those were they were to take heed of, he adds, *You shall know them by their fruits*. Now the fruits are our works; if they are evil, we be to be avoided, though we may be clothed like sheep.

When things are thus, how can that Bishop or Priest, who is the enemy of God, have the power of making God propitious to others? He who himself is banished from the kingdom of heaven, how can he have the keys of it? With what power can he confer orders? How can he administer the sacraments in the virtue of the Spirit, especially considering, that the Spirit is so far from dwelling in him, that he is an enemy of the Spirit? Surely the Spirit of God does not dwell in a body that is a slave to sin, but rather abominates both his actions and prayers. And if God doth not hear the wicked, in vain do we implore the suffrages of him, who himself hath not God favorable to him. In a word, since neither his prayers nor his other

actions are of any advantage, how can we suppose, that at his word Christ should transform himself under the species of bread and wine, and suffer himself to be handled by him whom he hath altogether rejected, and whose actions he detests and abhors? Moreover, O immortal God, what wise man can ever believe, that a king, endowed with the least grain of wisdom, will bestow his lieutenancy with sovereign power upon him to whom he scorns to allow a place amongst the meanest of his servants, him whom he thinks deserving the very worst of punishments? Who is the shepherd that trusts the wolf with his sheep? Shall a wise man trust his most chaste spouse with a filthy and dissolute libertine? Besides, is not he who turns himself away from God reduced to nothing? The Prophet saith, The wicked in his presence comes to nothing; also they shall be brought to nothing, like water that fleets away: and in many other places you will find the same. He therefore that is nothing, cannot be supposed to do any thing. And that we might not imagine that these things want Scripture testimonies to prove them, hear what God himself declares; *To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? I am sated with the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. And then adds, Bring no more vain oblations: incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with. Your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them. When ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye multiply your prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood.* And Malachi, speaking of these wicked Priests, cries out in this manner; *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, neither will I receive any offering at your hands. And a little lower, I will curse your blessings.* After this he answers a tacit objection; for they might alleges that God had confirmed the priesthood to Levi by an eternal covenant, and therefore that he could not remove it from their family. But to this he plainly answers, that his covenant continued firm with the family of Levi, as long as they walked in the steps of their father Levi: for after he had said, *My covenant of life and peace was with him; and I gave him my fear, and he feared me;* he adds, *But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have broken the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord. Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways,* etc. Which words are very applicable to all

Bishops and Priests who transgress the ordinances of Christ and his Apostles; seeing he also speaks by another Prophet, *I have hated the congregation of evil doers, and will not sit with the wicked.* And elsewhere, *I hate those that do wickedness, and all the workers of iniquity;* and infinite such like passages. Is it not said of Saul, after that he had transgressed the commandment of the Lord, *that the Spirit of God departed from him,* though before he had been chosen by God himself to govern his people? Moreover, does not Christ say in the Gospel, *If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross, and follow me?* and afterwards, *No man can serve two masters, God and mammon?* and that which is yet plainer and harder too, *He who doth not forsake all that he hath, cannot be my disciple?* Shall we imagine that he will commit his vicegerency to him whom he will not accept for his disciple? Now, if the Popes be such, who will part with nothing that belongs to them, and in other things do not keep the law of Christ, with what power then do they ordain Bishops? And those who receive any Orders from them, how can they confer the same upon others, since they are all of them sick of the same disease? In short, if they confer no Orders, then those whom they have ordained cannot be true Priests, and consequently neither can they administer any true sacrament; for if they really had Orders, yet they would defile them by the filthiness and impurity of their lives. If therefore we can make it appear, that such are all the Priests and Bishops of the Church of Rome, it will be evident, that the Church of God cannot consist of them; for Christ cannot be the head of them who are none of his members.

Some, it may be, will imagine that these accusations against the Church of Rome, and the corruption of her Pastors, are extremely exaggerated.

But first, we have reason to commend the uprightness of Claudius Seisselius, in reference to these criminations, if we further consider what he saith of the Waldenses in opposition to the Church of Rome.

“The Pope of Rome, and the rest of the Prelates and Priests of the Church of Rome, do neither follow the life nor the precepts of Christ, but do quite the contrary; and that no longer secretly, but so openly and manifestly, that it can no longer be hid or covered with a vail, because they chiefly value themselves in things that are

contrary to religion, and do not only contemn, but mock at the precepts of the Apostles. They lived in great poverty, humility, chastity, continence, as to carnal things, and contempt of the world: whereas we Prelates and Priests live in great pomp, luxuriousness, and dissoluteness; we think it a brave thing to excel in royal power, rather than sacerdotal sanctity; and all our endeavors and studies drive only at the acquisition of glory amongst men, not by virtue, holiness, and learning, but by the abundance and plenty of all things, by arms and warlike magnificence, and by a vast expense in an equipage, and furniture of horses, gold, and other things of that nature. The Apostles would not possess any thing as their own, nor would receive any into their society who had not forsaken all, and laid it in common: whereas we, not being contented with what we have already, fish for other people's goods, more avariciously and impudently than heathens themselves; therefore it is that we make wars, and incite Christian princes and people to take up arms. The Apostles travelling through towns and villages, and sowing the word of God with power, exercised besides many offices of charity, according to the several gifts they had received: whereas we do not only do nothing like this, and give no good examples of holy conversation, but besides, we frequently resist and oppose those that do, opening the way to all dissoluteness and avarice. They, as it were, against their wills, and with reluctancy, by the command or inspiration of God, received ordination to promote the salvation of others: whereas we buy benefices and preferments for money, or procure them by force, or by the favor of princes, and other indirect means, and for no other end but to satiate our lusts, to enrich our relations, and for the glory of the world. But besides all this, they spent their life in manifold fastings, watchings, and labors, being neither afrighted with trouble nor with danger, that they might shew to others the way to salvation: whereas we pass our time in idleness, in pleasures, and other earthly or wicked things. They despising gold and silver, as they had received the divine grace freely, so they dispensed it to others: whereas we set all holy things to sale, and barter with the heavenly treasures of God himself, and, in a word, confound all things, both divine and

human. So that the Church of Rome cannot be said to be the spouse of Christ, but that common prostitute whom Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and St. John in the Revelation, describes in such lively colors; for Christ hath joined his Church to him to be his bride, holy, pure, fair, adorned with the ornaments and jewels of all virtues, without spot or wrinkle, such as the Holy Spirit figuratively describes her in the Canticles. Far be it therefore that Christ should ever think of changing this his beautiful and lovely bride, for such a stinking, loathsome harlot.”

Secondly, We may say, that the case was so plain, that no disguise or excuse was any longer able to palliate the matter. “We do not deny,” say the Waldenses, according to the account Seisselius gives us,

“but that God alone is the searcher of hearts, *who*, as the Scripture saith, *searcheth the heart and trieth the reins*; and therefore that he alone knows whether the works of men be pleasing unto him, and obtain his favor, which others cannot know, save only by conjecture. But he himself hath taught us how we may know it, saying, *You shall know them by their fruits; for an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit, nor a good tree evil fruit*. Wherefore, though it be a difficult thing to judge of good works, because they receive their value from the intention of the doer, yet wicked works discover themselves, and the intention cannot make them good, especially when they are evidently repugnant to the law of God, and open and barefaced. And therefore, if I see the Bishops and Priests every day living in dissoluteness and luxury, robbing others of their goods, smiting their neighbors, persecuting those that are good, blaspheming the name of God, prodigally wasting the patrimony of the Church in voluptuousness and damnable crimes, may not I undoubtedly affirm, that they who commit these things are not the Ministers of God, but his public and avowed enemies? Surely such they are, though we should suppose created or confirmed by an universal synod of Christians, or by the Pope, or by Peter himself. But how much more may we conclude them such, when those who ordain them are worse than they themselves, and their works openly worse than theirs? What shall we say, if it appears that they have publicly and notoriously

bought the papacy; that they openly set to sale sacerdotal functions; and that they set over the Churches, not by mistake, but out of malice, those who are known to be wholly unworthy of that charge; and who never in all their lifetime did any thing worthy either of a Priest, or so much as of a Christian? Shall we obey such Priests and Prelates, who lead us the way to salvation neither by word nor work, but rather endeavour all they can to drag us into the same pit of destruction after them? Doth not our Savior tell us, that we must not suffer ourselves to be led by blind guides, lest, when one blind man leads another, they both fall into the ditch? Hath not he declared, that such as these are cut off from the life of the Church and the body of Christ, and destined to the fire? How can he be the vicegerent of Christ, who is not so much as a Christian, or a member of the mystical body of Christ, whom he commands us to avoid as a heathen and publican, as long as he continues incorrigible. And the apostolical authority, the faith of Peter, which Christ saith should not fail the Catholic Church, with whom he promiseth to abide for ever, is to be found amongst us who imitate the life of the Apostles, who, according to our weakness, observe their commands and ordinances. We are those very persons of whom St. Paul speaks in his Epistle to the Corinthians;

Brethren, consider your calling, that you are not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble: but God hath chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise; and the weak things of this world, to confound the things that are mighty; and the base and despised things of this world, yea, the things that are not, to bring to nought the things that are.

And St. Paul himself tells us, that he was sent to preach the Gospel, not in the mightiness of man's wisdom, but in simplicity and plainness; alleging to this purpose what the Lord saith elsewhere; *I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nought the prudence of the prudent.*"

Without doubt the Bishop of Meaux will tell us, that all this is nothing else but the overflowing of a schismatical temper, exasperated by the

corruption of the Clergy and their licentiousness; but that indeed there is nothing in all this that shews them to have held the same principles with those of the Reformation. I shall then make it my business to evidence the contrary, and that after so clear and visible a manner, that the Bishop shall no longer be in a condition to disguise it. What Seisselius tells us in particular, concerning the articles of their faith, is this:

“They receive only, saith he, what is written in the Old and New Testament.”

“They say, that the Popes of Rome, and other Priests, have depraved the Scriptures by their doctrines and glosses.”

“They say, that they owe neither tithes nor firstfruits to the Clergy.”

“They say, that the consecrations of churches, indulgences, and other such like benedictions, are the inventions of false Priests.”

“They do not celebrate the festivals of the saints.”

“They say, that men do not stand in need of the suffrages of the saints: Christ abundantly sufficing in all things.”

“They affirm, that marriage may be contracted in any degree, excepting only one or two at the most; as if the Popes had no power to prohibit marriage in any other degrees.”

“They say, that whatever is done to deliver the souls of the dead from the pains of purgatory, is useless, lost, and superstitious.”

“They say, that our Priests have no power of forgiving sins.”

“They say, that they alone observe the evangelical and apostolical doctrine, and upon this account, by an intolerable impudence, they usurp the name of the Catholic Church.”

Their Barbae, saith Seisselius, do err greatly, because they are neither sent of God, nor by the Pastors of the Church, but of the Devil; as appears from their damnable doctrine.

“They say, that the authority of hearing confessions belongs to all Christians that walk according to the Apostles’ precepts, (which their Barbae attribute to themselves,) because St. James saith, *Confess your sins one to another.*”

“They say, that we ought not to admit any kind of prayer, except it appear that it was composed by some certain author, and approved of God, in order to obtain something of him. Their Barbae have often preached this doctrine, to abolish the service of the glorious Virgin, and of other saints.”

“They do not think that Christians ought to say the angelical salutation to the mother of God, alleging, that it has not the form of a prayer, but a salutation: but it is only that they might rob the Virgin of this service, saying, that it is not lawful to worship or serve her any more than the rest of the saints.”

“They affirm, that the blessings of the Priests are of no virtue at all. Did not Christ bless the bread in the desert? When the Apostles sat down to eat bread, they blessed what was set upon the table.”

“They say, there is no need of holy water in the churches, because neither Christ himself nor his Apostles either made it or commanded it: as if we ought to say or do nothing but what we read was done by them.”

“They say, that the indulgences allowed of by the Church are despicable useless things.”

“They say, that the souls of the dead, without being tried by any purgation, do immediately upon their parting from the body enter into joy or pains, and that the Clergy, blinded by their covetousness, have invented purgatory.”

“They say, that the saints cannot take notice of what is done here below.”

“They abhor and detest all images, and the sign of the cross, much more than we honor them.”

“They make no distinction between the worship of *latria*, which is due to God only, and that of *dulia*, which belongs to the saints.”

“As to the fasts, which the Catholic Church has instituted for the honor of God and the saints, they have yet less reason to object these to us.”

There is a pleasant error Seisselius ascribes to them, about the nature of lying, which evidenceth how great their purity was as to this article, and with what impudence it is that their enemies calumniate them with equivocation. “They affirm, that a lie is always a mortal sin, because David says, *God destroys all liars*.” But it is evident that these general propositions are to be moderated, otherwise who should be saved? Hereupon to convince them in an error, he accuseth all the saints, even St. Paul and Christ himself, to have made use of lies upon occasion.

But because in all this we have made no mention of transubstantiation, the Bishop of Meaux will take it for granted, that in Seisselius’s time the Waldenses received it as a doctrine of faith; but he will mistake himself if he do, for Seisselius declares, that they rejected it as a great extravagance. He tells us also,

“That they made a mock of all the artifices they made use of, to make it appear more plausible to them. I think, saith he, that those took pains to little purpose, who, writing against this sect, made it their chief business to insist upon the difficulties about the sacrament of the Eucharist, and, in order to the clearing of them, have spoken so sharply and subtilly, that I may not say confusedly, that I have great reason to doubt whether ever they understood the thing themselves. Yet I will not say, that because I do not comprehend it myself, (for that I ingenuously confess,) I think it also to surpass the capacity of others; but because it has always appeared to me to be a point of that difficulty, that the most able have been fain to profess, that the strength of human understanding must in this case be subject to faith.” After which he useth his utmost endeavors to persuade the Waldenses to embrace an opinion, for the which they had always testified a great aversion.

By this we may see what was the faith of the believers of Piedmont, as far as Seisselius's account thereof reacheth. And as for their carriage and conversation, the same Seisselius tells us;

“They say, that they desire only to overcome by the simplicity of faith, purity of conscience, and integrity of life; not by philosophical niceties and theological subtilties.”

“Setting aside what they hold in opposition to our faith and religion, for the rest, saith that Bishop, they for the most part lead a more pure life than other Christians. They swear not at all, except they be forced to it, and very rarely take the name of God in vain: they honestly perform their promises; and the most part of them living in poverty, they protest that they alone observe the life and doctrine of the Apostles, and therefore affirm, that the power of the Church resides in them, as the true innocent disciples of Jesus Christ, for the sake of whose faith and religion they live in poverty.”

It is impossible to give them a more advantageous testimony than what he gives them elsewhere, acknowledging, that they looked upon it as an honorable and glorious thing to suffer the persecutions which were raised against them by the Church of Rome.

CHAPTER 28

Containing the conclusion of this Treatise.

THESE are the observations I thought myself obliged to make upon the ecclesiastical history of the ancient Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, to evidence their apostolical succession. If in this undertaking I have not been able to clear some points, the fault thereof is to be charged on those who have persecuted them to the highest degree of outrage and cruelty, and who have spared none of their monuments of antiquity, but such as they thought might some way or other make these believers odious and abominable to those of the Romish communion. However, I hope that an equal reader will meet with some satisfaction from these my endeavors, and will easily conclude from these remarks, that the cause of that implacable hatred of the Pope and his Clergy, against the Churches of Piedmont, was nothing else but the design of extirpating a race of people, whose zeal for the purity of the Gospel engaged them to upbraid the Church of Rome with her corruptions in matters of faith, her idolatry, her false and superstitious worship, and her horrid tyranny.

And forasmuch as my design is not to abuse my reader, I neither pretend to excuse all the errors which some of the members of these Churches may have held, nor indeed to justify them altogether, in all the articles which might have been objected against them, during the time of almost six hundred years, wherein the Romish party has opposed them. I am persuaded, that all good men will have that equity and kindness for these Churches, which the Doctors of the Romish Church do so dexterously make use of themselves, upon occasion of any indictments formed against the primitive Church, in those times that were nearest to the Apostles, by those that have attacked them; or when the question is concerning errors found in the writings of the most ancient Doctors or Fathers of the Church. Should any do otherwise, they would declare themselves thereby to be in opposition to natural equity and the principles of charity, especially since after all it cannot be denied, but that the body of these Churches have always preserved amongst them whatsoever is necessary to the constitution of a true society of Christians.

The Church of Rome herself furnisheth us with an excuse for some of the errors they had in common with the Christians of old, when she owns, that for all them they did not cease to be true Churches. Some of these errors are such, as that they of the Church of Rome are ready to apologize for these Churches in that behalf; and there be others again, wherein though they have not the approbation of many Protestant Churches, yet can they defend themselves with their agreeing therein with other Christian communions, whom the Protestants own for true members of the Church of Jesus Christ.

I cannot but represent to the reader the particular character which the author of the Noble Lesson has given us of these Churches, *viz.* their constancy in suffering the persecution of the Church of Rome, and indeed this is their true character in a most eminent and illustrious degree; for scarcely is there a Church to be found in the world, that ever had the advantage of having borne the cross of Christ, as the Church of the Valleys of Piedmont have done. Never did the Church of Rome give in a more incontestable evidence of her own antichristianism, than by her insatiable thirst after the blood of those Christians, who renounced her communion these six hundred years last past, for to allay which, she has made the blood of these poor innocents to run down every where like rivers, exterminating by fire and sword those who were not moved by the empty noise of her anathemas: so that for so great an interval of time the Waldenses have always been in the condition of sheep led to the slaughter, by their continual and uninterrupted martyrdom maintaining and adorning the religion of our Savior, which the Church of Rome did no longer profess, but in mode and way adapted to her corrupt worldly interests, and to the design she had of making it a *stalking horse* to the pomp, lordliness, and tyranny of her Pope and Clergy.

Whatsoever reflections they of the Church of Rome may pass upon God's seeming to have abandoned these poor and helpless Churches to the rage and fury of their cannibal party, I am fully persuaded, that they who have never so little made it their study to consider the conduct of Providence towards the primitive Church, will not at all be offended at this seeming desertion of the Waldenses, and abandoning of them to the outrageous cruelty of their persecutors, nor look upon the seeming triumphs of the apostate Church as a mark of the weakness of the truth professed by these

people. And indeed, notwithstanding the extreme rigour of their persecutions, we find, that God hath tenderly preserved them until the Reformation; and though he has often exposed them to the rage and barbarous usage of their persecutors, yet withal has from time to time sent them such deliverances, which have continued them until this day: these their persecutions, like those of the Apostles, having only served to procure martyrs to the glorious truth of the Gospel, and to disperse throughout all places the knowledge and good savor thereof, which the Romish party, treading in the steps of the ancient synagogue, did so cruelly persecute.

Without doubt this was the reflection Luther made upon this account, when he was so far from being offended at the rumor his adversaries had spread concerning him, that by means of the close pursuit of Leo X. he had no place left to hide his head, save amongst the Picars, who were a colony of the Waldenses, settled in Bohemia, he openly declared, that he was not in the least troubled at this their report; for after he had more exactly informed himself of their belief, and having searched into the design and intent of those black calumnies charged upon them, he owned them for his brethren, and commended them for faithful Christians: and though at that time he did not agree with them in all things, as being not himself wholly freed from the impurities of the Church of Rome, yet he writes to them with such an affection and esteem, as abundantly shews the respect he had for those who for so long a time had opposed the corruptions of the truth.

It was upon the same account that Conrad Pellican, one of the most learned men that had a hand in the Reformation, undertook in the year 1543, at Zurich, publicly to read the works of the Waldenses, that is to say, those pieces which since have been published by the author of *Fasciculus verum expetendarum*, and by Lydius, which contain their apologies presented to King Vadislas. By this means he gave to his auditors an occasion and sure means to refute the ridiculous cavillings of the Papists, who were very desirous, as they are still, to fix the epocha of the Reformation to the year 1517, in pointing out to them a whole body of a Church, which, in spite of all the opposition of the Romish party, had always maintained the truth, and preserved it in a sufficient degree of

purity, whilst the Church of Rome made use of her utmost endeavors to corrupt it, to serve her own base designs.

The learned and famous Usher followed the steps of these great men, in his undertaking to justify the Waldenses, and to make out their succession, with so many marks of exactness and diligence, and in having prompted those that have conversed with him, and who have inherited of his light and spirit, earnestly to desire that the history of these Churches might be more and more cleared.

Let the Bishop of Meaux then, if he please, think the Protestants might be ashamed to go and look for their ancestors among the Waldenses, and to hunt for them in the caverns of the Alps. His declamations shall never be able to make us forego a jot of that tender veneration and respect we have most justly conceived for this nursery and seed-plot of martyrs, and for those triumphant troops, who have so generously lavished away their blood in the defence of truth, against all the efforts, all the machinations, and all the violences of the Romish party. The judgment of St. Hilarius, expressed in his writing against Auxentius, may be sufficient to arm us against all the cavils of those who will needs have, that it was impossible that ever their Church should lose its purity, or that the same should be preserved by these Churches, reduced to caverns and mountains. *Unum moneo, cavete Antichristum. Male enim vos parietum amor coepit, male ecclesiam Dei in tectis aedificiisque veneramini; male sub his pacem ingeritis. Anne ambiguum est in his antichristum sessurum? Montes mihi et sylvae et lacus et carceres et voragines sunt tutiores; in his enim Prophetae aut manentes, aut demersi Dei spiritu prophetabant*, p. 316. *Oper. Hilarii.*

“One thing I must warn you of, beware of Antichrist. It is ill done of you to fall in love with walls; it is ill done of you to reverence the church of God in buildings and edifices; you do ill to rest in these things. Or, can you question, that it is on these Antichrist will fix his throne? Give me mountains, forests, pits, and prisons, as being far the safer places; for in these it was that the Prophets prophesied from the spirit of GOD.”

Scriptum Inquisitoris cujuspiam anonymi de Valdensibus, ex codice MS. G. in publica Bibliotheca Cantabrig.

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 pauperum de Lugduno, quos vulgus Valdenses appellat, dictos a *Valdeo, cive Lugdunensi*, in loco dicto vulgariter *Val grant* moram faciente, qui homo dives hacresiarcha primus hacresis sectae Valdensium inventor fuit, secundum Scripturam, *Qui bonis temporalibus renuncians*, coepit cum suis complicitibus 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 ipsis habitaverunt*, ubi paulatim procurante satore *zizaniac*, in copioso numero excreverunt, et demum palmites suos tristes in Liguriam, Italiam, et ultra Romam in Apuliam transmiserunt: et quemadmodum Christus Redemptor noster discipulos suos binos mittebat ad praedicandum; sic et idiota et bestialis illius sectae magniscius alios magistros inferiores per ipsum creatos et probatos, quos vulgo *Barbas* dicimus, ad docendum et praedicandum hujusmodi sectae doctrinam, hinc inde *binos mittere solitus* fuit, hi siquidem Barbac creati solent per eorum supremum in civitate Aquilae in regno Neapolitano; et in eorum creatione quaedam solet fieri solennitas. Nam *in derisum Romani Pontificis*, eis nomina mutantur cum ad magisterium hujusmodi afficiuntur, cujus siquidem damnatissimae hacresis 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 prae plusquam centum numero ex ipsis sponte confessi fuerunt, sequentes articulos contra fidem nostram, tenuerunt, tenentque, et immobiliter observant. Et ut de eo constet et liquidius appareat, Procurator fidelis juncto Procuratore patriae et locorum circumvicinorum patriae Briantonensis et Ebredunensis pro manutentione fidei Christianae et honoris patriae revelatione contra omnes et singulos

dictac valls Frayxineriac, dat et facit sequentes titulos, quos petit admitti ad probandum, citra tamen onus superfluae probationis, ad quod se astringere non intendit, de quo et de expensis contra eos omnes et singulos solenniter protestatur.

In primis ponit et dicit, ac probare intendit, quod ipsi homines vallis Frayxineriac fuerunt *a centum annis citra ultra*, ac per tempora ipsa et alia a tanto tempore cujus *initii memoria hominum non existit*, fuerunt et de praesenti sunt haeretici, et sequentes articulos contra Catholicam fidem tenuerint et tenent; et hoc est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et quod fuerunt et de praesenti sunt pro haereticis et Valdensibus habiti, tenti et reputati communiter, et ab omnibus de eisdem et eorum vita, moribus, et conversatione notitiam habentibus; et hoc fuit et est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et quod de praemissis fuit et est publica vox et fama, nedum apud circumvicinos, imo et apud omnes a centum leucis et ultra distantes a dicta valle; et hoc fuit et est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et quod fuerunt et de praesenti sunt ubique terrarum de haeresi et damnatissima Valdensium secta fidei Christianae contraria diffamati; et hoc fuit et est verum, notorium, et manifestum.

Item et quod propterea homines locorum circumvicinorum, licet Catholici et Christiani, ac Christi fideles, ex ipsorum de Frayxineria labe ubique terrarum dehonestantur, et impropria quamplurima..... atque damna et interesse, quia ab honoribus multis commodis rejiciuntur ex suspitione ipsorum de Frayxineria; et hoc fuit et est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et quod dicti de Frayxineria haeretici dicuntur, et visi sunt mali et obstinati, et fidei Catholicae contrarii, iniqui ac perversi, ac pro talibus habiti, tenti, et reputati, articulos sequentes contra fidem Christi tenentes; et hoc est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et pro eo, quia Ecclesiam Romanam dicunt Ecclesiam malignantium, et eam diffamant et reprobant, et ita credunt damnabiliter et contra fidem Catholicam; et hoc est verum, notorium, publicum, et manifestum.

Item et pro eo, quia credunt et crediderunt quod in ipsis tantum sit Ecclesia Dei, qui vivunt in paupertate, in *eorum symbolo* credentes in sanctam Ecclesiam sine macula et ruga constitutam; et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia damnabiliter credunt et crediderunt quod eorum Magistri et Barbac potestatem habeant ligandi et solvendi, et quod illis et non Presbyteris Romanac Ecclesiae confitenda sunt peccata; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod non licuit nec licet Praelatos Romanac Ecclesiae habere *patrimonium* aut jurisdictionem temporalem in hoc seculo, et quod a beato Sylvestro non fuit verus Papa; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod quantam quis habet sanctitatem, tantam habet facultatem et potestatem in Ecclesia, et non ultra; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod sacramenta per Presbyteros Romanac Ecclesiae ministrata nullius sint efficaciac seu virtutis; contra fidem nostram, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod eisdem Presbyteris Romanac Ecclesiae *non sunt solvendac decimac*, neque eis sunt dandac oblationes, propter praemissa; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod de censuris et poenis per Praelatos Romanac Ecclesiae inflictis curandum non est, quoniam non arctant neque ligant propter defectum sanctitatis, quia non servant vestigia Christi; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod Romana Ecclesia est *Domus confusionis, Babylon, Meretrix, et Synagoga Diaboli*; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod eidem Romanac Ecclesiae, seu Praelatis eisdem, non est obediendum; et quod omnes eis obedientes sunt damnati; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod *nullum est purgatorium* in alio seculo, sed tantum purgantur viventes in praesenti, et quod dum quis moritur, statim avolat ad paradysum, vel labitur in infemum, asseverantes Ecclesiam Romanam cupiditate ductam purgatorium invenisse; et quod pro mortuis ideo non est orandum; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod pro quacunq; re vera vel falsa non licet jurare; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod licitum est libidinosè convenire, et participare etiam cum omni persona sibi in quovis consanguinitatis vel affinitatis gradu conjuncta, saltem quando conveniunt cum aliis ejusdem sectae in eorum praedicationibus, et extinctis luminibus; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod tantum prodest Deum orare in stabulo, quantum in Ecclesia; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod *solus Deus orandus est*, non autem Virgo Maria, non sancti et sanctae, quia cum sint a nobis remoti, non possunt audire preces nostras; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod aquae pluviales sunt ejusdem virtutis, sicut sunt *aquae benedictae* in ecclesia, quia omnes aquae fuerunt a Deo benedictae; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod etiam *Dominis temporalibus non est obediendum*, nisi sint de eorum secta; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item quod pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod detegere aliquem de dicta secta est peccatum irremissibile, contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod extra eorum sectam nemo salvatur, et qui sunt de eorum secta sancti esse dicuntur; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod de *festivitatibus sanctorum et sanctarum* per Romanam Ecclesiam introductis, non est curandum, quod licitum est omni die opus servile exercere; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt quod ubicunque licet et permissum est *vesci caribus*, et quocunque tempore anni, et quod jejunia per Ecclesiam Romanam introducta non sunt servanda, eorum quadragesimam incipiendo secunda feria post primam Dominicam Quadragesimae; contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et pro eo, quia crediderunt et credunt quod non *licet haereticis eorum sectae* cum Catholicis matrimonia contrahere, et multa alia erronea et nefaria tenuerunt, crediderunt, et praedicaverunt, prout confessi fuerunt, et contra fidem, et hoc est verum.

Item et quod propterea Reverendissimi dudum Pontifices et Praelati Ebredunenses, cum Inquisitoribus haereticarum pravitatis retroactis temporibus, magnos assumpserunt labores, ut haereticam ipsam sectam a partibus illis avellerent, usque ad tempora Reverendissimi in Christo Patris et Domini Domini Joannis Archiepiscopi Ebredunensis novissime vita functi, et hoc est verum.

Item et quod praefatus quondam Reverendissimus Dominus Joannes Ebredunensis Archiepiscopus statim post ejus assumptionem, et de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo sexagesimo primo, ne sanguis eorum de suis manibus exquiretur, ad corrigendos illorum excessus, et ad extirpandam illam haereticam sectam per monitiones, exhortationes, et commendationes, coepit diligenter insurgere, sed intervenientibus impedimentis, non potuit ad finem perducere; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod propterea, de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo septuagesimo tertio Frater Joannes Veylleti, ordinis Minorum, sacrae Theologiae Doctor, et Inquisitor autoritate apostolica deputatus contra ipsos de Vallibus Frayxineriac, Argenteriac, et Vallis Loysiac, processus formavit, ex quibus detecta est dicta haeretica secta, qua pro insertis articulis sponte confessi sunt credidisse; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive praefatus quondam Reverendissimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo

octuagesimo tertio, cum viris Catholicis et allis eorum complicitibus usque ad numerum nonaginta *novas informationes sumpsit*, ex quibus apparet quod omnes illi de Frayxineria, et multi de Valle Loysia et Argenteria diffamatissimi et suspectissimi de dicta hacretica secta apud omnes habebantur; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod propterea praefatus Reverendissimus quondam Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus, et de anno millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo sexto et diebus decima octava et vigesima nona Junii, et tertio die nona Julii ejusdem anni eos genemliter moneri fecit infra terminum in litteris contentum et per litteras patentes debite executas, quibus parere neglexerunt; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod propterea et successive, et de mense Augusti, praefatus quondam Reverendissimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus mandavit eos omnes nominatim suspectos citari responsuros de fide, offerendo illis gratiam, si redire vellent ad gremium Ecclesiae, qui contumaciter comparere neglexerunt; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive de anno praedicto et die decima quinta Septembris praefatus quondam Reverendissimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus litteras patentes laxavit et excommunicatorias in eorum perfidiam et obstinatum contumaciam executas die decima septima ejusdem Septembris, et quam excommunicationem sustinuerunt usque ad diem sextam mensis Februarii anni Domini millesimi quadringentesimi octuagesimi septimi, et a longe ultra in excommunicatione sorduerunt. Inter quos nominatus fuit Angellinus Palloni, qui tanto opere nunc ad veritatem occultandam suis mendaciis elaborat; et hoc est verum.

Item et successive Reverendissimus Pater Dominus Albertus de Cappitaneis, Archidiaconus Cremonensis, in utraque facultate non mediocriter peritus, autoritate apostolica deputatus, contra eosdem processit, et informationes sumpsit, et de anno millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo octavo et die sexta Februarii, et se informavit cum quatuor ex complicitibus eorum concludentibus in effectum cum aliis per praefatum Reverendissimum quondam Dominum Joannem Archiepiscopum super his examinatis, ex quo formatis processibus, certis motus respectibus, a sede apostolica obtinuit procedere *non vocato*

Ordinario, et tandem nominatim citari mandavit eosdem responsuros de fide, eisdem benigne oblata gratia, si redire vellent ad Ecclesiae unitatem. Quibus citationibus ipsi obstinati haeretici comparere contempserunt; ex quo undecima Februarii successive pro secunda vice citati per litem debite executas, iterum contumaciter comparere neglexerunt. Et ideo contra eosdem et merito litem excommunicatorias laxavit debite executas et publicatas, sed excommunicationem ipsam et aggravationem semper magis eorum perfidia sustinuerunt, ex quo per litem patentes citati fuerunt visuri loca ad quae ipsis declinare contingebat supponi ecclesiastico interdicto, qui pariter comparere postposuerunt; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive praefatus Dominus commissarius sapius misit ad eos plures viros Deum timentes et salutem animarum haereticorum illorum quacrentes, ut eos ad viam lucis et gratiae reducerent, sed illos tanquam obstinatos ad postulandum veniam nullo modo flectere potuerunt; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive ac propterea antefactus Dominus Commissarius eos nominatim citari mandavit, ut coram eo comparerent audituri definitivam sententiam per ipsum ferendam per litem debite executas die secunda Martii anno supradicto, qui contumaciter semper magis comparere neglexerunt; et ideo nemine comparente, praefatus Dominus Commissarius cemens cor eorum induratum esse, nec in eis signa aliqua poenitentiae apparere, cum peritorum consilio, visis omnibus praecedentibus, ad suam definitivam processit sententiam, per quam eos ut haereticos pertinaces et rebelles brachio seculari reliquit; et hoc est verum.

Item quod propterea ex commissione extremi Parlamenti Dalphinalis pro brachio seculari implorati, strenuus miles Dominus Hugo de Palude Comes de Varax, Locumtenens Dalphini, et magnificus Jurium Doctor, et Dalphini Consiliarius Dominus Joannes Rabboti, servatis de jure servandis, processerunt contra eosdem qui proprias relinquentes domos, cavemas et latibula montium, ac rupturas rupum sibi pro fortalicio elegerunt: sed interim dicti Domini Commissarii Apostolicus et Dalphinales iterum eis gratiam et Ecclesiae gremium obtulerunt; proviso quod puro corde et fide non ficta redirent. Ipsi vero tunc quasi omnes de rupibus sponte non ligati, non quacstionati descendentes qui voluerunt venire mares et foeminac ad gratiam benigne recepti fuerunt per eundem Commissarium Apostolicum,

et confessi fuerunt gratis et sine metu torturac, se fuisse et esse Valdenses, seu Pauperes de Lugduno, et illorum hacresim seu sectam tenuisse, ac illi et illius articulis supra descriptis credidisse, et inter ceteros Angellinus Palloni qui materiam prosequitur ad pracsens, ac testante processu pracsenti justificando in forma probante; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod reliqui, duodecim vel quindecim numero, in eorum turma existentes, qui contenti gratia et venia, diabolico spiritu imbuti ab aliis aufugemnt cum essent plus obstinati, baniti fuerunt; et hoc est verum, notorium, et manifestum.

Item et quod alii ad gratiam admissi de se sponte confessi, dictam damnatissimam Valdensium sectam et hacreticam pravitatem supra declaratam abjuraverunt et quamcunque aliam solenniter post pracdicationem, et in eorum abjurationibus expresse promiserunt inter alia nusquam receptare seu occultare pracdicos banitos, sed illos dum venirent repellere, et Ecclesiae intimare, atque eis injungendas sententias satisfactorias pro peccatis efficaciter adimplere constante processu; et hoc est verum, et sub poena relapsus in processu contenta.

Item et quod pro poenitentiis fuit eis specialiter injunctum post abjurationem supradictam, quod viri qui fuerunt in cavemis rupum se defendentes, ad quinquenium, alii vero qui non ibi fuerunt, ad biennium deferrent cruces duas telac crocei coloris in superiori veste ante et retro consutas, et talia fuerunt eis injuncta Ebreduni, ubi fuerunt ante fores majoris Ecclesiae; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive dicti abjurati post eorum abjurationem Ecelesiac mandatis et monitionibus, abjurationibus et monitionibus et promissionibus factis parere pertinaciter contempserunt; et ideo nominatim citati fuerunt visuri testes pracdici jurare et examinari contra eos per procuratorem fidei producendos, quibus non comparentibus ac testibus in eorum contumacia examinatis, iterum citati fuerunt visuri attestaciones publicari, qui comparere renuerunt; ex quorum quidem testium tam Presbyterorum quam aliorum Catholicorum bonorum fide dignorum, et suorum complicum depositionibus luce meridiana clarioribus apparet eosdem de Frayxineria fuisse et esse *ficte conversos* et relapsos, quia hacreticos banitos receptaverunt, et poenitentias eis injunctas non

impleverunt, vocati venire noluerunt, quinimo Barbas et Magistros Valdensium postmodo receperunt, et eis more pristino confessi sunt; et hoc est verum.

Item et quod successive auctoritate apostolica deputatus fuit Inquisitor in dictis vallibus frater Franciscus Plorerii ordinis Minorum, sacrae Theologiae professor, qui de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo nono, et die prima Januarii, intelligens quod ipsi de Frayxineria de relapsu essent diffamati signanter informatus a curato loci, et a pluribus de dicto loco Frayxineriac, ac cum veris Catholicis et etiam complicibus usque ad numerum sexaginta sex, quorum dictorum apparuit quod dicti de Frayxineria non impleverunt eis impositas poenitentias, nec detulerunt cruces in suis superioribus vestibus: quinimo receptaverunt haereticos banitos, nec revelarunt Ecclesiae, contravenientes eorum abjurationibus, inter quos Angelinus Paloni, qui nunc causam prosequitur, descriptus invenitur, ex quo viso informabatur antefactus dominus Inquisitor cum Ordinario procedens, quia solus non potest, per litem patentem eos omnes nominatim citari mandavit responsuros de fide et de relapsu, qui suspectissimi se excusaturos, executos de anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo nono et die vigesima quarta Maii: qui tamen comparere postposuerunt, ex quo per alias litem legitime executas secundo citati fuerunt eodem anno, et die vigesima octava Maii, sed comparere contempserunt, duobus exceptis, qui nominibus propriis comparuerunt, et ideo non comparentes fuerunt. Et tertio per litem die septima Junii ejusdem anni debite executas vocati et non comparentes, in eorum contumacia excommunicati, et crescente contumacia aggravati, et quam excommunicationis sententiam in eos, ut praemittitur, latam, indurato animo sustinuerunt et adhuc sustinent, propter quod per alias vestras legitime executas anno praedicto et die vigesima octava Junii citati fuerunt audituri, et visuri se veluti pertinaces haereticos relapsos brachio seculari relinqui, et eorum bona a die commissi quacvis confiscata fuisse declarari; qui et iterum citati anno praedicto et die quinta Julii, ac iterum vocati anno quo supra et die sexta Septembris audituri sententiam contra eos ferendam, nunquam ut obstinati comparere curaverunt, ex quo recte et rite jure suadente damnati fuerunt, ex quo nunc audiendi non sunt, cum sint excommunicati, et interdicti, et pro talibus ac haereticis pertinacibus declarati per sententias in rem judicatam transactas, nulla appellatione

suspensas, adversus quas dicere aliquid admitti posse non videtur, nisi prius parito monitionibus, et judicatis, et Ecclesiae mandatis ac solutis expensis, super quibus dictus Procurator, tanquam super articulo praedjudiciabili, petit jus dici et interloqui, jusque et justitiam ministrari, officium vestrum humiliter implorando.

*Processus Inquisitoris contra Barbam Martinum, ex Cod. MS. H.
in Biblioth. publica Cantabr.*

ANNO Domini millesimo quadringentesimo nonagesimo secundo, die septima mensis Augusti, apud Ulcium venemibilis Dominus Bartholomaeus Paschalis Canonicus, et Pidancerius ac Locumtenens venemndi Domini de Turrellis, Vicarii Genemlis reverendissimi in Christo Patris et Domini, Domini Joannis Michaclis misemtionem divinae Episcopi Praenestini, Cardinalis sancti Angeli, Administratoris et Commendatoris inclity monasterii Ulciensis, secum existentibus spectabilibus et egregiis Dominis Pontio Pontii Dalphinali Consiliario, et Oroncio Eme Judice Bemensi, processit ad examinationem Francisci de Girundino, de Spoleto Barba Martino nuncupato, detento infra carceres Dalphinales Ulcii.

Et primo dixit, quod sunt sexdecim anni elapsi quod Girondinus ejus pater ipsum loquentem ipsam fidem Valdensium et hacresim docuit. Et incoepit ipsum ducere per patrias.

Interrogatus per quas patrias et regiones eum eduxit? dixit quod per patrias et regiones Italiac, videlicet Januac, Bononiac, Luce, et per montem Marchancone, et ipse ejus pater, qui emt Barba, ibat ad confitendum et praedicandum gentes in illis montibus.

Interrogatus cum quibus fuit, in quibus partibus, et quos persevemvit et conversatus est? dixit quod ex post secundo anno ivit ad discendum dictam doctrinam Valdensium cum viro alio Barba vocato Bamovo, qui emt de loco Perupage, et de dominio de Camerino, qui duxit ipsum spacio duorum vel trium annorum per loca supradicta.

Interrogatus cum quo ex post dictum Bamovo sequutus est dictam doctrinam, dixit quod cum quodam alio Barba nominato Josue, qui emt de loco sancto de dominio de Camerino, prope locum de Camerino, trium milliatium de Charretto. Dicens ulterius quod postquam ivit cum dicto Josue ad confitendum et praedicandum dictam sectam, et per dicta loca

quidam alius Barba, nominatus Andreas, duxit ipsum ad eorum magnum magistrum qui vocatur Joannes Antonii, et qui suam residentiam facit in loco de Cambro de dominio Papac.

Interrogatus quid sibi dixit dictus magnus magister, dixit quod in primis injunxit sibi quod faceret sacramentum sub fide ipsorum, et aliud insuper sibi injunxit. Super omnibus quod pro aliqua re mundi non revelaret, prorsus nec manifestaret quae sibi dicere volebat.

Dicens sibi quod manifestare seu revelare eorum fidem emt peccatum inexpressibile et irremissibile. Dicens eidem, quod si vellet sectam tenere, et insequi dictam sectam, faceret sibi multa bona.

Interrogatus si erant aliqui alii, dixit quod sic, quos vocabat Barbas, et vocabatur ipse magnus magister eorum Barba, et dicebat quod omnes tenebant dictam fidem, et quod tenerent secreta.

Et ulterius dicebat, magnus magister qui monebat eos, ut servarent eorum fidem et essent salvati, et ita praedicabat, Quod omnes qui sequerentur eorum fidem erunt salvati; qui vero non sequerentur eandem sectam, non erunt salvati, sed erunt damnati.

Interrogatus quod est potissimum fundamentum eorum fidei et sectae? dixit quod eorum magister dixit, et ita reperiunt dicti Barba eundo per mundum, quod propter malam et pessimam vitam Papac, Cardinalium, Episcoporum, et Sacerdotum, Religiosorum, et omnium aliorum ecclesiasticorum virorum, ipsi Barba sequuntur hanc fidem, et reperierint infinitos errores. Quia dicti Papa, Cardinales, Episcopi, et ecclesiastici viri, ducunt, et omnes sequuntur avaritiam, luxuriam, ac superbiam et pompas, peccatum gulac et irac; et in hoc omnes viri ecclesiastici errant; et eorum hoc est potissimum fundamentum, quia viri ecclesiastici male et pessime vivunt.

Dicens ulterius, quod postquam ipsi viri ecclesiastici sunt in peccato mortali, non possunt ministrare sacramenta, nec valent ea quae ipsi faciunt, quia quando efficiuntur sacerdotes, jurant castitatem, puritatem, et virginitatem, et quando eorumittunt peccata, frangunt fidem et juramentum, et veniunt contra fidem, et ex post perdunt omnimodam potestatem, quia quando eandela lucens mortua est, non potest aliam vivificare.

Dicens ulterius, quod non est Papa, nec Cardinalis, nec Episcopus, nec aliquis alius ecclesiasticus vir, qui ut plurimum non habeat suam dominam et suum regasum, qui dormiunt cum ipsis.

Dicens ulterius, quod dictus ejus magnus magister eisdem injunxit quod praedicarent et ampliarent eam fidem, et traherent gentes quantum possint ad illam, quia hoc faciendo lucrarentur vitam aeternam, cum omnes de eorum fide sunt salvati, ceteri vero damnati,

Dicens, quod quando eorum magnus magister.... appellat communitatem; quando facit eos Barbas, et dat potestatem, mutat eorum nomina, et quod ipse, antequam esset Barba effectus per dictam eorum communitatem, appellabatur Franciscus, et quando fuit factus Barba, imposuit sibi nomen Martinus.

Dicens ulterius, quod econstituuntur Barbae, et vacat officium Barbarum, et quando moritur aliquis Barba, substituitur unus alius loco illius.

Interrogatus si habeant provincias, dixit quod non, sed vadunt per mundum circumcirca.

Interrogatus quid ulterius injungebat eorum magister, et quid praedicare consueverunt Barbae per orbem, dixit quod dicebat, et ipsi praedicare consueverunt, quod unus solus Deus est adorandus, qui creavit coelum et terram, lunam, solem, et stellas, et aquam, et quod credant solum et dumtaxat ea quae vident.

Interrogatus quid dicebat eorum magister eisdem Barbis de sanctis, et quid praedicant de sanctis, dixit quod credunt in S. Petrum, et post ipsum in S. Gregorium, et Sylvestrum, et in S. Joannem Evangelistam; in S. Paulum vero non credunt, quia fuit assassinus.

Interrogatus quare melius credunt in Sanctum Petrum quam in S. Paulum, dixit quod ex eo, quia Deus constituit eundem S. Petrum vicarium suum, et dedit eidem potestatem absolvendi et ligandi, et quod ipse S. Petrus fecit ipso vivente miracula, et ideo credunt in ipsum inter ceterum.

Interrogatus quae miracula fecit? dixit, quod quando S. Petrus construi faciebat ecclesiam Sancti Petri in Roma, Diabolus venit ad ipsum, et dixit eidem, Ego faciam construere pulchriorem domum quam tu in breviori tempore, dicens, quod in crastinum; et modicum post Diabolus dixit S.

Petro, Venias ad videndum domum quam feci dum.... quod quando intrabis dictam domum quam feci, aliquo pacto non facias signum crucis. Et eo tunc S. Petrus venit ad visitandum dictam ecclesiam seu domum, et cum fuit in conspectu dictae domus, quae nunc dicitur Sancta Maria de Rotunda, cum cautela fecit signum crucis, dicendo, et apponendo manum ad barbam, et per istam sanctam barbam: deinde ponendo manum ad stomachum, dicendo, Per istum sanctum fontem: deinde ad brachia dextra et sinistra, dicendo, Per istas spatulas, ista est domus pulchra: quo signo crucis ut supra facto, Diabolus voluit ipsam domum destruere; sed Sanctus Petrus impedit ipsum, et adjurationem ejus fecit. Et quia dictus S. Petrus emt in valvis Ecclesiae, Diabolus non potuit exire per januam, sed affigens pedes in terram, dimisit vestigia, et exivit per unum foramen quod fecit in summitate Ecclesiae, et quod foramen adhuc est nunc, nec potuit ex post reparari; et propter dictum miraculum, quod videtur oculariter, credunt in S. Petrum: in aliis autem sanctis non credunt, quia fuerunt peccatores, et non viderunt eorum miracula.

De Sancto autem Johanne Baptista dixit, quia non petiit gratiam a Domino, expectatur quod in diem iudicii intercedet pro omnibus, et nescitur si est in terra vel in eoelo, et credit quod est in paradiso terrestri.

Dicens ulterius, quod in angelis, archangelis, cherubim, et semphim credunt, quia fuerunt creati a Deo Patre in vita actema.

De Virg. Maria autem dixit, quod quia solus Deus est adorandus, non sunt certi quod Virgo Maria audiat preces nostras, quia fuit humana creatura, et quod *Ave Maria* non est oratio, sed annunciatio et salutatio, et ideo non injungunt in poenitentiam eis qui sunt de eorum secta, quod dicant *Ave Maria*, et quod solus *Pater Noster* est vera oratio, quia a Deo facta fuit oratio illa.

De purgatorio dixit, quod nullum est purgatorum, sed viri ecclesiastici propter avaritiam ipsorum reperierunt ad extorquendas pecunias pro missis et orationibus dicendis, quae de nihilo prosunt; quia postquam homo moritur, aut est salvatus, aut est damnatus.

De aqua benedicta dixit, quod praedicant, dicunt, et credunt, quod omni anno de mensibus Maii, et in die Ascensionis Domini, quod Deus benedicit coelum, terram, aquam, herbas, flumina, fontes, et omnes fructus; et quod

illa benedictio est securior quam illa quae fit a Presbyteris, quia non valet, nisi sint puri et mundi ab omni peccato; et quia quamplurimum Sacerdotes sunt peccatores, ut supra dixit, et per consequens et hujusmodi rationes non credunt in aliis sacramentis ministratis per viros ecclesiasticos.

Dicens ulterius, quod tantum valet orare in stabulo quantum in templo, quia Deus est ubique.

De festivitibus autem dixit, quod festa quae sunt praecepta a Deo, prout est dies Dominicus, festum Nativitatis Domini, festum Paschae Ascensionis, et Pentecostes, sunt celebranda; alia autem festa Virginis Mariae et sanctorum sunt festacula, et qui non vult non tenetur illa celebrare, quia non sunt praecepta, nec vigiliae ipsarum festivitatum sunt jejunandae.

De corpore Christi dicunt, quod quia viri ecclesiastici sunt ut supra mali, et pessimae vitae, et peccatores, quod non possunt consecrare corpus Christi, et non valet consecratio per ipsos facta; ideo ipsi Barbari, et qui sunt de eorum secta, non recipiunt Eucharistiam, sed loco Eucharistiae benedicunt panem, et dicunt, quod illa benedictio est majoris virtutis quam dicta consecratio, ex eo quia tantum quantum quis habet bonitatis et puritatis, tantum habet et potestatis.

De peccato camis autem dixit in primis, quod eundo per mundum, et praedicando de nocte faciunt congregationes et synagogas, in quibus in primis praedicatio fit per ipsas Barbaras, et facta praedicatione incipiunt festa, solatia, et choreas ducere invicem discurrendo per locum ubi sunt cum candela accensa, atque quod se ad invicem teneant per manus, et celebratis ipsis festis et solatiis, alter ipsorum, et nescitur quis, suffocat lumen; quo suffocato, quilibet opemtur, exercet corpora super peccato camis, prout accidit casualiter, nec ibidem habetur respectus ad patrem, matrem, filiam, nec ad aliquod, dicens, quod si in dicta synagoga generetur filius, quod ille filius erit in futurum aptior ad exercendum officium Barbarum, praedicationum, et confessionum, quam aliquis alius, quia genitus est in dicta synagoga: celebrata dicta synagoga, quilibet recedit.

Dicens ulterius, quod ipsa synagoga fit semel in anno in qualibet patria, et quod Barba qui est de patria in qua fit synagoga interest in ipsa synagoga, quia habet ibidem parentes; si autem non est de patria, solum praedicat, et

post dimittit fieri inter ipsos eorum synagogam, ex eo quia non posset se immiscere cum parentibus suis, et aliter non se poneret in dicta synagoga, nisi haberet parentes.

Extra autem synagogam dicunt, tenent, et praedicant, quod peccatum luxuriae non est peccatum, nisi de matre ad filium, et e converso; et de compatre ad commatrem, et non ultra: rationem reddens, quia a Deo est facta prohibitio de filia ad matrem. Nam cum Deus ascenderet ad caelum, dixit vulgariter et formaliter ut sequitur, Crescite et multiplicate, et Saint Joanne garda te et done sariti saliiti una voutla non S. toriali pie.

Interrogatus quod declaret illa verba? dixit, quod Deus ascendendo caelos dixit praedicta verba, intelligendo quod homo non debet reverti ad vulvam matris unde exivit, et dicendo respicite S. Joannem Baptistam, quia Sanctus Joannes Baptista baptisavit Christum; et ex praedictis per legem Divinam prohibita est conjunctio de filio et de commatre; unius autem alia carnalis copula permissa est, quia non est prohibita a Deo, sed solum ab Ecclesia; et ideo indifferenter cognoscunt se adinvicem, et utuntur dicta carnali copula, nec contradicunt sibi invicem, quia melius est nubere quam uri.

Dicens ulterius, quod inter ipsos est honor quando Barbac agnoscunt eorundem Valdensium et de *secta filias*.

Et ulterius, si aliquis de secta ipsorum requirat aliquam mulierem, non contradicunt, quia non est peccatum, nec respiciunt parentes, nisi ut supra.

Dicens, quod habent articulum inter ipsos qui sunt de secta, quod unus subveniat alteri, ex quo mulieres non audent eisdem negare vel contradicere.

Super jurejurando dixit, quod nullo pacto jurandum est, quod nullo modo jurant inter ipsos, nec pro vero, nec pro falso, quia est peccatum mortale.

Dicens ulterius, quod pro quovis delicto. quantumcunque gravi, quis non tradendus est morti nisi sit homicida.

Dicens ulterius, quod quando creantur Barbac per eorum comites et magistrum, magister convocat certos alios Barbac sectae ut supra dixit, quod addendo ad ea quae supra deposuit; dicunt et juramentum praestant ipsi Barbac prout formaliter sequitur, Tu talis jura supra la fide tua de mantenere; multiplicare et accrescere nostra lege et de non la discoperire a

persona dal monde, et que tu prometes de non jurare Dieu anul modo, et que garda la domeneg, et que non farai altro coisino causa que non uvelho que sie fato a te, et que tu credie en Dieu, que a fat el sol et la luna, coelum et terram, cherubim et semphim et aquel que tu vedes: et pracstito dicto juramento, magnus magister dat eidem Barbac, sic fato, ad bibendum modicum vini; extunc mutat sibi nomen, dicendo, Desi en la la te chamaras tal; et quod ipse loquens prius vocabatur Franciscus, et nunc vocatur Martinus inter ipsos, et quod illa solemnitas habetur loco baptismi.

Dicens ulterius, quod quando ipsi Barbac audiunt confessiones a gentibus de eorum secta secretam, nec confiteantur Sacerdotibus, nec recipiant Eucharistiam nisi fecte et simulate, injungunt eis quod dictam sectam teneant.

Dicens ulterius, quod postquam exercuit officium Barbarum dictac sectac per Italiam spatio sex annorum vel circa, quod a duobus annis citra transivit per montes pergendo versus provinciam Provinciac et regnum Franciac, et prima vice cum quodam alio Barba vocato Antonio de Pilhocalia de Spoleto, et anno elapso ipsi duo venerunt et transiverunt per montem Cinescium, et venerunt ad regnum Franciac, et fuerunt in provinciis Borbonii et de Rodes, Forest Alvemii, de Marca usque ad patriam de Bordelleis, et in dictis provinciis pracdicaverunt eorum sectam, et confessi fuerunt quod plures in dictis provinciis de dicta eorum secta ad dictam sectam traxerunt quantum potuerunt.

Dicens ulterius, quod reperierunt se quidem alii Barbac in loco de Lymogiis, unde Colla de Joanne Baptista, de Thomasso, Paulo de Mala Came, Bartholomeo de Mocarello, Bastiano Luce, omnes de patria Spolitana, qui docuerunt ipsum loquentem, et ejus socium, et alios de eorum secta; et docuerunt eos loca ad quae possent accedere, et ibidem pracdicare, et quod extunc juverunt ad pracdicandum ad dictas patrias et regiones, ut supra.

Interrogatus quomodo nominantur omnes tenentes eorum sectam, dixit, quod de ultra montes in regno Franciac appellantur Pauperes de Lugduno, de citra vero montes in patria Italiac appellantur Pauperes Mundi; isto veto anno venit cum Andrea etiam ejus socius Barba, et venerunt per patriam Januac; deinde per Niciam et ad civitatem Aquensem; deinde ad patriam de Vivaresio, ubi repererunt aliquos de ista secta.

Ibidem in montibus Albenacii et de Privacio, ex post versus Alvemiam apud Clarum montem, unde ad montem de *Monte aureo*; in quo monte sunt plums de dicta secta, et ibidem multi reperiuntur, et ibidem maxime augmentatur propter malam vitam quam tenent ecclesiastici viri.

Item ulterius dixit, quod ista secta crescit et pullulat in locis de Heretable de Stabulo, in Crapona et Sineria in eadem regione Alvergniac, et etiam in patria Foresii, in montibus de Fumiis, in Foretio, et de Sancto Saforino; deinde venit ad patriam Belvosii, in qua etiam viget dicta secta; unde in locis seu montibus prope villam Belli Joci et prope villam Francam, et de loco Belli Joci venerunt Lugdunum; et cum fuerunt in civitate Lugduni, ubi die ultima Maii proxime fluxi, hospitati fuerunt retro Sanctum Nicesium in dicto loco signi forpicum, et se repperunt ibidem ex delibemtionem inter eos facta octo Barbac, unde alii sex cum ipsis duobus vocantur Pascalis de Pasco, Jacobus de Laro, Petrus Matthei de Capriano, Hucho de Andrea, Pasturius de Jaco, et cum supradicto, Petrus de Jaco, qui pracsentialiter detinetur cum dicto loquente, qui omnes octo sunt de patria Spolitana, et ibidem adinvicem congregati habuerunt conferentiam de gestis et gerendis per ipsos, recitantes loca unde veniebant et quo ibant.

Interrogatus, quis ipsorum sex reddebat rationem de patria Delphinatus? dixit quod Paschalis et Pastuchinus, et dicebant, quod fuerunt in Dalphinatu, et repperierunt multos in patria Valentiniensium in montibus de secta Valdensium; et fuerunt etiam in patria Ebredunensi et Vapincensi, ubi etiam repperiebant multos qui fuerunt banniti ab eorum patria, et ejecti ab eorum domibus, et propter maximas tribulationes quas habuerunt aliqui ex eis, dicebant quod volebant tenere bonam fidem: alii vero dicebant quod credebant habere remedium, et quod volebant habere et tenere eorum sectam.

Dicens ulterius, quod cum ipse et alius Andreas Barba ejus socius, de mense Martii proxime fluxu transirent per Provinciam veniendo ab eorum domibus, in ipsa patria Provinciac et prope civitatem Aquensem repperierunt tres qui dicebant quod erant de Dalphinatu, qui tres agnoverunt ipsos Barbas in habitibus eorum, videlicet in mantellis, et habuerunt invicem verba de dicta eorum secta; et ipsi tres homines dixerunt, quod erant banniti, et expectabant habere gratiam et restitui in eorum bonis et patria, et continuare in eorum proposito primo.

Item dixit, quod ipse Paschalis et Pastuchinus qui fuerunt in Dalphinatu, dicebant, quod quantum potuerunt conati fuerunt consolari ipsos bannitos et expulsos a Dalphinatu, sed causante dura et nimia persecutione compatiebantur vecordes et remissi; alii autem erant malac voluntatis redeundi, spemntes habere gratiam.

Dicens ulterius, quod pracnominati duo Barbac dicebant, quod habebant magnos persecutores, et ipsos in patria Delphinatus, viz. Reverend. Dominum Archiepiscopum Ebredunensem, et Dominum Poncium Poncii Consiliarium, et Dominum Oroncium Eme Judicem gran. quem Dominum Poncium comminabantur; quod si ipsum reperirent, facerent sibi ex fato suo.

Dicens ulterius, quod ipsi octo Barbac discesserunt omnes a civitate Lugduni, et ipse loquens mutavit socium, quia loco dicti Andreac Barbac, cepit dictum Barbara Petrum pracsentialiter detentum; alii vero Barbac discesserunt, et retrocesserunt ad eorum patriam ex delibemtionem inter eos facta, ut dicebant.

Dictus autem Petrus Barba, ejus novus socius et ipse loquens reversi sunt ad Dominam nostram de Podio, ut supra dixit, et ad alia loca Alvergniac, Foresii, Belli Joci, tendendo ad civitatem d'Autun in Burgundia, in qua duo, et in quadam valle, in qua est quoddam proximum flumen, quod discurrit a flumine de Lem; in qua valle sunt aliqui de dicta secta, et ex post venerunt per patriam Belli Joci, unde prope villam dicti Belli Joci et Villac Francac, ubi etiam de eorum secta consortes multi sunt et ibidem morantur, et exinde redierunt Lugdunum ad praedictum hospitium, et ex post arripuerunt viam apud Bressam et ad Sanctum Glaudium, et in Sancto Glaudio, et in quibusdam montibus citra et ultra; ubi sunt plures de eorum secta. Quilibet praedicant et eos de confessione audiunt, et exinde recesserunt et iverunt Gebennas et Niciacum, et a Niciaco ad locum Aquac Bellac; de Aqua Bella ad Camemm, et ibidem prope Camemm aliquos paucos comperierunt de eorum secta; deinde venerunt ad montem de Valono, Neuachiam et Bardonenchiam; et de Bardonenchia ad locum Ulcii; et inde Juvencellori et Salicis Ulcii usque prope collem Costac Planac, transeuntes apud Pratum Jalatum, in quo monte fuerunt capti et reversi, ducti, ultra reducti ad villam Ulcii per Officiarios Dalphinales Ulcii, ut apparet in processu super hoc facto.

Interrogatus, si sciebat quod in valle Prati Jallati erant aliqui de eorum secta? dixit, quod sic voce et fama referentibus, et quod si dicti de Prato Jalato voluissent confiteri eis, audivissent eos, et quod illa spe transivemnt per dictum locum animo exercendi eorum officium et ad consolandum dictos Valdenses ibidem commorantes.

Interrogatus, quando audivit aliquos de confessione quomodo consueverunt ipsos absolvere? dixit et respondet, quod non faciunt more Sacerdotum, sed dicunt eis quod teneant eorum sectam firmam; et insuper injungunt eisdem quod dicent aliquibus vicibus *Pater noster* pro poenitentia, non autem *Ave Maria*, neque permittunt peregrinationes Italiac, elemosynas ex amore Dei.

Interrogatus, si inter ipsos Barbas de ista secta fecerunt delibemtionem de se reperiendo in aliquo loco? dixit, quod duo alii, videlicet Joannes de Cristophoro et Libemtus de Coqueto, se debebant reperire cum ipsis duobus, videlicet, ipso loquente et ejus socio, in loco de Tortona in Lombardia.

Interrogatus, ubi habuit colloquium cum ipsis duobus proxime nominatis, Joanne Cristophoro et Libemto de Coqueto? dixit, quod ipsi una cum ipso Petro ejus socio ibidem detentis.

Interrogatus, quando audit aliquos de confessione de ipsa secta, de quibus peccatis ut plurimum confitentur? dixit, quod quando cohabitatur filius cum matre, et pater cum filia, et cum commatre et compatre, extra tamen synagogam, et quod multi confitentur persevemre in dictis peccatis, et cohabitare cum ipsis.

Dicens ulterius, quod confitentur de septem peccatis mortalibus, et non de aliis peccatis.

ISTA Peyronetta citata vetit, et tamen medio juramento, omnia negavit, tamen jussa mitti in carcerem, et missa, omnia sponte confessa est; videlicet, quod a viginti quinque annis eos vidit et cognovit, eorum pradicaciones audivit, de non jurando per Deum, de festis aliquibus non colendis, de non potestate Sacerdotum, et sacpe de purgatorio, et vanum orare pro mortuis, de aqua benedicta, de dando potius elemosynas pauperibus quam in ecclesia offerendo, de sanctis quod non habeant potestatem nos juvandi, de Romipetagiis, de jejunio, et unde ortum

habuerit secta, et quomodo oblationes desinunt facere, quomodo vidit eos novem aut decem vicibus, et quatuor vicibus eisdem confessa est peccata sua, nec unquam confessa est Curato suo, eis credidit et fidem dedit, misericordiam petiit, et repetita fuit.

*Processus Inquisitionis contra Peyronettam, ex codice H.
Waldensium in public. Biblioth. Cantabrig.*

INQUISITIONALIS processus factus et formatus coram egregiis et circumspcctis viris Dominis Antonio Fabri, Decretorum Doctore, Canonico Ebredunensi, hacreticacque pravitatis in toto Dalphinatu, et comitatibus Viennensis, Valentinensis, et Diensis, Genemli Inquisitore, a sancta sede apostolica specialiter et immediate deputato, et Christofforo de Salhiente etiam Decretorum Doctore, Canonico, Vicario, et Officiali Valentiac.

Ad instantiam et prosecutionem honorandi viri Domini Valentini de Razeriis, Jurium Professoris, Procuratorisque Fiscalis Valentiac, et in hac parte promotoris in favorem sanctae fidei Catholicac, ejusque Officii Inquisitionis Deputati.

Contra et adversus Peyronettam relictam Petri Bemudi, alias Fornerii, loci Belli Respectus, Valentinensis dioecesis, actatis suac quinquaginta annorum vel circa, de nefandissima hacresi Valdensium, seu Pauperum de Lugduno, quae in his partibus vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum secta, inculpatam et diffamatam.

In nomine sanctae et individuac Trinitatis. Ex serie atque tenore hujusmodi veri publici inquisitionalis, omnibus et singulis et Christi fidelibus tam praesentibus quam inde futuris luculenter innotescat, et in perpetuam redigatur memoria. Ex anno nativitatis Domini millesimo quatercentesimo nonagesimo, quarto, et die Mercurii quae fuit, et intitulata extitit vigesima nona mensis Januarii, apud locum Belli Respectus, et in domo probi viri Glaudii sua hospitis ipsius loci, et in camem nova ipsius domus, coramque egregio et circumspccto viro Domino Antonio Fabri, Decretorum Doctore, Canonico Ebredunensi, Inquisitore sanctae fidei Catholicac, autoritate apostolica deputato, cum assistentia mei Vincencii Gobaudi notarii, et in hac parte conscribac, de cujus quidem Domini Inquisitoris potestate constat, literis apostolicis in forma brevi inferius loco et ordine insertis.

Comparuit ibidem praedicta Peyronetta, relicta Petri Bemudi, alias Fornerii, Belli Respectus, Valenciensis dioecesis, quae de mandato et auctoritate ejusdem Domini Inquisitoris praecedentibus debitis informationibus contra eam ad causam haeresis pauperum de Lugduno, sive Valdensium quae in his partibus vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum secta, quae inculpata et diffamata existit, sumptis atque receptis factisque monitionibus genemlibus contra quoscunque dicta labe infectos in parochia dicti loci executis, personaliter citata extitit ad respondendum de fide Catholica, necnon de his quibus est inculpata ad causam haeresis praedictae, et ibidem per memoratum Dominum Inquisitorem, suo medio juramento ad sancta Dei Evangelia praestito, et ad poenam perjurii, et criminis sibi imposki, habendi pro integraliter confessato ac excommunicationis et viginti quinque ducatorum auri, de veritate dicenda super his quibus interrogabitur, examinata et interrogata; quae quidem Peyronetta praedicta volens, ut dixit, mandatis et praecipis justitiae obtemperare atque parere, paratam se obtulit omnem quam super his quibus interrogabitur siverit veritatem dicere et deponere, et licet sit foemina simplex et ignara ac ingenio grossa, tamen dixit vixisse toto tempore vitae suae ad instar et modum fidelium Christianorum, et secundum sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae traditionem, adeo quod non praetendit unquam a vera fide Catholica deviasse nec aberrasse, nec per ea quacunque dicet deviare seu aberrare intendit, de quo fuit solemniter protestata.

Et praelibatus Dominus Inquisitor, non obstantibus excusationibus supra per dictam Peyronettam deductis et allegatis, ex sui officii incumbentia, etiam propter notoriam diffamationem dictae Peyronettae, prout latius ex tenore dictarum secretarum informationum colligitur, ideo ipsam duxit examinandam et interrogandam per modum infra scriptum.

Et primo fuit praenominata Peyronetta in hac parte delata per praelibatum Dominum Inquisitorem interrogata et examinata qua de causa seu ad quid venit? dicta Peyronetta coram eodem Domino Inquisitore dixit et respondit quod, ex eo quia fuit citata, et advocata personaliter coram eodem Domino Inquisitore comparitura pro respondendo de fide Catholica, aut se exeusando super inquisitione haeresis sectae Valdensium, seu alias Chagmardorum nuncupatae, contra eam ut asseritur formata.

Interrogata quid est dicta hacresis sive secta Valdensium, alias Chagmardorum? dixit et respondit nescire, neque scire velle quid sit.

Interrogata an ullo unquam tempore viderit seu cognoverit nonnullos dictac hacresis sive sectac magistros seu pracdicatores qui discurrere solent per rura et loca campestria eundo de domo ad domum, faciendo pracdicationes clandestinas? dixit et respondit quod non, nec scit quinam dicantur dicti pracdicatores.

Interrogata an ullo unquam tempore audiverit aliquas pracdicationes sive documenta ab aliquibus hominibus secrete pracdicantibus, pracsertim horis nocturnis? dixit et respondit quod non.

Interrogata si sciat se esse de secta quae vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum diffamatam et inculpatam? dixit et respondit quod non, nec posse super hoc caput credi, inculpari seu diffamari legitimo titulo aut ratione aliqua.

Interrogata an unquam fuerit requisita aut instigata per quospiam de tenendo sectam ipsam, aut aliam quamcunque? dixit et respondit quod non.

Interrogata an sciat aliquos de loco pracdicto Belli Respectus fore et esse de secta pracdicta Chagmardorum? dixit et respondit quod non.

Interrogata an ipsa Peyronetta sit de secta pracdicta Chagmardorum, aut alias unquam ipsam sectam tenuerit, sive in eadem instructa fuerit? dixit et respondit, quod non est, nec unquam fuit de secta ipsa, nec esse, nec fuisse vult.

Interrogata an velit stare depositionibus testium fide dignorum ubi dicant eam esse de dicta secta? dixit et respondit quod ita, dum tamen non sint sibi suspecti aut inimici.

Interrogata an habeat aliquos inimicos de quibus dubitare posset aliquid contra eam dicere velle contra veritatem? respondit se nescire.

Amplius non fuit interrogata nec examinata; sed audita ipsius Peyronettac responsione per pracdictum Dominum Inquisitorem, quia secundum mentem et tenorem informationum contra eandem ad causam hacresis pracdictac sumptarum, eidem Domino Inquisitori visum fuit ipsam Peyronettam nimis sufficienter super pracmissis respondisse, veritatemque nullatenus dixisse: ideo volens latius cum ea inquirere,

ordinavit ipsam duci apud carceres episcopales Valentiac, et ibidem tute custodiri et detineri donec sufficientius de his quibus ex tenore dictarum informationum reperitur culpabilis, responderit.

Demum vero anno quo supra, et die Veneris quae fuit, et intitulata extitit ultima mensis Januarii, apud Valentiam, et palatio episcopali ejusdem, videlicet in camem residentiac praelibati Domini Inquisitoris, ac coram eodem existens et personaliter constituta praenominata Peyronetta mandato ejusdem Domini Inquisitoris infra carceres episcopales detenta, quae, ut dixit, attendens et considemns exhortationes sibi novissime factas de dicendo veritatem super interrogatoriis tangentibus sectam praedictam, promittendo sibi gratiam et misericordiam si id faceret, ideo meliori et salubriori uti volens consilio, non obstantibus perjuriis, et aliis variationibus per eam superius in respondendo commissis, confidendo ad plenum de benignitate ipsius Domini Inquisitoris, paratam se obtulit omnem veritatem quam super meritis ipsius sectae sciverit dicere et sponte confiteri, ac suam exonemte conscientiam, rogando sibi indulgeri et parceri ratione perjurii et de vacillationibus praedictis, et inde suam depositionem sive confessionem benigniter admitti, erroresque suos, si quos habeat, caritative et gratiose corrigi, submittendo se misericordiac et ordinationi sanetae matris Ecclesiae.

Et praelibatus Dominus Inquisitor, recepto ab ipsa Peyronetta corporali juramento de veritate dicenda praestito, impositaque sibi poena perjurii et rigorosae sibi ferendae justitiae, casu quo quidquam de ipsa veritate maliciose occultaverit, ad ipsius examen processit, in hunc qui sequitur modum infrascriptum.

In primis enim dixit et sponte confessa est, quod dudum sunt viginti quinque anni elapsi, vel circa, quibus venerunt ad domum quondam Petri Fornerii sui mariti duo homines extranei, induti vestibus grisei coloris, qui, ut sibi visum fuit, loquebantur lingua Italica, sive Lombardica, quos praedictus ejus maritus receperit in dicta sua domo, amore Dei: tandem ipsis ibidem existentibus hora nocturna, post coenam unus ipsorum legere coepit unum parvum librum quem secum deferebat, dicendo in eodem descripta fuisse Evangelia, et praecepta legis, quae ibidem dicebat se explicare et declarare velle in praesentia omnium ibidem circumstantium, quia dicebat se fore missum ex parte Dei ad reformandam fidem

Catholicam, eundo per mundum ad instar Apostolorum pro praedicando bonis et simplicibus gentibus de modo et forma serviendi Deo, et vivendi secundum ejus mandata.

Et inter ceterum dicebant quod nemo alteri facere debet id quod sibi fieri nollet.

Item quod solus Deus est colendus et adorandus, et deprecandus, quia ipse solus est qui nos potest juvare.

Item quod jurare pro quavis occasione vel causa Deum, pro vero vel mendacio, aut aliud quodcumque facere juramentum ubi poneretur ista locutio *per*, est magnum peccatum.

Item quod sacramentum matrimonii debebat fideliter et firmiter custodiri.

Item quod bona opera quae fiunt ante mortem hominis plus prosunt, quam omnia quae fiunt post mortem.

Item quod sancti et sanctae non erant deprecandi in nostrum auxilium, quia non poterunt nos in aliquo juvare nisi solus Deus.

Item quod dies Dominicales super omnia alia festa debebant solenniter coli, alia vero festa dicebant fuisse per Ecclesiam inventa, quae non erant de necessitate colenda; imo poterunt aliquis operari in ipsis, exceptis festivitatibus Apostolorum, et aliis majoribus quas non exprimebant.

Item quod viri ecclesiastici nimias habebant et possidebant divitias atque bona ultra quam oportebat, ob quod multa mala faciebant, quorum aliqui, causantibus eorum superfluitatibus et bonorum abundantibus, erant foenemtores, usurarii, superbi, et avaritia pleni; alii vero nimis lubriciter et inhoneste vivebant, tenendo meretrices in domibus suis palam et publice, sic malum exemplum ostendendo in populo.

Item quod praedicti Sacerdotes, eorum causante mala vita, non habebant majorem potestatem absolvendi quam habebant ipsi praedicatores, sive hujus sectae magistri, imo ipsi magistri sive praedicatores, licet essent laici, habebant tantam potestatem quantum ipsi Sacerdotes.

Item quod summus Pontifex ex quo non observabat sanctitatem quam debebat observare, non habebat aliquam potestatem, dicendo de eodem in

Haec verba, *Autant crois et autant malvais est le Pape comme nengun autre, et per se non sages de puissance.*

Item quod in alio mundo nullum emt purgatorium, dicendo, quod quando quis moritur, ejus anima tendit ad paradisum, illico et incontinenter, dummodo bene et juste vixerit; si vero male, ad infemum.

Item et subsequenter quod frustra fiebant deprecationes, cantaria et alia suffragia pro animabus defunctorum; nihilque valebat id quod faciebant Sacerdotes eundo per coemiterium, aspergendo aquam benedictam supra sepulturas mortuorum, dicendo, Kirie Eleyson, Christe Eleyson, etc.

Item quod Deus in initio mundi omnes aquas benedixemt, et omnia alia quae fecemt, propter quod non emt necesse itemto aquam benedicere per Sacerdotes, quae etiam nihil plus valebat quam alia aqua.

Item quod praeconominati Sacerdotes ex semetipsis invenemnt seu reperiemnt, quod in alio mundo emt purgatorium, ad effectus ut faciendo cantaria et deprecationes pro defunctis, majora sibi acquirant bona, ex quibus eorum malam vitam sustinerent.

Item quod melius et magis meritorium emt dare elemosynam alicui pauperi infirmo aut leproso, quam offerre in ecclesia Sacerdotibus praedictis, qui erant nimis abundantes bonis.

Item quod ita bonum et utile emt orare Deum in domo aut alibi, sicut in ecclesia, quia Deus ubique est.

Item quod sancti nec sanctae, quamvis propter eorum bene merita essent in paradiso collocati, non habebant potestatem nos in aliquo juvandi, et ideo non debebant deprecari in nostrum auxilium.

Item quod in vanum emt recurrere ad imagines sanctorum et sanctatum, orando coram ipsis, quia nullam habebant virtutem, cum non essent nisi res materiales et pieturac factae in parietibus.

Item propterea nihil prodesse potemt facere peregrinationes et Romipetagia ad orandum coram imaginibus sanctorum et sanctarum, cum nihil possint in nostrum auxilium, ut praedictum est.

Item quod non emt necesse jejunare aliquas alias vigiliis quam festivitatum Paschac, Pentecostes, Nativitatis et aliarum magnarum festivitatum Dominicalium, et potissime diebus Veneris emt etiam jejunandum.

Item quod ipsi pracdicatores sive magistri hujusmodi sectac, et Sacerdotes seu viri ecclesiastici olim solebant esse unius et ejusdem legis et ordinis, sed cum ipsi viri ecclesiastici voluerunt insequi avaritiam et vanitates hujus mundi, et ipsi pracdicatores in ipsa paupertate manere voluerunt; ideo fuit facta inter eos divisio, et effecti fuerunt inimici, adeoque cum numerus ipsorum pracdicatorum et aliorum hominum justorum hujusmodi sectam tenerint, adhuc esset parvus atque rarus, ideo eis emt necesse incedere occulte, sicut faciebant Christus et ejus Apostoli; quia nisi ipsi pracdicatores ambularent caute et secrete, dubitabant ab aliis offendi et male tractari.

Interrogata de nominibus ipsorum hominum sive pracdicatorum talia pracdicantium? dixit et respondit nescivisse eorum nomina.

Interrogata an propter ea quae dicebant, non esse orandum pro defunctis, distulerit et obmiserit pottare oblationes seu offerre in ecclesia pro ipsis defunctis? dixit et respondit quod multoties fecit oblationes in ecclesia, quas non fecisset nisi dubitasset quod aliqui male pracsumpsissent de ea, et quod sibi impromemretur quod esset Chagnarda.

Interrogata quis dedit sibi notitiam dictorum pracdicatorum sive magistrorum, seu alias quomodo introducta fuit ad conversandum cum eis? dixit et deposuit verum esse quod olim ipsa loquente existente cum Telmono Paschalis, quodam dicti loci Belli Respectus, quadam die de qua non recolit, et ipsis adinvicem de multis rebus conferentibus, descenderunt in propositum de modo vivendi secundum mandata Dei, et inter cactem alia verba inter eos tunc habita, pracnominatus Telmonus Paschalis dixit sibi loquenti Haec verba vel eis similia, videlicet, *Aves nous james auvi parler dung plen pung de mond, que si non em, tout le monde saria a fin:* quae quidem loquens sibi respondit quod ita, videlicet cuidam domino Andreac.... . de loco Pigesoni, Capellano, olim Vicario ipsius loci Belli Respectus, qui quadam die Ramis Palmarum, pracdicando in ipso loco Belli Respectus dicebat similia verba, videlicet, *Ces ung plen pung de gent que sosten tot le mond, et si aquello gent non em, tot le monde saria a fin;*

quo tunc praenominatus Telmonus Paschalis replicavit in Haec verba, *Et daquelles gens vos parle yeu*; dicendo sibi quod si contingeret ipsas gentes venire ad ejus domum, quod audacter loqueretur cum eis, et eorum documenta auscultaret, cum exinde melius se haberet; tamen dixit quod dictus Telmonus dubitabat ipsam, ne alicui praemissa panderet seu detegeret, ut moris est mulierum superflue loqui, ideo sibi fecit fieri juramentum super literis de non dicendo aut manifestando alicui quidquam de praemissis, prout et ipsa loquens fecit, et ex post ipsa loquens fuit inclinata et affecta videre dictas gentes prout fecit ut supra.

Interrogata si viderit dictos magistros sive praedicatores, de quibus superius ultra vicem praedictam? dixit et respondit quod a supradicto tempore viginti quinque annorum citra, vidit diversis vicibus, de quarum numero dixit se non posse bene recordari; tamen existimatione sua credit eos vidisse in universo novem aut decem vicibus, inclusa prima vice superius declarata.

Interrogata an qualibet vice qua eos vidit, audiverit similia documenta, modo et forma quibus superius declaravit? dixit et respondit quod ita.

Item, de dictis novem vel decem vicibus quibus dictos magistros praedicantes vidit et audivit? dixit dicta loquens quod fuit aliquoties in domo praenominati Telmoni Paschalis et Guilliemi Paschalis, ubi ipsi praedicatores fuerunt et fecerunt eorum praedicationes modo praemisso, praesentibus omnibus illis de eadem domo, videlicet dicto Telmono et Guilliemo Paschalis; de nominibus autem aliorum praesentium dixit se non recordari.

Item, similiter dixit eos vidisse in domo Petri Gamerii ejusdem loci certis vicibus, de quibus nec de tempore non potest recordari, ubi etiam fuerint factae praedicationes praedictae, praesentibus eodem Petro Gamerii et aliis de eadem domo, quorum nomina ignorat.

Interrogata si aliqui alii circumvicini interfuerint in praedictis praedicationibus factis in domibus eorum Paschalorum et Petri Gamerii? dixit quod non, quantum sibi potest recordari.

Interrogata an sciat quantis vicibus dicti praedicatores fuerunt in domo sua sive sui quondam mariti? dixit et respondit juxta aestimationem suam,

quod fuerunt in dicta ejus domo quatuor aut quinque vicibus, et ibidem praedicationes assuetas fecerunt.

Interrogata qui sunt illi qui erant praesentes et audientes in dictis praedicationibus factis in domo praedicta? dixit et respondit quod Petrus Bemudi alias Fornerii ejusdem loquentisque maritus dum vivebat; necnon aliquoties ibidem veniebant Joannes Prodome, et aliquando Telmonus Paschalis quidam, et Guilielmus Paschalis ac Petrus Gamerii, seu eorum alter alterutris vicibus, et aliquoties duo vel tres eorundem simul.

Interrogata si unquam confessa fuerit peccata sua alicui ex dictis praedicatoribus sive magistris? dixit et respondit quod singulis vicibus quibus ipsi praedicatores fuerunt in domo sui quondam mariti, ipsa confessa est peccata sua alteri ex eis genibus flexis, ac si fuisset coram suo proprio Sacerdote, et inde, facta confessione, ipsam absolvebat, manum ad caput imponendo more Sacerdotum.

Interrogata quam poenitentiam sibi imponebant praedicti praedicatores sive magistri pro peccatis confessatis? dixit et respondit quod diceret frequenter *Pater noster*, et hoc tantum quantum possem, et quod jejunaret aliquibus diebus Veneris, et faceret aliquas elemosynas secundum suam facultatem.

Interrogata quot vicibus confessa est dictis praedicatoribus? dixit quod tantis vicibus quantis fuerunt in dicta eorum domo, videlicet quatuor aut quinque vicibus, prout supradictum est.

Interrogata an confessa fuerit Capellano suo vidisse et cognovisse praedictos magistros sive praedicatores, eorumque praedicationes audivisse? dixit et respondit quod non, quia non credebat male agere.

Interrogata si crediderit seu alias dederit fidem supradictis praedicatoribus sive magistris et eorum documentis et doctrinac? dixit et sponte confessa est quod tanquam mulier insipiens et innocens et facilis ad decipiendum, credit et dedit fidem eisdem praedicatoribus et eorum doctrinis sive documentis, credendo bene et salubriter agere; nec putabat propterea errare in aliquo. Veruntamen ubi videatur ant cognoscatur ipsam in aliquo aberrasse, se submitit benignac correctioni sanctae matris Ecclesiae et eorundem dominorum Inquisitoris sive Officialis, petendo de omnibus in

quibus potuit hactenus in praemissis errare, veniam et misericordiam sibi impertiri.

Memoratus enim Dominus Inquisitor, audita confessione praedictae Peironettae, volens super eadem delibemre, necnon cum eadem latius inquirere super praemissis, terminum statuit et assignavit eidem Peironettae ad latius deponendum et declarandum super praemissis et aliis audiendis, delibemtionem ejusdem Domini Inquisitoris hinc ad diem crastinam circa horam meridiei: et iterum ordinavit eam stare sub praedicta carcerum custodia.

Crastina autem die supra novissime per praelibatum Dominum Inquisitorem pro termino in causa hujusmodi assignata, quae fuit intitulata Sabbati, prima mensis Februarii in camem superius mentionata, et coram praememorato Domino Inquisitore venit et comparuit supranominata Peironetta ibidem per carcerium episcopalem de mandato praefati Domini Inquisitoris ad actum hujusmodi a carceribus ipsis educta, petens et humiliter requirens se a dictis carceribus relaxari, paratam se offerendo facere quae debebit, necnon latius respondere super omnibus quibus interrogabitur: et Dominus Inquisitor praefatus visa ipsius loquentis superius facta confessione, ad majorem veritatis corroborantiam duxit eandem super eadem et omnibus in ea contentis examinandam et repetendam, vigore juramenti per eam supra praestiti, ac sub poena qua supra. Quae quidem Peironetta delata, audito tenore jam dictae suae confessionis sibi per me notarium infra scriptum de verbo ad verbum in vulgari sermone recitatis et declaratis, ac per eam, ut dixit, integraliter intellectis, dixit, deposuit, et sponte confessa est ea omnia et singula in jam dicta ipsius depositione et confessione, singula singulis, contenta et descripta fore et esse verum et veritati consona, eisque tanquam recte et legitime dictis et confessatis, persistit, pro quibus omnibus et singulis se submitit misericordiae sanctae matris Ecclesiae et jam dictorum dominorum Inquisitoris et Officialis, petendo et requirendo se a carceribus quibus pro praemissis detinetur relaxari: et praeterea addendo praedictae suae confessioni dixit audivisse a suprafatis praedicatoribus sive magistris praedicatoribus, quod Sacerdotes recipientes pecunias pro missis celebrandis comparabantur Judae qui vendidit Christum propter pecuniam: et illi qui dabant ipsas pecunias dictis Sacerdotibus occasione ipsarum missarum, comparabantur Judae qui Christum emerunt pecuniis.

Item, addendo dixit et confessa est, quod praedicti praedicatores dum recedebant a domo sua aliquoties dabant sibi certam quantitatem acuum sive d'aiguilles, et ejus quondam maritus dum vivebat dabat eis pecunias pro poena ipsorum.

Interrogata quantum dabat eis dictus ejus quondam maritus pro dicta eorum poena, dixit nescire, quia non vidit numemri.

Interrogata qui sunt illi de dicta ejus domo qui dictos homines sive praedicatores viderunt, et audiverunt eorum praedicationes? dixit quod Francisca ejusdem loquentis filia et Simeon Acto maritus ipsius Franciscac.

Interrogata si fuerit unquam in loco de Bareillonia ubi dictos magistros praedicatores audiverit praedicantes? dixit et respondit verum esse, et sibi recordari quod olim sunt decem anni elapsi vel circa quibus Petrus Fornerii ejus quondam vir ac ipsa loquens accesserunt apud dictum locum Bareilloniac ad visitandum Fabrentes ipsius loci, quia erant et adhuc sunt affines ejus, et visitando steterunt ibidem uno vel duobus diebus, quo interim ipsa loquens et praedictus ejus maritus quondam, quodam vespere iverunt de domo Joannis Fabri ubi erant hospitati, ad domum Moneti Fabri, fratris ipsius Joannis, pro eundem Monetum visitando, tandem dum intrassent domum ipsius Moneti reperierunt ibidem duos ex praedicatoribus sive magistris praedictis, qui ibidem praesente dicto Moneto et ejus familia praedicabant: et videns dictus Monetus ipsam loquentem et ejus virum ibidem ex incogitato intrasse et advenisse, fuit valde tristatus atque iratus de adventu ipsorum conjugum ad causam dictorum praedicatorum ibidem secreto praedicantium, et videntes ipsa loquens et dictus ejus quondam vir, eundem Monetum esse ita iratum et male contentum propter adventure ipsorum, post modicum temporis ab ipsa domo recesserunt.

Interrogata quid sibi dixerunt supradicti duo praedicatores? dixit quod nihil.

Interrogata si propter adventum suum et sui viri, dicti praedicatores desierint praedicare? dixit quod non.

Interrogata an ipsa et ejus vir eo tunc cognoverunt dictos praedicatores esse de consortio et conversatione ipsorum? dixit et respondit quod in verbis suis cognovit eos esse de illis.

Interrogata si unquam alias vident dictos duos homines sive praedicatores in domo sua de Bello Respectu? dixit non posse recordari.

Interrogata quid dicebant dicti praedicatores in eorum praedicationibus? dixit non posse bene recordari, quia paucum steterunt ibidem propter turbationem praedicti Moneti.

Interrogata an dicti praedicatores eo tunc iverint ad domum supradicti Joannis Fabri? dixit quod non.

Amplius non fuit eo tunc interrogata, tamen praelibatus Dominus Inquisitor certis motus respectibus etiam ut dictae mulieri parcat laboribus et expensis, recepto prius ab eadem juramento per eam ad sancta Dei Evangelia praestito, de se repraesentando toties quoties vocabitur, impositaque sibi poena haereticis relapsis a jure indicta, casu quo comparere obmiserit, tandem a carceribus praedictis quibus ob causam hujusmodi detinebatur, dixit et jussit relaxandam usque ad primam delibemtionem sive novum mandatum.

Rursum vero anno quo superius et die Dominica Ramis Palmarum, computata vigesima tertia mensis Martii, apud locum praedictum Belli Respectus, et coram nobis Henrico Dileri Capellano, et Vincentio Gobaudi, notariis publicis et causae hujusmodi scribis, ac in hac parte commissis per egregium et circumspectum virum Dominum Christophorum de Salhiente Decretorum Doctorem Vicariumque, et Officiale Valentiac, viva voce oraculo expresse deputatis, et ibidem infra domum claustralem ipsius loci, vocata supradicta Peironetta, et ea in praesentia nostra personaliter constituta, ipsam juxta nobis commissam de et super omnibus et singulis per eam pridem superius dictis, et confessatis, eis omnibus prius lectis et in lingua vulgarica et laica de verbo ad verbum recitatis et declaratis; duximus repetendam et re-examinandam, quibus omnibus et singulis per eam ut dixit ad plenum perceptis, ejus medio juramento ad sancta Dei Evangelia praestito, impositaque sibi poena qua superius, videlicet quae de jure haereticis relapsis debetur de dicenda veritate, dicta Peironetta dixit et sponte confessa est ea omnia et singula supra per eam dicta, deposita et confessata, fore et esse veram, veritati consona, prout et quemadmodum scripta sunt superius, eisque omnibus et singulis tanquam recte et legitime confessatis atque depositis, persistit petendo continue veniam et misericordiam. Actum uti supra praesente venembili viro Domino

Guillielmo Blanchardi, Vicario dicti loci. Quibus sic gestis dicta Peironetta virtute juramenti per eam superius sacpissime practiti, ac sub poenis quibus supra praemissis se repraesentare coram praelibato Domino Inquisitore ac Domino Officiali toties quoties vocabitur ex parte eorum.

Processum, sive acta praecedentia, sumpsi et recepi ego Notarius
subsignatus,

GOBAUDI.

TO

THE QUEEN

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,

THIS defense of the Albigenses, the ancient and illustrious Confessors, who some ages ago enlightened the southern parts of France, is laid down at your Majesty's feet for your protection, as well as their successors do now fly into your dominions for relief. That charity which moves your Majesty to protect them by your gracious favor, and support them by your royal bounty, makes me presume to offer this historical apology to your sacred Majesty.

Their faith was in most things the same with that which our Reformers taught in opposition to the Church of Rome; and after all the endeavors that have been used to blacken them by the most horrid calumnies, as well as to destroy them by the cruelest inquisitions and croisades, the innocence of their lives, and the exemplariness of their deaths, makes them to be justly gloried in as the true authors of the Reformation.

It was from them that this Church (now so happy in your Majesty) received the first beams of that heavenly light which it now enjoys, and which it of late maintained with such vast advantages, that it is deservedly esteemed the chief body, as well as the justest glory, of the whole Reformation. The persecutions of those earliest restorers of the doctrine of Jesus Christ drove them out of their country, and forced many to fly into this kingdom for shelter, who brought with them the first seeds of those truths which have since yielded so plentiful an increase. There is nothing in this history that will either strike or charm. Those true disciples of their crucified Master were considerable for nothing but the purity of their doctrine, the innocence of their lives, and the patience as well as the constancy of their sufferings. But the glories of this world which surround your Majesty do not darken or lessen in your esteem these distinguishing characters of the religion of Christ our Savior, and of those his suffering

members, in whose afflictions you are pleased to take so great a share, that you do very much diminish their own sense of them, and make them so much the easier by those vast supports you give them.

May that God who has raised up your Majesty to support religion, and protect its confessors in their lowest circumstances, and who has so miraculously preserved and prospered the King and your Majesty in opposition to the enemies and persecutors of his truth, still pour down the richest of his blessings upon your Majesties; may you perfect what you have so gloriously begun; may you be long, great and happy here, and infinitely greater and happier for ever. These are the daily wishes and most earnest prayers of,

May it please your Majesty,

Your Majesty's most dutiful, most faithful,
and most obedient subject,

PETER ALLIX.

THE PREFACE

It was no hard matter for us to justify the Waldenses from the accusation of schism, which the Bishop of Meaux thought fit to charge upon them; for, by shewing the antiquity, purity, and succession of those churches, I have made it appear, that what the Bishop calls schism, ought in justice to be looked upon as a vigorous opposition to the false worship and usurpations of the Romish faction; and by consequence, that there is no more reason to call the Waldenses schismatics, because of their refusing subjection to the Pope, and rejecting the errors of the Church of Rome, than there is to call the Church of England schismatical for the same reasons.

But it is so long since the heads of the Church of Rome have founded their design of an universal monarchy, and so have fitted their style to their pretensions, that it is now become a very familiar thing with them, to treat those as rebels and schismatics, who will not submit to their authority: so that we need not wonder, if they, who have espoused the interest of the Church of Rome, and who defend her against the Protestants, do boldly charge those with schism against whom they write, without giving themselves the trouble of proving their charge.

Nay, perhaps we are to think ourselves obliged to the Bishop of Meaux, who, raising himself a little above the common method of the Doctors of his own communion, has limited himself to accuse the Waldenses of schism only, whereas he might with as much reason have charged them with heresy, if he had followed the writers of controversy of his own party, or the legends of the saints of his communion. For it is certain, that the writers of controversy in the Church of Rome, and those who have writ the lives of those Inquisitors that have been canonized, have never looked upon the Waldenses as any other than Manichees; so thoroughly rooted is the spirit of calumny in the members of that Church: the character of father of lies being very necessary to support that of murderer honourably, whereof they have been in possession so very long.

I cannot tell whether the Bishop of Meaux has forgiven himself for his tenderness towards the Waldenses, whom he only treats as schismatics.

For seeing one day informs another, and that thus men come to refine their notions to the utmost, who knows but the Bishop, who, when he writ his Book of Variations, had only obscurely hinted, that to accuse the Pope of being Antichrist was a character of Manicheism; who knows, I say, but that now he sees so clearly that the Waldenses have formally declared that the Pope is Antichrist, he will not anew make them Manichees once more, the better to accommodate himself with the maxims of his new system? If he should not do it himself, to avoid the shame of being guilty of a variation, at least it is very obvious to believe, that some of those who are engaged with him in the same cause will not fail of taking that course; and therefore I am glad I have prevented him, by showing that the Waldenses were no Manichees, though they took the Pope to be Antichrist.

Be it as it will, I hope it will not be harder for us to justify the Albigenses from the accusations brought against them by the Bishop of Meaux. He uses his utmost endeavors to maintain a most abominable calumny raised by his predecessors, and strives, by representing the Albigenses as a people who had revived the errors of the Manichees, to make them equally odious to those of the Church of Rome, and the Protestants of France, whom his violence, together with that of his colleagues, have forced to take upon them the external profession of Popery.

The Jews built the tombs of those prophets whom their fathers slew; process of time having cured them of their fury, that enraged their forefathers against the ambassadors of heaven. Those of the Church of Rome only know not what it is to disown the rage and slanders of their predecessors. She has accused the Albigenses of Manicheism, and has done it on purpose to inspire her votaries with a barbarous cruelty against a people who refused to bear the yoke of her tyranny: and it is to please her, that her ministers must still go on to tear the memory of those faithful servants of God, for the utter extirpation of whom she formerly armed the hands of all the furious zealots of her communion.

And as in handling the history of the Waldenses, I thought needful, for the satisfaction of the reader, to make some remarks on their original, their succession, their separation from the Church of Rome, and their ministry; so I intend now to follow the same method exactly in these observations on the history of the Albigenses; and I hope this will be equally useful, to

shew what care God hath taken to preserve these other illustrious witnesses of his truth, notwithstanding all those corruptions that overspread the churches of the west.

I have set down the character of the Manichees, both ancient and modern, in my Remarks upon the History of the Churches of Piedmont, so fully, that it will not be necessary to repeat what I say there in this treatise.

1. Because it is certain, that it was rather humor in the Bishop of Meaux, that he did not accuse them of Manicheism, than any due regard to truth, the Waldenses having been as much accused of Manicheism as the Albigenses; neither are there any more solid proofs to convict the Albigenses of those errors, than the Waldenses.
2. Because this new hypothesis of the Bishop of Meaux, wherein he asserts, that to accuse the Pope of being Antichrist is a character of Manicheism, is so excessively ridiculous, that it is hard to guess, how even the Bishop himself could ever give entertainment to it.

It is a very surprising thing to see the Bishop maintain, in his new Commentary upon the Revelation, that the prophecies of St. John concerning Antichrist were actually accomplished above one thousand two hundred years since. Antichrist then must have made his escape in the crowd, without being at all perceived; for the greatest lights of the Church, and those who had their eyes most open to discover him, never perceived any thing of all this. Vega and Ribera, who have written on the Revelations with as much learning as the Bishop of Meaux, were never able to make any discovery in ancient history that could be applicable to the Apocalypse; and all the Romish writers of controversy must have been a company of asses, not to stumble upon so easy an answer, which would eternally have stopped the mouths of the Protestants in so ticklish and tender a point.

But it is no matter, since two Protestant authors, and those of the first rank too, Grotius and Hammond, have handed this notion to the Bishop: it being very probable, that the Bishop did for this reason hinder the Clergy from putting the works of Grotius in the catalogue of books, which they forbade a little before the revocation of the edict of Nantes: and he would have been as civil to Dr. Hammond too, if his Commentary upon the New

Testament had been known to him any where else than in Pool's Synopsis. And really these great men very well deserved that a particular regard should be had to them; their mistake in the point of Antichrist having proved as advantageous to the Church of Rome, as their learned works can be profitable to the Protestants.

But it is yet a more surprising thing to see the Bishop make this charge of the Albigenses against the Pope, a character of their being Manichees, which none that have ever writ against them before have taken the least notice of.

Whatever the success may be of so groundless a charge, I shall make it appear, that the Bishop of Meaux could not accuse the Albigenses, without making great numbers of his best Catholics suspected, and abettors of the Manicheism of the Albigenses in this point.

I thought it was my duty to clear Wicklef and his disciples from the slanders cast upon them by the Bishop of Meaux: I know very well, that he has done nothing, but repeat the old calumnies wherewith the Papists formerly endeavored to blacken that great man, without taking the least notice of the apologies that have been made in his behalf. But either men must resolve never to write against these gentlemen, or be content to undergo the drudgery of repeating publicly those solid answers that have been returned to their accusations before; which the writers of the Romish party always think fit to dissemble.

I hope, however, that seeing the matter I undertake to treat of naturally engaged me to take notice of great numbers of matters of fact, which were necessary to be examined towards the clearing of this subject; and that the malice and cruelty of the enemies of these ancient Christians have robbed us of what might be most material for their justification; the reader will not expect I should put these remarks into any other form, than that in which I wrote my Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Churches of Piedmont. For I could neither write a continued history, nor dispense with the examination of several matters of fact, which could not be cleared so well as they ought, without some critical inquiries, that will be unpleasant to all those who search for any thing else but truth. I have confined myself here entirely to the inquiry after and illustration of that alone; and I am persuaded, that those who will take the pains to weigh what I have said in

these following sheets with care, will be of the same opinion. And I heartily wish, that it may triumph over falsehood, and innocence prevail against all the assaults of obloquy and slander.

THE

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

*CONCERNING the original of the Churches of
Gallia Narbonensis and Aquitain*

CHAPTER 2

The faith of the Church of the Gauls in the second century

CHAPTER 3

The faith of Gallia Aquitanica and Narbonensis in the fourth century

CHAPTER 4

An examination of the opinions of Vigilantius

CHAPTER 5

The state of the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon in the fifth century

CHAPTER 6

The state of these dioceses in the sixth century

CHAPTER 7

The state of the dioceses of Aquitain and Narbon in the seventh century

CHAPTER 8

The opinion of the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon in the eighth century

CHAPTER 9

The faith of the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon in the ninth century

CHAPTER 10

The state of these dioceses in the tenth century

CHAPTER 11

The beginning of the Manichees in Aquitain, and the state of those Churches as to religion in that age

CHAPTER 12

That these dioceses continued independent of the Popes, until the beginning of the twelfth century

CHAPTER 13

Of the opposition that was made by a part of these Churches to the attempts of the Popes, and of their separation from the communion of Rome, before Peter Waldo

CHAPTER 14

Of the opinions of Peter de Bruis and Henry, and their disciples, and whether they were Manichees or not

CHAPTER 15

That it doth not appear from the Conference of Alby, that the Albigenses were Manichees

CHAPTER 16

The Albigenses justified by a conference, whereof we have an account written by Bernard of Foncaud

CHAPTER 17

The calumnies raised against the Albigenses, refuted by the Conference at Montreal

CHAPTER 18

Reflections on the convictions of Manicheism, which were said to be proved upon the Albigenses

CHAPTER 19

Whether the Albigenses were Manichees, because they accused the Pope of being the Antichrist

CHAPTER 20

Of the morals of the Albigenses, and of their ecclesiastical government

CHAPTER 21

Concerning the persecutions which the Albigenses have suffered from the Pope and his party

CHAPTER 22

That the doctrine of the Albigenses spread itself in England, and continued there till the time of the Reformation The petition of the Lollards

CHAPTER 23

Of the doctrine of Wicklef and his disciples in England

CHAPTER 24

Of the calumnies that have been unjustly charged upon Wicklef by the Papists

CHAPTER 25

That the doctrine of the Albigenses was propagated in Spain, and that it continued there till the Reformation

CONCLUSION

EXTRACTS

Of several trials of some pretended heretics in the diocese of Sarum. Taken out of an old Register

REMARKS

UPON THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT
CHURCHES OF THE COUNTRY OF

THE ALBIGENSES

CHAPTER 1

Concerning the original of the Churches of Gallia Narbonensis and Aquitain.

BEFORE the Gauls were entirely reduced by Caesar under the power of the Roman empire, and after that, under the said Emperor, Gallia was commonly divided into two parts, whereof the one was called Braccata, the other Comata. Gallia Braccata contained not only that part of Italy which is beyond the Alps, and was named Cisalpina, but also Gallia Narbonensis, whereof Vienna was the capital city. The other, to wit, Gallia Comata, was divided into three parts; the first whereof was called Belgica, the other Celtica, and the third Aquitain. But Augustus being absolute master of Gaul, made some alteration in this division; for he extended the bounds of Aquitain by restraining those of Celtica, and distinguished Aquitain into three provinces, whereof the first and second were on this side of the Garonne, and reached to the Loire; the third reached from the Garonne to the Pyrenean mountains. Bourges and Bourdeaux were the mother cities of the first and second of these provinces; and Eulse or Eaulse was the metropolis of the third; which city having been destroyed by the wars, Auch succeeded her in that dignity.

As for Gallia Narbonensis, which at first was only a province, whereof Vienna was the capital city, Augustus was pleased to take that honor from her, to bestow it upon Lyons, which seemed to him more commodious to be made the seat of government. This province was afterwards changed, by being divided into four parts, *viz.* into Narbonensis, Viennensis, the Maritime Alps, and the Greek Alps. And after this division, Narbonensis

was again subdivided into two parts, the first and second, as may be seen since the fourth century.

It was needful, at the entrance of this discourse, to give the reader this short draught of the countries that went under the name of Gallia, to give him an idea of that part of them, where we intend to shew him the continuation of that Church which gave birth to the Albigenses, and furnished the west with witnesses of so great weight against the corruptions of the Romish party; and indeed though the Visi-Goths, who cut off these provinces from the Roman empire, and afterwards the French, who destroyed the Visi-Goths in the time of Clovis, made very great changes in this division of Gallia Narbonensis and Aquitain, yet we may exactly observe, that the Church of these provinces hath well nigh always made a distinct body by her synods and canons.

It is a matter of difficulty precisely to fix the first rise of these Churches. I own that some Greek Fathers have believed, that St. Luke and Crescens, disciples of St. Paul, did preach the Gospel in Gallia; but that which engaged them in this opinion seems of little or no solidity. And the Galatia mentioned by St. Paul in the second of Timothy, doth not signify Gallia, but a province of the lesser Asia, as the learned Petavius acknowledgeth.

Others have believed, that St. Paul himself preached the Gospel in these provinces, as he passed through them in his way to Spain, where the fourth century took it for granted that he preached the Gospel: but neither doth this seem grounded upon sufficient authority; and we do not find that the ancient authors of these countries did ever maintain any such thing.

Should we indeed, as to this point, give credit to the most part of the Romish legends, to which Baronius in his Annals pays too great a deference, it would be an easy matter to give to the most part of these Churches a most august original. We might suppose that St. Peter and St. Paul were the founders of them by the ministry of their disciples, or that Clement, Bishop of Rome, sent them thither almost immediately after the martyrdom of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul. They tell us, that Paul was the first Bishop of Narbon, Saturninus of Toulouse, Martialis of Limoges, Frontinus of Perigueux, Vincentius of Daeqs, Georgius of Puy, Eutropius of Xaintes: much like as for some ages since, in most of the

other Churches of France, they suppose that the first Bishops were sent them by the same Apostles, or by their first successors.

But we meet with nothing but falsities in these pretended traditions: and it is impossible to reconcile them with what Sulpicius Severus and Gregorius Turonensis tell us concerning the rise of Christian religion among the Gauls. The former of these distinctly assures us, that Gaul never had any martyrs before the empire of Aurelius, son of Antoninus, *Hist. lib. 2. Sub Aurelio, Antonini filio, persecutio quinta agitata; ac tunc primum inter Gallias martyria visa, serius trans Alpes Dei religione suscepta:*

“The fifth persecution was carried on under Aurelius, Antonine’s son; and then first were martyrdoms seen among the Gauls, the Divine religion having been later entertained beyond the Alps.”

This single period of Severus gives sentence against all those pretended martyrs wherewith the Churches of France have filled their Breviaries. The latter tells us plainly, that it was not till the empire of Decius, about the year 250, that the city of Toulouse had for her first Bishop Saturninus, who was sent from Rome in company of six others, into the country of the Gauls, to preach the Gospel; to wit, Gatian at Tours, Trophimus at Arles, Paul at Narbon, Dionysius at Paris, Austremoine at Clermont, and Martialis at Limoges. This is that which is clearly proved from the acts of the Martyrdom of St. Saturninus, cited by Gregory, Bishop of Tours.

These testimonies of two ancient authors, the one of the fifth century, and the other more ancient, *viz.* the same who wrote the Martyrdom of St. Saturninus, have made such an impression upon some of the learnedest men of the Roman communion, *viz.* upon Bosquet, Bishop of Montpellier, Sirmond, and Launoy, the famous Doctor of the Faculty of Paris, as to make them with scorn reject those legends, which ascribe more ancient founders to these Churches, notwithstanding that they are the greatest ornament of the Breviaries of the Gallican Church, and that they cannot lose their credit, without shaking the belief of abundance of miracles, and the authority of a great number of devotions.

And indeed, what reason is there to own a tradition for authentic, which we scarcely find backed with any witness for the space of above seven hundred years? Besides, do not we know, that it was the dispute about

precedency between the Churches in the eighth and ninth century, and which we find lasted till the twelfth, that engaged the several parties to devise this great antiquity, and boldly change that, which before had been the current belief of their Churches, because it did not answer their pretensions, nor comport with their vanity, to substitute instead thereof fabulous originals, under whose shelter they might maintain a dispute with more advantage against those that were on even ground with them?

But however it be difficult to fix the certain original of these Churches; for the Gothic Liturgy, which was used in these provinces, assures us that St. Saturninus came from Smyrna, from whence it should seem that the first founders of the Churches of Lyons and Vienna came likewise; yet thus much we may assert, that the Gospel soon took deep root there.

My design is not to refute here what the authors of the legends have inserted in their fabulous relations, concerning the establishment of the Christian religion in these provinces, and the character of the piety of those first founders of Christianity, of their precepts and of their miracles. Indeed there is reason to deplore either the boundless impudence of the Pastors of the Roman communion, in obtruding such palpable falsities, or the prodigious stupidity of the people of that Church, who feed themselves with stories more fabulous than those of Amadis of Gaul, and make them the subject of their devotion. We read in the life of St. Martialis, that after the saint had converted Limoges, he there consecrated Churches to the honor of Jesus Christ, of the holy Virgin, and St. Stephen, whose cousin he was. We read that he raised to life the Priests of the idol, whom God had struck dead with a clap of thunder, for their poisoning St. Martialis; and that, after their resurrection, he converted them. We find that he admitted to the vow of virginity a person called Valeria, who some time after having had her head cut off, by order of the Duke of Guienne, whose courtship she had slighted, immediately took up her head, and carried it to St. Martialis, as he was saying Mass. We find him there going to Rome, to give an account to St. Peter of his commission: all this is very gravely related by the Legendaries; yea, the impudence of these knaves proceeded to that point, as in the ninth century to conciliate authority to these fabulous relations. Several councils were assembled at Limoges, where, with intolerable impudence, they imposed two epistles upon St. Martialis, the one as writ to those of Toulouse, and the other to those of

Bourdeaux, and which bear much a like resemblance to the apostolical writings of those times, as asses do to lions: and all that these insipid authors tell us about it, is so entirely framed according to the manners, notions, and customs of the later ages, that we can find nothing in their writings but what some stupid Monks have insolently invented and patched together, with so little regard to reason, that one of these extravagant fellows maintains, that the blessed Virgin was saying her rosary at the time she was visited by the angel Gabriel.

It is not certainly known, whether the books which St. Irenaeus has written against the Valentinians ought to persuade us that those heretics had then already spread themselves among the Gauls; for seeing he writ them in Greek, this work seems to have been designed against the heretics of the east; for though we have a translation of these books, more ancient than the time of St. Austin, yet we have no proof that it was done with design to refute persons who had endeavored to corrupt the faith from the very beginning of its establishment in Gaul.

True it is, that in the fourth century, Arianism had considerably corrupted and infected the purity of these dioceses: Saturninus, Bishop of Aries, and those of his cabal, having condemned St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, for an heretic, because he opposed Arianism with all his might; but soon after we find that truth raised herself again from under its ruins: for though at the beginning of the fifth century the Visi-Goths, who were Arians, had made themselves masters of these provinces of the Gauls, which they remained possessed of till they were taken from them by Clovis, King of France; yet we do not find that Arianism ever prevailed there, the vigilance of the Pastors having prevented the people's yielding so far to the authority of these Arian kings, as to follow them in their error, the very nature of these disputes engaging the enemies of the Church to maintain such maxims, as put a stop to the people's superstition, with respect to the veneration of martyrs.

I am not ignorant that St. Gaudentius takes notice that several Priscillianists were scattered up and down these provinces; and Priscillianism was nothing else but Manicheism in perfection, as appears from the writings of St. Austin. But this evil plant withered soon after; both the Arians, who were masters, and the orthodox, equally joining their

endeavors to confound that heresy. Neither indeed do we find, after the sixth century, any mention made of Priscillianists in these parts; so that we may affirm, that Christianity was preserved there with much purity in those primitive times, and arrived to such a degree of strength and vigor, as to banish both those heresies, whereof the one attacked the Father of our Savior, and the other denied the Divinity of the Son.

But what I have already said in general, is not sufficient to give us a competent and just idea of the Christianity which was planted in these provinces, and which the Albigenses have so happily asserted, both by their preachings and sufferings. We must therefore take a review of these primitive ages, and consider a little wherein consisted that religion which these dioceses received from those first Ministers of Jesus Christ, who conveyed thither the doctrine of the Gospel, and transmitted the same to posterity, as a sacred trust committed to them.

CHAPTER 2

The faith of the Church of the Gauls in, the second century.

WE have no Gallic author whose name is so famous as St. Irenaeus: he was a disciple of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna; and being sent into Gaul by that apostolic man, he was first Priest of the Church of Lyons, and afterwards succeeded Pothinus, first Bishop of that city: it was in his time that the Church suffered the fifth persecution under the government of the Emperors Verus and Marcus Aurelius. Eusebius has preserved the relation of the martyrdom of the believers of Lyons and Vienna, which, according to all probability, is judged to have been made by St. Irenaeus in the name of both these Churches.

This relation tells us **first** of all, that the Roman President having caused some slaves to be apprehended that belonged to Christians, made them confess, at the sight of tortures prepared for them, that the Christians did eat children in their assemblies, and that they there promiscuously polluted themselves by abominable incests; which was afterwards confirmed by weak Christians, who for fear of torments abjured their religion.

2. That the Christians having confuted this calumny, by their constancy in enduring the torments, and above all the rest Blandina, who after a whole day's suffering tortures, having cried with a loud voice, *I am a Christian; there is no wickedness committed amongst us:* (which was seconded by Byblis, who before had abjured:) *How, said she, should the Christians, to whom it is not lawful to eat the blood of beasts, devour infants?*

3. Blandina is represented to us in these acts, as praying to God with great affection, and as it were conversing with Jesus Christ in prayer. Attalus being set in a chair of iron, to be there burnt, and perceiving the smell of his broiled flesh, said to the spectators in Latin, *In hoc demum est homines vorare quod agitis; nos vero neque homines voramus, neque omnino quicquam mali facimus:*

“This that ye do here is indeed to devour men; but as for us, we neither devour men, nor do any thing at all that is evil.”

Lastly, The Church was desirous to bury what remained of their bodies, as the relation informs us, but the fury of the Pagans, who burnt them to ashes, hindered them: these are the chiefest heads of this relation, where we find nothing but God and Jesus Christ called upon; where we do not see the believers troubling themselves to explain or qualify the corporal manducation of the body of Jesus Christ, as it became them to have done, had they believed their eating of him with their bodily mouth; and where there is not the least word that might give us to understand that these Churches took care to preserve these so precious relics, to honor them with their adorations, as in latter times has been done.

We find here also the spirit of calumny transporting the heathens against the disciples of Jesus Christ; and how far the cruelty of torments may prevail to make men confess the most enormous calumnies to be true. The reader must not forget these two characters of old Rome, because the Inquisitors have renewed these very same slander against the Albigenses, and have pretended to confirm them by confessions which the cruelty of their tortures have forced from them.

Neither is it only in this work of his, that St. Irenaeus informs us, what in his time was the faith of these Churches planted in Gaul, for he hath left us five books, and Eusebius has preserved for us some epistles of that ancient Bishop, altogether refulgent with the purity of the faith delivered by the Apostles.

1. St. Irenaeus gives us this for one character of the Gnostics, that they embraced doctrines which were not to be found in the writings of the Prophets or the Apostles, lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 33.

And it is with the same spirit that he attributes to heretics the accusing of the Scripture for being unintelligible, without the help of tradition, whereas he maintains, that that which had been preached, was committed to writing by the special will of God, to the end it might be the ground and pillar of our faith, lib. 3. c. 1. et 2. And that it is to make the Apostles hypocrites, to suppose that they taught some things in public, and others in private;

whence it appears clearly, that when he makes use of tradition, he only does it with respect to those scriptural doctrines which the heretics opposed, and whereof they pretended that the Apostles had left the contrary to those that succeeded them, lib. 3. c. 2. It is upon this occasion that he allegeth the testimony of the Church of Rome, founded by the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, as of one that was most known: *Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam* (saith he) *propter potentioorem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in quo semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea, quae est ab Apostolis traditio;*

“For to this Church, because of its more powerful superiority, it behoves the whole Church to come, that is, the believers of all parts, forasmuch as therein the tradition from the Apostles has always been preserved by the believers of all parts.”

It is apparent, that whatsoever design he may have had to raise the authority of the Church of Rome, he makes no other use of it, than to make out that it was impossible those doctrines which the heretics gave out for apostolical should be really so, seeing they were unknown to a Church which had had the Apostles and their successors for her guides; more especially seeing that Church was placed in the very seat of the empire, which continually drew to Rome a vast number of believers from all the different places of the empire, from whence they brought not along with them a different tradition from that which they found in the bosom of the Church of Rome.

That St. Irenaeus had no other aim but this, is owned by F. Quesnel, in his notes upon the tenth Epistle of St. Leo, p. 809. And this appears evidently, because, after all that esteem which he had for the Church of Rome, he was not afraid to write to her Bishop very censuring letters, upon the account of his having excommunicated the Churches of Asia, that celebrated Easter the fourteenth of the moon of March; as also because he continued in the communion of those Churches of Asia, without being concerned at the excommunication of the Pope of Rome.

2. He reduces the whole faith of Christians throughout the world to that which we call the Apostles' Creed, without mentioning so much

as a word of those doctrines which the Church of Rome has superadded to it, pretending to confirm them by tradition, lib. 1. c. 2.

3. He maintains the Scriptures to be both clear and perfect, lib. 2. c. 47.

4. He rejects the doctrines which the heretics grounded upon the explication of some parables, maintaining that nothing ought to be established but upon clear and evident places of Scripture, lib. 2. c. 46.

5. It appears by his writings, that penance at that time was public, without dispensing with women that were overtaken with the sins of uncleanness, by which means being exposed to extreme confusion, it made some of them abjure Christianity, lib. 1. c. 9.

6. He makes it appear that caelibat was not yet known in Asia, whence these first Christians of the Gauls derived their original, which is acknowledged by Feuarentius, lib. 1. c. 9.

7. He assigns to the Marcosians the custom of anointing those they received into their communion with balm, [*opobalsamo*,] which shews, that at that time extreme unction was not known: and we may make the same observation from his imputing to other heretics the anointing of persons at the point of death with oil and water, lib. 1. c. 18.

8. He attributes to the Gnostics the imitation of the heathens, because they had the images of Jesus Christ, lib. 1. c. 24. which makes it evident that the Christians had no images, much less that they gave to them any religious worship. And indeed we find him reasoning, lib. 2. c. 6. after such a manner as shews that the Christians were yet in full possession of a right to reproach the heathens with all those absurdities that arise from the use of images. The same may also be gathered from lib. 2. c. 42. where he divides the law into two tables, in a manner very different from that of the Doctors of the Roman Church, and altogether conformable to the judgment of Josephus and other Jewish Doctors.

9. He makes it appear, that he knew nothing of the separability of accidents from their subjects, which is the sole support of transubstantiation, lib. 2. c. 14.

10. He in plain terms rejects the invocation of angels, instead thereof recommending that of our Savior Jesus Christ, lib. 2. c. 57.

11. He asserts that the blessed Virgin had unseasonable motions, *intempestivam festinationem*, John 2:3 so far was he from believing her wholly free from sin, lib. 2. c. 18. This shews that when he saith, cap. 33. *Quod alligavit Virgo Eva per incredulitatem, hoc Virgo Maria solvit per fidem;*

“What the Virgin Eve bound up by her unbelief, that the Virgin Mary set free by her faith;”

he doth not own the Virgin for the person that saved men, but his meaning is like that of Hesychius, who said, speaking of the women to whom Jesus Christ appeared after his resurrection; *Invenere enim*, saith he, *mulieres, quod olim amisere per Evam; lucrum invenit ea, quae damni occasionem praebuerat.*

“For the women found what formerly they lost by Eve; she found the gain, who had been an occasion of the loss.” T.15. B. P. p. 823, col. 1.

And this is the sense likewise of that other passage of St. Irenaeus, which we find, lib. 5. c. 19. for though he calls the Virgin, Eve’s advocate, it plainly appears that he meant nothing else but what is expressed by St. Chrysostom, in Ps. 44. t. 3. p. 221. *Virgo nos Paradiso expulit, per Virginem vitam aeternam invenimus;*

“A Virgin drove us out of Paradise, and by a Virgin we have found eternal life.”

12. That he did not believe we ought to have recourse to the intercession of saints, can be invincibly demonstrated from hence, because he did not believe that the faithful should see the face of God before the day of judgment, lib. 5. c. 3.

13. He plainly asserts that the apostolical succession is of no consideration without the truth of doctrine, lib. 4. c. 43. so far was he from making it a bar to hinder believers from examining the doctrine propounded to them.

14. He maintains that the gates of heaven were opened to Jesus Christ, because of the assumption of his flesh; so far was he from believing that his glorified body could penetrate bodies, lib. 3. c. 18. et lib. 4. c. 66.

He asserts that Jesus Christ, at his being born, opened the blessed Virgin's womb, lib. 4. c. 66. which the Church of Rome condemns for divers reasons.

And forasmuch as he holds the Holy Ghost to be the food of life, lib. 4. c. 75. accordingly he maintains, c. 2. lib. 5. that our bodies are nourished by the creatures of God received in the Eucharist, and that they receive growth by them.

He distinctly asserts, that the sacrament of the Eucharist, as to its substance, consists of bread and wine, which are the creatures of God, which he receives as oblations of a different kind from the sacrifices of the Old Testament; and, indeed, in case he had otherwise conceived the matter, he would have favored the opinion of the Gnostics, who, pretending that the work of the creation was not the work of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, could never have lighted upon a more comfortable doctrine than that of transubstantiation, by means of which the nature of bread and wine would be destroyed by Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, and nothing left but the accidents, that is to say, mere phantoms, without any thing of reality, lib. 4. c. 34. et 57.

In like manner we find him asserting, lib. 5. c. 33. that what Jesus Christ gave to his disciples in the cup, was the generation or product of the vine.

15. We see clearly from what Eusebius has preserved of St. Irenaeus, that the variety in observing a fast before Easter was very great, and that there was no law of the Apostles or of Jesus Christ enjoining it, every one using it according to his own free will and devotion. We find also, that whatsoever respect St. Irenaeus had for the Church of Rome, he was no more inclined to be led by her sole authority, than St. Polycarp was, whom he much commends; and if he considered her as an apostolic Church, yet he never attributed to her any authority over the other flocks of the Lord.

I will not dissemble that St. Irenaeus seems somewhat at a loss about the state of believers after death; but to this it is sufficient to say,

1. That we find in St. Irenaeus an abridgment of the faith almost in the same form that we find it in the Apostles' Creed, as it is called.
2. That if we do not agree to all the opinions of St. Irenaeus, about the state of souls after death, it is certain that the Doctors of the Church of Rome do at least reject as many articles as we do, yea, and more too.

From what I have said, we may however perceive what was the state of the Christian religion in Gaul, a little after the middle of the second century, which is the time wherein St. Irenaeus lived and flourished.

I wish I could produce for the following century as authentic a witness concerning the state of the Churches in this part of Gaul; but indeed, though there were divers famous writers, whose works are cited by St. Jerome, yet there is in a manner nothing of them left to us. I know there are some who believe that Victorinus was Bishop of Poitiers in the third century; but this is not found true, for it is certain that he was Bishop of Passau Patavionensis, and not Pictaviensis; so that we must proceed to those who can inform us of the state of this part of Gaul during the fourth century.

CHAPTER 3

The faith of Gallia Aquitana and Narbonensis in the fourth century.

St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, a famous Confessor in the persecution which the Arians stirred up against the orthodox, can afford us much light concerning the state and faith of these dioceses: this great man was married, as he who published his works at Paris owns, after the famous Baptista Mantuanus, observing that the law for the celibacy of the Clergy was not yet introduced, and that before that time, as St. Jerome expresseth it, they rather made choice of married persons than unmarried, because the former were judged more proper for the functions of the holy ministry.

But this is not the only article wherein he differed from Popery, as well as the Church of Aquitain.

1. He counts the canonical books as we do, and plainly holds them for apocryphal which we reject, as we find in the preface to his Commentary upon the Book of Psalms.
2. He lays it down for an error and piece of impiety to look upon the Scripture as imperfect, in Psalm 118. Lit. Vau.
3. He asserts that ignorance is not capable of excusing men, seeing the Scripture is proposed to us as the rule of our faith and manners: *Non habet veniam ignoratio voluntatis; quia sub scientiae facultate nescire, repudiatae magis, quam non repertae scientiae est reatus: ob id enim longe a peccatoribus salus, quia non exquisierint justificationes Dei: nam utique non ob aliud consignatae literis manent, quam ut ad universorum scientiam, notionemque defluerent.*

“Ignorance of the Divine will gives no excuse; because to be ignorant when we may learn, makes us guilty of rejecting knowledge, rather than missing of it: for therefore is salvation far from sinners, because they search not after that which justifies before God, and which indeed is for no other reason preserved in writing, but that it might be derived to the knowledge and understanding of all.”

This is a style, and these are maxims, very different from those of the Church of Rome.

4. He affirms that we are to be ignorant of whatsoever the Scripture doth not teach us: and after having asserted, that it is the character of heretics to conceal the holy Scripture, fol. 204, he maintains that it is another mark of heresy to believe beyond what the Gospel teacheth us. *Tu qui ultra Evangelium sapis, necesse est ut aliis alibi arcanorum doctrinis, cognitionem Paterni nominis adeptus sis.*

“Thou who art wise beyond the Gospel, it must needs be that thou hast elsewhere, by other secret doctrines, attained the knowledge of God the Father,” fol. 132.

5. He asserts, that it was the will of God, that the Scripture should be plain and clear. *Quanta enim potuit Dominus, verborum simplicitate evangelicam fidem locutus est, et in tantum ad intelligentiam nostram sermones aptavit, in quantum naturae nostrae ferret infirmitas, non tamen ut quicquam minus dignum naturae suae majestate loqueretur:*

“The Lord hath expressed the faith of the Gospel in the greatest simplicity of words he could, and so far accommodated his speech to our understanding, as the weakness of our nature would bear, yet so as not to speak any thing unbecoming the majesty of his nature.”

6. He there also confirms the fullness of Scripture after a most authentic manner: lib. 8. de Trin. *Non est humano aut seculi sensu in Dei rebus loquendum;*

“In the things of God we are not to speak according to a human or worldly sense and meaning.”

And a little after; *Quae scripta sunt legamus, et quae legerimus intelligamus, et tunc perfectae fidei officio fungemur:*

“Let us read what is written, and understand what we read, so shall we discharge the duty of perfect faith.”

So likewise, lib. 5. p. 46. *Non est de Deo humanis judiciis sentiendum, neque in nobis ea natura est, ut se in coelestem cognitionem suis viribus*

efferat; a Deo discendum est, quid ex Deo intelligendum sit; quia non nisi se authore cognoscitur.

“We must not think of God according to human judgment; for neither is our nature such, to be able to raise itself by its own strength to heavenly knowledge; we must learn of God whatsoever is to be understood of him, because he is not to be known any further than as he is the author of our knowledge.”

And a little after; *Loquendum ergo non aliter de Deo est, quam ut ipse ad intelligentiam nostram de se locutus est:*

“Wherefore we are no otherwise to speak of God, than as he, in compliance with our understanding, hath spoke to us concerning himself.”

7. He owns no other foundation of the Church besides the confession of the divinity of our Savior, made by St. Peter, instead of referring it to the person of St. Peter, or to the functions of his apostleship; lib. 2. *Unum igitur hoc est immobile fundamentum, una haec est foelix fidei petra, Petri ore confessa, Tu es Filius Dei vivi;*

“This is the only immoveable foundation, this is the only happy rock of faith confessed by the mouth of Peter, Thou art the Son of the living God.”

And so likewise, lib. 6. p. 77. *Super hanc igitur confessionis petram Ecclesiae aedificatio est:*

“Wherefore upon the rock of this confession the Church is built.”

9. He overthrows all the exceptions of the Church of Rome in favor of the adoration of angels, by maintaining that the angel who appeared to Abraham was Jesus Christ; de Trin. lib. 4. et lib. de Synodis contra Arianos.

10. He was so little of the belief, that the faith of the people depends upon that of their Pastors, that he asserts and proves, in his book against the Arians or Auxentius, that the people may continue orthodox under heretical Pastors.

11. He overthrows all worshipping of creatures, which is practiced by the Church of Rome, by maintaining, that if any should worship Jesus Christ, believing him to be a creature, he would be accursed, lib. 12. de Trinit.

12. He dreamed so little of the infallibility of the Pope, which a great part of the Church of Rome owns as the greatest article, into which the faith of all Christians must be resolved, that he pronounces many anathemas against Liberius, because he had subscribed to an Arian confession of faith; as may be seen in the Fragments of St. Hilary, published by Pithaeus.

13. He lays it down for a maxim, that Jesus Christ alone was without sin, in his discourse upon Psalm 58 and 138.

14. He owns God only to have the power of forgiving sins, Can. 8. in Matth.; so far was he from attributing this power to Ministers, as the Church of Rome doth at this day.

15. He formally asserts that the good works of one man are of no avail to deliver another from punishment, which overthrows the great foundation of satisfactions and purgatory, after the manner that the Church of Rome makes use of them, Can. 27. in Matthew The wise virgins tell the foolish, that they cannot give to them of their oil; *Quia non sit forte quod omnibus satis sit, alienis scilicet operibus et meritis neminem adjuvandum, quia unicuique lampadi suae emere oleum sit necesse:*

“Lest perhaps there might not be enough for them all; to intimate that nobody can be helped by the works and merits of another, because it is necessary for every one to buy oil for his own lamp.”

16. He was so far from believing the merit of works, as the Church of Rome at present doth, that he discourseth thus upon Psalm 118. lit. Coph. *In operibus quidem bonitatis totus perfectus est, sed satis esse hoc sibi non putat ad salutem, nisi secundum miserationem Dei et judicia, miserationem consequatur:*

“He is indeed wholly perfect in all the works of goodness, but he doth not think this sufficient for his salvation, except according to the mercy of God and his judgments he obtain mercy.”

And it is the same notion he gives us, speaking of the parable of the laborers, upon Psalm 130. *Mercedem non operis sed misericordiae undecimae horae operarii consequuntur.*

17. We cannot deny but that St. Hilary believed a purgatory, but yet in that point he differed much from the Church of Rome; he owns a baptism of fire after this life, but such a baptism as was to be conferred at the last day, *viz.* the day of judgment, Matthew Can. 2. And that which must needs greatly scandalize the Papists is, that St. Hilary maintains that all believers, without excepting so much as the blessed Virgin, must endure the fire, which he expressly affirms on Psalm 118.

18. If we have a mind to know whether he allowed the notion of the Church of Rome, which believes that we can perfectly fulfill the Law of God, we may easily be resolved by his manner of treating the young man, who boasted himself before Jesus Christ, as if he had done it: he accuses him of insolence, in several places of his works, for pretending to be justified by his works. De Trinit. lib. 9. Can. 19. in Matthew et lib. de Patris et Filii unitate.

19. He overturns the common notion of the Church of Rome, which is, that when Jesus Christ entered in to his disciples, the doors being shut, he had not lost the solidity of his body, and consequently that there was a penetration of dimensions: St. Hilary rejects this notion as absurd, accounting this penetration of dimensions impossible, lib. 3. de Trinit.

20. He asserts that the Eucharist is celebrated in breaking of bread, and that the disciples of Jesus Christ did drink of the fruit of the vine at the Lord’s Supper, and mentions not so much as one word of transubstantiation, in a place where he particularly explains the institution of the Eucharist, Can. 30. in Matthew To speak the truth, how could he have any other thoughts, who maintains that Jesus Christ is no longer on the earth, in respect of his body, because it is

impossible for a body to be in more places than one? *Adest enim et cum fideliter invocatur per naturam suam praesens est; spiritus enim est omnia penetrans et continens; non enim secundum nos corporalis est, ut cum alicubi adsit, absit aliunde, sed virtute praesenti, et se quacunque est porrigenti, cum replente omnia ejus spiritu in omnibus sit, tamen ei, qui in eum credat, adsistit.*

“For he is present by his nature, when he is called upon with faith, he being a spirit penetrating and containing all things: for he is not like us, corporeal, so as that when he is in one place he should be absent from another, but he is in all places by the presence of his power, which extendeth itself where-ever he is, and his Spirit that filleth all things; yet he is in a more peculiar manner with him that believes in him.”

21. He was so far from approving the Romish inquisition, that he calls the Emperor Constantius Antichrist, for persecuting those that were not of his opinion, lib. in Constant. August. Yea, he judged all force to be so contrary to the spirit of the Christian religion, that he maintains that there can be no religion where force is made use of.

Lastly, He was so far from believing that the Antichrist, whereof St. John speaks, was already come, that he maintains that he would be revealed in the Churches that were then possessed by the Arians, and that the faith being thus attacked, the true believers would be forced to look out for shelter amongst the mountains in woods and caves, leaving the Antichrist master of the public places consecrated to the worship of God.

This is the sum of what may be gathered from the writings of St. Hilary. I make no mention of some errors of this great man, because Claudianus Mamertus, having confuted them about the end of the fifth century, has made it appear that they were only some particular opinions of this great Confessor; and that we cannot look upon them as the common faith of the diocese where he was settled. But the same cannot be said of the articles I have noted; Claudianus is so far from blaming them, that he approves them by his silence, and shews that his doctrine, in this respect, was the doctrine of the Church of Gaul.

We have nothing left us of the works of Rhodanius, Bishop of Toulouse, who was contemporary with St. Hilary: but it appears clear to us, that this holy Confessor having been sent into banishment with St. Hilary, after the Council of Beziers, by the cabal of Saturninus, Bishop of Arles, favourer of the Arians, we are to consider Rhodanius as a defender of the same faith, and an illustrious witness of the belief of his diocese: and we ought to make the same judgment of Phaebadius, Bishop of Agen, who was so much engaged in the same quarrel, and who acquired so great a name by the vigorous opposition he made against the errors of Arius: but Providence has preserved us one of his books.

In effect, this great man, who wrote in the year 357, as appears by his book against the Arians, gives us sufficiently to understand what his faith was in divers articles, and what was the doctrine of the diocese.

1. He maintains that the Catholic faith is found with those who speak according to the holy Scripture, and not amongst those who only make use of prejudices. After having quoted several places of Scripture, to prove against the Arians the eternity of the Son, he concludes in this manner, B. Patr. t. 4. p. 174. *Volentes igitur a Patre Filium scindere, et infra Deum ponere, de Evangelio praescribunt:*

“Those therefore who would rend the Father from the Son, and place him below God, give law to the Gospel.”

He expresseth himself yet more strongly to this purpose towards the end of his book, ib. p. 180. *Hoc credimus, hoc tenemus, quia hoc accepimus a Prophetis; hoc nobis Evangelia locuta sunt, hoc Apostoli tradiderunt, hoc Martyres in passione confessi sunt; in hoc mentibus fidei etiam haeremus, contra quod si angelus de coelo annuntiaverit, anathema sit. — Ergo, ut supra diximus, praejudicatae opinionis autoritas nihil valebit, quia contra semetipsam ipsa consistit:*

“This we believe, this we hold fast, because it is this we have received from the Prophets, this the Gospels have declared to us, this the Apostles have left us, this the Martyrs in their sufferings have confessed, and to this we adhere with our minds by faith, so that if an angel from heaven should preach contrary to this, let him be accursed. — Wherefore, as was said before, the authority of a

prejudicate opinion can be of no force, because it stands against itself.”

2. He makes it appear that the name of Catholic was not sufficient to be a true Christian, when he represents that Arianism had so far seized the minds of all the world, that it was necessary to espouse the Arian heresy, to procure the name of being Catholics, *ib. p. 169. Sed quia aut haeresis suscipienda est ut Catholici dicamur, aut vere Catholici non futuri; si haeresin non repudiamus, ad hanc tractatus conditionem necessitate descendimus:*

“But because we are either to become heretics, that we may be called Catholics, or cease to be Catholics indeed; by becoming heretics we are necessitated to write this treatise.”

3. He asserts that the revelation of holy Scripture is so perfect, with respect to the divinity of our Saviour, that anathemas are to be pronounced against all those that advance any other doctrine. This appears from the great number of passages which he quotes from thence, p. 173 and 178, to which he joins the anathema, whereof I have already spoke before.

4. He observes expressly, that the same honors rendered to Jesus Christ in the Liturgy, as to God, do demonstrate his equality with God, p. 174. *Quod si ita est, saith he, quotidie blasphemamus in gratiarum actionibus et oblationibus sacrificiorum, communia haec Patri et Filio confitentes, etc.*

“If it be so, we blaspheme daily in our thanksgivings and offerings of sacrifice, in confessing these things common to Father and Son.”

Thus doth he implicitly overthrow the first principles of the Church of Rome, *viz.* the imperfection of the holy Scripture in matters of faith, the authority and necessity of traditions, which are the completing of it, and other such like doctrines. We should now proceed to examine what the state of these dioceses was in the following century, but that the Bishop of Meaux stops us, to reflect upon the history and doctrine of Vigilantius, whose name is too famous, and his memory too unworthily torn by that Bishop, not to afford him that defense which his zeal against superstition doth justly deserve.

CHAPTER 4

An examination of the opinions of Vigilantius.

VIGILANTIUS was born in Aquitain, as is proved by De Marca, in a dissertation of his which is not yet published, and Priest in the diocese of Barcelona; he had contracted a particular friendship with St. Paulinus, who was ordained Priest at Barcelona; St. Paulinus recommended him in particular to St. Jerome, as he passed through Campania, where St. Paulinus was Bishop, in his way to Jerusalem; St. Jerome received him with all the affection possible, in the year 394, and calls him the holy Priest Vigilantius, in his thirteenth epistle to St. Paulinus. He made no long stay in the Holy Land; it is probable that the disputes about Origenism, which troubled that province, obliged him, to return the sooner. St. Jerome seems to insinuate that Vigilantius had been gained by Rufinus, enemy to St. Jerome, and that after Vigilantius was come into Egypt, and in some other provinces, he accused St. Jerome for having too great a liking for the writings of Origen, etc. decrying him every where as an Origenist. This was the true cause of the hate and rage of St. Jerome against Vigilantius, whereof we have a very sensible instance in his seventy-fifth epistle, which he wrote against Vigilantius about the year 397, where he treats him with the greatest indignity. Vigilantius being returned into Gaul, seems to have made his abode there, and to have published a certain treatise, about the year 406, against the worshipping of relics, which about sixty years before was introduced into the Church. St. Jerome being informed hereof, had an occasion offered him of defending the superstition of the common people against the censures of Vigilantius, and of unloading against him the most injurious language that hatred could inspire.

The writers of the Church of Rome have not been wanting long since to draw their advantage from these invectives of St. Jerome against the Protestants, and never speak of Vigilantius but as a heretic. The Bishop of Meaux hath carefully traced their steps; he tells us therefore, after his manner, very confidently, that even in the fourth century, the most clearsighted of all the rest, there was found but one only, Vigilantius, who opposed himself against the honors given to the saints, and the worshipping of their relics; yet he is looked upon, by the Protestants, as

the person who has preserved the *depositum*, that is to say, the succession of the apostolical doctrine, and is preferred by them to St. Jerome, who hath the whole Church for him.

This of necessity obligeth us to take a particular view of the opinions of Vigilantius. I shall not make a stop to invalidate what the Bishop saith, that Vigilantius wrote in the fourth century, nor at his endeavoring to cloak the notion of his Church concerning the religious worship they give to saints and to relics, under the indeterminate expression of the honors of saints, and the worship of relics: but to come to the thing itself, I maintain, that if Vigilantius had the misfortune of falling under the displeasure of St. Jerome, by the censure he pronounced against the popular superstition of rendering various honors to the relics of saints, yet was he never condemned by the Church that then was, nor treated as an heretic.

Gennadius owns that Vigilantius had an elegant style, and that his zeal for religion had engaged him to write. I own that he charges him with a mistake in his explication of the second vision of Daniel, and in some other articles for which he reckoneth him amongst heretics. But we are to take notice,

1st. That Gennadius wrote an hundred years after Vigilantius, and so follows the judgment St. Jerome had given before of him.

2dly. That he calls these articles heretical, after the manner of ancient authors, who very frankly bestowed the name of heresy on every thing that displeased them, though it had never been condemned by the Scripture, nor rejected by the body of the Church.

3dly. That he looked upon these pretended heresies as of very small importance, because he speaks of an absurd explication of the second vision of Daniel, which St. Jerome had revived, as of an error more considerable than those of Vigilantius, which he does not express, and mentions them as trifles.

However, be it as it will, if the Bishop of Meaux maintains these two things;

1st. That Vigilantius was the only man that opposed the honors of the saints, and the worship of relics; and

2dly. That St. Jerome had the whole Church on his side in his answer; I maintain, against the Bishop, that either he is deceived himself, or was willing to deceive his reader, in both these things.

The falsity of the first will appear to every one that can read. St. Jerome's book against Vigilantius: St. Jerome himself witnesseth, that the holy Bishop, in whose diocese Vigilantius was a Priest, that is to say, the Bishop of Barcelona, was of Vigilantius's opinion; so that we have already discovered one Bishop, whom St. Jerome endeavored to conceal from us; but we shall find a greater number whom St. Jerome himself owns to have approved Vigilantius's opinion, lest we should imagine that Vigilantius and his Bishop were schismatics:

“O horrible!” saith St. Jerome, “some Bishops also are said to be partakers of his crimes:”

and we may judge of St. Jerome's moderation by that which follows; *Si tamen Episcopi nominandi sunt, qui non ordinant Diaconos nisi primo uxores duxerint, nulli caelibis credentes pudicitiam:*

“If we may call them Bishops, who ordain none to be Deacons except they be married, not trusting the chastity of any unmarried person.”

What then, shall we conclude that so many Churches, whose Bishops and Priests were all married, had no lawful Bishops or Priests? Can any thing be conceived more extravagant than this? To this acknowledgment of St. Jerome we may add what he saith himself on the sixty-fifth chapter of Isaiah; for he owns that Vigilantius's blaming of that popular superstition had induced divers persons in Gaul to abstain from frequenting the churches of the martyrs, and to withdraw themselves from the prayers that were made there. The falsity of the second article will be no less evident, if we examine the manner of St. Jerome's defending himself against Vigilantius; for though he had undertaken to run down Vigilantius, yet after all he agrees with him in the main.

St. Jerome owns in his fifty-third epistle, which he writes to Riparius, that Vigilantius had writ twice against the worship of relics, and that he called those that adored them, *Cinerarii* and idolaters, *qui mortuorum hominum ossa venerarentur*, who did honor the bones of dead men; for which St.

Jerome calls him a Samaritan and a Jew, because he counted dead bodies to be unclean, as if Christians still lived under the Law.

Whereas Vigilantius blamed the custom of honouring them in the churches, because it was a piece of superstition in a place dedicated to religious worship, to bestow any veneration upon creatures, though the most holy and most excellent that might be. St. Jerome is forced to prevaricate upon this charge; his way of defending this matter is such as would never please the palate of the Church of Rome. *Nos autem non dico martyrum reliquias, sed ne solem quidem et lunam, non angelos, non archangelos, non cherubin, non seraphim, et omne nomen quod nominatur, et in praesenti saeculo et in futuro, colimus et adoramus ne serviamus creaturae potius quam Creatori, qui est benedictus in saecula. Honoramus autem reliquias martyrum, ut eum cujus sunt martyres adoremus; honoramus servos, ut honor servorum redundet ad Dominum, qui ait, Qui vos suscipit, me suscipit. Ergo Petri et Pauli immundae sunt reliquiae, ergo Moysi corpusculum immundum erit, quod, juxta Hebraicam veritatem, ab ipso sepultum est Domino; et quotiescunque Apostolorum et Prophetarum, et omnium martyrum basilicas ingredimur, toties idolorum templa veneramur, accensique ante tumulos eorum cerei idololatriae insignia sunt.*

“But we neither worship nor adore, I do not say the relics of martyrs, but not so much as the sun and moon, etc. nor any name that is named in this world, or in that which is to come, lest we should serve the creature rather than God, who is blessed for ever: but we honor the relics of the martyrs, in worshipping him whose they are; we honor the servants, that their honor may redound to the Lord, who saith, *He that receives you, receives me*. What! are the relics then of Peter and Paul unclean? Is the body of Moses unclean, which according to the Hebrew truth was buried by the Lord himself? And as often as we enter the churches of the Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, do we worship the temples of idols? And shall we say that the tapers which burn before their monuments are the marks of idolatry?”

What a fine application doth St. Jerome make here of that passage, *He that receives you, receives me*; and how solid an answer doth he return to a

solid objection, when he tells us, “We honor the servants in worshipping him whose they are.”

What a consequence is this! Is there any other honor due to relics, besides that of being interred? Was not this the custom used to the Christians of old, before the time of Constantius? It is well enough seen, that the good Father skips over the difficulty, and under a general protestation of worshipping nothing but God, he endeavors to shelter a custom which had been introduced after the Emperor Constantius’s time, that is to say, about sixty years before. Vigilantius blamed the custom, which but a little before had been introduced, of lighting tapers before the tombs of martyrs, and passing the night by them in prayer, wherein he followed the maxims of the Council of Elvira, held under the empire of Constantine, about ninety years before. After what manner doth St. Jerome refute these complaints of Vigilantius? He tells us of the presence of the angels at the grave of Jesus Christ; he relies upon the example of the Apostles, who buried the body of St. Stephen; he produceth the custom of Daniel and the Apostles, who spent the night in prayer; and all this without doubt extremely to the purpose; and the Protestants are much in the wrong to prefer the opinions of Vigilantius to such solid reasonings as these.

But it may be replied, that St. Jerome disputed only slightly, and for argument’s sake, in his Epistle to Riparius, not having then seen the writing of Vigilantius, and therefore handled the matter only as a declaimer.

This indeed is the best excuse that can be alleged, to make the reader digest the furious transports and invectives of this famous Monk, who treats Vigilantius no otherwise than as another Julian the Apostate, and seems very willing to have had him destroyed by the law mentioned in the thirteenth of Deuteronomy. And after all this, St. Jerome is the same in his book against Vigilantius, which follows this epistle.

After a preface which outdoes all the monsters that either the Scripture or fables speak of, he begins thus; *Exortus est subito Vigilantius, seu verius Dormitantius, qui immundo spiritu pugnet contra Christi Spiritum, et martyrum neget sepulcra veneranda, damnandas dicat esse vigilias, nunquam nisi in Pascha alleluia cantandum, continentiam haeresin, pudicitiam libidinis seminarium; et quomodo Euphorbus in Pythagora*

renatus esse perhibetur, sic in isto Joviniani mens prava surrexit, ut in illo, et in hoc Diaboli respondere cogamur insidiis:

“Here is suddenly started up one Vigilantius, or rather Dormitantius, who with an unclean spirit fights against the Spirit of Christ, and denies that any veneration ought to be given to the sepulchres of martyrs, condemns the watchings at them, affirms that alleluias ought to be sung at no time except Easter, calls continence heresy, and chastity the nursery of lust; so that as Euphorbus was said to be born again in Pythagoras, in like manner in him seems to be revived Jovinianus’s wickedness, in whom as we were forced to oppose ourselves against the wiles of the Devil, so likewise are we now equally obliged to oppose this man’s errors.”

What Ciceronian eloquence is this! What a strange account of things is here!

But there is something worse behind: see what stories he tells of Jovinian; *Ecclesiae auctoritate damnatus inter Phasides aves et carnes suillas, non tam emisit spiritum, quam eructavit, iste caupo Callaguritanus, et in perversum propter nomen viculi, mutus Quintilianus: miscet aquam vino, et de pristino artificio, suae venena perfidiae Catholicae fidei sociare conatur, impugnare virginitatem, odisse pudicitiam, in convivio saecularium contra sanctorum azemia proclamare, dum inter phialas philosophatur, et ad placentas liguriens, Psalmorum modulatione mulcetur, ut tantum inter epulas David et Idithum et Asaph et filiorum Core cantica audire dignetur.* Surely the good St. Jerome did not think of what he said, so extremely was he transported with an inconsiderate zeal for celibacy; but however, this zeal of his had a reasonable motive: *Proh nefas!* said he. This is the first heresy of Vigilantius; he would have it allowed to Ministers to marry, whereas in the ten provinces subject to the Pope, in the seventeen provinces of the jurisdiction of Ephesus, and in the five provinces of Egypt, they followed a contrary custom.

This without doubt was a crying heresy, and yet it appears from the Decretal of Pope — — to Hymerius, Bishop of Tarracona, that it had made so little impression upon the minds of men, that Innocent I. was fain to write, A.D. 405, to Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, upon the same

subject of the celibacy of the Clergy; so much opposition did that business every where meet with at that time. We must consider further the manner how St. Jerome applies the passage, which only regards adultery, to the celibacy of the Clergy: but this is only by way of preface.

St. Jerome tells us at first, that he had received Vigilantius's book by the care of Riparius and Desiderius, who lived near the countries that Vigilantius had infected with his opinions; and that he had been informed by them, that there were some there who favored his vices, and were pleased with his blasphemies: after having branded his book for a stupid piece of ignorance, and which did not deserve to be discussed, were it not for the sake of some *silly women, laden with sins*, of whom St. Paul speaks, 2 Timothy 3:6, he assaults Vigilantius upon the account of the place of his birth; he was born at Calaguri, whereupon St. Jerome makes a learned disquisition into the original of that people from Pompey's time: *Nimirum, saith he, respondet generi suo, ut qui de latronum et convenarum natus est semine, quos Cn. Pompeius, edomita Hispania, et ad triumphum redire festinans, de Pyrenaei jugis deposuit, et in unum oppidum congregavit, unde et convenarum urbs nomen accepit, hucusque latrocinetur contra Ecclesiam; et de Vectonibus, Arrebacis, Celtiberisque descendens, incurset Galliarum Ecclesias, portetque nequaquam vexillum Christi, sed insigne Diaboli. Fecit hoc idem Pompeius etiam in orientis partibus, ut Cilicibus et Isauris piratis latronibusque superatis, sui nominis inter Ciliciam et Isauriam conderet civitatem. Sed haec urbs hodie servat scita majorum, et nullus in ea ortus est Dormitantius: Galliae vernaculum hostem sustinent, et hominem moti capitis, atque Hippocraticis vinculis alligandum, sedentem sinunt in Ecclesia, et inter caetera verba blasphemiae, etc.*

“He indeed,” saith he, “every way answers his extraction; for being descended from robbers, and a mixed rabble drawn together from several parts, whom Pompey, after he had conquered Spain, and hasting to his triumph, removed from the tops of the Pyrenean hills, and gathered them into one city, which therefore was called the City of Strangers: what wonder is it then, if, being such a one, he ravage and spoil the Church; and if, deriving his pedigree from the Vectones, Arrebaci, and Celtiberi, he make incursions upon the Gallic Churches, fighting not under Christ's, but the Devil's

banner? Pompey also did the same in the east; where, after he had overcome the pirates and robbers of Cilicia and Isauria, he built a city bearing his own name between Cilicia and Isauria: but to this day that city observes their forefathers' customs, and never produced any Dormitanti; whereas Gaul maintains an home-bred enemy, and suffers a man that is half mad, one fit to be bound in Hippocrates's bands, to sit in the church, etc."

Here is a violent transport of rage: what horrid thing then is it that this robber hath attempted? Why he said, *Quid necesse est to tanto honore non solum honorare, sed etiam adorare illud nescio quid, quod in modico vasculo transferendo colis? Et rursum in eodem libro; Quid pulverem linteamine circumdatum adorando oscularis? Et in consequentibus, Prope ritum Gentilium videmus sub praetextu religionis introductum in ecclesias; sole adhuc fulgente, moles cereorum accendi, et ubicunque pulvisculum nescio quod, in modico vasculo, pretioso linteamine circumdatum osculantes adorare. Magnum honorem praebent hujusmodi homines beatissimis martyribus, quos putant de vilissimis cereolis illustrandos, quos Agnus qui est in medio throni cum omni fulgore majestatis suae illustrat:*

"What need is there for thee not only to venerate, but also adore something I know not what which thou worshippest, carrying it about in a little box? And again in the same book; Why dost thou kiss by way of worship a little dust wrapped up in linen? And afterwards; We have almost seen a heathenish rite introduced into the churches; whole heaps of wax tapers lighted in the face of the sun, and men every where kissing a little dust, shut up in a small box, with religious reverence, which is wrapt about with fine linen. These men must need render a great honor to the most blessed martyrs, whom they suppose to stand in need of the illustration of vile candles, whereas the Lamb that is in the midst of the throne doth illuminate them with all the brightness of his majesty."

This is a dreadful crime in Vigilantius beyond all controversy.

Who is there, replies St. Jerome to this, that ever adored the martyrs? And he proves that it may not be done, by the example of Paul and Barnabas, and of St. Peter. The Church of Rome, and the Bishop of Meaux, are

concerned to inquire whether St. Jerome was very orthodox, in denying a thing which at present cannot be so absolutely denied, without the imputation of heresy. After St. Jerome has shewn his indignation against this expression, *illud nescio quid*, as if Vigilantius therein had spoke blasphemy, and derogated from the honor due to the martyrs, he defends his judgment by the examples of Constantine, that is to say, of Constantius, who had transported to Constantinople the relics of St. Andrew, St. Luke, and Timothy; and of the Emperor Arcadius, who had caused the bones of the Prophet Samuel to be brought out of Judea to Thrace, with the approbation of the Bishops and people of that time. This is a very solid defense, if we may believe St. Jerome; for it seems there is no more to be said, when once a superstition comes to be sixty years old.

But the pleasantest thing of all is, that St. Jerome goes about to support this popular worship by this curious way of arguing, *Mortuum suspicaris, et idcirco blasphemus; lege Evangelium, Deus Abraham, Deus Isaac, Deus Jacob; non est Deus mortuorum, sed vivorum. Si ergo vivunt, honesto juxta te carcere non clauduntur; ais enim vel in sinu Abraham, vel in loco refrigerii, vel subter aram Dei, animas Apostolorum et Martyrum consedis, nec posse suis tumulis et ubi voluerint adesse praesentes; senatoriae videlicet dignitatis sunt, ut non inter homicidas teterrimo carcere, sed in libera honestaque custodia in Fortunatarum Insulis et in Campis Elysiis recludantur. Tu Deo leges ponis, tu Apostolis vincula injicis, ut usque ad diem judicii teneantur custodia; nec sint cum Domino suo, de quibus scriptum est, Sequuntur Agnum quocumque vadit. Si Agnus ubique, ergo et hi qui cum Agno sunt, ubique esse credendi sunt. Et cum Diabolus et daemones toto vagentur orbe, et celeritate nimia ubique praesentes sint, martyres post effusionem sanguinis, sui arca operientur inclusi, et inde exire non poterunt?*

“Thou supposest him to be dead, and therefore thou blasphemest; read the Gospel, *I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; he is not the God of the dead, but of the living.* But if they be alive, say you, they ought not to be shut up in such narrow prisons; and you own that the souls of the Apostles and Martyrs have taken up their abode either in the bosom of Abraham, or in a place of refreshment, or under the altar of God, and they cannot be present at their tombs, or wherever they

please: for by your account, they are persons of the first quality, and so ought not to be shut up amongst murderers in a filthy dungeon, but to enjoy a free and honorable custody in the Fortunate Islands and the Elysian Fields. Thus you limit and set laws to God, and bind the Apostles in chains, and keep them in custody till the day of judgment; so that they cannot be with their Lord, of whom it is written, that they follow the Lamb whithersoever he goes. Now seeing the Lamb is every where, they who are with the Lamb must be supposed to be every where also; and when the Devil and spirits do wander throughout the whole world, and by their overgreat nimbleness are present every where, shall we say that the martyrs, after the shedding of their blood, are shut up in their coffins, without being able to stir from thence?"

These fine reasonings of St. Jerome against Vigilantius have two characters. The first is, that they are contrary to the sentiments of most of the ancients: the second is, that they have been despised by St. Austin, and, in fine, have displeased all the Schoolmen; so that it is not worth while to contradict them. St. Jerome handles the rest of his matter much at the same rate. *Dicis in libello tuo, quod dum vivimus mutui pro nobis orare possumus; postquam autem mortui fuerimus, nullius sit pro alio exaudienda oratio: praesertim cum martyres ultionem sui obsecrantes impetrare non quiverint:*

“You say in your book, that whilst we are alive we may mutually pray for one another, but that after we are once dead, no man’s prayer can be heard for another; and the rather, because even the martyrs themselves begging of God that he would avenge their blood, have not been able to obtain their request.”

What is it St. Jerome answers to this? He saith, that if the saints, when alive, procured favors for others, they may obtain them much rather now, when they are with Christ, seeing they are not dead, but asleep, as the Scripture tells us.

As to the wax tapers, the use of which is blamed by Vigilantius, St. Jerome tells us something that will not over well agree with the Church of Rome. *Cereos autem non clara luce accendimus, sicut frustra calumniaris, sed ut noctis tenebras hoc solatio temperemus, et vigilemus ad lumen, ne tecum*

dormiamus in tenebris. Quod si aliqui propter imperitiam et simplicitatem saecularium hominum, vel certe religiosarum feminarum, de quibus vere possumus dicere, confiteor zelum Dei habent, sed non secundum scientiam, hoc pro honore martyrum faciunt, quid inde perdis? Causabantur quondam et Apostoli quod periret unguentum, sed Domini voce correpti sunt; neque enim Christus indigebat unguento, nec martyres lumine cereorum; et tamen illa mulier in honore Christi hoc fecit, devotioque mentis ejus recipitur. et quicumque accendunt cereos, secundum fidem, suam habent mercedem, dicente Apostolo, Unusquisque suo sensu abundet.

“Neither do we light wax tapers at noonday, as you causelessly complain, but only to allay the darkness of the night with the help of candles, and to be kept waking by the light of them, lest being in darkness we should fall asleep as well as you. But and if some out of ignorance and simplicity amongst the laymen or devout women, of whom we may truly say, that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge, should do this in honor to the martyrs, what is the loss or hurt of all this? So the Apostles also murmured of old, that the woman made waste of her ointment, but were reproved by our Lord himself; neither did the Lord want the ointment, any more than the martyrs stand in need of wax tapers; and yet because the woman did it in honor to Christ, her devotion is accepted of; and so they who light wax tapers receive a reward according to their faith; for the Apostle tells us, *Let every one abound in his own sense.*”

One cannot avoid taking notice how St. Jerome abuseth this passage of St. Paul, and the pretense he gives for adjudging rewards to all sorts of superstition; however we must acknowledge, that in this article St. Jerome hath many more approvers than Vigilantius.

Vigilantius called them idolaters, who, by lighting wax tapers by daylight, did imitate the customs of the heathens. How does St. Jerome answer him? First, He tells him, that what was done of this kind to idols was detestable; but that the same thing, when done out of respect to the martyrs, is very commendable. Secondly, That the eastern Churches lighted candles at the reading of the Gospel, though there be no relics of

the martyrs. Thirdly, That Jesus Christ assigns to the wise virgins lamps lighted. Fourthly, He opposeth to Vigilantius the example of the Bishop of Rome, who celebrated the Mass upon the tombs of the Apostles, as upon an altar. I feared I should tire the patience of my reader, should I go about to examine this piece of St. Jerome's throughout: this specimen may suffice to judge of the whole work.

I shall therefore only reduce to some few articles what I have further to add, in order to the full clearing of this question.

1. I affirm, that the Bishop of Meaux had no reason to say that Vigilantius opposed himself against the honors done to saints. St. Jerome does not accuse him of it in any part of his works; he only blames him because he was not for giving them so great honor as other men did. *Quid necesse est tanto honore, non tantum honorare, sed etiam adorare illud nescio quid?*

“What necessity is there not only to honor, but even to adore and worship I know not what, with so very great honor?”

2. It is for the Bishop of Meaux to tell us, whether he believes with St. Jerome, that Vigilantius was an heretic for denying that the souls of saints are present at their graves; and whether St. Jerom doth solidly prove, that we ought to believe them to be every where, where Jesus Christ is, because it is said in the Revelations, that *the virgins follow the Lamb whithersoever he goes.*

3. The truth is, Vigilantius stretched the point too far, in maintaining, that, after we are dead, the prayer of any one for another cannot be heard. Probably also he might be too rigid, in refusing to enter into the churches of the Apostles and Martyrs, to signify his aversion to the superstition which then began to be introduced, as St. Austin complains, *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae*, cap. 34. p. 37.

1. But it is false, that because Vigilantius found fault with the adoration of relics, therefore St. Jerome maintained the same to be lawful: he was so far from that, that he upbraids Vigilantius with calumniating the Church by this his accusation. *Quis, O insanum caput! aliquando martyres adoravit? Quis hominem putavit Deum?*

“Who ever, O foolish man, adored the martyrs? Who ever took a man to be God?”

It is evident that St. Jerome takes adoration to be an act due to God alone, and which he does not divide in two sorts, as the Church of Rome does at this day, which indeed makes three different sorts of it.

2. It is false, that St. Jerome maintains that the Church prayed to saints, whereof Vigilantius accuseth those against whom he had writ. He agrees with Vigilantius, that the saints ought not to be prayed to even as friends to Christ, and intercessors with God; *ne ut amici quidem Dei et comprecatores ad Deum*. Is it not manifest that the Bishop of Meaux abuses the world, when he quotes St. Jerome in favor of the Church of Rome, which prays to saints on both these accounts, which are so expressly rejected by St. Jerome; and when he upbraids the Protestants for following of Vigilantius in an article which St. Jerome owns as well as he, and the whole Church at that time? But to speak the truth, the whole of Vigilantius’s crime consists, first, in that he was willing to bring the discipline of the Council of Elvira in force again, which was assembled at the beginning of the fourth century; the constitutions whereof were undervalued towards the end of the same age, after the Christian religion began to bear down all its opposers, under the reign of Constantine and his children. Secondly, because he attributes to the Church some customs which were not all of them authorized, though they were already generally received and maintained by the ignorant and superstitious sort of people. Thirdly, because he opposed some customs as general, which were capable of being explained in a tolerable sense. But indeed at the bottom, St. Jerome and Vigilantius were very well agreed upon the point we condemn in the Church of Rome; neither do we find that the Church, to which Vigilantius did belong, did ever except against him. Thus it is evident, that the Protestants may look upon Vigilantius as a zealous defender of the Christian purity, and one of those who opposed themselves against superstition in its first rise.

CHAPTER 5

The state of the Churches of Aquintain and Narbon in the fifth century.

THIS age furnisheth us with several considerable witnesses. St. Jerome, whom the Bishop of Meaux has endeavored to represent as our antagonist, is the first of them.

He saith, speaking of Exuperius, Bishop of Tholouse, that this holy Bishop carried the Eucharist in a wicker basket, a way by no means agreeable to the custom of the Church of Rome, where it is accompanied with quite different ceremonies. First, because it is made the object of adoration; and that in the very streets. Secondly, because people dare not touch the least crumb of it, as being persuaded that the body of Jesus Christ which is in the host multiplies according to the number of the crumbs into which the host may be broken. Thirdly, because by this means it might come to be trod under foot or lost, upon which a thousand inconveniencies must follow.

It is worth observing here concerning this custom of carrying the Eucharist about, which was in use in the second century, as appears from the writings of Justin Martyr, that it differed very much from what we find in the Romish Church since the twelfth century. For indeed since that time Rome has taken great care to obtain laws whereby all that walk in the streets, whether Jews, Heathens, or Christians, might be compelled to adore what she looks upon as her God. But we find nothing like this in any law of the emperors, or Christian princes in favor of the adoration of the Eucharist.

The second witness whom we may consult about the state of these dioceses is Sulpitius Severus, Monk of Primuliacum in Guienne. And since he wrote at a time when the zeal for that kind of life did transport the best men, we need not wonder that he hath inserted so many fables in the books we have of his, though, setting those aside, nothing was finer in that age than his writings.

But after all, it is certain, that notwithstanding all this leaven of a monastic spirit, we find many characters of a very pure divinity in his books: this

will appear from the following observations; whence it is obvious to conclude, that he was not engaged in Popish maxims.

1. He maintains, that it was Jesus Christ that wrestled with Jacob; which passage the Doctors of the Church of Rome corrupt, to have an occasion thence to conclude that a mere angel had blessed Jacob; *Pridie*, saith he, *quam inter se fratres convenirent, Dominus, humana specie assumpta, colluctatus cum Jacob refertur. Et cum adversus Dominum praevaluisset, tamen non esse mortalem non ignoravit; benedici sibi ab eo flagitabat:*

“The day before the brothers met, the Lord is said to have wrestled with Jacob in a human form; and though he prevailed against the Lord, yet he knew him not to be mortal, and desired to be blessed by him.”

2. He owns the second Commandment, and distinguisheth it from the first. *Non erunt tibi Dii alieni praeter me. Non facies tibi idolum.*

“Thou shalt have no other Gods but me. Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven image.”

Neither doth he split the last command into two, as the Church of Rome does at present; for he concludes the decalogue in this manner, *Non falsum testimonium dices adversus proximum tuum. Non concupisces quidquam proximi tui.*

“Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. Thou shalt not covet any thing that is thy neighbor’s?”

3. He was so little persuaded that the name of Catholic was a solid character of the true Church, that he confesses that Arianism had infected all the world. See how he expresseth himself, *Eoque his certaminibus processum, ut istiusmodi piaculis orbis terrarum implicaretur, nam Italiam, Illyricum atque orientem Valens et Ursacius, caeterique, quorum nomina edidimus, infecerant:*

“And these contests proceeded so far, that the whole world became involved in this wickedness; for Valens and Ursacius, with the rest, whose names we have mentioned, had infected Italy, Illyricum, and the east.”

4. He minded the Pope's power of suppressing heresy so little, that he owns St. Hilary to have preserved Gaul: *Illud*, saith he, *apud omnes constitit, unius Hilarii beneficio, Gallias nostras piaculo haeresis liberatas;*

“Thus much was known to all, that by the sole endeavors of Hilary, our Gaul was delivered from the infection of heresy.”

5. He shews so violent an aversion to the spirit of persecution, that he very sharply reproves Ithacius for using the Priscillianists hardly, who were a branch of the Manichees that had settled themselves in Spain, and for persuading the Emperor Gratian to banish them: *Is*, saith he, *viz. Ithacius, vero sine modo et ultra quam oportuit, Idacium sociosque ejus lacessens, facem quandam nascenti incendio subdidit, ut exasperaverit malos potius quam compresserit — Tum vero Idacius atque Ithacius acrius instare — arbitrantes posse inter initia malum comprimi; sed parum sanis consiliis saeculares judices adeunt, ut eorum decretis atque executionibus, haeretici urbibus pellerentur. Igitur post multa et foeda Idacio supplicante, elicitur a Gratiano tum Imperatore rescriptum,* etc.

“But he above measure, and beyond what ought to have been done, provoking Idacius and his fellows, helped to blow the flame, and exasperate these wicked men, rather than suppress them. — Whereupon Idacius and Ithacius began to *double their endeavors*, supposing that the mischief might be suppressed in its beginning; but being ill advised, they address themselves to secular judges, that by their decrees and executions the heretics might be banished the cities. Thus after many and base intrigues upon Idacius's petitioning, an order was drawn from Gratian, the then Emperor,” etc.

6. He draws such a parallel between St. Ambrose and Pope Damasus, that he attributes to them the supreme authority in the Church, which doth not at all agree with the notion of Papacy. After having said that it was impossible for the Priscillianists to justify themselves before Damasus, Bishop of Rome, and St. Ambrose, because both these Bishops refused to hear them, he proceeds thus; *Tum vertere consilia,*

ut quia duobus Episcopis, quorum ea tempestate summa autoritas erat, non illuserat, etc.

“Then they began to change their measures, and because they could not delude the two Bishops, whose authority was supreme at that time,” etc.

7. He informs us what the tendency is of the worship given to martyrs, by the history he gives us of an altar, which the popular superstition had rendered famous, because they pretended that some martyrs had been buried in that place. St. Martin, whose life is described by our author, not being able to make any certain discovery of the name of this martyr, and the circumstances of his sufferings, and being loth absolutely to doubt of the truth of it, thought fit himself to go to this famous sepulcher, in company of some of his brethren: being come to the place, he earnestly begged of God to reveal to him the name and merit of the martyr; and afterwards turning himself towards the left, *Vidit prope assistere umbram sordidam trucem;*

“He sees standing near him a hideous and terrible ghost.”

They command him to declare himself, the ghost obeys; *Nomen edicit, de crimine confitetur, latronem se fuisse, ob scelera percussus, vulgi errore celebratum; sibi nihil cum martyribus esse commune; cum illos gloria, se poena retineret:*

“Tells his name, confesseth his crime, that he had been executed for robbery, that it was only the error of the people caused him to be canonized; that he was in nothing like the martyrs, who were in glory, whereas he was in pain.”

The good St. Martin being troubled to hear this account, caused the altar to be carried to another place; and so, saith our author, delivered the people from a superstitious error.

8. He declares that the custom of carrying the images of the saints through the parishes, was no better than a custom derived from the heathens. The same saint, saith he, once by accident saw a company of heathens at a distance, who accompanied the body of an heathen to the grave; but finding himself too far off to discover what they were about,

and perceiving the winds to wave the linen wherewith the dead body was covered, he imagined they were employed about the profane ceremonies of their sacrifices, and the reason he gives of it is this: *Quia esset haec Gallorum rusticis consuetudo, simulacra daemonum, candido tecta velamine, misera per agros suos circumferre dementia;*

“Because it was the custom of the country people of Gaul to carry madly about their grounds the images of demons, covered over with a white veil.”

9. He lays down a very remarkable maxim for the Albigenses: *Ecclesiam auro non strui, sed potius destrui:*

“That gold was not the means of building, but rather of destroying the Church;”

which those of the Church of Rome could never forgive him, as appears by their censures in the margin.

10. He severely blames the conduct of those who employ violence against such as do not acquiesce in their decisions. He went, saith he, to Alexandria, but would not make any stay in a place: *Ubi recens fraternae cladis fervebat invidia; nam etsi fortasse videantur parere Episcopis debuisse, non ob hanc tamen causam multitudinem tantam sub Christi confessione viventem, praesertim ab Episcopis oportuisset affigi:*

“Where the reproach of their intestine slaughters was yet fresh; for though perhaps it was their duty to have obeyed the Bishops, yet such a vast number of persons living in the confession of Christ ought not to have been afflicted in that manner, especially by the Bishops.”

11. He acquaints us with the unjust proceedings of the Spanish Bishops against the Priscillianists, and the ridiculous marks they had to discover them: *Maximus Imperator, alias satis bonus, depravatus consiliis Sacerdotum, post Priscilliani necem, Ithacium Episcopum Priscilliani accusatorem, caeterosque illius socios, vi regia tuebatur, ne quis ei crimini daret, opera illius cujuscunque modi hominem fuisse damnatum. Et jam pridie Imperator ex illorum sententia decreverat*

tribunos summa potestate armatos ad Hispanias mittere, qui haereticos inquirerent, deprehensis vitam et bona adimerent. nec dubium erat quin sanctorum etiam maximam turbam tempestas ista depopulatura est, parvo discrimine inter hominum genera: etenim tum solis oculis judicabatur, cum quis pallore potius aut veste, quam fide haereticus aestimaretur.

“Maximus the Emperor, otherwise a very good man, being spoiled by the counsel of the Priests, after Priscillian’s death, did by his kingly power defend Ithacius the Bishop, Priscillian’s accuser, and the rest of his associates, that no body might reflect on him, as if by his procurement any man had been condemned. — The day before the Emperor had already, according to their liking, resolved to send tribunes with full power into Spain, to examine those that were heretics, and being found such, to take away their lives and estates: neither was it to be doubted but that this storm would have reached the greatest part of believers, because of the small distinction made between them and the other: for then they judged persons only by the eye, esteeming them heretics from their pale looks or habit, rather than by their faith.”

He afterwards shews the horror that St. Martin had conceived against these kind of proceedings. There was nothing he was more concerned about; *Illu praecipua cura ne tribuni cum jure gladiatorum ad Hispanias mitterentur.*

“Than to prevent the tribunes being sent into Spain, with the power of the sword.”

He renounced communion with these sanguinary bishops; but not long after, to avoid a greater mischief, he was obliged to give up that point, though he still refused to subscribe to the condemnation of the Priscillianists; *Hujus diei communionem Martinus iniit, satius aestimans ad horam cedere, quam his non consulere, quorum cervicibus gladius imminebat, veruntamen summa vi Episcopis nitentibus ut communionem illam subscriptione firmaret, extorqueri non potuit.*

“Martin communicated with them at that time, thinking it better for a while to give way to them, than not to provide for their

safety, who had the sword hanging over them: but yet though the Bishops used their utmost endeavors to make him ratify his communicating with them by his subscription, they could never bring him to it.”

If we consult Vincentius Lirinensis and Cassian, they will afford us much light as to the state of these dioceses.

Vincentius, a priest of the monastery of Lerins, is one of those who can best inform us what was esteemed orthodox in these churches. Indeed we find all the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome are condemned in the maxims that he solidly asserts in the 28th chapter of his *Commonitorium*, where he maintains that the Church may every day make a further progress in the knowledge of truth, and all this without making any innovation: *Crescat igitur oportet, et multum vehementerque proficiat, tam singulorum quam omnium, tam unius hominis quam totius Ecclesiae, aetatum ac saeculorum gradibus intelligentia, scientia, sapientia, sed in suo duntaxat genere, in eodem se dogmate, eodem sensu, eademque sententia:*

“The understanding, knowledge, and wisdom, as well of every singular person as of the whole Church, ought to grow and greatly increase, according to the several degrees of times and ages, but every one in his own way; that is to say, in the same doctrine, in the same sense, and the same judgement.”

2. He in the same place exclaims against all new doctrines and new names, and yet owns that the Church acquires daily more light in matters of religion; *Sed ita tamen ut vere profectus sit ille, fidei non permutatio:*

“But yet so that this is really an advancement, not a change of faith.”

3. He reduces all that we ought to believe to the rule of faith, and declares what is the true use and the true authority of the Doctors of the Church: *Quae tamen antiqua sanctorum Patrum consensus, non in omnibus Divinae legis quaestiunculis, sed solum certe praecipue in fidei regula, magno nobis studio et investiganda est et sequenda. — Quibus tamen (Patribus) hac lege credendum est, ut quicquid vel*

omnes vel plures, uno eodemque sensu, manifeste, frequenter, perseveranter, velut quodam consentiente sibi magistrorum consilio, accipiendo, tenendo, tradendo firmaverint, id pro indubitato, certo, ratoque habeatur:

“But yet this primitive consent of the holy Fathers is not to be inquired after and followed as to the lesser questions of Divine law alike, but especially, if not only, in the rule of faith. — Which Fathers we may give full credit to, on this condition, that whatsoever all or the most of them do in the same sense, manifestly, frequently, and constantly maintain, as in a council of masters agreeing together, by their receiving, holding and delivering the same, that ought to be esteemed unquestionable, certain, and firm.”

4. He lays down a method how we may dispute with the Church of Rome about the errors she has drawn from antiquity, by reducing the whole dispute to the Scripture: *Atque ideo quascunque illas antiquiores, vel schismatum vel haeresium profanitates, hullo modo nos oportet, nisi aut sola, si opus est, Scripturarum autoritate convincere, aut certe jam antiquitus universalibus Sacerdotum Catholicorum conciliis convictas damnatasque vitare:*

“Wherefore we are no other way to convict all ancient errors of schism or heresy, but either, if need be, by the sole authority of Scripture, or else to avoid them, as already condemned by the universal councils of Catholic Priests.”

5. He excellently explains the use of tradition, without derogating any thing from the sufficiency of Scripture: *Diximus in superioribus hanc fuisse semper, et esse hodieque Catholicorum consuetudinem, ut fidem veram duobus istis mediis adprobent: primum Divini canonis autoritate; deinde Ecclesiae traditione: non quia canon solus non sibi ad universa sufficiat, sed quia verba Divina pro suo plerique arbitrato interpretantes, varias opiniones erroresque concipiant; atque ideo necesse sit ut ad unam ecclesiastici sensus regulam Scripturae coelestis intelligentia dirigatur; in iis duntaxat praecipue quaestionibus, quibus totius Catholici dogmatis fundamenta nituntur:*

“We have said before, that this hath been and still is the custom of Catholics, to prove the true faith two ways; first, by the authority of the Divine canon; and secondly, by the Church’s tradition: not as if the canon were not of itself sufficient, but because most men interpret Scripture according to their own private fancy, which has given occasion to various opinions and errors: wherefore it is needful that the understanding of holy Scripture be regulated by one single determination of the Church, and particularly in those questions on which the foundations of all Catholic doctrine rest.”

Lastly, he desires that universal consent may be taken only from such a tradition as he authorizeth: *Item diximus in ipsa rursus Ecclesia universitatis pariter ac antiquitatis consensionem spectari oportere, ne aut ab unitatis integritate in partem schismatis abrumpamur, aut a vetustatis religione in haeresewn novitates praecipitemur.*

“We have said also that in the Church we are to have an eye to the consent of universality and antiquity, that we be not rent from the entire union into a schism, or be cast headlong from the religion of the ancients into the novelties of heresy.”

There needs little more than these maxims to secure a Church where they are taught, from those corruptions into which the Church of Rome is fallen by her continual practice of the contrary, as well in respect of the doctrines of faith, as of religious worship.

Cassian, a Priest, the disciple of Chrysostom, hath writ much concerning the institutes of Monks, and accordingly we find in his writings several instances of their folly and pride. He saith the young Monks observed the rules prescribed to them so exactly, *Ut non solum non audeant, absque Praepositi sui scientia vel permissu, non solum cella progredi, sed ne ipsi quidem communi et naturali necessitati satisfacere sua autoritate praesumant:*

“That, without leave obtained from their Abbot, they dare not only not stir out of their cells, but what is more, not so much as satisfy the common necessities of nature.”

He shews that covetousness began already to reign amongst the Monks of his time. *Tertius*, saith he, *nobis est conflictus adversus philargyriam,*

quam nos amorem pecuniarum possumus appellare; peregrinum bellum et extra naturam, nec aliunde in Monacho sumens principium, quam de corruptae et torpidae mentis ignavia, et plerumque initio abrenuntiationis male arrepto, et erga Deum tepido amore:

“Our third conflict is with the love of money, a foreign and unnatural war, and which arises in Monks from the sluggishness of a corrupt and benumbed mind, and very oft is grounded upon an inconsiderate entrance upon a self-denying life, and a lukewarm love towards God.”

He cannot bear the impudence of those covetous Monks who defended themselves with those words of Jesus Christ, *It is more glorious to give than to receive*. He censures the impertinent interpretation which some Monks put upon these words of Christ, *Whosoever doth not take up his cross and follow me, is not worthy of me: Quod quidam districtissimi Monachorum, habentes quidem zelum Dei, sed non secundum scientiam, simpliciter intelligentes, fecerunt sibi cruces ligneas, easque jugiter humeris circumferentes, non aedificationem, sed risum cunctis videntibus intulerunt:*

“Which some of the strictest Monks, having a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge, taking too literally, made themselves wooden crosses, and by carrying them about upon their shoulders, instead of edifying, provoked those that saw them to laughter.”

2. He informs us that the monks of Egypt were no scrupulous observers of their fasts, and that they made no difficulty of breaking them, in order to discharge some duty which appeared of more importance to them. Cassian tells us he was surprised at it; but one of the eldest Monks returned him this excellent answer: *Jejunium semper est mecum; vos autem continuo dimissurus, mecum jugiter tenere non potero. Et jejunium quidem, licet utile sit, ac jugiter necessarium, tamen voluntarii muneris est oblatio: opus autem charitatis impleri exigit praecepti necessitas:*

“To fast is always in my power; but you being ready to depart, I cannot have you always with me. Besides, to fast, though it be useful and always necessary, yet it is but a free-will-offering:

whereas acts of charity are required of us upon the account of their being commanded.”

3. It appears that they did not believe the Scriptures to be so obscure as at this day they are supposed to be. We may see what Abbot Theodorus thought of this matter, as we find it set down by Cassian. *Monachum ad Scripturarum notitiam pertingere cupientem, nequaquam debere labores suos erga commentatorum libros impendere, sed potius omnem mentis industriam et intentionem cordis erga emendationem vitiorum carnalium detinere, quibus expulsis, confestim cordis oculi, sublato velamine passionum, sacramenta Scripturarum velut natura liter incipient contemplari. Siquidem nobis, non ut essent incognita vel obscura, Sancti Spiritus gratia promulgata sunt: sed nostro vitio, velamine peccatorum cordis oculos obnubente, redduntur obscura, quibus rursus naturali redditis sanitati, ipsa Scripturarum sanctarum lectio ad contemplationem vere scientiæ abunde etiam sola sufficiat, nec eos commentatorum institutionibus indigere.*

“That a Monk who desires to attain to the knowledge of Scripture, ought not to spend his time upon commentators, but rather bend and apply his utmost industry and attention to the purging himself from fleshly lusts, which if they are once expelled, then immediately the eyes of the heart, upon removing of the veil of passions, will as it were naturally begin to contemplate the mysteries of Scripture; since we may be sure that the grace of the Holy Spirit never gave them forth that they should continue unknown or obscure; but they are darkened by our own fault, because the veil of sin covers the eyes of the soul, which when once restored to their natural soundness, the very reading of the Holy Scripture is alone abundantly sufficient for their contemplation of true knowledge; neither do they further need the instructions of commentators.”

4. It is evident that he did not believe transubstantiation, because he saith, *Nemo in terris situs in coelis esse potest:*

“No body placed on the earth can be in heaven.”

5. We find that he did not own auricular confession, no more than Chrysostom his master, because where he gives an account of the means whereby we may obtain the forgiveness of sins, he doth not mention one word of it. True it is that he speaks indeed of a confession of sins, but of such an one as is to be made to God alone. *Nec non, saith he, per peccatorum confessionem eorum abolitio conceditur; Dixi enim, ait, pronuntiabo adversum me injustitiam meam Domino, et tu remisisti impietatem peccati mei:*

“And also by the confession of sin their forgiveness is granted; For, saith he, I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.”

6. He acknowledges that the fast of Lent was no apostolical law. *Sciendum sane hanc observationem Quadragesimae, quamdiu Ecclesiae illius primitivae perfectio illibata permansit, penitus non fuisse. — Verum cum ab illa apostolica devotione descendens quotidie credentium multitudo suis opibus incubaret, nec eas usui cunctorum, secundum Apostolorum instituta divideret, sed privatim impendiis suis consulens, non servare tantum, sed etiam augere contenderet, Ananiae et Sapphirae exemplum non contenta sectari; id tunc universis Sacerdotibus placuit, ut homines curis saecularibus illigatos, et pene, ut ita dixerim, continentiae vel compunctionis ignaros, ad opus sanctum canonica indictione revocarent:*

“We are to know that as long as the perfection of that primitive Church remained untainted, there was no such observation of Lent. — But when the multitude of believers, daily declining from that apostolical devotion, set their hearts upon their riches, not distributing them for the use of all, according to the rule of the Apostles, but applying themselves to private expenses, endeavored not only to keep what they had, but to increase it, being not content to follow the example of Ananias and Sapphira; then was it thought good by the universality of priests, to recal men that were entangled in secular business, and in a manner ignorant of what continence or compunction meant, to this holy work by the canonical injunction of a fast.”

I proceed to other considerable authors who have lived in these dioceses. Salvian, a Priest at Marseilles, informs us what their faith was, in several important articles.

1. He refers all faith to the Scriptures: *Si scire vis*, saith he, *quid tenendum sit, habes Literas sacras: perfecta ratio est hoc tenere quod legeris.* — *Cum legimus quod regat cuncta quae fecit; hoc ipso approbamus quod regit, quia se regere testatur. Cum legimus quod praesenti iudicio omnia dispenset; hoc ipso est evidens quod iudicat, quia se iudicare confirmat. Alia enim omnia, id est, humana dicta, argumentis ac testibus egent. Dei autem sermo ipse sibi testis est; quia necesse est quicquid incorrupta veritas loquitur incorruptum sit veritatis testimonium:*

“Wouldst thou know what thou art to believe; thou hast the holy Scripture; it is the perfection of reason to hold whatever thou readest there. — When we read that he rules every thing that he hath made; by this we approve of his governing of every thing, because he says it. For all other, that is, human sayings, stand in need of proofs and witnesses; but God’s word is its own witness; because whatsoever incorrupt truth speaks must needs be an incorrupt witness of truth.”

2. He seems to approve of the difficulty which some of the Waldenses and Albigenses made to swear, when he saith, *Jussit Salvator noster, ut Christiani homines non jurarent:*

“Our Savior commanded that Christians should not swear.”

3. He absolutely forbids pride to those who believe themselves righteous. See how he expresses himself; *Et hoc intolerabilis superbiae atque immanis piaculi crimen est, si tam bonum se aliquis esse credat, ut etiam malos existimet per se posse salvari. Loquens Deus de terra quadam, vel de populo peccatore, sic dicit: Si fuerint tres viri in medio ejus, Noe et Daniel et Job, non liberabunt filios et filias, ipsi soli salvi erunt. Neminem tamen reor tam impudentem fore qui se his talibus viris audeat comparare: quia quamvis placere nunc aliquis Deo studeat, hoc ipsum tamen genus maximum injustitiae est, si se justum praesumat:*

“This also is intolerable pride, and the highest wickedness, for any one to think himself so good, as that wicked men may be saved by his means,”

etc. and concludes;

“For though a man may do his endeavor to please God, yet is it the highest kind of unrighteousness, if he presume himself to be righteous.”

He passeth the same judgment upon those who believe they merit by their prayer; *Neque enim unquam nos ita vivimus ut exaudiri mereamur:*

“Neither do we ever live so as to deserve to have our prayers heard.”

4. He gives us a perfect picture of the hypocrisy of the Monks of his time. *Qui, saith he, sub specie religionis, vitiis saecularibus mancipati: qui scilicet post veterum flagitiorum probra et crimina, titulo sanctitatis sibi inscripto, non conversatione aliis, sed professione nomen tantum denotaverunt, non vitam: et summam Divini cultus habitum magis quam actum existimantes, vestem tantummodo exuere, non mentem; nam taliter ferme omnes agunt, ut eos non tam putes antea poenitentiam criminum egisse, quam postea ipsius poenitentiae poenitere: nec tam prius poenituisse quod male vixerint, quam postea quod se promiserint bene esse victuros: Novum prorsus conversionis genus! licita non faciunt, et illicita committunt. Temperant a concubitu, et non temperant a rapina. — Quid agis, stulta persuasio? Peccata interdixit Deus, non matrimonia; non conveniunt studiis vestris facta vestra: non debetis esse amici criminum, qui dicitis vos sectatores esse virtutum:*

“Who under a shew of religion are slaves to the vices of this world; who having taken upon themselves a title of holiness, after the reproaches and scandals of former crimes, do not alter their lives by a new conversation, but change their names by a new profession; and thinking that the sum of the worship of God lies more in their clothes than their actions, they have only changed their garments, not their minds; for they do almost all things in such a manner, that you would not so much think that they had

repented of their former crimes, as that afterwards they had repented of their repentance; nor that at first they repented of their wicked lives, so much as afterwards that they had ever promised to live well. — A new kind of conversion this is: what is lawful they do not do, and commit what is unlawful. They abstain from women, but not from rapine.”

He adds to his sharp censure of them, that God never forbade marriage:

“O foolish persuasion, what dost thou? God forbids sin, not marriage; your actions do not agree with your profession; you must not be friends to crimes, who pretend to be followers of virtues.”

He shews also that at Carthage they were extremely despised.

“And if at any time any servant of God, from the monasteries of Egypt, or the holy places at Jerusalem, or from the holy and venerable retirements of the wilderness, happened to come to that town to perform some divine office, he was no sooner seen by the people, but they all loaded him with opprobrious language, sacrilege and curses.”

5. He shews that it is in vain for any one to bear the name of Catholic, if he doth not answer that character; and he prefers the Goths and Vandals, that were Arians, to the orthodox Christians of his time.

“They, saith he, are humble towards God, we rebellious; they believed victory to be in God’s hand, we in our own. — What can the privilege of a religious name avail us, that we call ourselves Catholics, that we boast ourselves to be believers, that we despise the Goths and Vandals, by reviling them as heretics, whilst we ourselves live as ill as heretics? — If we be not found doing these things, (*viz.* the duties of true Christians,) it is in vain that we flatter ourselves with the empty presumption of the name of Catholics.”

6. He sufficiently shews that prayer for the dead was at that time thought to be a very uncertain thing, when he saith,

“But if either the violence of the disease be such, or the carelessness of the sick hath been so great, as to continue in their spiritual infection till they are a dying, then I do not know what to say, or what to promise. — It is better in deed to leave nothing unattempted, than to neglect a dying person; especially, because I do not know, whether to endeavor any thing at the last gasp may be a medicine; sure it is, that to try nothing, is certain perdition.”

7. He expressly excludes the doctrine of merits.

“For this alone what equivalent can man pay, for whom Christ gave himself by the suffering of most extreme pains? Or what will he render to the Lord worthy of him, who owns God himself to be God, by whom he was redeemed?”

I ought in this place to mention a canon of the first Council of Orange, held in the year 441; at which fifteen of the Bishops of Gallia Narbonensis and the country about Lyons assisted. It is the 17th canon; the first words are these, *Cum capsa et calix offerendus est* (other MSS. have *inferendus*, which seems more agreeable to reason) *et admixtione Eucharistiae consecrandus*.

We find that this canon does hint at these two things very clearly. First, that at that time they kept the bread of the Eucharist in a casket or coffer, so far were they from making it an object of their adoration. Second, that the mingling only of the bread that was consecrated before, with the wine that was not consecrated, made them look upon the wine, though not consecrated by the words of Jesus Christ, as the blood of Jesus Christ; which is the most extravagant and senseless notion in the world, if we suppose that these Fathers were seasoned with the doctrine of transubstantiation, which attributes to the words of Christ, only the virtue of changing the substance of the wine into the substance of the blood of Christ. Allatius takes a great deal of pains to avoid this argument, which shews, that the Greek Church, that believes the same, cannot be of the faith of the Church of Rome. In the mean time, the thing is certain, and Mabillon has ingenuously acknowledged, that this is the true sense of that canon. And indeed there are many proofs that make it evident, that both the Greek and Latin Fathers were of this opinion.

Salonius, one of the most famous Bishops of Gallia Narbonensis, owns no other doctrine but that of the Old and New Testament. *Drink waters out of thine own cistern, and running waters out of thine own well.* S.

“By cistern he means the catholic doctrine, that is, that of the Old and New Testament; and by the well, he understands the depth and height of the same catholic doctrine, that is, the various meanings of holy Scripture: for in these words he teacheth us to beware of the doctrine of heretics, and to attend to the reading of holy Scripture.”

He will have the author’s meaning, and not tradition, to be the explication of Scripture. *Do not remove the ancient land-marks, or bounds, which thy fathers have set.* S.

“By the ancient bounds he understands the bounds of truth and faith, which catholic Doctors have placed from the beginning.”

He would have no man therefore receive the truth of holy faith and gospel doctrine, any otherwise than it hath been handed down to them by the holy Fathers, and likewise commands that no man interpret the words of holy Scripture, otherwise than according to the intention of each writer.

He doth not own the Apocrypha. How many books did Solomon publish? S.

“Three only, according to the number of their titles, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles. V. What doth Solomon say in the Proverbs, or what doth he teach in Ecclesiastes, and his Songs?”

He assigns but two places whither the soul goes immediately.

“For, by the tree, man is understood, because every man is as it were a tree in the wood of mankind; by the south, which is a warm wind, is signified the rest of paradise; and by the north, which is cold, is signified the pain of hell: and the meaning of it is, wheresoever man prepares a place for his future abode, if to the south, when he falls, (that is, dies,) he shall abide to all eternity in the rest of paradise, and the glory of the kingdom of heaven.”

He makes it the greatest absurdity, that a man should eat his own flesh; which yet follows from the doctrine of transubstantiation.

“But that expression, he eats his own flesh, is spoke by an hyperbole. *V.* What is an hyperbole? *S.* When any thing is expressed that is incredible. *V.* How is this expressed hyperbolically, he eats his own flesh? *S.* Because it is incredible that any man should eat his own flesh: but to aggravate the slothfulness of this fool, he saith, that he eats his own flesh, to shew that a fool rather desires his flesh should waste by hunger, and be consumed by the misery of want, than to support it by the labor of his hands.”

These are all maxims concerning divers important articles, very different from the present maxims of the Church of Rome.

I grant that Prosper, who was a native of Aquitain, was no more than a layman; but he was in so great a reputation, that there were but few Bishops of his time, that have shewn more knowledge, or expressed more zeal for the defense of truth, than he did. This testimony is given of him by Cassiodorus, Photius, and Vasquez. Wherefore his testimony concerning the faith of his country must be of great weight with us.

Would we know the opinion of the Church of this diocese? He tells us of a small part of the body of Jesus Christ, thereby meaning the Eucharist or the Sacrament, which was given in little bits. And it is in the same sense that he speaks of a small part of the sacrifice; expressions that are utterly inconsistent with the notion of the Church of Rome concerning the carnal presence. And indeed it is plain in all his writings, that he follows the steps of St. Augustin, in his expressions and judgments of things which are contrary to those of the Church of Rome.

This we may see in his extract of the Sentences of St. Augustin, where he repeats what that Father had said upon Psalm 33 upon occasion of these words of the vulgar version, which says, that *David ferebater in manibus suis*, in the presence of Achish. Where it clearly appears, that he understood those words, as well as St. Augustin did, of the sacrament of his body, which may be called his body in some sense; that is to say, by way of likeness, as St. Augustin expresseth himself concerning it.

I cite nothing here from those other works, which are attributed to him, because indeed they are none of his.

I shall only observe two things: the first is, that in his Epistle to Demetrius he plainly shews, that he knew nothing of the doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning the necessity of the Minister's intention for the validity of the sacraments: for there he attributes all to the work of God, and not to that of the Minister, according to the doctrine of St. Augustin upon the question of the validity of baptism conferred by heretics.

The other is, that as he follows St. Augustin in the matter of free grace, as one may see in his poems gathered from the opinions of St. Augustin and his Sentences; so he rejects the doctrine of merit and works, as a pure Pelagian doctrine, in several places of his writings.

Lastly, we must join with these authors, Arnobius the Rhetorician, (since it is very probable that he lived in Gallia Narbonensis, because he has dedicated some of his works to Leontius, Bishop of Arles, to the Bishop of Narbonne, and Faustus, Bishop of Riez, who died about the year 485.) Arnobius explains his belief in the matter of the Eucharist after this manner: *We have received*, saith he upon the fourth Psalm, *wheat in the body, wine in the blood, and oil in chrism*. So likewise on Psalm 104 he saith of Jesus Christ, that he administers *not only the species of bread, but also of wine and oil*. Thus it is he describes the Eucharist and baptism. We may observe likewise, that as he recommends to believers the consideration of these words, *sursum corda*, at the moment of their receiving these mysteries; so he doth not own that any receive the body of Christ besides those that fear him, and who by faith are made the sanctuary of God: thus he argues in his Commentaries upon Psalm 21 et 132.

As for Faustus, Bishop of Riez, whatever contests he had with those who defended the doctrine of St. Augustin in the matter of grace, which made Pope Gelasius condemn his writings; yet certain it is, that France has always had the highest esteem for him possible; and his name is registered in the catalogue of her saints in the Roman Martyrology, till it was expunged by Molanes in the last century. Neither hath this hindered but

that to this day he is honoured and prayed unto, as a saint, in the diocese of Riez. His doctrine is as follows.

1. He rejects the merits of good works, and works of supererogation, as particularly as if he had had an eye to the Papists:

“Wherefore, saith he, though we endeavor with all labors of soul and body; though we exercise ourselves with all the might of our obedience; yet nothing of all this is of sufficient worth to be rendered or offered up by us as a deserving recompence for heavenly good things. No temporal obedience whatsoever can be equivalent to the joys of eternal life. Though our limbs may be wearied with watchings, and our faces discoloured with fastings; yet when all is done, the sufferings of this time will never be worthy to be compared with that glory which shall be revealed in us.”

He discourseth much at the same rate concerning grace and free-will.

2. We see clearly that he did not own the existence of the body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, in the manner of a spirit, because he maintains all creatures to be corporal; and that the soul is distinctly in a certain place, because if it were otherwise, we must conclude it to be every where. That which is very strange is, that Mamertus, who hath refuted him, doth yet more directly thwart this doctrine of Rome, by the various hypotheses which he proposeth when he confutes this Faustus, Bishop of Riez. But this century hath detained me too long; I proceed now therefore to consider the state of these dioceses in the sixth century.

CHAPTER 6

The state of these dioceses in the sixth century.

WE do not find so many authors of these dioceses in the sixth century, as we have had in the foregoing; but however, those we have of them are sufficient to inform us what their state was. I begin with St. Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, who assisted at the Council of Agde in the year 502, and died in 542; so that he reached almost the middle of this century.

This great man fully represents the notion that he had of the Eucharist, when he shews, that in baptism there is the same change, and the same presence of the blood of Jesus Christ, which he owns in the Eucharist; as appears in the 4th and 5th Homily. But in his 7th Homily he speaks in such a manner as needs no commentary:

“And therefore since he was now about to withdraw his assumed body from our eyes, and carry it up to heaven, it was needful that the same day he should consecrate for us the sacrament of his body and blood, that he might continually be remembered by the mystery which was once offered up for our redemption:”

that so seeing his intercession for the salvation of man was daily and continual, the offering up of our redemption might be perpetual also, that this everlasting sacrifice might live in our memory, and be always present by grace.

2. Though he speaks of the Eucharist as changed into the body of Jesus Christ by the power of God, yet he maintains that it is by faith, and by the acts of understanding, that we can partake thereof. See how he speaks to a Christian who hath been regenerated by baptism.

“Wherefore as without any bodily feeling, having laid aside what before thou esteemedst advantageous, thou art suddenly become clothed with a new dignity; and as it is not thy eyes, but thy understanding that persuades thee that God hath healed what was wounded in thee, blotted out thy sins, and washed away thy stains; so when thou goest up to the venerable altar to be satisfied

with food, thou mayest see the sacred body and blood of thy God by faith, admire it with reverence, reach it with thy mind, receive it with thy heart, and above all, take it in with thy soul.”

3. He expressly asserts, that the body which the Priest distributes is as well in a little part as in the whole; which agrees only with the Sacrament, and not with the natural body of Jesus Christ.

4. He maintains, that the oblation of the bread and wine made by Melchizedeck did typically signify the sacrifice of Jesus Christ; which is absolutely false, if it be true that the consecration destroys the nature of the things offered, as the Church of Rome believes. Hear what he saith:

“He therefore, in Melchizedeck, (whose genealogy or original was unknown to those of that time) by the offering of bread and wine did foreshew this sacrifice of Christ: of whom the prophet pronounceth, *Thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchizedeck*. And blessed Moses also speaking of this mystery, signifies the wine and blood with one word; *Long before*, (pointing at the Lord’s passion) *in the blessing of the patriarch, he shall wash his garment in wine, and his clothes in the blood of the grape*. Mark how evidently it appears, that the creature wine is called the blood of Christ. Consider what thou art further to inquire concerning this twofold species, seeing the Lord himself witnesseth; *Except saith he, you shall eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*; which testimony is a most evident and strong argument against the blasphemies of Pelagius, who impiously presumes to maintain that baptism ought to be conferred upon infants, not to obtain life, but to attain the kingdom of heaven: for by these words of our Lord pronounced by the Evangelist, *you shall not have life in you*, is plainly understood that every soul that hath not been baptized is not only deprived of glory, but life also.”

Lastly, in the same sermon, he saith, in conformity with the notion of St. Cyprian, about the mixture of the water with the wine in the chalice, that by the water is represented the figure of the nations, and by the wine the blood of the passion of our Savior, which supposeth the subsistence of the

wine, as well as of the water, and utterly overthrows the doctrine of transubstantiation.

2. He overturns the notion of the Romish purgatory, and follows here also the sentiments of those of the ancients who removed purgatory to the last day of judgment.

“But if neither in our tribulations we bless God, nor redeem our sins by good works, we shall so long abide in that purgatory till all our lesser sins be consumed, like wood, hay, and stubble. But somebody may say, What matter is it how long I stay there, so I may but at last pass through into eternal life? Let no man say so, most dear brethren, forasmuch as this purgatory fire is more painful than any thing that can be thought, seen, or felt in this world. And seeing it is writ of the day of judgment, that it shall be one day, how can any one know whether he may be days, months, or even years, in passing through it?”

3. In his 12th Homily he exhorts the people not to go out of the church on Sundays, before the celebration of the Eucharist; and makes the prayers of the priest to appear ridiculous, when there are no communicants to receive: *to whom*, saith he, *shall the priest say, Sursum corda?* But we are especially to observe, that when he presses the greatness of the sacrifice of the mass, and the adoration due to the Sacrament, he says never a word of what some Popish orator would represent to us on the like occasion.

4. In the 20th Homily he exhorts the country people to read the Scriptures, and removes all excuses which they might make to avoid this duty, with as much earnestness as those of the Church of Rome expressed, when they would dissuade their auditors from the reading of it.

5. The 38th Homily is a collection of several places of Scripture, treating of the means by which remission of sins is granted to us. He reckons up there twelve several means, where we are to take notice, first, that he doth not speak one word of confessing to a priest, nor of the power God hath bestowed on them to pardon sins, as judges, which at present is the great and only mean to obtain the pardon of

sin; those other, whereof St. Caesarius speaks, being of no use without the pardons pronounced by the priest, in the tribunal of confession. That which is here peculiar is, that though he has said a very great deal about the efficacy of contrition for the remission of sins, in his 29th Homily he has not been able to avoid the *caute lege* of the Romish censors, as we may see in the *Bibliotheca Patrum, of the Paris edition*. Secondly, we are to observe, that whereas the Church of Rome pretends to find the sacrament of extreme unction and auricular confession in the fifth chapter of St. James's Epistle; Caesarius discovers nothing there, but the Christian duty of praying one for another, proceeding from the charity we owe to our neighbor.

Ruricius was Bishop of Limoges from the year 535, in which he assisted at the first Council of Auvergne: he assisted also at the fourth Council of Orleans in 541, and at the fifth in 549.

We have nothing left us of this Prelate, save his two books of Epistles; though even there we can inform ourselves about several very important matters, which demonstrate what the faith was that was then received and embraced in Aquitain.

1. He takes for granted that dying persons are immediately taken up into heaven; so far is he from mentioning purgatory. See in what manner he comforts Namacius and Ceraunia, for the loss of their son.

“Indeed you have reason to take a great deal of comfort from the will of Christ, since untimely death was his lot, that he has been pleased to take him away in that state, to which he pronounceth the kingdom of heaven to belong, that at the same time you might have a patron instead of a son, and leave off deploring him as lost, whom you see the Lord hath taken to himself.”

And in another place:

“Wherefore let your faith wipe off your tears, since we believe that those who are dear to us do not lose their life, but change it, they leave this world full of sorrows, and hasten to the region of the blessed, and take their leave of this painful pilgrimage, that they may arrive at the land of rest.”

2. He supposeth *Abraham's bosom* and *heaven* to be the same thing, when he brings in a young woman that enjoyed the glory of heaven, speaking after this manner:

“Wherefore, my loving parents, rather bewail your own sins, and seriously think of redeeming your own crimes, that if you love me in Christ, you may be thought worthy to be admitted into the Patriarch's bosom, where the Lord, according to the purity of my innocence, and his great kindness, has placed me,” etc.

3. He exhorts a lady of his acquaintance to the reading of holy Scripture, when he sent her a painter.

“But,” saith he, “you ought to look for more perfect and great instruments in those divine writings from whence these are taken, if ever you desire to perfect what you have begun, or attain what is promised you. If you thus seek, the Lord will give you both knowledge and strength to understand what you read, and keep what you understand.”

St. Ferreolus, Bishop of Uzez, must not be forgot by us: he was chosen in the year 553, and died in 581. We find in the rule that he writ for Monks, that he settled in his diocese an uncommon strain of piety.

1. We do not find him to demand the approbation of this his rule at Rome, as has been done for some ages since. He sends to the Bishop of Die, to desire his advice, and afterwards published it with the approbation only of that Bishop, without troubling himself about any other authority.

2. He orders his Monks to work with their hands, that they might not be chargeable to the public, as all the orders of Mendicants are at this time.

3. He receives none but such as are come to men's estate, and will have them tried before they be admitted; whereas St. Bennet ordained, that those whom their parents had presented to a monastery, should from their infancy be received and abide there.

4. He will have the great employment of the Monks to be the reading of the Psalms, which he will have them go through every week.

5. He will have them on anniversary days of the martyrdom of the saints, to read the acts of their martyrdom, for a worthy celebration of the memory of their passion; but not a word of encouraging the Monks to offer up prayers to them on these solemn days.

6. Above all he requires of every Monk daily to read the Scripture, and not to dispense with it upon any pretense, or because of any other business whatsoever.

Fortunatus was born in Italy, but coming into France in the year 575, he stayed there in the service of St. Radegunda, and was ordained Priest at Poitiers, where he lived in great reputation till the end of that century. Some will have him to have been raised to the episcopal dignity in the same city, but this appears to be wholly uncertain. Gregorius Turonensis, who often mentions him as his friend, never gives him any other title but that of Priest. However it be, it appears by his writings that he was very far from Popery; in these following articles.

1. He never in the Life of St. Martin attributes to that holy man, that upon any occasion he prayed to the saints for the working of his miracles. This we may see in his relation of St. Martin's raising a child to life.

2. He looks upon all Bishops as the Vicars of St. Peter; accordingly he saith to the Bishop of Metz; *Apparet Petri vos meruisse vices*: It appears you have deserved to be St. Peter's Vicar.

3. We meet with nothing more commonly in the epitaphs which he made than this notion, that deceased believers are in heaven; from such expressions as these; *Hunc tenet ulna Dei. Inter apostolicos credimus esse choros. Non hanc flere decet, quam Paradisus habet*. Accordingly also he maintains that Abraham's bosom is the heavenly glory.

Lastly, it appears from an exposition he hath made on the Apostles' Creed, that he owned no doctrines, besides those contained in that ancient formulary, as articles of his faith, because he makes no mention at all of those new articles which the Church of Rome hath added to that Creed, and which she imposeth on her people, as another part of that which makes the object of faith.

It cannot be denied but that the spirit of superstition had already made a considerable progress in all places; we meet with an illustrious example thereof in the diocese of Marseilles, which joined to Gallia Narbonensis: the people there began to render a religious worship to images, whereupon Serenus, the Bishop of Marseilles, was forced to follow the method of St. Epiphanius, in breaking the images to pieces, which drew upon him the censures of Gregory I. who exhorts him to erect them again, though he commends him for having opposed himself to their adoration, and exhorts him carefully to instruct the people, to prevent their falling again into idolatry. And it is natural to conclude, that this excess of the people met with the same checks in many other places.

CHAPTER 7

The state of the dioceses of Aquitain and Narbon, in the seventh century.

I AM come to the seventh century, of which I have two pieces of great authority to produce: the first concerns the purity of these dioceses, in regard to their faith. There was a council held at Toledo in the year 633, whereat Silva, Bishop of Narbon, assisted, in the name of the Bishops of Gallia Narbonensis, and they began the Synod with a confession of faith, which shews, beyond all controversy, that nothing was looked upon by them as an article of faith, that was not received for such in the creed of the ancient Christians; for there was not so much as one word to be found there of all those articles which the Church of Rome imposeth upon those of her communion, as an addition to the primitive faith.

The second regards the practice of the public acts of religion, and that is the Gothic Liturgy, which of a long time was used in these dioceses; wherefore to make a fuller discovery of the religion of these provinces, it will be of importance to make some remarks upon this Liturgy, which was in use there.

It is not probable that all the parts of it are of equal antiquity, as may be seen by the office of the assumption of the blessed Virgin in soul and body, which was rejected in France, as a thing uncertain, towards the end of the ninth century, according to the testimony of Usuardus. One may make the same judgment of divers other offices, which are found in this Gothic Liturgy; the barbarism which appears in all its parts sufficiently shows its age: in the mean time, such as it is, it does not want the marks of a considerable purity, which, it seems, obliged Gregory VII. to abolish and suppress it with all his might.

1. We find in it the recital of the Apostles' Creed, as the only profession of faith, which the Churches of these provinces required of those who would be partakers of her communion.
2. We do not find in it any prayer addressed to saints. It supposeth all along, from one end to the other, that the saints pray in general for the Church; and on this ground it is, that therein they desire God to have

regard to their prayers, and to receive their intercession, their suffrages, and so forth. There is no greater stress laid upon the power of the blessed Virgin with God, than on that of the patriarchs and apostles, yea, of the anchorets and virgins. True it is, that there is a solemn commemoration of divers saints, but it may easily be perceived, that it is only done out of a design to glorify God, by representing to themselves their examples, and forming or disposing themselves to imitate them. This is done in the office of St. Forrestus and Ferucio.

We find divers confessions to God before the Liturgy, but none at all made to angels, to the blessed Virgin, or saints, as at this day is done in the Romish mass.

3. We find there no particular distinction for the Bishop of Rome, only that the Bishop of the city of Rome is called the first of Bishops. Mabillon in his preface triumphs because of this title, but he is extremely out in his account; for hath the first Bishop any jurisdiction over the second? the second over the third? We find there the prayer for the feast of St. Peter, but with a clause which Mabillon owns to be found in all the ancient missals, and is struck out of the Roman Liturgy, in order to extend the Papal monarchy over all the earth.

We do not find therein the least footstep of prayers for the Pope, which shews that the decree of the Council of Vaison, wherein it was ordained that prayers should be made to God for the Bishop of Rome, was not observed throughout Gaul; yea, what is more, the same Liturgy gives the title of Head of the Church to St. Paul, as well as to St. Peter.

We find therein no adoration of the cross on Good-Friday.

4. We find therein an office for St. Saturninus, Bishop of Toulouse, who is looked upon as come from the eastern parts, in the place of St. Peter, which shews that all the Bishops of France considered themselves as the Vicars of St. Peter, as well as the Bishop of Rome: *Si quidem ipse Pontifex tuus ab orientis partibus in urbem Tolosatium destinatus, Roma, Garonae invicem Petri tui, tam cathedram, quam martyrium consummavit.*

“For this your Bishop being sent from the east to Toulouse, instead of Rome, has now upon the Garonne filled the chair, and consummated the martyrdom of your Peter.”

5. We find therein that the confession of St. Peter was the foundation of the Church; and the festival of his chair is therein referred to his bishopric. *Testis est dies hodierna beati Petri cathedra episcopatus exposita: in qua fidei merito revelationis mysterium, Filium Dei, confitendo, Praelatus Apostolus ordinatur. In cujus confessione est fundamentum Ecclesiae; nec adversus hanc petram portae inferi praevalent.*

“St. Peter’s episcopal chair, which is shewn to this day, can testify this; wherein by reason of his faith, when he confessed that mystery that was then revealed, even the Son of God, he was ordained a Bishop. In whose confession is the foundation of the Church; neither shall the gates of hell prevail against this rock.”

6. We read there, that the gates of hell do not signify errors, as the Church of Rome will have it, but the state of the dead, from whence the faith which St. Peter hath professed delivers those who imitate him:

“Let us pray,” saith he, “that the souls of the deceased being brought up out of hell, the infernal gates may not prevail over the dead, because of their crimes, which the Church believes are overcome by the faith of the Apostle.”

7. We find there, as in the Romish mass, an high abjuration of the doctrine of the merit of works: and though we find the word merit often used in it, yet we also meet with those necessary explications of it, as are sufficient to hinder any wrong impression that may be made by a word of an ambiguous sense.

8. I do own that we find in it the prayer for the dead, but there are a hundred other passages which speak them to be in *peace*, in the *peace of God*, that they are at rest; and other expressions, which very plainly import that they had not received the notion of purgatory, no more than the authors of the Roman Liturgy had at that time.

I know there are some passages in it, which seem to suppose the souls departed to be in a place of torment; but I have two things to say to this point; the one is, that those missals, whose style comes near to the belief of the Church of Rome, are of a later date: the other is, that the ordinary article, *pro pausantibus*, for those who are at rest, imports nothing like a place of torment. To these two considerations we may add, that what is ordinarily requested for them, is either that they may have a part in the first, that is to say, a more early resurrection, which is the same with the opinion of the millennium: or that they may be written in the book of life, or carried into Abraham's bosom: which shews that the state of souls after death was not more certainly determined by those who governed these churches at this time, than by the members of the Catholic Church any where else.

We read that there are divers flocks, whereof each Bishop is the pastor, as well St. Cyprian as Cornelius. Indeed we find that to every bishop is given the title of *summus Pontifex*, and *summus Sacerdos*.

“Grant unto us, Lord, who this day are celebrating the anniversary of the decease of thy high Priest and our Father, Bishop Martin.”

We see there the manner of administering baptism, with the unction or anointing called the *chrismation*; but we do not find that they made two sacraments of them, as the Church of Rome has since done.

We find there also the consecration of wax tapers, but yet without ascribing to them all those virtues which the Church of Rome attributes to her consecrated tapers in the *Roman order*.

But I go on to that which is most considerable in this Liturgy. Mabillon, who hath published it in France, according to the copy printed at Rome, pretends that it expressly shews, that the Churches which made use of this Liturgy held the doctrine of the real presence. If, instead of some passages that he quotes, we could find there a precise order for adoring the Sacrament after consecration, as being become the body of Jesus Christ, which we do not find in any part of it, there would, indeed, be some ground for his pretension; but there is not so much as a word to this purpose; which makes it evident, that in these dioceses they had not received this doctrine, nor the natural consequences of it, any more than in

any other part of the Catholic Church; for we find that as soon as ever this opinion was entertained, it was immediately followed with supreme adoration.

Neither do we find any thing therein of the sacrifice of the mass, any more than of the adoration of the Sacrament, which is another consequence of the real presence.

We do not find any masses there without communicants. St. Caesarius, whom I have already cited, would have accounted them ridiculous, and a mere profanation.

Lastly, we do not find that the communion under one kind was there thought to be a consequent, as it hath been in the Church of Rome, of the real presence: and yet one would think that the fear of profaning the blood of Jesus Christ, as being very subject to be spilt, ought to have obliged them to take the same precautions as the Church of Rome has since done to prevent such dreadful, and yet such common, inconveniences.

If Mabillon had well considered these essential defects, which a Papist cannot but naturally meet with in this Gothic Liturgy, in all appearance he would not have been so lavish of his judgment. But without making use of these just anticipations, upon the matter in hand, let us consider a little, whether the attentive examination of the Liturgy be not sufficient to clear these prejudices, and oblige him to put another sense upon the words, which he hath wrested to confirm his assertion.

The characters we meet with in this Liturgy are these:

1. It makes a great distinction between that which is taken with the mouth, and that which is received by the heart. *Grant, O Lord, that what we have taken with our mouths, we may receive with our minds, and that the temporal gift may be to us an eternal remedy.* This observation is decretory; for the transubstantiators own that both good and bad receive the body of Christ. Goffridus Vindocinensis expressly asserts it, notwithstanding that St. Augustin has rejected it as a great absurdity.
2. It supposeth likewise that Jesus Christ is above the heavens, and that he is no otherwise near to us than by the communion of our

nature, which he hath taken to himself. *Ut qui te consortem in carnis propinquitate laetantur, ad summorum civium unitatem, super quos corpus assumptum evexisti, perducantur:*

“That they who rejoice to see thee their brother, in the nearness of thy flesh, may be brought up to the unity of those highest citizens, above whom thou hast carried up thy assumed body.”

3. It supposeth the Sacrament to be only a commemoration; *We remember thy suffering, and thy body broken for the remission of our sins.* Which is a plain allusion to the words of St. Paul, 1 Corinthians 11:24 and shews that the authors of this Liturgy did understand them of the cross, and not, as the Church of Rome doth, of the Eucharist. The Ambrosian and Gallican Liturgies have followed the sense of the Gothic Liturgy, which deserves some observation. We meet with the same thing again:

“Thou didst command by Moses and Aaron thy servants, that the Passover should be celebrated by the offering of a lamb for ever, until the coming of Christ; and hast commanded the same custom to be observed for a memorial.”

4. It supposeth that we receive the body of Jesus Christ spiritually:

“Let us, dearest brethren, who have been fed with the food of heaven, and refreshed with the cup of the eternal wine, render never-ceasing praises and thanks to our God, begging of him, that we who have spiritually received the sacred body of our Lord Jesus Christ, being freed from fleshly vices, may deserve to be made spiritual.”

What it means by the word *spiritual* is very plain, where it calls the dove that appeared at the baptism of Jesus Christ, *spiritalis columba*. *And the spiritual dove descending upon his head by the Holy Ghost, that camest thyself.* Thus it calls the Eucharist spiritual sacrifices; *He hath refreshed us with the heavenly bread and the spiritual cup.*

5. It takes for granted, that the believers of old did eat the same living bread, which Jesus Christ gives us:

“For he himself is the living and true bread that came down from heaven, and always dwells in heaven, who is the substance of eternity, and the food of power. For thy word, by which all things were made, is not only the bread of human souls, but of the very angels themselves. By the nourishment of this bread, thy servant Moses was enabled to fast forty days and nights, when he received the Law, and abstained from carnal food, that he might be the more capable of tasting thy sweetness, living on thy word. Let this living and true bread, which came down from heaven, that he might give food to the hungry, yea that he himself might be the food of the living, become to us such bread as that our hearts may be strengthened thereby; that so in the power of this bread we may be enabled to fast these forty days without any impediment from flesh and blood.”

6. It calls the Sacrament, gifts laid upon the altar.

“Be pleased to sanctify, O Lord, these gifts which we offer upon thy altar, offering immaculate sacrifices upon the holy altar. Let us beseech the Almighty, through his only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath vouchsafed to bless and sanctify these gifts by the offering up of his body and blood, that he would be pleased also to bless the gifts offered by his servants.”

7. It calls the Sacrament, *salutiferam Dominicae immolationis effigiem, in sacrificio spiritali Christo offerente transfusam*:

“The salutiferous representation of our Lord’s offering up of himself transfused into the spiritual sacrifice, whereof Christ himself is the sacrificer or offerer.”

8. We find there a prayer, whose title is, A Collect for the Breaking of the Bread after Consecration. Which scarce proves, that they were persuaded that the substance of the bread was destroyed by the consecration.

9. The same which in some places it calls the body of Christ, it elsewhere calls the Sacrament of the body.

10. It reduceth all to the virtue of the Eucharist.

“Keep within us, Lord, the gift of thy glory, and let us by the virtue of the Eucharist, which we receive, be armed against all the pollutions of the world.”

11. It supposeth that the body of Jesus Christ abides within us, and prays that it may continue there incorruptible.

“Hear the prayers of thy family, Almighty God, and grant that these holy things which we have received of thy gift, we may by thy gift keep uncorrupted within us.”

And again;

“Let us with unanimous prayer entreat the Divine Mercy, that these saving Sacraments being received into our inward parts, may purify our soul, and sanctify our body, and confirm our hearts and minds in the hope of heavenly things.”

12. It calls the Eucharist *holy bread*:

“Bearing in mind the most glorious passion of our Lord, and his resurrection from the lower parts of the earth; we offer up unto thee, O Lord, this unspotted sacrifice, this holy bread, and this saving cup, beseeching thee,” etc.

13. It calls the Sacrament *holy mysteries*, in several places.

These many instances one would have thought might have obliged Mabillon to believe that the authors of this Liturgy did speak figuratively in some other places, where they seem to speak more strongly, and to give us another notion; especially considering the manner of their expressing themselves, when they speak of the feast of St. John Baptist.

“It is worthy and just, equal and saving, for us always to give thanks to the almighty and merciful God, and in this banquet of thy Sacrament to join the head of thy martyr by an evangelical commemoration, and to offer it upon thy propitiatory table, as in a dish of shining metal.”

And we may add several others upon each of those passages which seem the most likely to deceive us.

If we had the Canon of this Liturgy, which these gentlemen did not think fit to give us, we should there easily find the solution of these difficulties; for it is very probable, it was like that of the Ambrosian Liturgy, where it was so clearly specified, that the bread was the figure of the body of Jesus Christ, as that it put an end to all manner of cavillings on the point. Indeed these words, *the figure or representation of the sacrifice of our Lord*, do plainly shew, that this was their meaning. But we must make a shift to help ourselves with what they have been pleased to give us. It is easy to judge what those passages were, which Mabillon judged to be most favorable to his cause; for he hath caused them to be printed in great characters, that nobody might pass them by.

Thus the word *truth* seemed to him to determine the question of the real presence: the words are these:

“We beseech thee, Almighty God, that like as we do now perform the truth of the heavenly Sacrament, so we may cleave to the truth of the body and blood of our Lord.”

But this learned Benedictine has suffered himself to be overtaken by his own prejudice; The author of the Liturgy distinguisheth two times; the one before the death of Jesus Christ, which was only an obscure image of a thing that was to come; this is that which is expressed in these words:

“Or that the living bread, by denying of himself, should not afford life; but for the redemption of his possession, and the praise of his glory, what before he vouchsafed in a parable, he may now vouchsafe in truth.”

The other, wherein the death of Jesus Christ hath authorized the signification of the Eucharist; upon which account he calls it *the truth of the heavenly Sacrament*. We have a like expression of Baptism, alluding to the passage of the Red sea, in one of St. Augustin’s Homilies upon Nicodemus’s coming to Jesus Christ, related by Paulus Diaconus, *In inventione S. Crucis*; and it is the same we find also in several passages of St. Caesarius.

We find that the word *transformation* has perfectly charmed him.

“We therefore, Lord, keeping these institutes and precepts, do most humbly beseech thee, that thou wouldst be pleased to receive, bless, and sanctify this sacrifice, that it may be to us a true Eucharist, in thy own and son’s name, and of the Holy Ghost; that so there may be a transformation of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, thy only begotten,”

etc. And in a marginal note he observes, that the same word is made use of in this Liturgy:

“That it may please thee to send down thy Holy Spirit upon these solemnities, that it may be to us a true Eucharist, in thy own and Son’s name, and of the Holy Ghost, for a transformation of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, thy only begotten; that it may bestow upon us, who eat it, eternal life, and the everlasting kingdom to those that shall drink it.”

And also,

“That thy blessing may come down upon this bread and wine, for the transformation of thy Holy Spirit; that blessing thou mayest bless them, and sanctifying thou mayest sanctify them,”

etc. And the like in other missals as ancient as this; which he observes also in his preface.

But this, after all, signifies nothing else but the change which the Holy Ghost produceth in making the elements, after consecration, to become the Sacrament of the body of Jesus Christ. This is that which our authors have fully justified by an infinite number of examples borrowed from Baptism, and other things consecrated by prayer. Boethius, in his books, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, saith, *Conversi in malitiam, humanam quoque amisere naturam. Evenit ergo, ut quem transformatum vitiis videas, hominem existimare non possis.*

“Being turned into malice, they at the same time lose human nature: so that if you see one transformed by vice, you cannot look upon him as a man.”

And Ratramnus, in his book of the body and blood of our Lord, saith, that Jesus Christ in former times could change the manna, and water out of the

rock, in the wilderness, into his flesh and blood: the same Rattramnus that opposed Paschasius, who was the first publisher of the doctrine of a real change.

We find there the notion of *vertere* and *convertere in carnem*:

“Beseeching, that he who then changed the water into wine, would be pleased now to change the wine of our oblations into his blood.”

And again;

“Let us entreat him, that he who, as at this day, by his Son, turned the species of water into wine, would be pleased, in like manner, to change the oblations and prayers of us all into a divine sacrifice, and to accept them as he did accept the offering of Abel the just, and the sacrifice of Abraham his Patriarch.”

But the appearance of this seeming difficulty we find in the following leaf. Besides, that it is ridiculous to suppose the real change of the prayers of believers into the body and blood of our Savior, which is supposed of the oblations.

We meet with an expression which seems somewhat strange:

“O Jesu Christ, who in the evening of the world wast made an evening sacrifice on the cross, vouchsafe to us, that we may become new sepulchres for thy body.”

Though indeed these expressions plainly shew, that they are only intended for the prefiguring the death of Christ, according to the notion of Rabanus Maurus.

We find there frequently, that the Sacrament is said to be a remedy for the body, and an expiation for the soul; but this doth no more suppose the carnal presence, or the expiation, which is the fruit of a propitiatory sacrifice, than that which we find in the Roman Order, in blessing a grave, that it may be a saving remedy to the party resting in it, for the redemption of his soul.

In the same Liturgy, they say to God,

“Do thou therefore so come down into the present oblation, that it may afford healing unto the living, and refreshment unto those who are dead.”

But this regards only the presence of virtue, as in the Roman Order; they beg of God that he would afford his presence and majesty in Baptism.

There is mention likewise made of the immolation of the body of Jesus Christ; but this is only said by way of resemblance, as St. Augustin explains it in his 23d Epistle to Bonifacius; for in other places this Liturgy speaks of bread offered up.

There is also mention made of a sacrifice. But first, he gives that name to the Eucharist, which every where throughout this Liturgy is termed a sacrifice of praises and thanksgivings. Secondly, it compares the sacrifice with that of Melchizedek, wherein every one knows there was nothing of transubstantiation. This is that which Rabanus explains, lib. 1. de Institut. Clericor. c. 31.

Mabillon particularly triumphs, when he takes notice of a passage which is found in the 78th Office.

“He offered up himself first to thee a sacrifice, and first taught himself to be offered.”

These words, *offered up himself*, seem to him to be applicable to the act of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist; but he must not take it ill if we tell him, that it is not true, that he then offered up any sacrifice: the sacrifice of Jesus Christ consisting only in his death on the cross; the Eucharist, where he had only his death before his eyes, was only the memorial of his sacrifice, his offering consisting only in his death. If he did offer up himself in the Eucharist, then was he already dead, which is a notion attributed to Gregory Nissen, but is refuted by the Divines of the Church of Rome as impertinent.

Some, it may be, will imagine, that the authors of the Gothic Liturgy take away all equivocation, when they say,

“Let us receive that in the wine which flowed from thee on the cross.”

But indeed here we have reason to admire how far strong prejudices will carry men, so as even to hinder common sense from acting; for really there can be no notion more opposite to transubstantiation: since this notion represents the state in which Christ was given to us, that is, a state of death, which is contrary to the Popish notions, by which they believe him alive in the Eucharist. Besides, it is absolutely false, that Jesus Christ did after his resurrection retake the same blood which he lost on the cross. The Church of Rome pretends that she hath it in her keeping, and it is shown in I do not know how many places. This expression is well known to be St. Augustin's, whose doctrine is vastly opposite to that of transubstantiation, as De Marca hath been forced to acknowledge.

This is what I thought might be observed concerning this Gothic Liturgy, which was used amongst the Visigoths, and which mentions no saint of later standing than St. Leodegarius, who died in the year 677. Now because Pope Adrian the First engaged Charlemain to abolish the Gallican Liturgy, which was very different from the Roman, endeavoring by this means to subject the Gallican Churches to himself, under the plausible pretense of making them more uniform with the Church of Rome; Gregory the VIIth undertook to suppress the Gothic Liturgy, which was not less, but rather more different; because the Popes after Adrian I. had made great changes in the Roman Liturgy, and had enriched it with many novelties, which the ages after Gregory the First had produced in religion. However it be, thus much is evident from what I have observed at the beginning of this chapter, that in the seventh century, in which this Liturgy was in use in these dioceses, there was nothing less known than the Romish religion, as it concerns those articles which the Protestants reject as novelties. But let us proceed to take a view of the state of these dioceses in the eighth century.

CHAPTER 8

The opinion of the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon in the eighth century.

THERE was no part of Gaul so shaken and laid waste by the wars, as Aquitain and Gallia Narbonensis were in the eighth century. Though all France suffered in some measure, yet these two provinces were, during a long series of years, the theater of war and calamity. However, we may say that these mishaps served only to awaken the zeal of these people, and to make them the more sensible of the aversion they ought to have to the idolatry which reigned in the east; and which, it seems, God was willing to punish with the scourge of the Saracens, the great enemies of images and idolatry. For not only did the Bishops of these dioceses preserve their purity in the faith, which they made appear at the end of this century, by their opposing the opinions of Felix, Bishop of Urgel, and of Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo, who revived Nestorianism; but they also gave a public testimony of their aversion to the worshipping of images, which the Popes asserted in conjunction with those of the east.

The judgment of these dioceses concerning images appeared in public, when their deputies assisted at the Council of Francfort, which condemned the second Council of Nice, notwithstanding that it had been approved by the Pope. The second Council of Nice had in the year 787 ordained the adoration of images, under the penalty of being anathematized. The east was entirely overrun with this superstition; and what we have already seen of Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, makes it evident, that it had likewise made great progress in the west. Charlemain, and the whole body of the western Churches, if we except Rome, and some partisans of the Pope in Italy, were desirous to stop this torrent: England condemned the decrees of the Nicene Council, and censured them by the pen of the famous Alcuin. His writings were subscribed by all the Bishops of England, and sent to Charlemain. This great Emperor thereupon, in the year 794 assembled at Francfort a council of the Bishops under his government; that is, those of Italy, Aquitain, and Provence, as well to condemn Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo, and Felix, Bishop of Urgel, as to make an inquiry into the acts of the second Council of Nice. They were examined in presence of the Pope's legates. And this Council finding that

the second Council of Nice had anathematized all those who refused to render to the images of the saints the worship and adoration which are only due to the Trinity; she denied the service and adoration of images, despised the Nicene acts, and condemned those who received them. Now that we may exactly know the opinions which obtained in these dioceses, whose Bishops approved the book of Charlemain; the reader needs only consider carefully the positions of Charlemain against several opinions which have since prevailed in the Church of Rome.

1. In his preface, he expressly rejects traditions; when he saith,
 “that as for themselves, they were content with prophetical, evangelical, and apostolic writings.”

2. He maintains,

“that we are principally to believe the truth of the Hebrew original;
Hebraeae veritati potissimum fides adhibenda est.”

Thus he expresseth himself by way of opposition to translations, and the vulgar Latin in particular.

3. He lays it down for a rule, that God alone is the lawful object of religious worship.

“It is no small error to serve any thing with religious worship besides him who saith, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*”

And he repeats this afterwards;

“Neither do we read that any thing is to be worshipped besides God; because it is written, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*”

4. Would we know his opinion concerning the worship which at this day is given to angels and saints? We may find it, lib. 1. c. 9. p. 69.

“Moreover,” saith he, “forasmuch as we see that John in the Revelation is restrained by the angel from worshipping him; and that Peter, the Pastor of the Church, forbade the worship of the centurion; and that the chosen vessel, together with Barnabas, with

a strong opposition, rejected the adorations of the Lycaonians; we are without doubt to conclude from these examples, that adoration, which only belongs to God, who alone is to be worshipped and alone to be served, is not to be rendered to any creature whatsoever, except only by way of salutation, to express our humility.”

So afterwards;

“The Gospel rule of the doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, which is sometimes recommended to us in the words of our Lord himself, and sometimes by examples, sometimes is represented to us by oracles, either more obscure, or more plain and open; sometimes is taught in plain, and other times in figurative expressions, rejecting the adoration of all other things whatsoever, save only the adoration whereby we mutually salute one another, enjoins the adoration of God alone.”

And again;

“Neither men nor angels are in the least to be adored, save only by that adoration which is given to express our charity, and as a salutation.”

5. He distinguisheth very well between the honor we give to saints, and that which we render to God, when he saith;

“God alone is to be worshipped, God alone is to be adored, God alone is to be glorified; of whom it is said by the Prophet, *The name of him alone is exalted*; and to the saints, who having triumphed over the Devil, do reign with him, veneration is to be rendered, either because they have fought courageously for the preservation of the state of the Church, or because they are known to assist it with their continual patronage and intercession.”

So likewise;

“We venerate the saints who are dead with the triumph of merits, but they are not to be adored with divine worship, for that very reason, because it is divine worship. Seeing therefore,” saith he, “that God alone is to be worshipped, the martyrs and all other

saints are rather to be venerated than worshipped, as we have said before in this book.”

And the same thing we meet with also, c. 28. towards the end.

6. It appears clearly from what he saith concerning the means whereby we obtain remission of sins, that he owned no other sacraments of the Church besides Baptism and the Eucharist; for indeed he mentions only these two.

7. He was so far from owning either the infallibility of the Pope, or of a Council which the Pope hath approved, that he maintains it was a piece of folly to look upon the second Council of Nice as universal, and calls it a Council of one part of the Church only; and he afterwards censures the Fathers of that Council for giving it the title of universal, whereas it had been convened without the participation and consent of many Catholic Churches. This remark made such an impression upon the learned Jesuit Sirmondus, that he seems not to own the second Council of Nice as a general Council.

8. The Fathers of the second Nicene Council having made a comparison between the Eucharist and images, and used these following expressions, which are not to be found at present in the copies of that Council; *As the body of our Savior passeth from the fruits of the earth into an excellent mystery; so images, formed by the industry of artificers, pass to the veneration of those persons, according to whose likeness they have been wrought;* Charlemain doth censure those who had made a parallel between images and the Eucharist, in such a manner as shews that he knew nothing of Romish transubstantiation. He saith,

“that the Eucharist is made by the hand of the priest, and by calling upon the name of God, both priest and people joining their prayers in the consecration thereof; whereas images stand in no need of consecration, but are made at the discretion of the painter. He saith, that Melchizedek did not present an image as a type of the body and blood, but bread and wine: that Moses commanded a lamb to be eaten as a type of our Savior, wholly rejecting the custom of worshipping images. That the Psalmist, who sang that

men should eat the bread of angels, that is, Jesus Christ, hath also declared, that the makers of images are like unto the images they have made. That the Sacrament is of divine institution; whereas the insolent use of images is not only without Scripture, but also directly contrary to the writings of the Old and New Testament. That our Savior never instituted the memory of his suffering to be kept up by the works of artificers and worldly arts, but by the consecration of his body and blood: that he was not willing that his faith and his confession should be expressed by pictures, but by the mouth and the heart.”

We are carefully to take notice, that the authors of this book, who desired to exalt the sacrament of the Eucharist with all their might, never give the least hint that Jesus Christ had instituted it, to make it an object of adoration.

“They say, that the Eucharist, according to the judgment of St. Paul, is preferable almost to every other sacrament; that it is made invisibly by the Spirit of God, and consecrated by the Priest, who calls upon God; that it is carried by the hands of angels, and laid upon the altar of God in heaven; that it can neither increase nor be diminished; that it is confirmed by the Old and New Testament; that it is the life and nourishment of souls; that by its manducation it leads to the entrance of the heavenly kingdom; that it can never be abolished, no not in the time of persecution; and that nobody can be saved without receiving of it. Whereas images are visibly made by the hand of the workman, painted by the art of the painter, placed on the walls by the hands of men, that by them, if men inconsiderately abuse them, sins are increased; that they can increase and diminish in beauty, according to the ability of the workman; that age spoils them; that they only feed the eye; that they only bring to remembrance things past, by looking upon them; that they may be spoiled by taking wet; that they who keep to the true faith are saved, without having any regard to images. And to exaggerate the folly of their anathemas pronounced against those that did not worship them, they conclude that this anathema strikes at the saints of old, of whom we never read that they adored them; that the same was levelled at the martyrs, who from

the baptismal font passed immediately to the kingdom of heaven, without any adoration of images; and lastly, that it is darted against little infants, who cannot worship them, and of whom, notwithstanding, the Son of, God saith, *Suffer little children to come to me*, etc.”

I own that Charlemain censureth Gregory, Bishop of Neocaesaria, for giving to the Eucharist the name of the true image of Jesus Christ: for after having made out, that no artificer can form a true image of Jesus Christ, he adds, when he speaks of the Eucharist,

“that Jesus Christ did not offer up to God the Father for us in sacrifice any image or prototype, but himself; and that he who of old had been foretold by visible resemblances under the shadow of the Law, in the immolation of the lamb, and in some other things, as being the sacrifice that was to be offered, by truly accomplishing the things that had been prophesied of him in the oracles of the Prophets, did offer up himself to God the Father, for a saving sacrifice, and bestowed upon us, (the shadows of the Law being passed away,) not some imaginary sign, but the Sacrament of his body and of his blood. For the mystery of the blood and body of our Lord must not now be called an image, but the truth; not the shadow, but the body; not a type of things to come, but that which had been prefigured by the types of old. For now (according to the Song of Songs) the day is risen, and the shadows are gone. Now Jesus Christ, the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believes, is come, he hath now fully accomplished the Law. Now upon those who sat in the region of the shadow of death a great light is risen. Now the vail is taken off from the face of Moses; and the vail of the temple being rent, hath opened to us all secrets and things hid. Now the true Melchizedek, Christ, the King of righteousness, and King of peace, hath bestowed upon us, not sacrifices of beasts, but the Sacrament of his body and of his blood, and hath not said, This is the image of my body and of my blood; but, This is my body, which shall be given for you, and this is my blood which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins.”

But it is plain that Charlemain understands by the word *image* a prototype, like the shadows of the Law; with respect to which it is true, what many of the Fathers have said, that the sacraments of the New Testament are the body and the truth; though otherwise considered as sacraments, they are sacred signs, which cannot be confounded with the things signified by them, without renouncing the light of common sense. Moreover, we are to observe, that Charlemain never said that the Eucharist is properly the body of Jesus Christ. If he denies Jesus Christ to have said concerning the Eucharist, This is the image of my body, taking the word as a prototype and a shadow of things to come; yet he always holds that it is his body in a sacramental sense, for he never speaks of the Eucharist as the body of our Lord, without adding the restriction of sacrament, or of mystery. *If, saith he, he hears the mystery of the body and of the blood once mentioned; and twice together, he hath bestowed upon us the sacrament of his body and of his blood; and lastly, the mystery of the body and of the blood cannot be called an image.* Now the word *mystery*, according to the constant use of the Church, properly signifies the *symbol*, the *figure*, the *sacred sign* of the body and blood of our Savior.

Lastly, we ought to observe, that though he says that the Sacrament is the body of Jesus Christ, yet he never saith that it ought to be adored. Indeed he ought to have drawn up an impeachment against these worshippers of images, upon this article, and a very important one too, because it is very evident that the Greek worshippers of images did not adore the Eucharist, but gave only a simple, veneration to it, like to that which they bestowed upon the cross, the altar, and the gospel, as one of their authors tells us, in a book which they call, *An Invective of the Orthodox against the Opposers of Images*, printed at the Louvre in 1685, in the collection of authors who have writ since Theophanes.

CHAPTER 9

The faith of the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon in the ninth century.

CHARLEMAIN, that great man, who lived till the year 814, maintained the spirit of opposition against the errors and superstitions of the Church of Rome, that espoused the interest of the image-worshippers, by approving the second Council of Nice. This Council having established the authority of tradition, as being a necessary principle to support the worship of images, we find that the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon kept themselves firmly to the authority of the Scriptures, grounding their faith thereon, and regulating their worship according to the same.

Of this we have an illustrious example in the Council of Arles, assembled in the year 813, by the order of Charlemain, whereat the Archbishop of Narbon assisted with his suffragans. For the Fathers of this Council thought fit to begin it with a profession of their faith, which is nothing but an extract of that creed which bears the name of Athanasius; and this is that which they ordain should be preached to the people for the Catholic faith, without so much as mentioning one word of those articles of faith that the Church of Rome now imposeth.

Charlemain had ordered a collection of homilies to be made out of the works of Origen, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustin, St. Leo, St. Maxims, St. Gregory, and Bede, which he caused to be published in these dioceses, as well as the rest of his empire; now these homilies do so strongly oppose the most part of those novelties, which were then endeavored to be introduced, that this book for a long time served as a bar, to hinder people from leaning too much towards those things that incline men to superstition. There is no Protestant in the least versed in the matters of controversy, who seeing the names of those ancient Doctors comprised in this collection, will not remember how much these Fathers have opposed themselves to a multitude of corruptions which prevailed at last, by the factious endeavours of some of the latter Popes; wherefore I may excuse myself from making an extract of this collection, choosing rather to produce other witnesses, which the same

diocese affords us, concerning the faith of these dioceses in the ninth century.

I can only produce three or four; but to recompense the smallness of their number, they are men against whose authority the most contentious adversaries will have nothing to oppose. In the first place it is certain, that as the Bishops of Aquitain and Narbon had set themselves against the superstition and idolatry of the Greeks and the Pope in the matter of images at the Council of Francfort; so their successors imitated their zeal and vigor in the Synod at Paris in 824, upon the same question; where they determined that Pope Adrian, who had writ an answer to the book of Charlemain, and therein undertaken the defense of the second Council of Nice, had made use of in the said reply, *superstitious testimonies, and not at all to the purpose, answering what he thought fit, and not what was agreeable*. And besides they drew up a new collection of great numbers of arguments against this superstitious worship, to recall Pope Paschal and those of his party from their doating on images.

We can shew further, that the same zeal was continued in this diocese. Baluzius hath acknowledged, and so has Massonus before him, that the book of Agobardus, Archbishop of Lyons, concerning pictures, expresseth no more than the general opinions of the Bishops of France and Germany concerning this point. But it may not be amiss to quote it in particular, not only to shew what were the opinions of the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon, (because though he was born in Spain, yet he had continued for a long time in Aquitain, whither he was invited, because of the general esteem he had gained, to be the coadjutor to Leidradus, Archbishop of Lyons, to whom he succeeded;) but also because it appears by his works, that the most illustrious Bishops of Gallia Narbonensis carefully consulted him in matters of difficulty, as their master, being indeed a most famous doctor, able to instruct and inform them.

1. He declares, as St. Augustin did before him, that we can never equalize the authority of any interpreter whatsoever to that of the Apostles:

“The blessed Father Augustin has told us, that we ought to have quite another opinion of expositions than that which you hold; who, in his book against Faustas the Manichee, speaks not only of

those which have been blamed by learned men, but also of those which have been approved of, after this manner. Which sort of writings, that is to say expositions, are not to be read with a necessity of believing, but with a liberty of judging; for those books only that are of Divine authority are to be read, not with a liberty of judging, but with a necessity of believing, which form the Apostle himself delivered, saying, *Quench not the Spirit; despise not prophecies; try all things; hold fast what is good; abstain from every appearance of evil.*”

Which is absolutely false, if an infallible principle has continued in the Church; whether in the person of the Pope, or in Councils, or that we must of necessity explain Scripture according to the sense of the Fathers, as the Church of Rome has defined.

2. We see with what force he maintains the canons of the Gallican Church against the contempt which some cast upon them, because they had been made without the Pope’s concurrence.
3. We do not find that in his time they applied to the blessed Virgin the words of the first promise, by reading, *Ipsa tuum conteret caput*, She shall bruise thy head; for he reads, *Ipsa tuum*, He shall bruise, etc. when he disputes against Felix, Bishop of Urgel.
4. He maintains in the same place, that the notion of a people’s being without sin, who yet confess themselves to be sinners out of humility, is pure Pelagianism.

“That if this is the property of humble saints, why then doth John the Apostle say, *If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us; but if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins?* Who, if like you, he had been inclined to have not mean, but great thoughts of himself; he had whereof he might glory, because he lay in the bosom of his Lord, and was beloved of him above the rest of his disciples. James the Apostle also saith, *In many things we offend all*; which if any shall imagine not to be spoke in truth, but by way of humility, let him know that therein he follows Pelagius.”

5. He plainly declares that our communion in the Sacrament is the same with that of the believers of old, when he applies that passage of the 1st to the Corinthians, ch. 10 ver. 1 and 2, of the drinking of the Holy Ghost, and maintains in these terms that there is no other difference between the believers of the Old and New Testament, but this,

“that the great sacraments of salvation which are wrought by the Mediator for us and for them, save us as being already past, but them as yet to come, because we believe and hold what is past, they believed and held what was to come: they held them only in their minds, as figures of future things; but we in an open profession, vows, and declaration of things past, under the signification of sensible sacraments, as those two who carried one cluster of grapes upon a staff did indifferently do the same work, only that the one of them had it behind his back, and the other before his face.”

I should be obliged to transcribe his whole book against pictures and images, if I should go about to extract all that it contains in opposition to the opinions of the Church of Rome. It will be sufficient for us to observe, that the Romish *Index Expurgatorius* hath forbid this book, as well as the rest, till its errors be expunged: and indeed it did deserve no less; for it maintains, according to the doctrine of St. Augustin, that we ought not to adore any image of God, but only that which is God himself, even his eternal Son; and that it is a piece of folly and sacrilege to vouchsafe any worship to images, and to call them holy, as the second Council of Nice had done. He refutes the excuse of the Council of Trent, which only considers those as idolaters, that attribute something of divinity to the image. He maintains it to be mere Paganism to have images for any other use than that of a memorial; and at the same time asserts, that images are of as little use and advantage as the picture of a mower, or of some hero in armor, can advantage a mower or soldier, who looks upon those pictures. In a word, he speaks exactly like a true iconoclast; for after he had said, that it was impossible any longer to bear with the abuses against which he had taken pen in hand, he adds;

“From whence we may plainly infer, that if Hezekiah, a godly and religious king, brake the brazen serpent, made by God’s express command, because the mistaken multitude began to worship it as an idol, for which his piety was very much commended; much more religiously may and ought the images of the saints (they themselves approving it) be broken and ground to powder, which were never set up by God’s command, but are absolutely human inventions.”

But besides this, there are four other articles, which are as disrelishing to the Church of Rome as these:

1. He maintains that there is no other Mediator between God and man, save Jesus Christ, God and man, which he proves by the authority of St. Augustin, de Civ. Dei, 50. 9. c. 15.

2. He looks upon those as worthy to be anathematized and excommunicated from the Church of God, who should undertake to dedicate a Church to the most excellent of saints or angels.

“If any of us,” saith he, “should make a temple of wood or stone to any, though the most excellent of saints, we ought for doing that to be anathematized from the truth of Christ, and from the Church of God, because by so doing we should give that worship to the creature, which is only due to the Creator.”

3. Having given a relation of the manner how the faithful gathered up the bones of St. Polycarp, and interred them in a place where they intended to meet and celebrate his memory, to encourage believers to imitate the constancy of that martyr; he declares, that all manner of worship or honor done to them, over and above this, is unlawful, religious worship being due to God alone.

4. He proves that his judgment concerning these points is founded upon the example of the ancient Doctors, upon their opinions, and upon the book of the Sacraments of the Church of Rome, that it was the ground of the ancient Doctors of the Church, who rejected the worship which the Arians gave to Jesus Christ as idolatrous, though they owned him to be no more than a man.

The reader needs not take much pains to apprehend why Rome though fit to condemn these books of Agobardus; though he may be at a loss how it comes to pass, that notwithstanding all this, he is at this day held for a saint, and publicly adored at Lyons under the name of St. Agobo. This is a riddle which has strangely perplexed the learned Jesuit, Theophilus Raynaldus, as well as le Cointe, in his Annals of the Church of France. But he is not the only person that has opposed the belief and worship of the Church of Rome, and is publicly adored by her.

I have another author to produce, who gives us so clear an idea of the belief of this diocese wherein he was born, concerning the Eucharist, that the Papists have never been able to return any pertinent answer to it, save only this, that the passage we quote is supposititious. The person we speak of is Christianus Druthmarus, Monk of Corbie, whom it seems God was willing to oppose to the corrupt notions of Paschasius Radbertus, his Abbot. The passage is this, [*And as they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed it and brake it.*]

“After that he had fulfilled the command concerning the old Passover, and put an end to the old shadows, he makes a beginning of new grace, and of a new sacrifice. He took bread, which strengthens the heart of man, and which doth most of all support men’s bodies, and in it placeth the Sacrament of his love: but much more doth that spiritual bread fully strengthen and comfort all sorts of creatures; because in him we move and have our being: first, he blessed it, because in him self *who was man*, he blessed all mankind; for having taken human nature upon him from the blessed Virgin, he thereby demonstrated that the blessing and power of the divine immortality was really therein. He brake the bread himself, because he voluntarily offered up himself to suffer; and that he might fill and satisfy us, he made no difficulty to break the mansion of his soul, as himself said; *I have power to lay down my life, and have power to take it up again.* [*And gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body.*] He gave to his disciples the Sacrament of his body for the remission of sins, and preservation of charity, that they, remembering this act of his, might always perform that in a figure which he was now about to do for them, and might not forget that, *This is my body*, that is in the Sacrament.

[*And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying;*] forasmuch as amongst all sorts of food, bread and wine are found to be the most effectual to strengthen and refresh our weak bodies, he with good reason thought fit by these two, to ratify and confirm the ministry of his Sacrament; for wine not only exhilarates, but also increases blood, and therefore is the blood of Christ very properly typified thereby; because whatsoever comes to us from him, doth enliven us with a true joy, and increaseth all our good. And lastly, as when a person that is to take a far journey, leaves to his friends that love him some pledge or token of his love, upon this condition, that they use it every day, that they may not forget him: so likewise hath God commanded us, having spiritually changed his body into bread, and the wine into blood, by these two, to remember what he hath done for us with his body and blood, and not to be unthankful to his most endearing love and charity; and because water is mingled with the Sacrament of his blood, it represents his people, for whom he was pleased to die. And neither is the wine without water, nor the water without wine; because as he died for us, so must we die for him, or for our brethren, that is, for the Church. Wherefore also water and blood came forth from his body. And whereas he saith, *This is my blood of the new testament*; this is added in contradistinction to that of the old testament, which by the blood of goats could not purge away sin from those who were still in bondage to sin. [*But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when shall drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.*] The vine is Judaea, the wine that of the patriarchs, prophets, and other elect. For till that time, Judaea had brought forth clusters of grapes, from whence wine flowed forth, that is, works done in faith; but from the death of our Lord wild grapes only, until the time that Enoch and Elias shall carry them up into the kingdom, that is, the Church of Christ, at the end of the world. Or else more simply the words may be thus taken, that from the hour of his supping with his disciples, he would drink no more wine, until he was become immortal and incorruptible after his resurrection. Whereas also he was pleased not to administer the Sacrament of his body and blood to his disciples till after they had supped, and that

we are not commanded to take it fasting; this may be the reason the Lord had a mind to shew, that the figurative testament was only commanded till the true was come, and he had now put an end to the old testament, and instituted a new one, and therefore it was that he celebrated the old before the new. The Apostles also for a long time continued the same custom, and after their other food, took this by the Lord's appointment; but afterwards, when many Jews came to communicate, it was enjoined in a Synod, that every one (if he was cleansed from other sins) should first take the repast of spiritual bread, before he took that of the temporal."

This place, which contains an exact commentary upon the institution of the holy Supper, has much enraged the Papists; and they have wrested it into all senses, to avoid the threatening blow. Sixtus Senensis tells us, that in another copy, after the words, *This is my body, that is in a Sacrament*, was added, *truly subsisting*. But this copy was never yet produced, though they who reprinted the work of Druthmarus, in the Bibliotheca Patrum, of the Cologne edition, have been pleased to put this falsification of Sixtus Senensis in the margent.

Cardinal Perron, who was as able as any man of France to justify the fair dealing of Sixtus Senensis in the business of this manuscript of Lyons, but did not care to concern himself about it, hath boldly maintained, that he might with the more ease slip his neck out of the collar, that this passage of Druthmarus had been corrupted by the Protestants. But it hath been already shewn, that the edition published in 1514, by Wimfelingius, before Luther begun to write against Leo X. of which the Reverend Dr. Tenison hath a copy in his library, with the privilege of the Emperor Maximilian, and the arms of Pope Leo X. contains this passage whole and entire. So that it is obvious to judge, that Druthmarus, who was born in Aquitain, taught nothing at Corbie but what he had learned from his infancy, and that which was the common doctrine, before Paschasius had undertaken to publish his extravagancies, which he did not till the year of our Lord 835.

We ought also here to take notice of an action that happened in this century concerning the Eucharist. In the year 844, Bernard, Earl of Barcelona and Duke of Septimania, made a treaty with King Charles the Bald, near the city of Toulouse, in the abbey of St. Saturninus, where they

mingled the blood of the Eucharist with some ink, to sign the treaty they had agreed upon. The thing has been published by the famous Baluzius, in his notes upon Agobardus, and is lately reprinted by the same author. The words of Odo Aripertus, who relates the matter, translated, run thus:

“The peace therefore being severally ratified and sealed by the King and Earl with the blood of the Eucharist; Bernard, Count of Toulouse, came from Barcelona to Toulouse, and did homage to King Charles in the abbey of St. Saturninus, near Toulouse.”

Mabillon acknowledges that this was not a fact without example. Now let any man imagine, if he can, whether people that believe transubstantiation, would ever have been capable of such a profanation of the blood of Jesus Christ, or whether the Monks, in whose abbey the thing was done, would ever have suffered it, had the thing appeared as horrible unto them, as it must of necessity appear to those who defend the opinion of the Church of Rome.

I shall conclude this chapter with that courageous opposition which the Bishops of Aquitain and Narbon made in the year 876, in the Council of Pontyon, against the enterprises of Pope John VIII. who, being backed by the Emperor Charles the Bald, had a mind to subject all the Bishops of France and Germany to Ansegisus, Archbishop of Sens, as their Primate; but at the same time, as to his Vicar, that he might execute his decrees, and inform him of the most important affairs of those Churches, which he pretended ought to be decided and ended at Rome, which, if so, would have abolished the power of Synods and Metropolitans. This was in a manner the last considerable effort they ever made to preserve their ancient discipline; for soon after the Popes knew to manage the Kings, that stood in need of them in Italy, so well, that by little and little they at last gained the point, and so made themselves absolute, the Synods and Metropolitans retaining only an empty name, without almost any authority at all.

CHAPTER 10

The state of these dioceses in the tenth century.

WE are now come to the tenth century, in which ignorance and barbarism overwhelmed well nigh all the west; and the Church of Rome fell at the same time into such monstrous corruptions, that those who have wrote the history thereof do not mention it without horror. I do not intend to make any stop here, in alleging proofs for what I say, from the concurrent testimonies of Genebrard, Baronius, and other Doctors of the Church of Rome. It is a thing not denied by any one that hath ever heard speak of the history of the Church; and hath been particularly set forth by Gerbertus, Archbishop of Rheims, who was afterwards advanced to the Papacy.

But yet in the mean time, whatever the corruption may have been, which was scattered elsewhere, we have good ground to believe, that it had not quite stifled the ancient doctrine and religion of these dioceses, which may be easily made out by the following observations:

1. I own that we find in the writings of Odo, the first Abbot of Clugny, who was born in Aquitain, some expressions which import that he inclined to the opinions of Paschasius, as appears in his collations; which might make one judge that this notion began then already to be propagated in Aquitain, whose Duke William was the founder of Clugny. But we must here take notice of two things: the first is, that the ancient customs of this monastery do plainly show, that when this congregation was founded, those who were the authors of these customs were not of Paschasius's opinion. This is evident from chapter 30 of the second book, and from chapter 28 of the third. The second is, that though Odo might have entertained this opinion of Paschasius concerning the carnal presence of Jesus Christ, yet we may easily observe that he never owned the consequences of it. For we find in the relation of the death of this Odo, who died at Rome in the year 942, that he received the Eucharist, but there is no mention made of any adoration that he paid at his receiving it.
2. We are to observe, that in this description of Odo's departure, which was made by one of his disciples, we meet with neither

confession before the receiving of the Eucharist, nor the receiving of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, which are sufficient proofs that he knew nothing of these sacraments.

3. It appears by the writings of Gerbertus, who was educated in the monastery of Aurillac, what was the faith of this diocese. He had been the tutor of Robert, son to Hugh Capet, who raised him to the archbishopric of Rheims in the year 991, in the room of Arnulphus, who was deposed. He hath writ an apology for the Council which deposed Arnulphus, wherein he gives full evidence what esteem he had for the Pope, and how little he believed the Papacy necessary to the Church, not only because of the vices of the Popes of his time, but also for several political reasons, which engage every Church not to subject themselves to a foreign power.

“Suppose,” saith he, “that by the warlike incursions of barbarous nations there be no way open for us to go to Rome; or that Rome itself, being become subject to some barbarous prince, be at his pleasure made part of his kingdom, shall we in this case be reduced to the necessity of having no Councils at all? or shall the Bishops of the world, to the loss and ruin of their own kings, expect the advice and counsels of their enemies for the management of the affairs of Church and State?”

We may see another assertion of his in a letter to Seguinus, Archbishop of Sens:

“I do resolvedly affirm, that if the Pope of Rome himself should sin against his brother, and being often admonished, should not hear the Church, that this same Pope of Rome ought to be looked upon as a heathen and publican.”

Whereupon Baronius exclaims, *Here is a sentence indeed, worthy only to proceed from the mouth of some great heretic, or of some most impudent schismatic, which abrogates all sacred Councils at once, cuts the throat of Canons, strangles traditions, and treads under foot all the rights of the Church, that it seems impossible that a Catholic should ever dream of such things; much less so saucily utter and assert them.* We may also gather

from the subsequent words, whether or no he conceived communion with the Church of Rome to be of absolute necessity.

“If he (the Pope of Rome) do therefore judge us unworthy of his communion, because none of us will comply with him in his anti-evangelical sentiments, yet he cannot separate us from the communion of Christ; seeing a Priest ought not to be removed from his function except he have confessed, or be convict of the crime laid to his charge: especially when the Apostle saith, *Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?* And again, *I am certain that neither death nor life*, etc. And what greater separation can there be, than to debar any believer from the body and blood of the Son of God, which is daily offered up for our salvation? And if he be a murderer, that takes away the bodily life from himself or his neighbor, he that robs himself or another of eternal life, by what name shall we call him?”

We find in another letter which he wrote to Wilderodus, Bishop of Strasburg, what work he makes with those false decretals which were foisted in on purpose to make the whole Church submit to the Papal yoke, as if before Syricius all the east and west had belonged to the Papal jurisdiction; wherein he exactly follows the footsteps of Hincmar, who confuted them with all his might.

If we inquire into the rest of his opinions, we shall find, that he did not believe that the Popes had received the keys of the kingdom of heaven in any other manner than all other Bishops. See how he explains himself in a discourse to Bishops, when he was Bishop either of Rheims or Ravenna.

“And as woe is me if I do not preach the Gospel, or if hide long in my heart the treasure that I have received, burying it in the ground; or if I keep the candle of the divine word covered under a bushel, and do not expose it on a candlestick to the eyes of all: so likewise if I do not open the locks of human ignorance, with those keys of the kingdom of heaven, which all of us, who are Priests, have received in the person of St. Peter; so that upon this account I may deserve, according to my small measure, to hear that, *Well done, good and faithful servant; because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many.*”

And again;

“For so the Lord said to St. Peter, *Simon Peter, lovest thou me?* and he, *Thou knowest, Lord, that I love thee.* And when he had asked this a third time, and had been as often answered, the Lord repeated a third time, *Feed my sheep.* Which sheep, and which flock, St. Peter not only received at that time, but also hath received them with us, and all of us have received them with him.”

He shews that he did not believe the necessity of the Priest’s intention in the Sacraments, when he saith in the same piece, speaking to those that were guilty of simony,

“I do once more inquire of my brother Bishop, lest we should seem to have omitted any thing that belongs to a true proof and trial, who is it, brother Bishop, that confers episcopal grace? Is it God or man? God without doubt, but yet by man. Man lays on his hand, and God confers grace; the Priest serves God with his suppliant hand, and God blesseth with his powerful right hand: the Bishop admits thee into the order, but God makes thee worthy of it. O justice! O equity! If money be given to a man, who in ordination does no more but discharge a piece of service laid upon him, why is the whole denied to God, who bestows the order itself upon thee? Doth it seem just to thee to honor the servant, whilst thou dost affront the Lord? And whilst the Priest unrighteously takes money, shall God be injured by man? And seeing God expects nothing from thee, for the order bestowed upon thee, why doth the Priest impudently look for money? God is willing to bestow it upon man for nothing, but the ravenous Bishop demands money. God of his kindness and love vouchsafes it for nought, but the malicious Priest captivates him, and ties him to terms: for what hast thou that thou hast not received? And if thou have received it, why dost thou boast, as if thou hadst not received it?”

Lastly, we see in his 26th epistle the confession of faith that he makes, which contains nothing besides the symbol or the Apostles’ Creed, to which he adds only what follows:

“I do not forbid marriage...I do not condemn second marriages; I do not blaine the eating of flesh; I own that reconciled penitents ought to be admitted to the communion. I believe that in Baptism all sins, whether original or actual, are forgiven; and do profess that out of the Catholic Church nobody can be saved; and I confirm and ratify the four holy universal Synods, which the mother-church confirms and approves of.”

It is worth observing, that he doth not speak one word concerning the Romish traditions; so far was he from authorizing the definitions of the second Council of Nice, which the Church of Rome hath been pleased to authorize in the Council of Trent.

Lastly, We may take notice, that Leuthericus, Archbishop of Sens, who died in the year 1032, had been the disciple of this Gerbertus, which is attested by the continuator of Aimoinus; and Clarius, Monk of St. Peter le Vif, at Sens, has accused Leuthericus of having laid the beginning, and cast the seeds of Berengarius’s heresy.

I do not believe any one will think strange, that I have quoted Gerbertus amongst the writers of Aquitain, under pretense, that probably he might have changed his opinions after that he was elevated to the Papacy, under the name of Sylvester II. It is but too well known to be customary, for those who used to speak according to their own judgment, and the opinions of the place where they were educated, as soon as they have been elevated to the Papal dignity, to change their notes. Of this we have an illustrious example in AEneas Sylvius, whom we find quite transformed into another man as soon as he had taken upon him the name of Pius II. the Papal diadem having changed him from white to black. And I am much mistaken if the eleventh century doth not furnish us an example every whit as remarkable, in the person of Gregory VII. who having been before Prior of the monastery of Clugny, the customs whereof, as I have hinted, did not suit well with the doctrine of Paschasius, seems thence to have derived his opinions concerning the Eucharist; for Urspergensis takes notice that the Council of Bresse, where he was deposed by thirty Bishops, laid to his charge, that he was of Berengarius’s opinion, as being his ancient disciple; and we shall find this accusation not to be without ground, if we cast our eyes on his Commentary on St. Matthew; of which

I have elsewhere given an extract. Yet for all this, we see, that this Pope, complying with his own interest, became afterwards one of the most furious persecutors of Berengarius.

I suppose these few remarks will be sufficient for my purpose: though I might add, that St. Fulbert, as well as Leutherick, having been the disciple of Gerbert, had derived the same doctrine concerning the Eucharist from him; this is so certain, that a Doctor of the Sorbonne, named Villiers, found no other means, about the beginning of this century, to make him speak to his mind in publishing of his works, than by inserting some words in the text which might make it to be looked upon as the objection of heretics; whereas indeed it is an answer of his own, wherein he sets down his opinion, and he doth it in the self-same terms used by St. Augustin. But I keep myself within the bounds of what concerns those dioceses whose history I am upon.

I shall only take leave to add one thing, which is, that though Gerbertus seems in his twenty-sixth letter, which contains his Confession of Faith, to make an allusion to some of the opinions of the Manichees; yet we may be sure, that he did not express himself in this manner, to show, that he held nothing of their tenets; no, he had other reasons for it, which it is not necessary to unfold here. Besides, it is notorious that the Manichees did not spread themselves in Aquitain till he was a very old man: at least, it is true, that Ademar doth not make them to appear in Aquitain till the year 1011, and that the first Synod held against them, did not meet at Toulouse till the year 1019, that is to say, sixteen years after his death, which happened in 1003.

CHAPTER 11

*The beginning of the Manichees in Aquitain,
and the state of those Churches as to religion in that age.*

THERE appeared in Lombardy and in France some Manichees chased from the east by the Emperors of Constantinople. Ademar Cabannensis, Monk of St. Eparque, at Limoges, says, that they first were taken notice of in Aquitain, a little after the year 1010, and he afterwards speaks of a Council assembled at Charoux against them. The Bishop of Meaux makes no question but that this gave rise of the Albigenses; and to evidence the solidity of his conjecture, he accuseth, besides some writers of the eleventh century, the Canons whom Robert caused to be burnt at Orleans, to have been the first disciples of these Manichees, supposing all this while that the Albigenses derive themselves from the same source, and that they defended the same opinions.

Now because it is a matter of small importance to the history of the Albigenses, whether the Canons of Orleans were Manichees or not, I might very well excuse myself from entering upon that inquiry. They may have been Manichees, and yet the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon not the least concerned in the matter. Neither do I think myself obliged to repeat here, what I have already delivered concerning the differing opinions of the ancient and modern Manichees in the 15th, 16th, and 17th chapters of my Remarks upon the History of the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, supposing that my reader may easily have recourse to them. Our business is to see what was the faith of these dioceses, and question not but we shall make it appear in the sequel, that those whom the Bishop pretends to convict of Manicheism are falsely charged therewith; the Romish party having bestowed that name upon them, only to make them the more execrable to those of their communion.

Nevertheless, because Ademar Cabannensis testifies, that these Canons of Orleans had been instructed, not by a woman come from Italy, as their history records the story, but by a country fellow (as some MS. copies of Ademar tell us) of Perigueux, I am not unwilling to inquire a little into the authority of this history. Glaber relates it, 50. 3. c. 8. p. 308; but

besides his relation, D'Achery hath given us, though not the very acts of the Synod that condemned them, but the account of a private man of Chartres, who professeth that he set down in writing what passed in that Synod, which seems to be of sufficient authority. Be it as it will, they suppose from these proofs, that these Canons were Manichees, and I own they are very like them, in the relation that is given of this Synod, as well as in Ademarus.

But yet, after all, there are several things which seem to give us ground to doubt of the truth of this whole relation. First, It scarcely seems probable, that a woman, who was a stranger or a peasant, should have been able in so short a time to make so many proselytes amongst the canons and citizens of Orleans, as to be able to form secret conventicles amongst them, and to propagate such monstrous doctrines as those of the Manichees were. Neither can we, with any appearance of reason, suppose, that one of these Canons, who formerly had been Confessor to the Queen, was so stupid a fellow, as all on a sudden to fall into the enthusiasm of the Manichees. Secondly, It is evident, that in perusing these pretended acts, we find that all the witnesses which are produced against them are reducible to one only, and he too of no credit, because himself had been engaged once of their communion. I say all their proceedings were founded upon the depositions of one single man; and then afterwards they make the men, once executed, speak what they please. It will be objected perhaps, that the interrogatories were made in public, in the presence of the people; but then let us consider, that all this was writ after the death of Robert, to justify so bloody an execution. Thirdly, We do not find in these acts the same accusations; one accuseth them of one thing, and another of another; though it be evident that the design of all these authors is equally to defame them, and make them execrable. Fourthly, We find in those acts, that these pretended Manichees justify themselves against the capital accusations of Manicheism, chiefly upon the article of the Creation. Fifthly, We find that they expressed at their martyrdom a hope directly opposite to the principles of Manicheism. Sixthly, Their very enemies themselves are obliged to give them a most illustrious testimony, as to the sanctity of their lives and manners.

It is certain that the accusing them of denying transubstantiation, and rejecting Baptism, cannot justly be looked upon as a badge of Manicheism,

if we consider on the one hand, that the question, whether the bread be changed into the body of Jesus Christ, hath no relation to the doctrine of the Manichees, but respects only those novel doctrines which Paschasius had introduced: and on the other hand, that the Church of Rome accuseth all those for being enemies to Baptism, who in that point do not espouse all the opinions she teacheth, in holding, as she did at that time, the absolute necessity of that sacrament.

And as for their being charged with celebrating horrible festivals, full of incest and abominations, we know that the same hath been imputed to some heretics of old, but falsely. It was laid to the charge also of the Waldenses, but was never proved to be other than a mere calumny: our first reformers have been accused of the same, but with an impudence for which the Church of Rome ought still to blush, if that were a possible thing.

In a word, I find nothing in all this relation that makes it look probable, but only two or three characters which agree with the barbarous maxims of the Church of Rome. The first is, that it attributes to Queen Constance an unusual action, that with a stick she put out the eye of Stephen, who had been her Confessor. The second is an action, much resembling the course that is taken nowadays to surprise heretics, and to discover them; for according to the practice of the Inquisition, we cannot find fault with the method made use of by this Arefastus, who feigned himself willing to become a Manichee, that he might the better discover their opinions. It seems this casuist of Chartres had not much studied St. Paul, who tells us, *We ought not to do evil, that good may come of it.* The third is, the manner of their taking up the dead body of Theodatus, the Canon, out of his grave, who died three years before, and examining it by the trial of water, that they might be certain whether he was an heretic when he was alive. This is an action well becoming this barbarous age, very like the Inquisitors; and accordingly this was the compendious method which St. Peter of Luxemburg put in practice for the trial and discerning of heretics. I do not remember ever to have read any thing that might authorize this barbarous and extravagant custom, save only the second Canon of the second Council of Sarragossa, held in the year 592, where it is ordained, *That the relics which should be found in the churches that had been possessed by the Arians, should be carried to the Bishop, that he might try them by fire.*

The Bishop of Meaux might have been as sensible of most of these things as we, in perusing these acts; and then it would have been easy for him to judge whether the authority of Vignier, who simply relates what he met with in historians, did deserve to be pressed against us. But it seems it was enough for him to delude his reader, and the name of Vignier (though otherwise he does not accuse these persons of Manicheism) seemed to make for his purpose.

But whatsoever judgment a prudent reader may pass on this accusation of Manicheism, upon which these Canons of Orleans were burnt in the year 1017, it will be easy for us to shew, that the dioceses of Narbon and Aquitain, where some of those eastern Manichees took refuge, did never quit the faith or worship of their ancestors. This is what we shall easily make out in the sequel of this discourse.

Ademarus, a Monk of St. Eparque, at Limoges, hath writ a chronicle from the beginning of the French monarchy until the year 1030, wherein he informs us what was the faith of the Churches of Aquitain at the beginning of the eleventh century.

1. He relates, without passing any censure upon it, the synod held at Gentilly, under Pepin, about images that are set up in churches, and shews that the Bishops of Aquitain assisted at the same, and that they opposed themselves to the Church of Rome and to the Greeks.

2. Though he grossly mistakes in his chronology about the age of Bede, yet he makes it plain enough who they were whom he looked upon as the preservers of the true theology. He makes this encomium of Rabanus;

“A most learned Monk, the master of Alcuinus; for Bede taught Simplicius, and Simplicius Rabanus, (whom the Emperor Charles sent for from beyond sea, and made a Bishop in France,) who instructed Alcuinus, and Alcuinus informed Smaragdus, Smaragdus again taught Theodulphus of Orleans, and Theodulphus, Elias a Scotchman, Bishop of Angoulesm; this Elias instructed Heiricus, and Heiricus left two Monks, Remigius and Vebaldus, surnamed the Bald, his heirs in philosophy.”

This is a most convincing proof of the judgment of the Churches of Aquitain, concerning the controversies that Paschasius had kindled.

1. We find here that they followed the opinions of Bede, whose Homilies Paulus Diaconus had inserted in his collection, for the use of the Pastors of Gaul, together with those of St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustin, St. Maximus, and several others. Now the opinions of Bede are diametrically opposite to those of the Church of Rome. This has been formerly proved by a vast number of passages. I shall content myself with setting down one or two of them: the first is upon the third Psalm, where he extols the patience of our Savior to Judas, because he did not exclude him from his most holy supper; wherein, saith he, *he delivered the figure of his most sacred body and blood to his disciples*. The second is upon the Evangelists, in that part of them which speaks of the institution of that sacrament, where he declares, that *because bread strengthens the body, and wine produceth blood in the flesh, the bread is mystically referred to the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine to his blood*.

2. They followed Alcuinus's notions, who had a great hand in all the writings of Charlemain, and especially in that concerning images, where we find also his judgment concerning the Eucharist, opposite to that of Paschasius.

3. We find they followed the opinions of Theodulphus, Bishop of Orleans, in whom we see a hundred things that are contrary to the opinions of the present Church of Rome.

4. They followed the opinions of Rabanus Maurus, whom Abbot Herigerus has cried down, for maintaining, that the eucharistical body of Jesus Christ goes to the draught, together with our other food; and whom one Waldensis, in his epistle to Martin, placeth with Heribaldus, amongst the number of those heretics who have dishonored Germany.

5. Ademarus proves, beyond contest, that they did not adore the Eucharist in their communion; when on the one hand, speaking of those of Narbon, he saith,

“That to prepare themselves to oppose the Moors of Corduba, who had invaded their coasts, they received the Eucharist at the hands of their Priests, without mentioning any adoration paid to the Sacrament, in so extreme and threatening a danger:”

and on the other, speaking of the death of Earl William;

“Whereupon,” saith he, “the Earl accepting of the penance laid upon him by the Bishops and Abbots, and disposing of all his goods, and particularly bequeathing his estate and honor amongst his sons and his wife; he was reconciled and absolved, and the whole time of Lent frequented Mass and divine worship, till the week before Easter, when after he had received the holy oil and viaticum, and adored and kissed the cross, he yielded up the ghost in the hands of the Bishop of Roan and his Priests, after a very laudable manner.”

It is a thing singular and observable, that this Earl pays his adoration to the cross, though at the same time he forgets to worship the Sacrament, which yet is the chief object of adoration. Moreover, we are to observe, that the Latin word *adorare*, when spoken of the cross, imports only a reverence which we own was practiced on these occasions long before this time, because the cross being no image, there was no fear of incurring the sin of idolatry in saluting of it. This Count died in the year 1028.

But since this eleventh century was in a manner wholly taken up by the Papists, in opposing Berengarius, who, upon several attacks maintained the interest of truth against Paschasius and his followers; it will be our business to represent how far these disputes were serviceable in hindering the opinions of Paschasius from getting the upper hand in the dioceses of Aquitain and Narbon, and how this prepared their minds for a separation from the Church of Rome.

Never was any man so often condemned as Berengarius, never was any man more backed than he, nor ever did any man give more trouble to those who endeavored to crush him, than he did. An author of the twelfth century hath writ a book, *Concerning Berengarius's manifold Condemnation*; and Mabillon hath taken care to collect the names and the times of all those assemblies wherein he was condemned; but withal we

may assert, that the reasons and authorities he produced, gave his enemies a terrible deal of trouble. His adversaries have employed their utmost efforts to abolish the memory of his works; but a sufficient part of them have been preserved by their own care, to enable us to judge of the injustice of their calumnies against him, and of the purity of his faith in the matter of the Eucharist. And forasmuch as he was of considerable use to the Albigenses, in their opposing of the doctrine of the carnal presence, which the faction of Paschasius and his followers endeavored to introduce and establish under the shelter and favor of that gross ignorance which reigned at this time, I suppose I may affirm, that his works, whereof Lanfrank hath given us an extract, were of no small service to oblige those who undertook his defense, to separate themselves from the communion of the Pope, or rather to hinder him from subjecting them to his yoke; seeing it was at this very time that the Popes began to make themselves masters of the Churches of the west.

It will be of great moment to prove, that the Popes had not as yet made themselves absolute masters of this part of the Church, which was always careful to maintain its rights against their encroachments and usurpations. My intent, therefore, is to employ the following chapter upon this subject, before I proceed to inquire how the faith was preserved in these dioceses in the next age, when they refused to submit themselves to the authority of the Popes of Rome.

CHAPTER 12

*That these dioceses continued independent of the Popes,
until the beginning of the twelfth century.*

I ACKNOWLEDGE, that were the business to be decided by the modern pretensions of the Popes of Rome to the empire of all the Churches of the world, and in particular to a patriarchate over all the Churches of the west, we should be forced to own, that they had been subject to them ever since the time that the Gospel was first preached in Gaul, in both these respects. They have made it their business to persuade mankind, that the whole world is but the Pope's parish; and that more particularly the Churches of the west, which have been founded by their ancestors, who sent them the first preachers of the Gospel, do belong to their patriarchate; as if these envoys of the ancient Popes, in their endeavours to propagate the Gospel of Jesus Christ throughout the world, had designed to establish the Papal empire over all the new conquests that they acquired to the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

But notwithstanding all these new-found claims and pretensions of the Popes, we can prove, that nothing can be imagined more vain, or more destitute of any ground or foundation, than they are. For it is not true that those Churches, which have received the Gospel from another, are therefore subject to it, as we can demonstratively evince by the examples of the Churches of Vienna and Lyons, which were founded by persons sent from the Churches of Asia; upon which account it was, that St. Irenaeus sent them a relation of the persecution they suffered. Neither is it true, that the ancient Popes, how careful soever otherwise they might be to promote their own authority, did ever pretend to be the Patriarchs of all the west, or of Gaul in particular.

This is a truth we can unanswerably prove, by the testimony of the first Council of Nice, which assigns no other jurisdiction to the Pope, save that which he enjoyed in those which Rufinus calls the *suburbicarian regions*, and which the learned men of the Church of Rome at present own to have been comprehended within the ten provinces of Italy, to which the Papal ordination did belong, as we see it was under Honorius, and which were

distinguished from the diocese of Italy, properly so called, that is to say, the seven provinces which constituted the diocese of Milan. This canon therefore looks upon it as a thing not to be questioned, that Gaul was a diocese distinct from that of the Popes, having its authority within itself, governed by its own synods, without having the ordination of its Clergy, the determination of its affairs, or the authority of its assemblies, subjected to the Pope's authority as their superior.

If we had not this canon of the first Council of Nice, which distinctly determines the Pope's diocese, yet would it be very easy to prove it by other arguments, such as these:

1. We find, that the Churches of Gaul convoked a synod, upon the contest about Easter, towards the end of the second century, without receiving any orders from Pope Victor for so doing.
2. We find, that when the Donatists were condemned by the Pope, they desired the Emperor that they might be judged by the Bishops of Gaul: and accordingly we find that Marinus, Bishop of Arles, presided in the great Council of Arles in the year 314, at which were present eighty-three Bishops, twenty-one of Italy, eleven of Spain, eleven of Africa, five of Britain, and thirty-five of Gaul.

Since the Council of Nice, we find the Churches of Gaul governing themselves with the same independency, under the conduct of their several Metropolitans.

We are to observe in general, that these Churches had their peculiar code of canons, made by themselves, and that these canons continued to have the force of a law till the eighth century, when their discipline began to receive a great alteration, by the cares of Bonifacius, Bishop of Mentz, and his successors. This is amply proved by Justel, in the preface to his collection of the ancient canons. Now it is visible, that a Church which had its particular rules could not be dependent on the Pope, whose diocese had its own particular rules and canons.

We can truly affirm, that the Bishops of Gaul were so far from acknowledging the Pope as their Patriarch, that his name was not so much as ever recited in the Churches of Gaul till the year 529, as may be clearly

collected from the Council of Vaison; where it was first determined, that the Pope should be mentioned in their public prayers.

And indeed if we inquire into the constant conduct of the Bishops of Gaul, throughout the several centuries that are past since the Council of Nice, we shall easily perceive, that they never conceived themselves to be subject to the Pope of Rome.

In the year 337, Maximinus, Bishop of Triers, defends St. Athanasius, as Pope Julius also did, and admits to his communion Paul, Bishop of Constantinople, and writes in favor of him to the Council of Sardica.

In 356, Saturninus, Bishop of Arles, convened the Council of Beziers, which condemned St. Hilary, of Poitiers, in consequence of which he was sent into banishment.

In 358, the Bishops of Gaul condemned the confession of faith of Sirmium, as we are informed by Sulpicius Severus.

In the year 360, St. Hilary vigorously defended the faith against the Arian party, in favor of which Pope Liberius had declared himself; and it is well known what anathemas were discharged in Gaul by St. Hilary and his friends, against that apostate Pope.

Pope Leo was so fully convinced of their authority as independent upon his, that he sent to them in the year 450 that dogmatical epistle which he was to send to the east, as soon as the synods of Gaul had approved of it.

And it was upon the same account that he sent them the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon against the Eutychians.

In the sixth century we find Avitus, Bishop of Vienna, using his utmost endeavors to appease the differences between the Church of Rome and that of Constantinople.

We find likewise Pope Hormisda communicating to the Bishops of Gaul his reconciliation with the Patriarchs of Constantinople.

We find in 529 the Fathers of the Council of Orange handling the questions about grace, and sending their decrees to Boniface II. who approved them the year following.

In 550 Pope Vigilius gives an account to the Churches of Gaul, of what had passed in the East; and the Prelates of Italy entreat the Bishops of Gaul, to endeavor to appease Justinian in favor of Vigilius and Dacius Bishop of Milan.

In the seventh century we find, that the Gallican Bishops confirmed the Lateran Council that was assembled under Martin I.

We find Pope Agatho inviting the Bishops of Gaul to come to a council that he intended to call, whither also they sent their deputies at his request.

The eighth century being in a manner wholly spent in wars, affords us little or nothing considerable in this matter; however, we may easily discern that this diocese did even then maintain its authority, in spite of all the Popes endeavors to the contrary: whereof we have two most evident instances. First, Pope Adrian I. was so little informed of what passed in France, that he knew not whether the city of Bourges was subject to the jurisdiction of another Archbishop or no; as appears from the Codex Carolinus, Epist. 87. Secondly, Their independency clearly appears from the several councils assembled about the controversy of images, contrary to the designs of the Popes, and particularly from the Council of Francfort.

We find the same spirit also in the following century. And to speak truth, whatever change the ancient discipline underwent by occasion of the new decretals which the Pope's emissaries had published, in order to subjugate all the west, and France in particular; yet we find that the Bishops of France hindered the Popes from concerning themselves with their affairs: the business of Hincmar of Laon alone evidently shews, that they did not acknowledge that new right, invented to make them buckle to the Papal yoke; for we see that they maintained, that the determinations of their synods were not to be altered by the Popes, they having no power to concern themselves about their ordination, or any part of their jurisdiction. About the end of the tenth century, in the year 991, we find the Bishops of France that were assembled at Rheims, maintaining themselves by the canons of the African Code, in opposing the Pope's encroachments, who would, in pursuance of those spurious decretals of the ancient Popes,

arrogate to himself a right of reviewing and altering the determinations that were made by the synods of France.

I own, that since the middle of the fifth century, we find the Popes granted a kind of vicarship to some of the Bishops of South Gaul; but withal, we know that this power was so extremely wavering, that it stood in need of being confirmed at the instance of Leo I. by the Emperor Valentinian III. Secondly, That these were in a manner of no efficacy at all, these Vicars having scarcely had the power of convening synods, but in virtue of the right they had as they were Metropolitans, and little or no authority as to the ordination of Bishops in general, and of Metropolitans in particular.

It cannot be denied also, but that the Popes, since the eighth century, began to grant divers privileges, to the violating of the ancient discipline, though under the pretense of preserving it in the monasteries, against the attempts of the Bishops, because most of the Bishops, being turned soldiers, thought of nothing else but robbing them, under color of holding their visitations. But it is worth our while to consider the esteem that Hincmar, of Rheims, had of these sort of privileges, in his letter to Nicholas I.

“Now I did not,” saith he, “desire the privileges of the apostolical see, as supposing that the holy canons and decrees, which the Church of Rome grants to every Metropolitan, were not sufficient; neither did I nor do I desire any other or ampler privileges, than what have been formerly granted to the Church of Rheims; but because not only my diocese, but also my province, is divided between two kingdoms, belonging to two several kings; and because the concerns of the Church, committed to my charge, seem to lie under the jurisdiction of several princes, from whom our Church can reap little or no advantage; because the ancient constitutions being already condemned by some carnal and brutal men, they might at least be frightened by these new decretals into a more reverential carriage towards the Church, which is committed to the care of me, though unworthy.”

From whence we may see what it was that Hincmar meant.

We may make the same reflection upon those vicarships aforementioned: we have an illustrious example to this purpose in the case of Ansegisus, Archbishop of Sens, 11. kalend. July, indiction 9.

“After the Bishops were met together, and the Gospels were read before the synod, and in view of the imperial throne, (which were afterwards laid up at Pontyon,) the Emperor Charles came with the legates of the apostolical see, and after the singing of several hymns, and a prayer pronounced by John, Bishop of Tusculanum, the Emperor took his seat in the synod. After which, John, the Bishop of Tusculanum, read some letters sent from the Pope, and amongst them one, recommending to them Ansegisus, Archbishop of Sens, for their Primate; that as oft as the interest of the Church should require it, either in calling of synods, or in the managing of other concerns in France and Germany, he might be looked upon as the apostolical Vicar; and so by his means the decrees of the apostolical see might be made known to the Bishops; and on the other hand, that any matters of importance might by him be communicated to the apostolic see, and that all affairs of moment and difficulty might, by his suggestion, be recommended to the apostolic see, to be cleared and determined. Whereupon the Emperor demanded of the Bishops, what answer they designed to return to these apostolical letters: who answered to this effect, that saving the right and privileges of each Metropolitan, according to the sacred canons, and the decrees of the Popes of the see of Rome, promulged from the said sacred canons, they would obey the apostolical commands of Pope John. And when the Emperor and the apostolical legates had done their utmost endeavors to persuade the Bishops to an absolute answer, that they would obey without reserve, in accepting of Ansegisus for their Primate, as the Pope had written, yet could they never draw from them any other answer. Then the Emperor commanded a chair to be set above all the Bishops of his Cisalpine kingdom, next to John, Bishop of Tusculanum, who sat at his right hand, and commanded Ansegisus to take place of all the Bishops that had been ordained before him, and to sit down in that chair; the Archbishop of Rheims protesting against it in the hearing of them all, as a thing directly contrary to

the sacred canons. In like manner, the day before the ides of July, the same letter concerning the primacy of Ansegisus was read a second time at the Emperor's command, and the Bishops answer demanded thereupon. Whereupon the Archbishops answered severally for themselves, that as their predecessors had been regularly obedient to his predecessors, so would they be to his decrees. So likewise, at the command of the apostolical legates, that the Bishops should meet the 17th day before the kalends of August; the Emperor entered the synod at nine o'clock in the morning — being accompanied by the apostolical legates — and all took their places as before. Then Johannes Aretinus read a certain paper, which had neither reason nor authority. Afterwards Odo, Bishop of Beauvais, read some articles set down by the apostolical legates, and by Ansegisus and Odo, without the knowledge of the synod, between — — containing nothing to the purpose; and besides, void of all reason and authority, which for that reason are not here added. And then again a motion was made concerning the primacy of Ansegisus, who, after all, could obtain no more this last time than he did at the first day of the synod."

From which account it is most evident, that notwithstanding all the pains Charles the Bald took to oblige the Pope, whose friendship he had occasion for, and whose ambition he maintained by trampling upon the ecclesiastical laws, and the rights of the Prelates of France; yet the Bishops continued firm in their judgments, and would not suffer themselves to be enslaved, as the Pope would fain have had them. This happened in the year 876.

In particular, we may justly observe concerning these parts where the Albigenes have appeared with the greatest lustre. First, That the greatest part of these dioceses, being rent off from the empire after the year 409, when Alaric made Thoulouse the seat of the kingdom of the Visi-Goths, it continued so divided till it was again reduced under the power of the French, by Clovis, in the year of our Lord 507. Secondly, That since that time, we find that these parts of France have been almost always united with the Churches of Spain, as appears from the subscriptions of the synods held in Spain. Thirdly, That they were never, to speak properly, reunited with the body of the Churches of France, till the reign of the

Emperor Charlemain. Fourthly, That the power of the Popes in France hath been so very inconsiderable, that a legate of the Pope, having undertaken to consecrate a chapel in Anjou by the Duke's order, but without consent of the Bishop, Radulphus Glaber, who relates this history, could not forbear exclaiming against this encroachment: Baronius, on the other hand, storms against Glaber, but the one of them writ what those of his time thought and spoke concerning it; whereas the other gave himself entirely up to the power of prejudice, and followed the design he had undertaken of accommodating ancient history with the interest of the court of Rome, on which he had his dependance.

But we are especially to observe, that the Popes never began to exercise their absolute power there, till they had settled their legates in those parts, and had brought all causes to be tried at their tribunal. Thus Paschal II. appointed Girard, Bishop of Angoulesm, to be his Vicar in the provinces of Bourges, Bourdeaux, Tours, and Britain, in the year 1107, as appears by the commission granted by Paschal II. to Girard, Bishop of Angoulesm, published by D'Achery.

Thus the legantine power, in the diocese of Ausch, was given after the year 1102, to William, Archbishop of Ausch, as De Marca shews, on the Council of Clermont.

What I have just now observed is so certain, that Mezeray hath publicly owned it in his Chronological Abridgment. From the time of the eighth century, the Popes found ways to lessen the power of Metropolitans, by obliging them by the decree of a Council held at Mentz by St. Boniface, which forced them to receive the Pallium at Rome, and to subject themselves, and be canonically obedient in all points to the Church of Rome; which profession was afterwards changed into an oath of fidelity under Gregory VII. They also attributed to themselves, excluding all others, the power of annulling the spiritual marriage which a Bishop contracts with his church, and to give him the liberty to espouse another. They had extended their patriarchal jurisdiction all over the west, by obliging the Bishops to take confirmation from them, for which they paid certain dues, which, in process of time, were changed into what they called *annates*, and by taking cognizance of those things which belonged to the Bishops only. Nay, what is more, they had in a manner wholly abolished

the provincial councils, in taking away their sovereignty, by hulling of their decrees; so that these assemblies were at last wholly left off as useless, because they afforded nothing to those who assisted at them, save the displeasure of frequently seeing their determinations made void at Rome, without once hearing their reasons. Gregory VII. established it for a rule of common right, that nobody should dare to condemn any person who had appealed to the holy see. But they never made a greater breach upon the liberties of the Gallican Church, than when they introduced this opinion, that no council could be assembled without their authority; and when, after several attempts to establish perpetual Vicars in Gaul, they found the way of having their legates received there. To this purpose they first made use of a canon of the Council of Sardica, which gave them power to send legates into the provinces, to examine the processes and the depositions of any Bishops, in cases where any complaint was made. After that they had thus accustomed the French Bishops to admit their legates in this case, they by little and little gained another point, when the princes were weak, which was to send some amongst them without any complaint or appeal at all; and at last, after they had submitted to the yoke, Alexander II. established it as a rule, that the Pope ought to have the government and administration of all Churches.

Of these legates, some had a whole kingdom under their jurisdiction, others some part only: they came thither with full power to depose Bishops, yea, the Metropolitan himself, whenever they pleased to assemble the councils of their district, and to preside therein with the Metropolitan; but taking place of him, to make canons, to send the decision of those matters to the Pope, to which the Bishops would not give their consent, as likewise all the acts of the council, whereof he disposed at his will and pleasure. And it is to be observed, that their suffrages outweighed those of all the Bishops together, and that oftentimes by their simple authority they judged and determined the causes of the elections of Bishops, of benefices, of the excommunications of laymen, and the like. Insomuch, that these assemblies, which before were so sacred and so sovereign, for the supporting and maintaining of discipline, having no power any longer, were, to speak properly, rather councils to authorize and ratify the will and pleasure of the Pope, than any lawful or free councils.

So that it was not till the Papacy of Alexander II. and Gregory VII. that the Churches of Aquitain saw themselves in danger of losing their liberty, by submitting to the Papal yoke, as well as the rest of the French Churches. We are now to see how they avoided this yoke, which was thus imposed upon them in some measure.

CHAPTER 13

Of the opposition that was made by a part of these Churches to the attempts of the Popes, and of their separation from the communion of Rome before Peter Waldo.

It is difficult precisely to set down the year wherein a considerable part of these dioceses rejected the power of the Pope's legates, and loudly condemned the errors which they would have introduced under the name of councils, which the Popes had so often assembled against Berengarius. But we have great reason to conclude, that it happened under Gregory VII. when he undertook to oblige the Bishops of France to swear an oath of fidelity to him, in much a like form as vassals swear to the lords of the fee; for in reality it is the very same. This strange piece of novelty, which at one blow destroyed all the rights of the Church, excited both pastors and people to defend their liberties, and to reject this imperious yoke. Then it was also, that he endeavoured to change the common service of the Church, by striking out all that was not agreeable to the Roman service, which was very proper to inflame the minds of the people, and make them more watchful for the preservation of the doctrine and ceremonies of religion, which they had received from their ancestors.

For instance, it is certain that in the eleventh century they changed the collects which concerned the prayer for the dead. We have an example of it that was inserted in the decretal of Gregory IX. It is an answer of Innocent III. to John de Beauxmains, Archbishop of Lyons, who at that time was retired in the abbey of Clairvaux. It contains the question which that Archbishop, who was the persecutor and condemner of Peter Waldo, propounds to Innocent III. together with the Pope's answer.

“Your brothership has inquired why there was a change made in the service of Saint Leo; so that whereas the ancient books express the prayer thus, Grant to us, Lord, that this offering may be of advantage to the soul of thy servant Leo; in the modern books it is expressed thus, Grant to us, O Lord, we beseech thee, that by the intercession of St. Leo this offering may be of advantage to us?”

“To which we answer, saith the Pope, that since the authority of Scripture assures us, that he doth an injury to a martyr, who prays for a martyr, we are by a parity of reason to judge the same of other saints, because they need not our prayers, as being perfectly happy, and enjoying all things according to their wishes: but it is we rather that stand in need of their prayers, who being miserable, are in continual trouble, by reason of the evils that surround us. Wherefore such expressions as these, *that such an offering may be of advantage to this or that saint, for their glory and honor*, which we meet with in most prayers, are thus to be understood, that it may conduce to this end, that he may be more and more glorified by the faithful here on earth. Though most suppose it a thing not unworthy of the saints, to assert that their glory is continually increased until the day of judgment; and therefore that the Church may in the mean time lawfully wish for the increase of their glorification. But whether in this point that distinction may take place, which teacheth us, that of those who are dead some are very good, others very bad, others indifferently good, and others indifferently bad; and therefore whether the suffrages of believers in the Church for the very good are thanksgiving; for the very bad, comforts to the living; for those who are indifferently good, expiations; and for the indifferently bad, propitiations; I leave to your prudence to require.”

Moreover, the Popes, Nicholas II. and his successors, undertook to defend the celibacy of the Clergy, by which means a great many Pastors were deprived of the functions of their ministry, which obliged also a vast number of them to separate themselves from the communion of the Pope, whose creatures, after the decree was passed for authorizing celibacy, looked upon the married Clergy to be no more than simple laymen; not to mention now that the multiplicity of schisms and Antipopes had reduced most of the dioceses of France into a strange confusion; some holding for one Pope, others for another.

But though we cannot assign the precise epocha of the beginning of this courageous opposition to the see of Rome, which had no other original but the just defense of their liberties, and the desire of preserving their ancient truths; yet thus much seems to be certain, as far as we can gather from the

poor remainder of records which the barbarity of the Inquisitors hath suffered to come down to us:

1. That this public opposition against the efforts of Popery was made about the beginning of the twelfth century.
2. That without great ignorance, both in history and chronology, it cannot be supposed that the Albigenses were the disciples of Peter Waldo, and that consequently they are to be looked upon as a colony of the Vaudois.

It is necessary that we prove both these articles with the greatest clearness that may be; as well, on the one hand, to make it appear that the Bishop of Meaux hath no ground to suppose that these dioceses were peaceably united to the Church of Rome, and in dependence upon it, before the Albigenses appeared amongst them; and on the other hand, to disabuse some of our own people, who too lightly have believed, because the Albigenses are esteemed by some to be the same with the Vaudois, that they borrowed their light from Peter Waldo.

The first article can be very solidly proved by an argument which seems beyond all exception; I observe therefore, that Radulphus, Abbot of Tron, about the year 1125, would not return from Italy through the southern parts of France, *audiebat pollutam esse inveterata haeresi de corpore et sanguine Domini,*

“because he heard they were polluted with an inveterate heresy concerning the body and blood of our Lord.”

We see clearly that the heresy that reigned in these dioceses was that of Berengarius, who had bestowed the title of *Mystical Babylon* upon the Church of Rome, and not that of the Manichees. This passage of Radulphus of Tron agrees perfectly with what Petrus Cluniacensis, and Baronius after him, tell us, that Peter de Bruis had preached in the diocese of Arles about the beginning of the twelfth century. Now it is ridiculous to suppose that one can declare a country to be infected with an inveterate heresy, except there be great numbers of men who publicly profess it.

True it is, that they bestow the name of Petrobusians upon the disciples of Peter de Bruis, as if he had been the author of that sect; but this doth

not overthrow what we have said, and only shews that the Papists are usually ready to bestow upon the disciples the name of their masters, thereby to reflect upon them as innovators. Thus they called the followers of Berengarius *Berengarians*, as if he had been an innovator, who indeed took upon him the defense of the old notions against the innovations of Paschasius Radbertus. In like manner, they called those Henricians, who followed the doctrine of Henry, who yet followed and preached the doctrine of Peter de Bruis and Berengarius; so that it doth not follow from thence, that Henry was the first that ever preached that doctrine. Thus afterwards they gave the name of Esperonites to the disciples of Esperonus, as if he had been the first author of that sect. And is not this very conformable to that ancient method, whereby Lindanus, Bishop of Ruremonde, made as many heads of the Reformation as there were men of note that had a hand in that great work? A different method, or the least article wherein they did not agree with their brethren, serving him for a sufficient pretense to make them so many different heads of distinct parties.

The proofs I am about to produce in confirmation of the second article do no less shew the truth of what I have laid down, that these dioceses had a long time since a great number of people and pastors, who were of different opinions from those of the Church of Rome. I do acknowledge that, towards the end of the twelfth century, there may have been some of the disciples of Peter Waldo in these dioceses of Aquitain and Narbon; which has occasioned that several Popish writers have almost persuaded some Protestants that the Waldenses were the authors of the Reformation amongst the Albigenses. Perrin takes it for granted in the beginning of his History, which he was the more easily persuaded to believe, since he had observed that the Albigenses have maintained the same faith with the Waldenses.

But it is not true that the Waldenses ever carried their faith into these countries, but they found it there already established, and they joined themselves to those who defended the same, before ever any of Waldo's disciples came thither to seek refuge for themselves.

This is a matter of fact which it is easy to prove beyond controversy; for seeing that St. Bernard was in that country in the year 1147, to preach

there, and that he made but small progress in it, (so firmly were they grounded in their faith,) we must necessarily infer from hence, that they had for a long time been engaged in the same. And indeed it appears from the manner of St. Bernard's expressing himself in his Sermons, and in his Epistle to the Count of St. Gilles, that these opinions, so opposite to those of the Church of Rome, had of a long time been entertained in these countries.

We have the fourth canon of the Council of Tours in the year 1163, which declares the antiquity of this pretended heresy in Gascoin and the country about Tholouse, and speaks of their meetings, which the title of the canon justly refers to the Albigenses, in these words;

“In the country about Tholouse, there sprung up long ago a damnable heresy, which by little and little, like a cancer, spreading itself to the neighboring places in Gascoin, hath already infected many other provinces; which, whilst, like a serpent, it hid itself in its own windings and twinings, crept on more secretly, and threatened more danger to the simple and unwary. Wherefore we do command all Bishops and Priests, dwelling in these parts, to keep a watchful eye upon these heretics, and, under the pain of excommunication, to forbid all persons, as soon as these heretics are discovered, from presuming to afford them any abode in their country, or to lend them any assistance, or to entertain any commerce with them in buying or selling; that so at least, by the loss of the advantages of human society, they may be compelled to repent of the error of their life. And if any prince, making himself partaker of their iniquity, shall endeavor to oppose these decrees, let him be struck with the same anathema. And if they shall be seized by any Catholic princes, and cast into prison, let them be punished by confiscation of all their goods: and because they frequently come together from divers parts into one hiding-place; and because they have no other ground for their dwelling together, save only their agreement and consent in error; therefore we will, that such their conventicles be both diligently searched after, and when they are found, that they be examined according to canonical severity.”

This canon expressly declares, first, That this pretended heresy had appeared a long time before. Secondly, That it had infected several provinces of these dioceses. Thirdly, That most severe methods were made use of to reduce them. This appears by the Council of Lateran, in the year 1179, in the last chapter. And it is plain also from the letters of the Archbishop of Narbon to King Lewis VII.

“My Lord the King, we are extremely pressed with many calamities, amongst which there is one that most of all affects us, which is, that the Catholic faith is extremely shaken in this our diocese, and St. Peter’s boat is so violently tossed by the waves, that it is in great danger of sinking.”

Now, since Lewis VII. died in the year 1180, having reigned ever since the year 1137, it appears clearly, that Languedoc was full of the disciples of Peter de Bruis and Henry, a long time before ever Waldo or any of his disciples had begun to preach.

We may gather the same from what is related by Henry, Abbot of Clairvaux, in the Annals of Hoveden, anno 1178, where he saith, *That this plague was come to such a head in that country, that they had not only made themselves Priests and Popes, but also had their Evangelists.*

I own that Hoveden seems to suppose that the faith of these Albigenses came from Italy, by his calling them Paterines; for as for the name of Publicans, it was like that of Cathari, given them on purpose to blacken them, and is the same with that of Bulgarians and Paphlagonians; all relating to the original of the Manichees, who came out of those countries at first.

Thirdly, It appears from the edicts quoted by Hoveden, that they were made against people of a more ancient standing than the disciples of Waldo.

“Wherefore, because the damnable perverseness of those heretics, whom some call Cathari, others Publicans, others Paterines, and others by other names, is increased in Gascoin, the country of Alby, and other places, so far that they do no more now, as in other places, exercise their impiety in private, but manifest their errors publicly.”

Stephen of Tournay is an unquestionable witness to the same truth; he wrote a letter to Johannes de Beauxmains, Bishop of Polctiers, in the year 1181, to persuade him to comply with the election of those of Lyons, who desired him for their Archbishop, and lays before his eyes the notorious infidelity of the dioceses of Languedoc, Gascoign, and Septimania, and the general desolation of the churches of the Romish party in those parts.

“Far be it, Father,” saith he, “from your clemency, that you should have any inclination for the barbarity of the Goths, the levity of the Gascoigns, or for the cruel and savage manners of those of Septimania, where infidelity is above faith, famine above fame, treachery and trouble more than can be conceived. I lately saw in my passage, when the King sent me to Tholouse, a terrible image of death, frequent and fervent in that country, the walls of churches half demolished, sacred buildings half burnt down, their foundations digged up, and where there were formerly the dwellings of men, now nothing but the habitations of beasts. I confess I shaked and trembled when I heard you were invited to those parts, in which, though you might chance to be a Bishop, yet you might easily be so without any advantage.”

We have the concurrent testimony of the Archbishops and other Prelates assembled at Lavaur against the Albigenses, who declare in their letters to Innocent III. that this heresy had been sown in these countries long before, in these terms:

“For whereas the heretical pestilence, which of old time hath been sown in those parts, was now grown to that height, that Divine worship was scorned and derided, and the heretics on one hand, and the robbers on the other, harassed the Clergy and the Church’s revenue, and that both prince and people, being given over to a reprobate mind, swerved from the true faith; now, by means of your armies, by which you have most wisely designed to purge away the infection and noisomeness of this pestilence, and their most Christian leader, the Earl of Montfort, an undaunted warrior, and unconquered fighter of the Lord’s battles, the Church, which was so miserably ruined, begins again to lift up her head; and both enemies and errors being for the most part destroyed, the land

which hath so long been wasted by the followers of these opinions, will at length accustom itself again to the worship of God.”

Lastly, The same thing appears by the testimony of Peter, a Monk of Veaux Cernay, in the first chapter of his History:

“In the province of Narbon, where formerly the faith flourished, the enemy of the faith has begun to sow his tares. The people there are distasted with the sacraments of Christ, who is the savor and wisdom of God, being become profane and unwise, by forsaking the wisdom of true godliness.”

And after having represented how the Monks, Petrus de Castro Novo and Radulphus, the Pope’s legates, had forced those of Tholouse to abjure their faith for fear of punishments, but that soon after they returned again to their former opinions; he adds,

“For being perjured, and relapsing into their former calamity, they concealed the heretics that preached at midnight in their conventicles. O how difficult a thing it is to pluck up a deep-rooted custom! This treacherous city of Tholouse, from its very first foundation, (as it is said,) hath seldom or never been clear of this detestable plague; this poison of heretical pravity and superstitious infidelity having been successively diffused from father to son. Wherefore she also, as a due vengeance for so great wickedness, has endured the effects of avenging hands, and the ruin of a just desolation. — Yea, what is more, she has suffered this heretical nature and home-bred heresy, after it had been driven out by a well-deserved severity, to return again upon her; being desirous to imitate her ancestors, and refusing to degenerate. By the example of whose neighborhood, as one rotten grape taints another, and as a whole herd of swine are infected by the scabbiness of a single hog, so the neighboring cities and towns, having once had these arch-heretics rooted amongst them, are become wonderfully and miserably infected with this plague, by the springing shoots of their infidelity; the Barons of the several lordships in these provinces being almost all of them become the defenders and entertainers of heretics, loving them sincerely, and defending them against God and the Church very warmly.”

One needs only to reflect upon what I have here produced concerning the time of the promotion of Johannes de Beauxmains to the archbishopric of Lyons, and to recollect that it was he that persecuted Peter Waldo, to make us acknowledge that we cannot suppose the Albigenses to have been the disciples of this Peter Waldo.

CHAPTER 14

Of the opinions of Peter de Bruis and Henry, and their disciples, and whether they were Manichees, or not.

WE find that though some Manichees settled themselves in Languedoc, yet it seems they have only served to give the Papists a color to accuse those whom their errors and their false worship obliged them to look upon as an antichristian Church. This will appear yet more clearly, by the account we are about to give here of the opinions of Peter de Bruis, of Henry, and of their disciples, whom the Bishop of Meaux would willingly have thought to have been Manichees. Baronius was not so quicksighted as the Bishop; but because it happens oft, that those who stand upon the shoulders of a tall man can see a little further than he, we must inquire, by examining this matter carefully, whether we are to believe Baronius or the Bishop of Meaux.

The care of the Inquisition has scarcely left us any record of Peter de Bruis; so that we know scarce any thing of what concerns him, but what we have from the report of his enemies, and those enemies too to that degree, that they used fire and sword to destroy him; which alone is sufficiently a strong presumption, that they had little or no inclination to extenuate the horridness of his opinions, nor to put a reasonable sense upon them, when, according to the rules of equity, they could have given them a good one. Be it as it will, Peter, Abbot of Clugny, bears witness, that Peter de Bruis, from whom the Albigenses have been called Petrobusians, had taught almost twenty years in the dioceses of Arles, Embrun, and in Gascoin, whither the persecution, which he suffered from the Bishops and Archbishops of those dioceses, stirred up against him by Peter de Clugny, had forced him to take refuge. He declares that he had made a great number of disciples, and exhorts these Prelates to oppose themselves against the progress of his doctrine, by forcing him in this his retreat, not only by preaching against him, but also, if it were needful, *vi armata per laicos*,

“with armed force by laymen.”

These Bishops answered these exhortations of Peter de Clugny perfectly well; so that after they had obliged him to keep more private, they watched him so closely by their votaries, that at last they seized him at St. Gilles, where they caused him to be burnt in the year 1126, to the great satisfaction of Peter de Clugny and of Baronius, who highly extol the zeal of those who by this means had avenged the injury he had done to crosses, in burning them to boil his meat on Good Friday.

This is one of the crimes laid to his charge by Peter de Clugny, a crime of such a nature, that king Hezekiah may upon the same account be looked upon as a most profane person, though we know that his zeal hereto was approved by God himself. At this rate also, John of Jerusalem must be looked upon as a very negligent Prelate for not burning St. Epiphanius, who at Anablatha had torn the hangings of a church in which he found the pictures of Jesus Christ, and of some other saints. And Gregory I. must pass for a negligent ignorant person, for not burning Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, who broke down the church-images, as well as Peter de Bruis, in a time when idolatry was not yet come to its height. For as for his boiling meat with the wood of the cross on Good Friday, and eating of the same, supposing he had indeed done so, (though there be great probability to the contrary, and that it was only one of those slanderous imputations the Monks make use of to stir up the fury of the ignorant rabble,) it would at the most have been no more than a notable action to awaken these idolaters, by setting before them their own Pagan folly, described by the Prophet Isaiah in the 44th chapter of his prophecy.

But this was not the only crime of Peter de Bruis; he was not only an image-breaker, but he had besides, during these twenty years of his ministry, preached up many heresies: the chiefest of which Peter de Clugny reduceth to five articles, as being more horrid than the rest.

“And because,” saith he, “the first seeds of this erroneous doctrine were sown and propagated by Peter de Bruis for almost twenty years together, they brought forth chiefly five poisonous shoots, against which I opposed myself as much as I was able.”

“**The first** consisted in denying that infants could be saved by baptism, when they are under the age of reason; and that the faith of the parents can be available to those who are not of age to believe.”

“**The second** consisted in maintaining that no temples or churches ought to be built, and that those already built ought to be destroyed; and that Christians did not need holy, that is, consecrated, places to worship God in, etc.”

“**The third** consisted in asserting that they ought to break down and burn the holy crosses, because that figure and that instrument wherewith Jesus Christ had been so cruelly tormented and put to death, was so far from being worthy of adoration, veneration, or any other kind of supplication, that it ought to be dishonored with indignity, broke to pieces and burnt, to revenge our Saviour’s torments and his death.”

“**The fourth** consisted, not only in denying the truth of the body and blood of our Lord, which is offered up every day, and continually by the sacrament of the Church; but also in maintaining that it was nothing, and ought not to be offered.”

“**The fifth** consisted in deriding all the offerings, prayers and alms, and other good works done by the faithful that are living, for those that are dead, because they could not by any of these means afford them the least comfort.”

These were the heresies which Peter de Bruis had taught for twenty years together, which is time enough to know the opinions of one man. And though Peter de Clugny, by his character of being a Monk, and his mortal enemy, was easily persuaded to indulge his credulity so far as to believe some reports spread abroad concerning the disciples of Peter de Bruis, that they did not own the Old Testament, which put him upon proving the divinity thereof, yet he insisted so little upon it, that he shews he was not persuaded in his conscience that the Petrobusians were Manichees: and the Bishop of Meaux ought to have imitated his discretion in the same matter.

But, saith the Bishop, they rejected baptism, which is one of the characters of the Manichees. If he had said that Peter de Bruis had revived the error of the Hieracites, whom St. Epiphanius speaks of, he would have had more reason on his side; for the first article, as Peter de Clugny hath expressed it, comes very near the opinion of the Hieracites: but it is absolutely false, that it agrees with the belief of the Manichees concerning

that sacrament. The Manichees absolutely rejected baptism; whereas, if we will believe Peter de Clugny, the Petrobusians did not look upon it as needless, but only to infants. In a word, Peter de Clugny attributes to them a kind of anabaptism, which maintained that infants were not capable of baptism, and that it was only to be conferred upon such as were full grown, because at the receiving of it they were to make profession of their faith for themselves. At this rate we might as well accuse Tertullian, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and Walfridus Strabo, of Manicheism. We shall find hereafter, that this error was not general amongst them, because the disciples of Peter de Bruis and Henry reject it as a slanderous imputation, and because the malice which appears in the wording of this calumny is nothing but the effect of that hatred wherewith Peter de Clugny was inflamed against these pretended heretics.

The second article is visibly nothing else but a consequence drawn from the aversion the Petrobusians had for the Popish churches, because of the idolatries there committed, and of their consecrations to the honor of saints. It is no such strange thing to see men condemn temples to be demolished, which they believe to have been profaned by idolatry. Gregory I. was one of the first that ever consecrated Pagan temples into meeting places for Christians; whereas before, the emperors had ordered them to be shut up, and caused some of them to be pulled down. It is very ordinary for those who detest the idolatry reigning in churches to be desirous to remove all the objects of it at the greatest distance from those whose salvation they endeavor to procure. Lastly, We know that the Petrobusians judged the Pope to be the Antichrist, which might very well prompt them to so great an aversion for these kind of buildings, in which Antichrist had his throne, as St. Hilary of Poitiers had distinctly foretold. But let men think what they please, this article has nothing of Manicheism in it.

The third heresy of the Petrobusians hath still less of Manicheism than the former. It is evident that this also is nothing but a popular consequence against the worship of the cross, which was then practiced upon diverse occasions, of which we have before seen an example, at the death of a great lord of that country. But whereas he supposeth that the Petrobusians did acknowledge that Jesus Christ hath endured the cross, and that he died upon it; in so doing he fully acquits them of being Manichees, since they

did not own that our Lord Jesus Christ truly died upon the cross. Moreover it must be confessed, that no man could better have renewed the doctrine of St. Agobardus, than Peter de Bruys, when he maintained that neither veneration, adoration, nor supplication, were due to the cross, and that they were to be broken, in case people were found to bestow any such worship upon them. For this was the doctrine of Agobardus, in his Discourse of Pictures.

The fourth heresy is expressed in very odious terms, and after the Popish manner, who own nothing to be real in the Sacrament, if the flesh of Jesus Christ and his blood be not there in substance, and who do not believe he is present in the Sacrament upon any other account, but as he is offered up to God before he is eaten. But yet here there is nothing in this double article of Manicheism. On the contrary, we may assert that the Romish opinion rather is a branch of Manicheism than theirs: for is not the body of Jesus Christ in the bread? and doth not the substance of the bread become the substance of Jesus Christ? and the Priest, or the faithful, when they digest it, do they not restore the body of Christ to liberty, in freeing it of its bonds, by which the charm of consecration tied it up?

The act of oblation which the Petrobusians blamed in the Mass, is more clearly explained by their disciples, as we shall see hereafter. In the mean time, it is worth observing, that they opposed the change which then began to be made in the Church of Rome, and which being accomplished, produced that addition in the Liturgy, where they make the Priest say, *et pro quibus tibi offerimus*,

“and for whom we offer up to thee;”

whereas before the whole offering respected only the people, *qui tibi offerunt*,

“who offer up unto thee,”

in allusion to that custom of the people’s offering the bread and wine which was used at the communion. As soon as the faith of the real presence was once entertained, they presently inquired what use might be made of it; and they found that it might be offered up to God, before it was offered to the people: and when they were once confirmed in the belief of this custom, they found it was necessary for the Priest to express

a sacerdotal act; whereas therefore the people before simply offered the bread and wine to God, in order to celebrate the communion with it, after consecration they thought good to substitute the Priest's offering of them up for the people. This was more distinctly practiced in the thirteenth century, as Menardus the Benedictine informs us in his Discourse upon the *Sacramentarium* of St. Gregory, though before that time we find some footsteps of this opinion.

The fifth article, which rejects purgatory, and maintains that the living cannot help the deceased believers by their prayers, alms, or good works, nor by any masses designedly said for them, has as little Manicheism as the former: for as the Petrobusians cannot be said to be Manichees for condemning the use of infant baptism, so neither can they be esteemed Manichees for denying purgatory and prayers for the dead. Let the Bishop of Meaux turn over as long as he pleaseth the catalogue of heresies, he will nowhere be able to find that the rejecting of purgatory, and prayers for the dead, are characters of Manicheism.

Is not the Bishop therefore, think we, very judicious, in taking Peter de Bruys and his disciples for Manichees? whereas he ought to have taken notice of two things in Peter de Clugny: the first is, that Peter de Bruys, whom they accuse of having boiled meat on Good-Friday with broken pieces of the cross, eat of it when he had done, with those who assisted at that execution. The second is, that he maintained that Priests and Monks ought rather to marry, than to live in a single state defiled with impurity; Coccius makes this article one of the heresies of Peter de Bruys.

One clearly sees what solid grounds the Bishop of Meaux had to accuse Peter de Bruys of Manicheism: let us now see whether he hath any better success with Henry, the disciple of Peter de Bruys.

The burning of Peter de Bruys at St. Gilles did not stifle the doctrine that he maintained; it had taken too deep root in these dioceses: on the contrary, it increased very considerably, after it was once watered with the blood of that martyr. The opposition which the disciples of Peter de Bruys made to the false worship of the Church of Rome, which they endeavored to introduce into these dioceses, after that they had made them submit to her yoke, was very useful to awaken the people. Pope Eugenius, the disciple of St. Bernard, being then in France, (where he was more

exactly informed of these difficulties than the Roman emissaries,) took the alarm very hotly. See here how St. Bernard describes the state of affairs, in a letter of his to the Count St. Gilles.

“How great evils have we heard and known that Henry the heretic hath done and does every day in the churches of God? He wanders up and down in your country in sheep’s clothing, being indeed a ravenous wolf: but according to the hint given by our Lord, we know him by his fruits. The churches are without people, people without Priests, Priests without due reverence, and lastly, Christians without Christ. The churches of Christ are looked upon as synagogues; the sanctuary of God is denied to be holy; sacraments are no longer esteemed sacred; holy feasts are deprived of festival solemnities; men die in their sins; souls are frequently snatched away to appear before the terrible tribunal, who are neither reconciled by repentance, nor armed with the sacred communion: the life of Christ is denied to Christian infants, by refusing them the grace of baptism; nor are they suffered to draw near unto salvation, though our Saviour tenderly cries on their behalf, *Suffer little children to come unto me.* — This man is not of God, who acts and speaks things so contrary to God; and yet, alas, he is listened to by many, and has a people that believe him. O most unhappy people! at the voice of an heretic all the voices of the Prophets and Apostles are silenced, who from one Spirit of truth have declared, that the Church is to be called by the faith of Christ out of all the nations of the world: so that the divine oracles have deceived us, the eyes and souls of all men are deluded, who see the same thing fulfilled, which they read before to have been foretold: which truth, though it be most manifest to all, he alone, by an astonishing and altogether *Judaical* blindness, either sees not, or else is sorry to see it fulfilled; and at the same time, by I know not what diabolical art, persuades the foolish and senseless people not to believe their own eyes in a thing that is so manifest; and that those that went before have deceived, those that come after have been deceived; that the whole world, even after the shedding of Christ’s blood, shall be lost; and that all the riches of the mercies of

God, and the grace of the universe, are devoted upon those alone whom he deceives.”

Pope Eugenius, finding things in this posture, names Albericus, Bishop of Ostia, for his legate to the people of Tholouse, and to the Count of St. Gilles. Baronius, in his Annals, gives us an account of this Henry, the disciple of Peter de Bruys, and his death, in the year 1147, which seems to be very exact, because St. Bernard writ to the Count of St. Gilles, to exhort him to drive Henry out of his country, where he preached his doctrine very freely: but the earl died in the holy land, having been poisoned there (as it was said) by the queen: wherefore in the year 1147. Henry suffered martyrdom, at the solicitation of St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, by the cruelty of Albericus, Bishop of Ostia, Cardinal, and legate of Pope Eugenius II. at Tholouse, where he caused him to be burnt, after they had brought him thither loaded with irons. Baronius sets down with great care whatever he thought might blemish the reputation of the martyr. He relates all that St. Bernard wrote against him to Aldephonsus, Earl of St. Gilles. He quotes St. Bernard, who calls Henry an apostate Monk, and accuseth him of having made use of the great talents he had in preaching, as a means to get money to spend at gaming and upon his lusts. He says, that Henry was a man defiled with adulteries, who, for his frequent crimes, durst not appear in several parts of France and Germany, and who by consequence was not to be endured in the territories of the Count of St. Gilles; but yet he doth not lay any thing of Manicheism to his charge, no more than Peter de Clugny and St. Bernard: nay, Baronius does more; for he formerly distinguished him from those heretics whom St. Bernard opposed under the name of Apostolics, in his 66th Homily upon the Canticles.

How then could the Bishop of Meaux make a Manichee of him? Perhaps the loose life, whereof St. Bernard accuseth him, may be a character of it. But not to undervalue the vanity of this loose accusation, without any proof, and proceeding from a sworn and cruel enemy, which was quite overthrown by the courageous martyrdom of Henry: at this rate the Clergy of the Church of Rome, who were so generally guilty of sodomy, that St. Peter Damian writ a book, entitled *Gomorrhæus*, must have been Manichees; and upon the same ground Johannes Cremensis, a Cardinal, the Pope's legate in England, for abolishing the marriage of the Priests, must

likewise have been a Manichee; for the English historians say, that this holy Cardinal, having assembled a synod at Westminster, wherein he represented to the Priests that it was the worst of crimes to rise from a whore to consecrate the body of Jesus Christ, was himself surprised in bed with a common whore, the same day that he had said mass. Upon this account also the legates of Anacletus, the competitor of Eugenius II. must have been Manichees; for they are taxed with carrying women along with them in men's habits, probably to avoid the inconvenience that Johannes Cremensis fell into in England, for want of taking this care beforehand.

They charge Henry with the same heresies which they attributed to Peter de Bruys; so that what I have already said concerning the heresies of the Petrobusians, I need not repeat here. Baronius adds, I confess, that Henry had superadded to these heresies this proposition, *Additis irrideri Deum canticis ecclesiasticis*,

“That the singing in churches was but a mocking of God.”

And accordingly Peter de Clugny refutes this pretended heresy with a great deal of earnestness: but if I may speak my opinion in this matter, neither did this proposition contain any great crime. For first, singing in general was owned by Isidore as an innovation. It was about seventy years before, that the Popes had abolished the ancient Liturgies, to substitute the Roman Liturgy. The Gothic Liturgy, which was used in the diocese of Languedoc, and other neighbouring dioceses, which at that time depended on the kings of Spain, had been suppressed, because it was not over-favorable to the opinions of the Church of Rome. Secondly, they had at the same time introduced a sort of rhyming verses, which they call *proses*, so ridiculous, so foolish, and so full of novelties, both as to the worship of saints, and as to the fabulous stories they contained, that it was very difficult for those who looked for wisdom in their prayers, not to take them for profanations. The hymn composed by King Robert, in honor of Queen Constantia, may give us an hint what sort of things they were, *O Constantia Martyrum*, etc. And now let any one judge whether Henry was a Manichee, because he condemned this sort of profanations.

This also is what hath been owned by Mezeray, in his Chronological Abridgement of the History of France, printed at Amsterdam in 1673, where, upon the year 1163, he saith,

“that there were two sorts of heretics; the one ignorant and loose, who were a sort of Manichees; the other more learned, and remote from such filthiness, who held much the same opinions as the Calvinists, and were called Henricians or Waldenses, though the people ignorantly confounded them with the Cathari, Bulgarians, etc.”

Mezeray had spoken more exactly, had he said, that the people were abused by the Bishops and Clergy, who purposely confounded the ancient followers of Peter de Bruys and Henry with the Manichees and Cathari, to make them odious.

CHAPTER 15

*That it doth not appear from the conference of Alby,
that the Albigenes were Manichees.*

HAVING thus justified Peter de Bruys, Henry, and his disciples, from the imputation of Manicheism, which the Bishop of Meaux has endeavored to fasten upon them, we will yet further endeavor to clear this point, by examining the conference of Alby, from whence the Bishop thinks that he has drawn a solid argument to confirm his imputation. Let us see how this conference is related by Roger Hoveden, in his Annals upon the year 1176.

“It was in this year that the Arian heresy was condemned, which had well nigh infected all the province of Tholouse. There were,” saith he, “certain heretics in the province of Tholouse, who called themselves The Good Men; they were supported by the militia of Lombez, and preached and taught the people contrary to the Christian faith, professing themselves not to own the Law of Moses, nor the Prophets, nor the Psalms, nor any part of the Old Testament, nor the doctors of the New Testament, save only the Gospels, and the Epistles of St. Paul, with the seven Canonical Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Revelation.”

“Being questioned concerning their faith,” proceeds he, “and concerning the baptism of infants, and whether they were saved by baptism; and concerning the body and blood of our Lord, where it was consecrated, or by whom, and who were those that received it; and whether it were more or better consecrated by a good man than by a wicked man; and concerning marriage, if a man and woman could be saved, that knew one another carnally. They answered, that they would say nothing of their faith nor of the baptism of infants; neither were they obliged to say any thing of those matters. Concerning the body and blood of our Savior they said, that he who received it worthily was saved; and that he who received it unworthily procured his own condemnation. Concerning marriage they said, that a man and woman join themselves together to avoid fornication, as St. Paul saith. They also declared many

things, without being questioned; as that they ought not to use any oaths whatsoever, as St. John said in his Gospel, and St. James in his Epistle. They said also, that St. Paul had foretold that they ought to ordain Bishops and Priests in the Church; and that if these orders were not conferred upon such as he there commands, that then they were neither Bishops nor Priests, but ravening wolves, hypocrites, and deceivers, who loved the salutations in the market-places, the first places, and the first seats at feasts: who love to be called masters, against the commandment of Jesus Christ; who wear white and shining garments; who wear rings of gold and precious stones on their fingers, which their Master never commanded them. Accordingly they maintained, that since the Bishops and Priests were like to those Priests who betrayed our Saviour Jesus Christ, they ought not to obey them, because they were wicked.”

“After divers reasons alleged on both sides in presence of the Bishop of Alby, they chose and settled judges on both sides, with consent of the Bishop of Alby. After this, Roger Hoveden observes, that the Prelates cited divers authorities out of the New Testament, (for these heretics, saith he, would not be determined but by the New Testament,) and that afterwards the Bishop of Lyons pronounced the definitive sentence, drawn from the New Testament, in these terms; I Gislebert, Bishop of Lyons, at the command of the Bishop of Alby and his assessors, do judge that they are heretics; and I condemn the opinions of Oliver and his companions, wherever they are: and we judge this from the New Testament: I bring therefore, for this reason, proofs to confirm the divinity of the Old Testament, drawn from the New, and thereby oppose these heretics, because they owned that they received Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, only in those particulars which Jesus and his Apostles had by their testimony approved, and not in others: whereupon he maintains with reason, that if an instrument or testimony in writing is allowed of in one part, the whole must needs be owned, or else wholly cast aside.”

“**In the second place**, saith he, we convict them, and judge them to be heretics, by the authorities of the New Testament; for we say, that he

has not the Catholic faith who doth not confess it when he is required, and when it is exposed to any danger; whence it is that our Lord, in the Acts of the Apostles, saith to Ananias, speaking of Paul, *For he is to me a chosen vessel, to carry my name*, etc. These heretics also boast themselves that they do not lie; whereas we maintain that they lie manifestly, for there is deceit in holding one's peace, as well as speaking; wherefore also Paul boldly resisted Peter to his face, because he gave way to the circumcised."

"In the third place, saith he, we convict and judge them to be heretics by the authorities of the New Testament; for we say that God will have all men to be saved, etc. After which he produces the proofs for infant baptism, and solves the objection taken from infants wanting faith, without which it is impossible to please God: we say that it is by the faith of the Church, or of their godfathers, as the man sick of the palsy was healed by the faith of those who presented him, and let him down through the tiling of the house."

"In the fourth place, saith he, we do convict and judge them as heretics by the authorities of the New Testament, because the body of our Lord cannot be consecrated but by a Priest, be he good or bad; which he proves, because consecration is made by the words of Jesus Christ. Moreover, he proves that the consecration of the body of our Lord must be celebrated in the church, and by the ministers of the church only, whose authority he asserts from passages of Scripture."

"Clerks therefore and laymen, pursues he, must be obedient for God's sake to these Priests, Bishops, and Deacons, be they good or bad, according to what our Lord saith, *The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses's chair: whatsoever therefore they say, do ye; but do not according to their works: for they say, and do not.*"

"In the fifth place, we convict and judge them to be heretics by the authority of the New Testament, because they will not own that man and wife, if carnally joined, can be saved; and yet they are wont to preach in public, that man and wife cannot be saved, if they know one another carnally: by striving to preach up the study of virginity, saith he, they seem to derogate from the state of marriage, and to condemn it; which he refutes by the common proofs."

“**In the sixth place**, saith he, we convict and judge by the authorities of the New Testament, that they are heretics, and separated from the unity of the Church; for we say that the Lord hath given the power to St. Peter, of binding and absolving, saying, *Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound*, etc. and St. James say, *If any one among you be sick, let him call for the Priests of the Church*, etc. and again, *Behold, I send unto you wise men and scribes*; but as our Lord saith, *All men cannot comprehend this saying.*”

“Moreover, we say, that they ought to have stood up, in answering and disputing concerning the Gospel, because all Christians stand when the Gospels are read; now if we ought to stand when they are read, much more ought we to stand when they are read and expounded together. Neither ought they to have sat down, after that they had once chosen to stand. Besides, we have many authorities, by which it plainly appears that we ought to be standing when the Gospel is reading, as that where it is said, *And Jesus stood in the plain*; and again, *Jesus stood and cried, saying*; and again, *There stands one in the midst of you, whom ye know not*. Moreover, Jesus was in a standing posture, when, after his resurrection, he confirmed his disciples, and preached unto them; as it is written, *Jesus stood in the midst of his disciples, and said, Peace be with you*. And as for them, saith the Bishop, they have no right to judge, but only to answer; for the Lord ought to sit, to whom all judgment is committed by the Father. But as for them, they judge not, but are judged, and it is not permitted to them to preach in the churches. These heretics are such as St. Paul foretells of, when he saith, that *there shall be wicked men and seducers, who will go on to grow worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived; for the time shall come, that they will not bear sound doctrine, but will turn their ears away from the truth to fables*. And again, *From which some going astray, have given themselves to vain things, who desiring to be teachers of the law, understand not what they say or affirm*. He maintains, that they ought to punish the disobedience of those heretics, and to give them public correction, according to St. Paul’s saying, *that sinners should be reprov’d openly in the presence of all for their amendment*. St. Paul

also, speaking to Bishops, saith, *Being always ready to reprove every disobedience, and having power to confute those that gainsay; and again, Exhort, rebuke, and reprove with all authority; and again, I have delivered them to Satan, etc. Moreover, Being absent, I have already judged, etc. And lastly, Whoever shall preach any other thing, let him be accursed.*”

“**In the seventh place**, the said Bishop questioned them concerning repentance, whether it were saving when performed at the last gasp, or whether soldiers mortally wounded may be saved, if they repent at last; or whether every one ought to confess their sins to the Priest and Ministers of the church, or to some layman, or to those of whom St. James says, *Confess your sins one to another?* To which they answered, that it was sufficient for those that were sick to confess to whom they would. As for soldiers, they would answer nothing, because St. James there speaks only of the sick. It was also asked them, whether one single act of contrition of heart, and one confession of the mouth were sufficient, or whether satisfaction were necessary, after penance had been enjoined, in deploring their sins by fasting, alms, and affliction, if they had opportunity. To which they answered, saying, that St. James said, *Confess your sins one to another, that you may be healed:* so that by these words they knew that the Apostle did not enjoin any thing else, but only to confess to one another; and that so they should be saved; and that they would not be better than the Apostle, by adding any thing thereto of their own, as the Bishops do.”

“The heretics added besides, that the Bishop who pronounced sentence was an heretic, and not they; and that he was their enemy, and a ravening wolf, a hypocrite, and an enemy of God; and that he had not judged rightly, and that they would not answer any thing concerning their faith, because they mistrusted him, as our Lord had commanded them in the Gospel; *Beware of false prophets, who come unto you in sheeps clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves:* and that he was their malicious persecutor; and they were ready to make it appear from the Gospels and the Epistles, that he was not a good Pastor, neither he, nor all the rest of the Bishops and Priests, but rather hirelings.”

“The Bishop answered, that the sentence had been duly pronounced against them, and that he was ready to verify the same, either in the court of Lord Alexander the Catholic Pope, or in the court of Lewis King of France, or of Raimond Earl of Tholouse, or of his wife who was present, or in the court of Frenkwel who was there present; that he had passed a right judgment; and that they were evidently heretics, and branded as such. He promised also that he would indict them for heresy, and that he would denounce them to be such in all Catholic courts.”

“The heretics seeing themselves convicted and confounded, turned themselves towards all the people, saying, Good people, the faith which we now confess, we confess for your sakes. The Bishop answered, You say, that you speak for the sake of the people, and not for Godsake. And they said, *We believe that there is one only God, in three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and that the Son of God hath taken our flesh upon him, that he was baptized in Jordan, that he fasted in the wilderness, that he hath preached our salvation; that he suffered, died, and was buried; that he descended into hell, that he rose again the third day, that he ascended into heaven, that he sent the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, that he shall come at the day of judgment to judge both the quick and the dead, and that all shall rise again. We know also, that what we believe with our heart, we ought to confess with our mouth. We believe, that he is not saved who doth not eat the body of Jesus Christ, and that the body of Jesus Christ is not consecrated but in the church, and by the Priest, be he good or bad; and that it is no better consecrated by a good than by a bad one. We believe also, that none can be saved but those that are baptized, and that little children are saved by baptism. We believe also, that man and wife are saved, though they be carnally joined; and that every one must repent with his mouth and heart, and be baptized in the church by a Priest; and that if they could shew them more from the Gospels and Epistles, they would believe and own it.*”

“The said Bishop told them also, that if they should swear, they would be obliged to keep the faith; and if there were any thing else, that they ought to confess it, because before they had maintained

wicked opinions, and had spoken ill. They answered, that they could not swear at all, because in so doing they should sin against the Gospel and the Epistles. Whereupon, they produced against them authorities out of the New Testament; and after they had been cited and heard on both sides, one of the Bishops, standing up, passed his judgment in this manner:”

“I Gozelin, Bishop of Lodeve, by permission and command of the Bishop of Alby and his assessors, do judge and declare openly, that these heretics are in a wrong opinion concerning the matter of oaths: they must swear, if so be they desire to be received, for in matters of faith men ought to swear: and forasmuch as they are infamous, and stained with heresy, they must clear their innocence; and returning to the unity of the Church, they must confirm their faith by an oath, as the Catholic Church holds and believes; that so the weak ones that are in the Church be not corrupted, and that the infected sheep may not spoil the whole flock. Neither is this contrary to the Gospel, or to the Epistles of St. Paul; for though it be said in the Gospel, *Let your communication be Yea, yea, Nay, nay*; and, *Thou shalt not swear, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth*, etc. yet it is not forbidden to swear by God, but only by the creatures: for the heathens worshipped the creature; and if it were permitted to swear by creatures, we should give to the creatures the respect and honor which is due to God alone; and thus idols and creatures would be adored as God.”

“After several arguments to prove the lawfulness of swearing, he added; Or it may be, those expressions in the Gospel and the Epistle of St. James are only by way of advice, and not by way of precept, because if men did not swear, they would not be forsworn; and *whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil*, that is, of sin or of the Devil, who persuades men to swear by creatures. Finding therefore that they were convicted in this point also, they said that the Bishop of Alby had agreed with them that he would not force them to swear; which the Bishop of Alby denied, and standing up, said, I confirm the sentence which Gozelin, Bishop of Lodeve, hath pronounced, which was given by my order; and I give notice to the militia of Lombez not to protect them. This was

signed by the nine Bishops, Clerks, Abbots, and laymen, with this conclusion, We approve this sentence, and we know they are heretics, and we reject their opinion.”

This is the substance of what passed at the conference of Alby, according to the relation of Roger Hoveden. One sees that he represents to us these three things: First, the accusations laid to the charge of the Albigenses: they are accused of several articles which are pure Manicheism. Secondly, the arguments they brought to convict them. Thirdly, the confession of faith of the Albigenses, in opposition to their accusations.

As for their accusations, we are to observe, that they are only consequences of their being looked upon as heretics, such as they pretended had been long since condemned in the councils held against the Manichees; and accordingly they make a recapitulation of the errors, either defended by the Cathari, or commonly attributed to them; and with these they charge the Albigenses without further ceremony.

They produce indeed some witnesses who accuse them, and maintain that they have heard some of them maintain Manichean propositions.

But the manner of their justifying themselves confounds this accusation and these witnesses.

1. They declare, that the silence they kept was like that of Jesus Christ, who sometimes held his peace without answering the questions of the Pharisees.
2. They called the persons appointed to confront them false witnesses and impostors, in as handsome a manner as could be shown to persons of their quality who appeared against them.
3. They propound their confession of faith in terms wholly orthodox; addressing themselves to the people who had been witnesses of these horrid accusations.

Probably some will say, Here is a company of men actually accused of abominable heresies, and here are persons produced to prove it really upon them. To this I have three things to answer.

1. That we have this conference from the hand of their enemies only.

2. That what is insisted on concerning the authority of their witnesses is overthrown by a very natural reflection; which is, that the integrity of the Waldenses was so well known, and their adversaries so much noted for their inclinations to calumny, that the princes and all the people favored them. This is observed by Puylaurens in his Chronicle, and it is taken notice of by Ribera in his Antiquities of Tholouse; and yet their enemies have still gone on to accuse them of Manicheism.

CHAPTER 16

*The Albigenses justified by a conference,
whereof we have an account written by Bernard of Foncaud.*

WHAT I have here represented in general might be sufficient to clear the Albigenses from the charge of Manicheism, which the Bishop of Meaux, after so many ages, hath improved against them, but that we have something more to say. This Bishop, who makes the Waldenses only schismatics from the Church of Rome, though he looks upon them as another sort of schismatics than Donatists, hath pretended to prove this business infallibly, by the conference, whereof Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, hath given us the relation, and which was held in presence of Bernard, Archbishop of Narbon. He observes therefore, that it appears from the said conference, that those against whom the dispute was maintained differed from the Church of Rome only in the following articles.

“The dispute,” saith he, “chiefly concerned the obedience that is due to Pastors, which we find that the Waldenses denied, and that, notwithstanding all prohibitions to the contrary, they believed they had power to preach, both men and women; and since this their disobedience could not be grounded but upon the unworthiness of the Pastors, the Catholics, in proving obedience to be due unto them, prove it to be due even to those that are wicked; and that, whatsoever the channels be, believers do not fail of receiving grace through them. For the same reason, they shew, that this speaking against their pastors, whence the pretence of disobeying them was taken, is forbidden by the law of God. Afterwards they confute the liberty that laymen took to themselves of preaching without leave of their Pastors, and indeed in opposition to their prohibitions; and they shew that this seditious kind of preaching tends to the subversion of the weak and ignorant. Above all, they prove from Scripture, that women, to whom silence only is recommended, must not undertake to teach. Lastly, they represent to the Waldenses, that they do ill in rejecting prayer for the dead, which hath so much foundation in

Scripture, and so clear a succession in tradition. And as these heretics absented themselves from the churches, to pray amongst themselves in private in their houses, they tell them that they ought not to leave the house of prayer, the holiness whereof was so much recommended in Scripture, and even by the Son of God himself.”

Here we may see the Albigenses, in case they be the persons concerned, (though the Bishop pretends they are the Waldenses,) sufficiently cleared from all the accusations of Manicheism that can be formed against their faith. For according to these articles, if we believe the Bishop of Meaux, they cannot be charged with any thing of Arianism, much less of Manicheism.

I cannot perfectly agree to what the Bishop of Meaux concludes, from their examining only these pretended differences in the conference held before the Archbishop of Narbon, that there was no other difference betwixt the Church of Rome and those against whom the Papists disputed at this conference. There are solid reasons that hinder me from being of the Bishop’s opinion: but however it be, he cannot defend himself from having furnished his adversaries with the most compendious way in the world to overthrow without much inquiry all that he had done to prove that the Albigenses were guilty of Manicheism.

For in truth this dispute, whereof the Abbot of Foncaud gives us an account, was not maintained against the Vaudois, but against the Albigenses. For,

1. the Bishop might easily have discovered as much from the presence of the Archbishop of Narbon, the matter in question relating to the interest of his diocese.
2. Because the Abbot of Foncaud, who is the relater, was one of the principal actors, his abbey being in the diocese of Narbon.
3. Because this conference, with some others, served as a prologue to the cruelties exercised against the Albigenses; the Church of Rome and her Ministers having already made use of these ways of sweetness, before they came to the extremities of a croisade, which interrupted their other projects towards Greece and the Holy Land.

It follows clearly from hence, that, according to the acknowledgment of the Bishop, the Albigenses cannot be more justly accused of Manicheism than the Vaudois, concerning whom he pretends that the Abbot of Foncaud speaks.

I cannot imagine how the Bishop can answer the force of this argument, except only by denying that he is mistaken, and pretending that this conference was held with some of the Vaudois, who had fled into the diocese of Narbon, and had so considerably propagated their doctrine there, that a public dispute was judged necessary to stop the progress of it.

But first, it would be very strange that they should be able in so short a time to make themselves more considerable than the Petrobusians and the Henricians, with whom we know that the dioceses of Aquitain and Narbon were already filled, according to the testimony of their enemies. Secondly, were it so, it would be necessary to suppose that Bernard, Archbishop of Narbon, who died the second of October, 1191, made it his business to stop the progress of some of Waldo's disciples, who at that time could scarcely be known, (John de Beauxmains, Archbishop of Lyons, who condemned Peter Waldo, not having possessed his see above ten years, as far as we can judge, which he then quitted to retire to Clairvaux,) whilst in the mean time he took no notice of the Petrobusians and Henricians. Thirdly, it is ridiculous to suppose, against the credit of all historians, that the Vaudois composed a distinct body from the Albigenses, who, as we shall shew hereafter, clearly suppose that there were no Vaudois that had churches, and that made a distinct body. Fourthly, neither do we find that the cruel Inquisition made any such like distinction about this matter, in using more or less cruelty, according to the degrees of schism and heresy, as it is pretended they ought to do, in case they would act justly.

But whatever answer the Bishop may invent to defend his opinion, we have a sure way to overthrow it without remedy, and it is the same which he himself hath furnished us with; for he owns that the conference of 1206, mentioned by the Monk of Vaux Cernay, was a conference with the Vaudois. Besides that which Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, hath set down, we have another, saith he, in Peter of Vaux Cernay, about the year 1206, where the Vaudois were confounded: now all men know that the

conference of 1206 was held with the Albigenses, as Peter of Vaux Cernay, who lived at that time, assures us in his History of the Albigenses.

But why then, will the Bishop say, did not they dispute before the Bishop of Nismes and the Archbishop of Narbon, but only upon these four points? The question is easily answered: they disputed about many other articles; but either he who wrote the conference did not give us a relation of the whole, as not supposing it convenient to publish their objections against those other opinions and superstitions which the Albigenses opposed; or else they wanted time to examine the other articles of the Roman faith which they rejected.

What I say now is not a conjecture at random, produced only to stop the Bishop's answer, but is matter of fact grounded upon the relation which we have of the conference of Montreal, as I shall shew hereafter.

All this will lead us to pass a true judgment on the condemnations which the Popes, King Alphonsus, and the Emperor Frederic II. issued out against the Albigenses in their bulls and edicts. They endeavoured in short to make them be looked upon as infamous Manichees, as a company of Arians, and as the most execrable heretics. The Popes prepossessed the kings and emperors with these notions by the reproachful names which they fastened upon them, after they had gotten the power to lead them by the nose as so many wild beasts: hence proceeds that heap of names which we find in the bulls and edicts of that time.

The reflection we ought to make on all these terms of obloquy is this, that excepting only the names of Publicans and Cathari, particularly given to the Manichees, it appears from these edicts, that the Albigenses and the Waldenses did both believe the same thing.

But if what I have said is sufficient to shew the injustice of the Bishop of Meaux in making the Albigenses pass for Manichees, the matter may be still further cleared, if we turn over the books of Alanus Magnus, surnamed the Universal Doctor; for it appears clearly from his treatise against the heretics of his time, and above all against the Albigenses, which he dedicated to William, Prince of Montpellier, that it was the fashion at that time to treat the Albigenses as Manichees, and to confound them with those heretics, whereas their faith was very opposite to that of the

Manichees; for in his refutation he huddles them all together without almost any distinction, though their principles were very different. It seems he made use of this way, that he might make use of his common places the better; or else he did it to avoid frequent repetitions.

In the first place therefore Alanus refutes the Manichees, who asserted that there were two principles, whereof the one was good, the other evil, and maintained that the evil god had created the world; of whom also some affirmed that the souls of men were apostate angels, who should be saved after their abode in human bodies; and that the souls of the patriarchs had no share in the salvation of Jesus Christ. They held likewise that Jesus Christ did not take upon him a true body, and that he never eat or drunk. They believed that the body of man was the workmanship of the Devil, and that it should not rise again; and they seemed to think that souls perished with their bodies.

He refutes some, who, though they believed the flesh of Jesus Christ, yet denied him to be the Son of God: others, who maintained that Jesus Christ had taken a celestial body; that the Virgin had been created in heaven, and had neither father nor mother. He takes up the first thirty-four chapters of his first book in confuting these opinions.

Afterwards, in his 35th chapter, he refutes the opinion of those who pretended that the Law of Moses was published by the Devil, and that the Fathers of the Old Testament were all damned.

As to the sacraments, whereof he treats from the 39th chapter, he owns that some of those heretics, whom he opposeth in general, absolutely rejected baptism; these were Manichees: that others denied the efficacy of it to infants, denying original sin: that others again believed it unprofitable to children, and only useful for those of riper years: and he disputes against every one of these opinions.

In chapter 45 he disputes against those who denied baptism to be useful without the imposition of hands. Afterwards he confutes those that maintained that we ought not, after having obtained the pardon of our sins in baptism, hope to obtain the same grace a second time by repentance, which in obliged them to excommunicate those who relapsed into their sins after baptism, which they proved from the 6th and 10th chapters of the

Epistle to the Hebrews, and because penance was no more to be reiterated than baptism or orders. It seems that these Albigenses had a discipline like that which prevailed in the Church before the Council of Carthage in Tertullian's time, where they never admitted to the Communion those who had committed any great crimes after their baptism.

In the 50th chapter he attacks other heretics, who asserted that penance did not procure remission of sins, because it is God alone that can pardon sins. One sees plainly enough what they meant, especially because he adds, that they believed it was sufficient to confess their sins to God, which they proved by the authorities of St. Ambrose, St. Maximus, and St. Chrysostom.

He says that these heretics denied transubstantiation. It is worth observing to see with what force and subtilty they disputed against this doctrine: I shall produce the arguments themselves of the Albigenses, which Alanus endeavors to confute. *Et hoc sic probare conantur: Si singulis diebus panis in corpus Christi mutaretur, illud in infinitum augetur. Quaerunt etiam utrum ille panis desinat esse: si desinit esse, adnihilatur, et ita etiam corrumpitur. **Item**, quaerunt quomodo corpus tantae quantitatis intrat per os hominis? **Item**, si corpus Christi comeditur, dentibus atteritur, et ita in partes dividitur, item, panis fit corpus Christi, ergo erit corpus Christi, et ita aliud quam sit. **Item**, panis fiet corpus, ergo de pane fiet corpus Christi, et sic de pane erit materia corporis Christi. **Item**, post transubstantiationem remanent accidentia; ergo in alio subjecto, vel in aere; sed si in aere, aliqua pars aeris est rotunda, sapida, et secundum quod illa forma defertur per diversa loca, mutant accidentia subjectum. **Item**, in eadem parte aeris manent illa accidentia, et illa soliditas est in aere, cum illa sint solida, et sic aer solidus est: Ex his videtur, quod accidentia illa non sint in aere, sed nec in corpore Christi sunt: nec est assignare aliquid corpus in quo sint, ergo non videntur remanere accidentia. **Item**, cum forma illa sub qua latet corpus Christi dividatur in partes, sub illa forma desinit corpus Christi: quomodo ergo sub singulis portionibus illius Hostiae datur corpus Christi? **Item**, si corpus Christi latet sub illa exigua forma, ubi est Christi caput vel pes? Et ita indistincta sunt membra illius. **Item**, Christus dedit suum corpus discipulis ante passionem: sed dedit eis mortale vel immortale: si immortale dedit, sed*

*tunc erat mortalis; ergo quando erat mortalis immortalis erat, quod est impossibile. **Item**, ponatur quod aliquis celebraverit divina tempore passionis Christi, corpus existens Romae, passum fuisset Romae, quia ubicunque erat, patiebatur tempore passionis, et sic non patiebatur tantum in Hierusalem, sed in multis aliis locis. **Item**, ponatur quod mus accedat ad pyxidem, in qua est Christi corpus; mus aliquid comedit, ergo aera, vel accidens, vel corpus: sed quod comedat aera, vel accidens, absurdum est, et magis absurdum quod comedat corpus Christi. **Item**, cum sanguis Christi glorificatus sit, nec faciat localem distantiam, videtur quod calice repleto sanguine, alius liquor possit infundi. **Item**, Christus ait in Evangelio, Omne quod in os intrat in secessum emittitur. Ergo Christi corpus non intrat, quando ad manducandum datur, nec in secessum emittitur.*

“And this they endeavor to prove thus: If the bread every day should be changed into the body of Christ, it would be infinitely increased. They inquire also, whether the bread cease to be: if it ceaseth to be, then is it annihilated, and so it is spoiled. Also they ask, How a body of so great a bulk can enter into the mouth of a man? Whether the body of Christ be eaten, chewed with teeth, and consequently divided into parts? Whether the bread becomes the body of Christ, because then it will be the body of Christ, that is to say, something else than it is? Whether the bread becomes the body; and if so, then bread is the body of Christ, and so bread will be the matter of Christ’s body? Also after transubstantiation the accidents do remain; if so, they must be in another subject, in the air, for instance; but if there, then some part of the air must be round, savoury, and white; and as this form is carried through divers places, so the accidents change their subject. Again, these accidents abide in the same part of the air, and thus solidity will be in the air, because they are solid, and consequently the air will be solid. Hence it appears that these accidents are not in the air; neither are they in the body of Christ; neither can any other body be assigned, in which they are, so that the accidents do not seem to remain. Again, when the form or figure, in which the body of Christ lieth hid, is divided into parts, the body of Christ continues no longer in that figure which it had before: how therefore can the

body of Christ be in every part of that Host? Again, if the body of Christ be hid in that little form, where is the head or foot? and consequently his members must be indistinguished. Again, Christ gave his body to his disciples before his passion: now he gave it them either mortal or immortal; if he gave it immortal, yet it is certain that then it was mortal; and consequently whilst it was mortal, it was immortal, which is impossible. Again, suppose we that some one or other had celebrated the Communion at the time that Christ suffered; the body that was (suppose) at Rome would have suffered there, because, wheresoever it was, it suffered at the time of the passion; and so Christ would have suffered not only at Jerusalem, but in many other places. Again, suppose that a mouse should come to the pix, in which the body of Christ is, and eat some part of it, the mouse would eat either air, or accidents, or the body of Christ; but it is absurd to say that the mouse should eat either air or accidents; and much more absurd it is to say that it eats the body of Christ. Again, seeing that the blood of Christ is glorified, and does not fill a place, it seems to follow, that when the cup is full of blood, some other liquor may be poured into it. Again, Christ saith in the Gospel, *Whatsoever enters in at the mouth is cast forth into the draught*; whence it will follow, that the body of Christ doth not go in at the mouth when it is given to be eaten, or if it does, it must be cast forth into the draught.”

In the 59th chapter he relates this objection of the Albigenes concerning the same matter: *Quaerunt etiam haeretici, utrum sit articulus fidei Christianae panem transubstantiari in corpus Christi, cum de hoc non fiat mentio in aliquo Symbolo: non enim in Symbolo Apostolico, scilicet, Credo in Deum; vel in Nicaeno, Credo in unum, etc. vel in Symbolo Athanasii, Quieunque vult, etc. Cum in his Symbolis de omnibus articulis Christianae fidei fiat mentio, cur non fiat mentio de illo ineffabili sacramento, cui magis videtur obviare humana ratio?*

“The heretics also demand, whether it be an article of the Christian faith, that the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ, seeing there is no mention made of it in any Creed: for we do not meet with it in the Apostles’ Creed, that is, *Credo in Deum*; nor in the Nicene, that is, *Credo in unum*; nor in the Athanasian,

Quicumque vult: and since in these Creeds are contained all the articles of the Christian faith, why is there no mention of this ineffable sacrament, which of all things seems most contrary to reason?”

I have set down these arguments in order, first, Because it is visible to any one that will take the pains to examine them, that they are the same that were urged by Berengarius, as appears by the extracts of his book, which Lanfrank has preserved, and afterwards by those, who in the twelfth century endeavored to qualify and defend the absurdities of the confession which they made Berengarius sign. Secondly, Because it plainly appears that those who admitted the three Creeds, the Apostles’, the Nicene, and the Athanasian, did not reject the use of matrimony, which yet he lays to their charge, there being nothing more remote from Manicheism. Neither doth he impute it, save only to some of these heretics; which makes it manifest, that he hath confounded all these people together, and that he only pursued his matter, and his common places, without giving us particularly the opinions of every one of these heretics.

We find, that he charges them with rejecting the sacrament of confirmation, because there is no mention made of it, neither in the Gospel nor in the other books of the New Testament, as an institution of Christ. They rejected also the sacrament of orders, as it was believed in the Church of Rome. See what Alanus saith of it: *Dicunt etiam fidei Catholicae inimici, ordinem, ut Diaconatum vel Sacerdotium, non esse sacramentum, quod sic probare conantur: Non legitur in aliqua canonica Scriptura Apostolos ordinatos fuisse in Sacerdotes, cur ergo eorum vicarios sic ordinari oportet? Item, Apostoli qui majores Sacerdotes dicti sunt, non leguntur uncti fuisse chrismate; cur ergo ununtur eorum vicarii? Praeterita merita faciunt et suffragantur ut quis sit dignus aliquo officio, quid ergo confert ordo?*

“Besides, the adversaries of the Catholic faith affirm, that the order of Deacons or Priests is not a sacrament, which they endeavor to prove thus: We do not read in any part of canonical Scripture that the Apostles were ordained Priests; and therefore what necessity is there that: their vicars should be so? Again, the Apostles, who are said to be the higher Priests, were never anointed; and why then are

their vicars anointed? It is forepast merit and true worth that makes one fit for any function; what need therefore is there of orders?"

Concerning extreme unction, they believe after this manner: *Dicunt etiam extremam olei unctionem, quae, datur infirmis, nec esse sacramentum, nec aliquem habere effectum, quia hoc sacramentum unctionis infirmorum ab Apostolis institutum non legitur.*

"They say, that extreme unction, which is conferred upon sick persons, is neither a sacrament, nor otherwise of any efficacy, because this sacrament of anointing the sick is not found to be of apostolical institution."

As to churches, we find that they followed the opinions of Henry, the disciple of Peter de Bruis: *Non desunt qui dicant locum materiale non esse Ecclesiam, sed conventum fidelium sanctum: quia, ut aiunt, locus ad orationem non pertinet; sicut enim ubique est Deus, sic ubique adorari vel orari potest. Hoc autem probare nituntur autoritate Christi, dicentis Samaritanae, Mulier, crede mihi, venit hora, quando nec in monte hoc, nec in Hierosolymis, adorabitis Patrem: sed venit hora et nunc est, quando veri adoratores adorabunt in spiritu et veritate. Item, si locus facit ad orationem, cur heremitae antiquitus in locis abditis habitantes, ecclesias non habebant? Cur etiam sacramenta effectum suum habent, etsi non celebrantur in loco qui dicitur ecclesia? Item, quid operantur parietes ad supplicandum ei qui ubique est, cum in uno loco non magis sit quam in alio? Christum etiam in montibus et locis desertis legimus orasse, non in locis orationi dedicatis. Item, estne fructuosior oratio quae fit in templo, quam illa quae fit in agro, si par fuerit devotio?*

"There be some who affirm, that the Church is not a material place, but an holy assembly of believers; for, say they, place is not of any concern to prayer, because as God is every where, so he may every where be worshipped and prayed to. This they endeavor to prove by the authority of Christ, saying to the Samaritan woman; *Woman, believe me, the hour comes when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor at Jerusalem, worship the Father, but the hour comes and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.* Again, if the place be any furtherance

to prayer, why had not the hermits of old, who lived in desert places, their churches to pray in? Or how can the sacraments be of any efficacy, when they are not celebrated in a place called a church. Again, what do walls help us to pray to him who is every where, and not more in one place than he is in another? We read also, that Christ went aside to mountains and desert places to pray, and not to places appointed for prayer. Again, is the prayer that is performed in the church of more efficacy than that which is offered up in the fields, supposing the devotion of both to be alike?"

Against the prayers that are made to saints, they objected as follows:

*Dicunt etiam heretici quidam, orationes sanctorum non prodesse vivis, nec vivorum orationes mortuis: probare etiam videntur, quod sancti non orant pro vivis, qui sciunt qui sint salvandi vel damnandi; pro illis autem quos sciunt salvandos non orant, quia superflua esset oratio, quia sive orant, sive non, salvabuntur: si vero orarent pro damnatis, non assequerentur quod petunt, et ita beati non essent; beatus enim est, cui omnia optata succedunt. **Item**, quilibet judicabitur secundum opera sua, et non aliena merita, nec pro alienis meritis reddetur ei: et ideo orationes sanctorum non prosunt; vel quantum ad meritum, vel quantum ad praemium; quia non augent merita vel praemia. **Item**, sancti non sunt in loco merendi, sed recipiendi; ergo orationibus nec aliis bonis merentur sibi vel aliis. **Item**, in Evangelio Lucae legitur, quod Abraham dixit animae divitis quae erat in inferno, Magnum chaos firmatum est inter nos et vos; ubi chaos nihil aliud vocavit, nisi dissimilitudinem bonorum et malorum tantam, ut etiam sancti damnatis non compatiantur. Si vero non compatiantur, nec orant pro eis.*

“Some heretics also assert, that the prayers of saints are of no use to the living, nor those of the living to the dead. That the saints do not pray for the living, they prove thus: Because the saints, knowing who shall be saved and who damned, they cannot pray for those they know shall be saved, since their prayers would be superfluous, seeing whether they pray or no, they will be saved; but should they pray for those that shall be damned, they would not obtain what they pray for, and so would not be happy; for he is only happy, who has all his desires. Again, every one shall be judged according to his works, and not according to the merits of

another, neither shall any man receive according to the merits of other men; and therefore the prayers of the saints profit nothing, neither in regard of merit or reward, because they cannot increase either a man's merit or reward. Again, the saints are not in a place where they can merit, but only where they receive; and therefore by their prayers or other good works can neither merit any good for themselves or for others. Again, we read in the Gospel of St. Luke, that Abraham said to the soul of the rich man that was in hell, *There is a great gulf fixed between us and you*; where by gulf he means nothing else but the disagreement there is between the good and the wicked, which is so great, that the saints are neither sensible, nor have any compassion for the damned; now if so, neither can we suppose that they pray for them."

At last, he attributes to some of them the belief that it is unlawful to eat flesh, upon very ridiculous grounds, but such as have nothing common with the doctrine of the Manichees.

It seems to me to be evident from this book of Alanus, first, That he owned there were several sorts of heretics in the country of the Albigenses, Manichees, or Cathari, who rejected the principal articles of the Christian religion. Secondly, Another sort of people, who renounced all the chief doctrines of the Romish religion, which the protestants rejected afterwards. And since he quotes no author in particular, it is obvious to judge, that he made but small distinction of the nature of the several objections which he pretends to refute, and which he had frequently assigned to the Albigenses in general; which, without doubt, ought not to be attributed but to some of them, and which possibly, and very probably too, was only taken up from the mouths of the common people amongst them, by those who had a design to expose them.

CHAPTER 17

*The calumnies raised against the Albigenses,
refuted by the conference of Montreal.*

THOSE who will reflect a little upon the innocence of the primitive Christians, and the horrid slanders cast upon them, will not be much surprised to see the innocence of the Albigenses attacked after the same manner. The Devil having found this method succeed in the first beginnings of Christianity, was not so careless of his interest to forget to employ the same against those who opposed themselves to the corruptions which he had introduced, and which he was willing to substitute instead of the religion of Jesus Christ.

He made use of the same method against those of the reformed religion. Whoever reads the writings of the Jesuits shall find that they have accused our Reformers of the same heresies which the Devil raised to put a stop to the progress of Christianity. The Jesuit Gauthier alone may be a sufficient witness hereof, in his Chronological Table; and we may well say, that in this point he hath at least equalized the impudence of Feuarentius, if he hath not outdone him. Why should any man therefore think strange, that the Church of Rome and her adorers should take the same course against the Albigenses, which she practiced in our days; and which she hath not yet left, because she believed it would not fail of certain success? so prodigious is the stupidity of the people of her communion. And truly the managers for the Church of Rome were no less diligent to employ these devilish artifices against the Albigenses, than against us. Here are some instances of it, for it is impossible to relate all; I begin with some of the more general articles:

1. They accused them of novelty, sometimes supposing them to have been only known since the time of Peter de Bruis, or of Henry his disciple; though the contrary be evident from the history of this Church, as we have set it down; and by the public Liturgy, which the Papists themselves have published not long since.
2. They accused them of being the disciples of Peter Waldo, and from thence raised this accusation, that they were only a company of

laymen, without either ministry or right to administer the sacraments; whereas it is certain, that they had a lawful ministry, and indeed a thousand times more lawful than that of the Church of Rome.

3. They accused them in general of being Manichees, perhaps, because formerly the Priscillianists, who were a branch of the Manichees, had a party in that province, or near it, as Philastrius tells us, and of whom some were scattered through Languedock, after the year 1010, though indeed the Albigenses disputed against them, and solidly confuted them, as we are informed by William Puylaurens.

4. They endeavored to make them own the opinions and crimes that were proper to the Manichees, by producing false witnesses to convict them thereof. We have an illustrious example of this, in the History of the Earls of Toulouse. William Catel, Counsellor for the King in the Parliament of Tholouse, tells us, that two heretics, whereof the one was called Raymond, the other Bennett, having appeared before the Pope's legate, it was witnessed against them, that they had been heard to preach that there were two gods, the one good, and the other evil; that Priests could not consecrate the holy Host; that married persons could not be saved, if they had to do with their wives; that baptism is not necessary to infants; and many other heresies, which they would never acknowledge, notwithstanding all the witnesses that appeared against them; but said, they were false witnesses, and that they believed what the Catholic religion engageth us to believe. But notwithstanding these their solemn protestations, they further object against them all the consequences of Manicheism as natural inferences from the former opinions, of which they pretended that they had convicted them by witnesses. This probably was the rise of those fine controversies we find in Alanus Magnus, and other polemical writers who copied him.

5. They have been charged with forswearing themselves before a court of justice without scruple, though at the same time they are accused for maintaining that every lie is a mortal sin. This is done by Alanus, who falls upon them very heavily upon that account.

6. They are accused of being Arians, though Alanus distinguisheth them, and that the Popish Priests ought rather to be accused of

favoring Manicheism and Arianism, than the Albigenses, who subtilly disputed against these heresies.

But it will be easy to refute these calumnies, by the conference of Montreal, in the year 1206, related by the Monk of Vaux Cernay. It was offered to the Bishops by the Albigenses, under certain conditions: That there should be moderators appointed on both sides, men of authority, able to hinder any tumult or sedition. Also, that the place where the conference was to be, might be free and safe for all those that should assist at it: moreover, that the subjects to be disputed upon should be agreed to by joint consent, and not to be quitted till they were wholly discussed; and that those that could not maintain their opinions by the word of God, should be looked upon as overcome. The Bishops and Monks accepted of all these conditions. The place they agreed upon was Montreal, near Carcasson, in the year 1206; the moderators agreed on on both sides, were B. of Villeneuve, and B. of Auxerre, for the Bishops; and for the Albigenses, R. de Bot, and Anthony Riviere: Arnoldus Hot, the Pastor of the Albigenses, accompanied with those that were thought fit for this action, appeared first at the place and time assigned; and afterwards came the Bishop of Ozma, and the Monk Dominic, a Spaniard, with two of the Pope's legates, Peter Castel and Radulphus de Lust, Abbot of Candets; P. Bertrand, Prior of Auterive, as also the Prior of Palat, and several other Priests and Monks.

The theses propounded by Arnoldus were, that the mass and transubstantiation were the invention of men, and not the ordinance of Jesus Christ or his Apostles.

That the Church of Rome was not the spouse of Christ, but the Church of confusion, drunk with the blood of the martyrs.

That the polity of the Church of Rome was neither good nor holy, nor established by Jesus Christ.

Arnaud sent these propositions to the Bishop, who demanded a fortnight to prepare his answer, which was granted. At the day appointed the Bishop failed not to appear with a large writing; whereupon Arnaud Hot desired leave to be heard upon the spot, *extempore*, declaring that he would answer all the particulars contained in the said writing, desiring, the

auditors not to be tired, if he took up some time in answering so long a discourse; they promised he should be heard with attention and patience, without the least interruption. He discoursed at several times for four days together, with so much admiration of the assistants, and dexterity on his part, that all the Bishops, Abbots, Monks, and Priests, could have been willing to have been farther off; for he deduced his answer according to the several points laid down in that writing, with so much order and perspicuity, that he made his auditors perceive, that, though the Bishop had writ much, yet he had concluded nothing that could be made use of, to the advantage of the Church of Rome, against these propositions.

This done, Arnaud demanded, that, since the Bishops and he stood engaged to one another at the beginning of their conference, to prove their assertions by the word of God alone, the Bishops and Priests might be commanded to prove the authority of the mass, as it was sung in churches, piece by piece; that it was instituted by the Son of God, and sung in the same manner by his Apostles, beginning at the *Introit*, as they call it, to the *Ite missa est*: but the Bishops could not prove that any of those parts had been instituted for that purpose by Christ or by his Apostles. Here it was that the Bishops were covered with shame and regret; for Arnaud had reduced them to the single canon, which they pretended was the best piece of the mass; where he proved that the holy supper of the Lord was not the mass; saying, that if the mass were the Lord's supper, there would be all after consecration that there was before in the Lord's supper: whereas, said he, in your mass there is no bread, for by transubstantiation the bread vanisheth; wherefore the mass, being without bread, cannot be the supper of the Lord, wherein all know there is bread. Jesus Christ brake bread, Saint Paul brake bread, the Priest breaks the body, not bread; therefore the Priest neither doth what Jesus Christ nor what St. Paul did. As Arnaud was about to proceed in these anti-theses between the Lord's supper and the mass, to prove that it was neither of Christ's nor of the Apostles' institution, the Monks, Bishops, Legates, and Priests thought fit to withdraw themselves, being resolved to hear no more, for fear they might fix impressions on those that were by, which might extremely shake their belief of the mass.

The Monk of Vaux Cernay endeavored to render this action suspected, in saying, that when these heretical judges perceived the weakness of their

cause, and the misfortune of engaging in such a dispute, they refused to pronounce any judgment concerning it, as likewise to restore us our own writings, for fear, adds he, they might come to be published, but restored the heretics theirs. But how could two of the Pope's Legates, and so many Bishops, Abbots, Monks, and Priests suffer themselves to be drawn into a place, there to be thus abused and tricked? The Monk himself saith in the same place, that the heads of the heretics came to meet with the Catholics at the castle of Montreal, to dispute with them: the Catholics therefore were in possession of the castle; there could be therefore no opportunity of foul play, nor of any such violence; neither was it necessary that the moderators should pronounce their judgment in a case of dispute; seeing they hold that no other judgment is necessary but that of the Pope, who cannot err. Besides, how could this Monk know that the Albigenses were overcome, seeing that no sentence was given?

Perrin could have given us a faithful extract of this conference, because himself observes, that it had been brought to him from the Albigenses by Mr. Rafur, minister of the church of Montreal, in an old manuscript: from whence, though he doth not express it in so many words, I judge that he reduced the points in question between the Albigenses and the Church of Rome to six articles.

- I.** Article. The doctrines which they asserted in opposition to the Church of Rome were, that the Church of Rome was not the holy Church, nor the spouse of Christ, but that it was a Church which had drunk in the doctrine of devils; the whore of Babylon, which St. John describes in the Revelations, the mother of fornications and abominations, covered with the blood of the saints.
- II.** That the mass was neither instituted by Christ nor his Apostles, but a human invention.
- III.** That the prayers of the living are unprofitable for the dead.
- IV.** That the purgatory maintained in the Church of Rome is no better than a human invention, to satisfy the avarice of the Priests.
- V.** That the saints ought not to be prayed unto.

VI. That transubstantiation is a human invention, and erroneous doctrine; and that the worshipping of the bread is manifest idolatry.

That therefore it was necessary to separate from the Church of Rome, in which the contrary was said and taught, because one cannot assist at the mass, without partaking of the idolatry there practiced, nor expect salvation by any other means than by Jesus Christ, nor transfer to creatures the honor which is due to the Creator, nor say concerning the bread, that it is God, and worship it as such, without incurring the pain of eternal damnation, because idolaters shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven. For all these things therefore which they asserted, they have been hated and persecuted to death.

This account of the conference of Montreal, which I have copied from Perrin, is enough in my judgment fully to refute any scruple that might remain in the mind of a reader who reads in Roger Hoveden the letters of Peter, Cardinal of St. Chrysogon writ in the year 1178; which testify, that the Manichees of Toulouse had been convicted by the confession which many of them had made of the greatest part of the articles of that heresy. It is very visible that it was upon the authority of these letters, or upon some informations of this nature, that Alanus, who was born at Lisle in Flanders, and who had spent the greatest part of his time at the university of Paris, has built his catalogue of the heresies which he refutes in his treatise against the Albigenses, whereof I have given an extract in the foregoing chapter.

So that it is necessary to suppose one of these three things: either that the Earl Raymond of Toulouse, and those whom he protected, were really Manichees, as they are accused to be by the Pope's Legates, by the Bishops, and by Peter of Vaux Cernay, who sets down this accusation, and the forced confessions of the Albigenses, who own themselves to be Manichees; or that the Albigenses, who were the disciples of Peter de Bruys and of Henry, that were no Manichees, had gone over to that sect towards the end of the 12th century, and afterwards again became Petrobusians and Henricians at the beginning of the 13th, as it plainly appears they then were, from the conference of Montreal, where they freely proposed their opinions, entirely opposite to Manicheism; or that the Legates and Monks, that persecuted them with fire and sword, were

great impostors in taking advantage against them from some confessions extorted from Manichees, who were here and there scattered in those dioceses, and which they made use of to animate the people of the Roman communion, and to engage the Princes and Bishops of all places to exterminate without mercy a sort of people who utterly subverted all the rules of morality, which is the band of society, and all the principles of both natural and Christian religion.

CHAPTER 18

*Reflections on the convictions of Manicheism,
which were said to be proved upon the Albigenses.*

ONE of the most plausible objections that can be made against the purity of the faith of the Albigenses, is the testimony of the Inquisitors, who have filled their trials with plain confessions, which several Albigenses, judged and condemned by them, have made of sundry errors of the Manichees. I shall produce an extract of the Acts of the Inquisition of Toulouse, which are in the hands of Mr. Wetstein, bookseller at Amsterdam, as it was sent me out of Holland, and which was made by a man of great reputation.

“The Albigenses,” saith he, “held some opinions in common with the Vaudois: as, that to a Christian all oaths are unlawful; that the confession of sins, made to the Priests of the Church of Rome, is wholly unprofitable; and that neither the Pope, nor any one else in the Romish Church, can absolve any man of sin: but that they have power to absolve all those from their sins, who will join themselves to their sect, by the laying on of hands. This last clause is also laid to the charge of the Vaudois, *viz.* that they have power from God alone, as the Apostles had, to hear confessions both of men and women that believe them; and of imposing penance upon such as confess to them, as fasting, and several repetitions of the Lord’s Prayer, whereupon they absolve their penitents: and that this absolution and penance is as available to the salvation of their souls as if they had been confessed to their own Priest. (That here is some wresting or mutilation of the opinion of the Vaudois, is manifest from the confession of a certain woman, who, as we read, declared her faith to this purpose; that God alone forgives sin; and that he to whom confession of sins is made gives only his advice what the person ought to do, and so enjoins penance, which any wise and prudent man may do, whether he be a Priest or no.) That the opinions of the Albigenses that were proper to them were, that there be two lords; the one good, and the other evil: that the body of Christ is not in the Eucharist, but only mere bread: that baptism

is of no use. One of the Albigenses was said to believe, that the baptism of water, celebrated by the Church, stands infants in no stead, because they did not consent to the sacrament, but cried at the receiving of it. (I believe, saith he who examined these Acts, that they denied baptism to be the instrument of regeneration; or perhaps they might be against infant baptism.) That an external anointing of the sick with material oil was of no use. That the orders of the Church of Rome had no power of binding and loosing; since they themselves, who conferred them, were great sinners. That marriage is always joined with sin, and never can be without sin; and that it could never have been instituted by the good God. That our Lord did not assume a real human body and true flesh of our nature; and that he did not truly, but only in likeness, rise again in the same, and perform the other works of our salvation; and that he never really ascended to the right hand of the Father. They deny the resurrection of the body; (but in the declaration of Petrus Anterius, a chief teacher amongst them, this is more clearly and distinctly explained; that they feign that certain spiritual bodies, and a certain internal man, should rise again in such sort of bodies. And elsewhere they express themselves, that though the souls of men shall come to judgment, yet they shall not come in their own bodies.) They said, that the souls of men were spirits which fell from heaven for their sins; so that they seem to have believed the pre-existence of souls. Man (they say) must not worship what he eats. Moreover, it is ascribed to them, that they believe man is saved by the laying on of hands, which they confer on their believers; and that by the same means all sins are forgiven without confession and satisfaction. That they can bestow the Holy Ghost, for salvation, upon those whom they receive. That the Virgin Mary never was a carnal woman, but their Church, which they say is true repentance; and that this is the Virgin Mary. (The very obscurity of these words shews that this opinion is wrested; because it is better expressed in another place thus; That God never entered the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary; and that he only is the mother, brother, and sister of God, who keeps the commandments of God the Father.) These are said to be the doctrines of the Albigenses, whereof none are ascribed to the

Waldenses, but others different from these, whereof we find no mention made in the opinions of the Albigenses; and they are these; That all judgment is forbid by God, and that it is contrary to the Divine prohibition for any judge, in any cause whatsoever, to judge or sentence any man to punishment of death. That indulgences granted by the Prelates or the Church of Rome are of no use or efficacy. That there is no purgatory for souls after this life; and that consequently the prayers and suffrages of believers for the dead are of no use to them. That the soul, when it departs from the body, goes either to paradise or hell. That there are no more than three orders in the Church, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.”

From these Acts it appears how much the rites and ceremonies of the Albigenses differed from those practiced by the Vaudois.

“Besides,” saith the author of the extract, “the rites and institutions of them both were very different. Of the Albigenses there were two sorts: some who professed their faith and rites, and they were called *Perfect*, or *Comforted*; others, who had entered into a covenant with the former sort, called *Perfect*, which they call *la Convenenza*, the Agreement, that at the end of their life they should be received by them into their sect. This reception is frequently called by them Exercise, and is performed in this manner; *The Benedicite, or the Blessing conferred upon one Molinerius when he was sick*. Bernard Goes, one of the Albigenses, held the hands of the sick person between his own hands, and besides held a certain book over him, wherein he read the Gospel of St. John, *In the beginning was the Word*; and delivered to the sick person a fine thread, to tie about him as a mark that he was admitted into their heresy: upon some others it is said that they laid a white linen cloth, and besides, that many genuflections were performed by the bed-side. This reception was supposed to save the soul of him who was received, and was called a spiritual baptism or consolation, a reception, and a good end, and sometimes a melioration, by means of which they believed that the person was sanctified; so that it was not lawful for a woman to touch any one that was thus received. Now, because it might sometimes

happen that the person thus received, after his recovery, might relapse into his former defilements, therefore they always deferred this reception till the extremest weakness, when there was no longer hopes of life, for fear they might afterward lose the good they had received. For which reason also some sick persons amongst them, though the person who thus initiated them was already come, yet were not received, because they were not believed to be at the point of death. But they who were thus received in their sickness were commanded to put themselves upon hardship; that is, to hasten their own death, by abstaining from all meat: and there are several examples of those who are said to have killed themselves, not only with fasting, but by opening of a vein, wounding of themselves, yea, and sometimes too by drinking poison. But others, who had no mind to submit themselves to so hard a law, refused to be received, though this their teacher was come for that purpose. They had also a peculiar way of saluting, by way of embracing one another, laying their hands on each side of one another, and turning their head to both shoulders, saying each time, *Benedicite*: which kind of salutation seems to have been usual amongst them, because it is to be met with in several accounts of their opinions; and sometimes it was performed with bended knees, sometimes with their hands let down to the ground. Which salutation was sometimes called *melioration*. Neither did they only require this salutation from those who were received, but from them also who were called *Perfect* amongst them, and received others, observed the same way of salutation. We read also in many of their books, that such a one did *eat of the blessed bread of the heretics*; and in some it is added, *and saw the manner of blessing it*: but what that manner was, is no where described, neither is any circumstance added, from whence it might be gathered, whether they blessed the common bread at their dinners and suppers, or whether this was only a ceremony used by them at the celebrating of the Lord's supper: though it is added in one place, that they call this blessed bread the Bread of Prayer. Three days in the week they keep a fast with bread and water. But we do not read that any of these things were observed by the Waldenses, but what was vastly different: as, that they had some elders of their own; that

even laymen bless the table before and after meat; they pray kneeling, and bowing themselves to the ground. It is usual for them to bless the table. They profess to observe apostolical poverty. And besides, they are said to differ from the common conversation of other believers in their life and manners. These are the chief things we meet with in this book concerning the Albigenses and Waldenses; for there is no mention made of the opinions of any other party.”

This is the extract which was sent me, with some passages wherein the author gives his own judgment.

One would think, that nothing could be of greater force to convict the Albigenses of Manicheism, especially if we consider, that Emericus, in his Directory for the Inquisitors, ascribes almost the very same opinions to the Manichees of Italy.

But I have three things to say, to take off this prejudice: the first is, That nothing ought to be more suspected by us than these Acts of the Inquisition; for he that is a murderer is certainly a liar and a knave. I have shewed, in my Remarks upon the History of the Valleys of Piedmont, that nothing can be conceived more false than the carriage of the Inquisitors, and that they never pretended to any thing less than to faithfulness in their accounts of things.

This appears from the trials of the Waldenses, whom the Monks have endeavored to make the most infamous heretics; and yet, in the mean time, if we will believe the Bishop of Meaux, they were very far from being Manichees. What authority therefore can the testimonies of the Inquisitors have against the Albigenses, since the Bishop himself acknowledges that they can be of no authority against the Waldenses, who have been no less accused of Manicheism than the Albigenses themselves?

Now, that the reader may be thoroughly convinced of the justice of this our denying to admit these testimonies of the Inquisitors, and Emericus in particular, I might allege here what Emericus hath said of the *Eternal Gospel*, attributed commonly to John of Crema, the seventh General of the Cordeliers. This book contained the most horrid propositions imaginable; and yet now it is pretended, that he was overborne by a cabal of the

Inquisition, and they endeavor to justify him against all the accusations of Emericus. But I can do more than this; for I have received from a friend of Mr. G. advocate of N. an extract of the Acts of the Inquisition of Toulouse, which may serve as a pattern to judge of their other trials which are found in that register, where there is scarce any thing of these accusations. The extract runs thus: *Anno Domini 1283, 8 Idus Julii, Guilhelmus de Maunhaco, filius quondam Guilhelmi Arloyer de Maunhaco, diocesis Aniciensis, eductus de carcere Inquisitorum, constitutus in praesentia Fratris Joannis Vigorosi, ordinis Praedicatorum, Inquisitoris haereticae pravitatis, requisitus per dictum Inquisitorem quod juraret ad sancta Dei Evangelia, ut veritatem diceret de fide sua, respondit, quod non juraret: inquisitus, si erat ei licitum jurare super sancta Dei Evangelia, respondit, quod non. Inquisitus si Papa Ecclesiae Romanae Dominus Martinus qui nunc est, habet potestatem ligandi atque solvendi, respondit, quod non. Inquisitus si Ecclesia Romana, cui praest Papa, sit caput fidei, respondit, quod nec Papa, nec Ecclesia cui praest, est caput fidei, nec Christianitatis, nec agnoscit, nec credit aliquem hominem carnalem esse Papam, nisi Jesum Christum. Inquisitus si Archiepiscopi, Episcopi, et alii Ecclesiarum Praelati, per Romanam Ecclesiam ordinati, sunt veri Praelati, et si habent potestatem ligandi atque solvendi, respondit, quod non. Inquisitus si aliquis baptizatur, ita quod baptizans dicat, Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, Amen, valeat baptizato, et si per talem baptismum habet remissionera peccatorum, respondit, quod non credit quod aliquis carnalis homo possit baptizare, nisi solus Deus. Inquisitus si sacramentum confirmationis, quod confert Episcopus quando confirmat, valet confirmato, respondit, quod nihil valet ei, nec sacramentum est, nec ille qui confert sacramentum est Episcopus, nec aliquid potest. Inquisitus si sacramentum extremae unctionis valet infirmo, quando ei ministratur a Sacerdote, respondit, quod non credit quod valeat ei, nec quod sit sacramentum. Inquisitus si sacramentum ordinis collatum ab Episcopo valet aliquid, et si est sacramentum, respondit, quod nihil valet, nec est sacramentum, nec Episcopus potest aliquod sacramentum conferre. Inquisitus si panis, quem Sacerdos tenet in manibus suis dum celebrat, postquam Sacerdos protulit verba consecrationis, Hoc est corpus meum, remanet panis; respondit, quod panis erat ante, et panis remanet post, et quod magna injuria fit Deo, quod panis commuteret in corpus Christi. Inquisitus si verba Sacerdotis*

*absolventis aliquem ei confessum de peccatis, dicendo, Ego te absolvo ab omnibus peccatis tuis, valent confesso; respondit, quod nihil valent confesso, nec est sacramentum. Inquisitus si est licitum jurare super sancta Dei Evangelia in aliquo casu, dixit quod non. Inquisitus si Rex Franciae qui nunc est comburit vel facit comburi aliquem pro crimine haeresis, vel facit suspendi aliquem pro aliquo crimine, peccet, respondit, quod peccat, nec est ei licitum facere vindictam nec justitiam. **Item** requisitus si vult credere sacramenta Ecclesiae Romanae sicut nos credimus, et sicut Ecclesia Romana praedicat et observat, respondit, quod nihil aliud crederet, nisi quod superius dixit. Haec deposuit Tholosae coram Fratre Laurentio Aurelianensi, et dicto Fratre Johanne Vigoroso, Inquisitore, in praesentia et testimonio Fratris Arnaldi Del Gras, Fratris Bertrandi Jacobi, et Fratris Raymundi Navarrii, ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum, et Juliani Vasconii, publici Tholosae notarii, qui haec scripsit.*

“In the year of our Lord 1283, the 8th of the Ides of July, William of Maunhaco, formerly the son of William Arloyer of Maunhaco, of the diocese of Anecy, being brought out of the prison of the Inquisitors, and set in the presence of Brother John Vigoroso, of the order of Preachers, an Inquisitor of heretical pravity, being demanded by the said Inquisitor to swear by the holy Gospels, that he would declare the truth concerning his faith; he answered, that he would not swear. Being demanded, whether it were lawful for him to swear upon the holy Gospels? he answered, No. Being demanded, whether Lord Martin, the present Pope of the Church of Rome, hath the power of binding and loosing? he answered, No. Being demanded, whether the Church of Rome, over which the Pope presides, be the head of the faith? he answered, that neither the Pope, nor the Church he presides over, is head of the faith, or of the Christian world; neither doth he own or believe that any carnal man can be Pope, but only Jesus Christ. Being demanded, whether Archbishops, Bishops, and other Prelates of Churches, ordained by the Church of Rome, were true Prelates, and whether they have the power of binding and loosing? he answered, No. Being demanded, whether if any one be baptized, the baptizer saying, *I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen*; whether this be of efficacy to the party

baptized; and whether by such baptism he can obtain remission of his sins? he answered, that he did not believe that any carnal man can baptize, but God alone. Being demanded, whether the sacrament of confirmation, which the Bishop confers, be of any use to the person confirmed? he answered, that it was of no use at all; neither is it a sacrament; neither is he who confers it a Bishop, nor hath the power to do any thing. Being demanded, whether the sacrament of extreme unction be of any use to the sick, when it is administered to him by a Priest? he answered, that he did not believe that it did him any good, or that it is a sacrament. Being demanded, whether the sacrament of orders, conferred by the Bishop, were of any use, and whether it be a sacrament? he answered, that it is of no use; neither is it a sacrament; neither can a Bishop confer any sacrament. Being demanded, whether the bread which the Priest holds in his hands whilst he celebrates, after he hath pronounced the words of consecration, *This is my body*, still remains bread? he answered, that it was bread before, and continued bread still; and that it was a great injury to God to say, that the bread is changed into the body of Christ. Being examined, whether the words of a Priest, whereby he absolves one that hath confessed his sins, saying, I absolve thee of all thy sins, be of any use to the party confessed? he answered, that they were of no use, neither is it a sacrament. Being examined, whether it be lawful to swear upon the holy Gospels of God in any case? he answered, No. Being examined, whether the King of France that now is, by burning, or causing any one to be burnt for the crime of heresy, or by hanging any other criminal, doth sin? he answered, He doth; and that it is not lawful for him to execute vengeance, or do justice. Also being examined, whether he was willing to believe the sacraments of the Church of Rome as we believe, and as the Church of Rome preaches and observes? he answered, that he believes nothing but what he had said before. These things he deposed at Toulouse before Brother Laurence of Orleans, and the foresaid Brother John Vigorosis the Inquisitor, in the presence of the witnesses Brother Arnold Del Gras, Brother Bertrand James, and Brother Raymond Navarr, of the order of Friars Preachers, and of Julian Vascon, public notary of Toulouse, who wrote this.”

The letter which Mr. G. writ to my friend concluded with these words:

“I must not forget to tell you, that, according to my copy, the Albigenses said of themselves, that they were *de illis qui non reddebant malum pro malo*; (of those who did not render evil for evil;) that *boni homines* (good men) were their ministers. The formality they observed when they made a proselyte was this, *Haereticaverunt eum, ponentes librum et manus super caput ejus, et interrogantes eum si volebat se reddere Deo et Evangelio*: They made him a heretic by laying a book and their hands upon his head, and asking him, whether he were willing to surrender himself to God and the Gospel. I have observed from several passages, that on this occasion they were used to read more particularly the Gospel according to St. John, and that after these solemnities the proselytes *adorabant dictos bonos homines, flexis ter genibus, dicendo, Benedicite; haereticis respondentibus, Deus vos benedicat*: (paid their reverence to these good men, by thrice bending of the knee, saying, Give us your blessing; the heretics answering, God bless you.) The Inquisitors call the proselytes, and those that are born Albigenses, *heretics*.”

It is easy to judge by this specimen, that it is almost impossible to give any credit to the deposition of Inquisitors concerning the matters which, they say, they have made the Albigenses confess; and that therefore this pretended conviction of the Albigenses by the registers of the Inquisitors is absolutely null.

The second thing that I am to represent to the reader is, that the testimony of the Inquisitors cannot be set against the contrary confessions of the Albigenses, which those who have read find very conformable to the faith of the Protestants. This is that which Paradin affirms in his Annals of Burgundy, where he confesses that he has read some histories which excuse the Albigenses, with their princes and lords, of all those crimes which many have cast upon them, affirming them to be wholly innocent, as having never done any thing else but reprove the vices and abuses of the Prelates of the Church of Rome.

This is also acknowledged by James de Ribera, in his Collections concerning the city of Tholouse.

“In these times there were frequent disputes held with the heretics several times at Viride Folium and at Pamiers; but the famous disputation was at Montreal, where two noblemen were chosen arbitrators, Bernardus de Villa Nova and Bernardus Arrensis; and two of the commons, Raimond Godius and Arnoldus Ribera; but they who were accounted heretics could not agree about any thing: the names of the chiefest of them were these; Ponticus Jordanus, Arnoldus Aurisanus, Arnoldus Othonus, Philibertus Casliensis, Benedictus Thermus. They all constantly affirmed, that the Church of Rome was not the holy Church, nor the spouse of Christ, but a Church that had imbibed the doctrine of devils; that she was that Babylon which St. John describes in the Revelation, the mother of fornications and abominations, covered over with the blood of the saints; that what the Church of Rome approved of was not approved by the Lord; that the mass was neither instituted by Christ, nor by his Apostles, but was merely a human invention.”

The same hath been owned by Carolus Molineus, the glory of the bar of France, who declares that the Albigenses of Provence taught this very thing expressly, in the reign of Lewis XII. which was afterwards taught by those of the reformed religion in France. This testimony is alleged by Camerarius, in his Historical Account of the Brethren of Bohemia. This obliged Vignier, in his Historical Library, to condemn all the calumnies cast upon the Albigenses. In his account of the year 1206, he relates, that a Gascon, a man of reputation, assured him, that he had read one of their confessions in the old Gascon language, which was preached before the late Chancellor de l’Hospital, a little before the second troubles of France, which had not one word of these opinions, but only those articles which we formerly ascribed to the Waldenses. Amongst which they expressly declared that they received the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, and that they rejected every doctrine that was not grounded upon, or authorized by them, or was contrary to any one point of doctrine that may be found there. According to which maxim, they confessed that they rejected and condemned all the ceremonies, traditions, and ordinances of the Church of Rome, which they declared to be a den of thieves, and the whore that is spoken of in the Revelation. Upon which account also, the colloquies, disputes, and conferences, which the legates of the Pope and

their commissioners had together, were only upon these points, as we shall prove by the testimony of James de Ribera, in his book, entitled, his Collections about the city of Tholouse.

The third thing that we are to observe is, that this conformity of faith between the Waldenses and the Albigenses has made many people take them for the very same.

I suppose there is no reader that is ever so little just, but will allow me to make a very great difference between the accounts of the Inquisitors and the truth. The Inquisitors make the Albigenses guilty of the errors of the Cathari and Manichees, as if they had been all one, and that they had exactly answered the description which is given us of them in the Directory of the Inquisitors, by Emericus. But we have other ways of knowing, from their own confessions of faith, that they were not at all polluted by Manicheism; and the most part of those authors that have writ with any degree of honesty, call them Waldenses, because they held the same faith and opinions.

The same authors acknowledge, that it was against the Waldenses that St. Bernard preached in Languedoc; and that it is with them, whom they promiscuously call Albigenses, that those conferences were held, which the Bishop of Meaux owns to have been held with the Albigenses. This is acknowledged by James de Ribera, Counsellor of State, in his Collections concerning the City of Tholouse, that are set down in the catalogue of the Witnesses of the Truth. This is owned by Gretzer the Jesuit, in his *Prolegomena* to the authors who have written concerning the sect of the Waldenses; where he acknowledgeth that the Waldenses and Albigenses were the same, and were called *insabbatati*, because of their shoes; and that the Albigenses and Waldenses differ only in their names. Cardinal Hosius also had the same notion of them, in his book concerning the sacrament of the Eucharist, where he speaks of the Henricians and Petrobusians. This was the opinion of Andrew Favin, in his History of Navarre; where he saith, that the heresy of the Albigenses is otherwise termed the heresy of the Waldenses. Genebrard, in his Chronology, saith expressly, that the Fathers of the Calvinists were the Petrobusians, the Henricians, and the Albigenses; and it is well known, that the Calvinists are no Manichees. Catel, in his History of Tholouse, acknowledgeth that the Henricians were

the forerunners of the Albigenses, and that they had not this name till after the Council of Alby, in the year 1178.

CHAPTER 19

*Whether the Albigenses were Manichees,
because they accused the Pope of being the Antichrist.*

AS one day gives light to another, so the Bishop of Meaux hath at last discovered that the accusation charged upon the Pope by the Albigenses, as being the Antichrist, was a character of Manicheism. He thought fit to reveal this great secret to the world in his History of the Variations; and afterwards he makes it an express character of Manicheism, in his explication of the Revelation. But saving the reverence due to this Prelate, there is nothing falser, nothing that seems more to be raving.

For, **1.** Hath he found this character of the Manichees in the writings of Archelaus, Bishop of Mesopotamia, which the late Mr. Bigosa hath communicated to the public; or in St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who confutes the Manichees in his catechetical lectures?

2. Hath he found any thing like it in the writings of St. Epiphanius, who hath given us so large a catalogue of their heresies?

3. Hath he found any thing to this purpose in St. Augustin, who hath writ so many books against these madmen; or in St. Leo, in his Epistle to Turribius, Bishop of Tarracon?

4. Hath he found any such thing in the treatise of Predestinatus concerning heresies, published by Sirmondus?

5. Hath he found this character of the Manichees in any of those authors that have written since; as in Isidore of Seville, in Johannes Damascenus, in the Catalogue of Heresies, published by Cotelerius?

6. Hath he found any thing to this purpose in Petrus Siculus, who lived in the ninth century, and who conversed and disputed at Tibrica with the Manichees, whose opinions he sets down?

All the Greek authors which speak of the Manichees before and after the ninth century, and all the Latin authors, without so much as excepting one

only, know of no such thing: who could therefore discover this character of Manicheism to the Bishop?

We must conclude that the Bishop, who hath made a discovery which none of the ancients, no, nor modern writers neither, whether Papists or Protestants, have been able to make, must have had it from the revelation of some angel, *albus an ater nescio*, since he speaks so very positively of this new character of the Manichees.

But, saith he, the case is plain, the Albigenses were Manichees, and they called the Pope the Anti-christ, and with an invincible obstinacy have maintained that this title belongs to him; wherefore it must follow, that this accusation of the Pope must be a character of Manicheism.

If the Bishop had reflected never so little upon what he here asserts, this single character of the Albigenses, who accused the Pope of being the Anti-christ, would have made him draw a quite contrary consequence; that is to say, that the Albigenses could not be Manichees.

For it is most certain, that the Manichees never taught any such thing: this heresy, which sprung up in the east, never attacked the Bishop of Rome in particular, but the whole body of Christians who received the books of the Old Testament, and who owned the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ to be the Creator of the world.

But whence comes it then, may some say, that the Albigenses have peculiarly affected to call the Pope Antichrist? which certainly must be looked upon a character of the Albigenses, unless we should find it to be a character of the Manichees, as the Bishop of Meaux pretends.

The question would not have been so difficult to resolve, had not the Bishop affected to appear ignorant in a question which he ought to have inquired into, since he hath undertaken to handle it in a commentary on purpose.

In a word, France, which first bestowed upon the Popes the temporal dominions they now enjoy, long since owned the Pope to be the Antichrist. For Gregory I. having declared, in twelve several letters written against the Patriarch of Constantinople, who assumed the title of Universal Bishop, that whoever claimed that title for himself was either

the Antichrist, or the forerunner of him; it was not long after, that Pope Boniface III. persuaded Phocas to give him the title of Universal, which all his successors took up afterwards with joy, and affected to use it: for which reason the French, fearing lest they should fail of the respect which they had for St. Gregory, if they should accuse themselves of having so often made use of a false way of reasoning, at last called the Pope Antichrist.

They were not therefore Manichees that were come from the east, in the eleventh century, to settle themselves in the West, who first set on foot this accusation; but they were the French, who, in a full council at Rheims, after the tenth century, called the Pope Antichrist.

Seguinus, Archbishop of Sens, having maintained that Arnulphus, Bishop of Rheims, could not be deposed without the consent of the Pope; Arnulphus, Bishop of Orleans, who had the greatest reputation of any man of his time, solidly maintained, from the canons and customs of the Church, that the Pope's sentence was not to be waited for in that case; *Ab eo responsa petere, marmora consulere est;*

“To desire an answer from him, is to consult the stones;”

speaking to the assembly of the Council. He further saith,

“Who do you think that man is, who sits in his high chair? he is, answers he, the Antichrist, who sits in the temple of God, and shews himself as God.”

And the rest of his discourse is a sufficient evidence that he took the Pope to be the Antichrist, and that he acknowledged that the mystery of iniquity was then coming in upon the Church. It was Gerbertus, afterwards Pope, that digested the acts of that Council, and who, in an epistle to Seguinus, Archbishop of Sens, makes it appear, that in his time they were not much concerned for the Pope's excommunications, and that it was not pretended that he was the center of Christian communion. *Non est ergo (says he) danda occasio nostris aemulis, ne sacerdotium, quod ubique unum est, sicut Ecclesia una est, ita uni subjici videatur, ut eo pecunia, gratia, metu, vel ignorantia corrupto, nemo Sacerdos esse possit, nisi quem hae virtutes commendaverint:*

“We ought not therefore to give an opportunity to our rivals, lest the priesthood, which is everywhere one and the same, as the Church is one, should come to be so subjected to one, as that he being corrupted with money, favour, fear, or ignorance, no man should be able to obtain that order, except he had these virtues to recommend him.”

Here we see the true style of the Albigenses, before ever any Manichee was come from the east into France.

Now after this was once set on foot, it was maintained from century to century by those who were brought up and that died in the communion of the Church of Rome. It would be an easy matter to give a catalogue of those who have spoke at this rate, to show what heed there is to be given to the most positive assertions of the Bishop of Meaux.

If the Bishop of Meaux, in the least desired to undeceive himself, he need only read what Aventinus says, in his Annals of Bavaria, of Pope Gregory VII. who there is termed Antichrist by persons who were very far from being Manichees: he need only read, in the Acts of the Life of Paschal II. what the Bishop of Florence openly preached concerning this matter; or to read in the Life of Richard I. written by Roger Hoveden, what Abbot Joachim maintained before Richard I. without being ever accused of Manicheism: or he may take notice in Matthew Paris, upon the year 1253, what notions Robert Grosthead, Bishop of Lincoln, one of the greatest Bishops of his time, maintained: or he may peruse the Revelations of St. Brigit, and the 16th Epistle of Petrarch, in his second tome. And yet never were any of these persons accused of Manicheism. But this has been treated of at large already by Wolfius in his Various Lections; and besides, this would lead us too far from the subject we are upon at present.

I shall content myself therefore with observing three things concerning this matter.

The first is, that nothing was more common with the Popes and Antipopes, than mutually to brand each other with the title of Antichrist: and the writers of both parties kept always close to this style, and yet all of them lived and died in the bosom of the Church of Rome, and never were thought to be the disciples of the Manichees.

Secondly, That there are many authors, and even several of those that have been canonized, who have made use of the same notions in speaking and writing of the Church of Rome, and yet none have ever condemned them of Manicheism.

The third is, That ever since the Reformation, though the Bishop pretends that the prophecy concerning the beast hath been already fulfilled; there is scarcely (if you except the Bishop) any one Popish author, who doth not own that Rome is to be the seat of Antichrist.

What I say now deserves to be considered, because in the year 1516, December the 19th, in the 11th session of the Lateran Council, under Leo X. in whose time Luther began to preach, we find that there was a prohibition against handling the question of Antichrist in the pulpit, though under the pretense of advancing some new revelation concerning it, without having obtained leave from the holy see, or from the Bishop. The words of the canon which oblige all those who should ever undertake to preach on this subject are these:

“And we command all who bear this charge, or who shall bear it for the future, that they preach and explain the evangelical truth and the holy Scripture, according to the exposition and interpretation of those Doctors, whom the Church or long tradition has approved, and has hitherto allowed to be read, or which shall be so for time to come, without adding any thing that is contrary to, or disagreeing from the proper sense of them, but that they always insist upon such matters as do not disagree with the words of the Scripture, nor with the interpretations of the foresaid Doctors. Neither let them presume to fix in their sermons any certain time of the evils to come, of the coming of Antichrist, or of the day of judgment; forasmuch as truth assures us, that it is not for us to know the times and seasons. Moreover, if the Lord should be pleased to reveal to any of them in the Church of God future things by some inspiration, as he hath promised by the Prophet Amos; and seeing the Apostle Paul saith, *Despise not prophesying*, etc. we will not have such as these reckoned amongst impostors and liars, or that they shall be any ways hindered: but because it is a matter of great moment, and that we are not upon light grounds to believe

every spirit, but are to try them whether they be of God; we command that by a constant law any such asserted inspirations, before they be published or preached to the people, be henceforward understood to be reserved to the examination of the apostolical see. But in case this cannot be done without the danger of too long a delay, or that urgent necessity should otherwise persuade; then, observing the same order, it may be signified to the ordinary of the place, who taking along with him three or four learned and grave men, and diligently examining the matter with them, if they see it expedient (which we charge upon their consciences) they may grant them liberty: but whosoever presumes to commit any thing contrary to the premises, shall incur excommunication, from the which he shall not be absolved but by the Pope himself; that so by their example others may be deterred from presuming to do any such thing; for which reason we decree that they be for ever made incapable of the office of preaching, any privileges whatsoever to the contrary notwithstanding," etc.

It is not our business to examine the question, whether the Bishop of Meaux hath exactly followed the rules that this canon prescribes, in his explication of the Scripture, and especially about the matter of Antichrist, though they be rules by which Bishops are no less bound than the meanest divines. It may be the Church of Rome finds the Bishop's new system so much for her interest, that it inclines her to suspend the severity of her canons, in favor of a person who has so dexterously plucked a thorn out of her foot, which hath troubled her so long, and which hath always caused new pains to her, as oft as any of her doctors have endeavored to pluck it out.

But I fear I have insisted too long upon so vain a conjecture, and which scarce deserved to be confuted. There are able men of the Church of Rome, who have taken the pains to refute the conjecture of some Papists who would needs have Mahomet to be the Antichrist: this was the chimera of Annius of Viterbo, a Monk famous for his impostures; this likewise was the whimsey of Fevardentius and some others, whom Pererius, the Jesuit, hath refuted so solidly, as that he has put the Bishop of Meaux to the trouble of inventing a new system to oppose the Protestants. I hope his system will meet with the same destiny amongst his own party, that so

the Protestants may not be put to the trouble of giving it a formal confutation. For indeed, though the politics of the Church of Rome do bear with several opinions that differ from the common hypotheses of their society, yet the divines of that party are not patient enough to dissemble the dislike they have to see their old opinions, which have been maintained for several ages, trod under foot. The Bishop himself has all example hereof, which he cannot well have forgot, in the person of Cardinal Capizucchi, who, having given his approbation to the exposition of the Romish faith, made by the Bishop of Meaux, in which he sweetens the worship of images so very much, for fear of incensing the Protestants, whom he designed to bring over to his own side, was not wanting some years after to publish a treatise, wherein he shews that he gave that approbation, only upon the account of reason of state, and not because he sincerely approved the way which the Bishop had taken to make the worship of images appear more tolerable to the Protestant party.

CHAPTER 20

Of the morals of the Albigenses, and of their ecclesiastical government.

HAVING thus justified the Albigenses as to their doctrine and worship, it is time now to proceed to shew the regularity of their discipline, by representing the nature of their Church government, and the conduct of those Churches in matters that related to their manners. This will not be a matter of any difficulty; for it is easily conceived that these dioceses being stored with people who maintained the doctrine of Berengarius, as the Abbot of Tron tells us, they had a great party of the Clergy at the head of them. I do not say this without good grounds; for, first, we see that in the councils held against Berengarius, there were very great contests about this matter, and that the opposite party carried their point only by downright violence. Secondly, That, according to the testimony of Sigebert, if many persons wrote against Berengarius, many also wrote in favor of him, and who can doubt of their being Churchmen? Thirdly, That his own Bishop Bruno, Bishop of Angers, where he was Archdeacon, declared himself for him. Fourthly, That in Aquitain, in the year 1075, Giraldus, Legate of Pope Gregory VII. was obliged to call a council at Poitiers, where Berengarius narrowly escaped being murdered, as we are assured by the Chronicle of St. Maixant, the circumstances whereof, there set down, they that published it took care to leave out. Fifthly, That five years after they were obliged to convocate another council at Bourdeaux, where Berengarius gave an account of his faith, as the same Chronicle acquaints us. We ought naturally to observe that from the year 1050, wherein Berengarius appeared at Rome, where he maintained his opinions with so much courage, that Leo of Ostia, Abbot of Mont-Cassin, owns that there was nobody able to oppose him, until the year 1080, in which the Council of Bourdeaux met; the Church of Rome could not overthrow Berengarius's party, though she had employed by turns both councils and violence, which shews that there were amongst Berengarius's followers a considerable party of the Clergy, and of those of Aquitain in particular.

Neither was it only this difference in point of doctrine that strengthened the Berengarian party, but also the regulations of Pope Nicholas II. and his successors; and, above all, those of Gregory VII. in the Council of Rome,

in 1074. and 1075. We may see the effect of his prohibiting matrimony to Priests, as Sigebert has recorded it upon the year 1074.

“Gregory the Pope,” saith he, “at a synod held by him, anathematized all that came into preferments by simony, and removed all married Priests from their functions, and forbad laymen to assist at their masses, by not only an unheard of precedent, but also (as several people thought at that time) by an inconsiderate prejudice, contrary to the opinion of the holy Fathers, who have written, that the sacraments used in the Church, to wit, baptism, chrism, and the body and blood of our Lord, have the selfsame efficacy by the secret operation of the Holy Ghost, be the dispensers of them good or bad. Wherefore then, since they are quickened by the Holy Spirit, so that they are neither amplified by the worthiness of the good dispensers, nor lessened by the sins of the wicked, whence is this man that baptizes? which thing hath given so great occasion of scandal, that never was the holy Church rent with a more dangerous schism at any time by a prevailing heresy than it is now, whilst some act for righteousness, others against it; some openly are guilty of simony, others cover the stain of covetousness with an honest name, selling that under the name of charity, which they pretend to give freely, as Eusebius saith of the Montanists, whilst under the name of offerings, they more artificially receive bribes. By this means also things are brought to that pass, that there are very few that practice continence, whilst some make only an hypocritical shew of it for gain and boasting; and others aggravate their incontinence by forswearing themselves, and by multiplied adulteries. Besides, upon this occasion laymen rise up in rebellion against the holy orders of the Church, shaking off the yoke of ecclesiastical subjection; laymen profane holy mysteries, and dispute about them, baptize infants, using the filthy excrement of the ears, instead of the holy oil and chrism; on their death-beds they scorn to receive at the hands of married Priests the Lord’s provision for their last journey, and the usual service of Church burial. The tithes that are assigned to the Priests they consume with fire: and that by one horrid profanation you may make an estimate of the rest, laymen have been often seen to

trample the body of our Lord, that had been consecrated by married Priests, under their feet, and wilfully spill his blood upon the ground; and many such things against the laws of God and man are daily committed in the Church. By this means also many false teachers rise in the Church, who, by their profane innovations, alienate the minds of the common people from the discipline of the Church.”

This therefore was the great occasion that was given to many of the Clergy and people of Aquitain, not to entertain any communion with the Church of Rome, or to submit themselves to the yoke which she was preparing for all the western Churches.

I have, in my Remarks upon the History of the Churches of Piedmont, given an account of the rise of the opinion of those who believed that the Pope’s excommunications deprived such as had been duly ordained, of all power to exercise their functions, and did incapacitate them to confer orders upon other ministers. This was the true reason that made all that maintained the principles of the Church of Rome look upon the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, who had thus renounced the Roman communion, as a company of laymen, and to consider their ordinations as null. I need not repeat the same here, it being sufficiently confirmed by the passage of Sigebert, which I just now quoted.

It appears therefore that the discipline of the Albigenses was the same that had been practiced in the primitive Church: they had their Bishops, their Priests, and their Deacons, whom the Church of Rome at first held for schismatics, and whose ministry she at last absolutely rejected, for the same reasons that made her consider the ministry of the Waldenses as null and void. We find in Peter, the Abbot of Clugny, that he reproacheth the Petrobusians for being joined with schismatics; whereas they took the name of apostolical men. See how he speaks to them: *Vos magistri errorum, et caeci duces caecorum, faeces haeresium, et reliquiae schismaticorum!*

“O you masters of errors, and blind leaders of the blind, the dregs of heresies, and the relics of schismatics!”

Who were these schismatics but the Berengarians? It is manifest that union with the Church of Rome being become impossible, by reason of the errors she had defined, and the tyranny she had usurped over the State and Church; there was even before his time a separation made of the greatest part of the dioceses of Narbon, Toulouse, Agen, and other places; and that Peter Bruys and his disciples were of his party, appears from his 2d Epistle, which is considerable, to this purpose.

“In your parts,” saith he “the people are re-baptized, the churches profaned, the altars overthrown, crosses burnt, and flesh eaten on the very day of our Saviour’s passion; Priests are whipped, Monks imprisoned, and forced by terrors and torments to marry. The heads of which contagion you have indeed by the Divine assistance, and the help of Catholic princes, driven out of your country; but the members, as I have already said, remain yet amongst you, infected with this deadly poison, as I myself lately perceived.”

By which passage we find that the same disorders had happened in those dioceses which he speaks of, that Sigebert had before observed. Bouchet, in his Annals of Aquitain, understands the thing after the same manner, where he speaks thus of the voyage of St. Bernard.

“In the mean time, whilst all these things were a doing, Godfry, Bishop of Chartres, and Innocent’s legate in France, and St. Bernard, who were employed to purge the schismatics out of Aquitain, or to reduce them to the union of the Church, went first to Nantes,” etc.

I have shewed how Henry opposed himself to the abuses and superstitions which the Church of Rome endeavored to introduce into these dioceses. But whatever efforts the Romish party made use of to overthrow this happy work, it seems that they could never attain their end. We have a letter writ by an Earl of Toulouse to the Abbot of Cisteaux, and to the general Chapter of that order, in the year 1177, which declares that the Clergy sided with the party which he accuseth of Manicheism; and that the Popish churches were reduced to extreme desolation, he himself being in no condition to remedy it, or to oppose

himself against the torrent, most of the great Lords having declared themselves for them.

“So far,” saith he, “hath this noisome heretical infection prevailed, that almost all closing with it believe that in so doing they do God good service; and the wicked one, who is now exerting the mystery of iniquity in the children of unbelief, doth so transform himself into an angel of light, that the wife separates from her husband, the son from his father, and the daughter-in-law from her mother-in-law. And, O miserable! has the gold lost its lustre amongst us to that degree, that it is trod under the Devil’s feet like dirt? for even the Priests are depraved with the filth of heresy; and the ancient and once venerable churches appointed for worship, are left desolate, and lie in ruins. — And now what shall I say? there are none that consider with themselves, and say in their hearts, What do we do? for we see that these men do a great deal of mischief. If we let them alone, all men will believe in them; and he who hath swallowed down a river already, will not wonder at it, from the boldness of his wicked Presumption, if Jordan should flow into his mouth. For my part, who am girt with one of the two divine swords, and who do own myself an avenger of the divine wrath, and minister of God appointed for that purpose, whilst I endeavor to set bounds, and put a stop to this infidelity, do find that my power is too weak to effect such and so great a work, because the most part of the gentry of my dominion, having drunk of this poison of infidelity already, are wasted away with its contagion, and together with them, the greatest part of the common people, fallen from the faith, pines likewise; so that I neither dare nor am able to undertake it.”

Roger Hoveden sets down a letter of Peter, Cardinal Legate at Toulouse, wherein he makes mention of the Albigensian Pastors, Raymond Baimiac, Bernard Raimond, and some other chief heretics, who came to speak with him, under his and the Earl of Toulouse’s safe conduct, and made profession of their faith in a great assembly in the Church of St. Stephen.

He afterwards gives us an account of a letter of Henry Abbot, of Clairvaux, who, lamenting the corruption of Toulouse, by these arch-heretics, adds these words:

“Yea, so far had this plague prevailed in the land, that they had not only made to themselves Priests and Bishops, but had also their Evangelists, who, having depraved and cancelled the truth of the Gospel, had copied to themselves new Gospels, and from their wicked hearts preached to the deceived people new doctrines. I lie, if there was not amongst them a man of a great age, of a very plentiful estate, who had several brethren and friends, and who had the reputation of a great man amongst the greatest of the city, whom, in punishment for his sins, the Devil had so blinded, that he declared himself to be John the Evangelist, and he distinguished the Word that was in the beginning with God, from another principle of things, as from another God. He was the head of these miserable wretches, and the ringleader of the heretics in this city; who, though a layman and an idiot, and so knew nothing, yet, as a fountain of diabolical wisdom, the bitter waters of perdition and death flowed from him amongst them. A company of dark owls associated to him at nights, where he, sitting amongst them in a garment like a rochet, and a surplice over it, seemed like a king with his army standing about him, and was the preacher to these fools. He had filled the whole city with his disciples and doctrine; nobody daring to oppose him, because of his power and riches. Yea, so great was the licentiousness of these heretics, that at our entrance into the town, as we passed through the streets and lanes, they mocked us, and pointed at us with their finger, calling us apostates, hypocrites, and heretics.”

Peter, Monk of Vaux Cernay, owns that the Albigenses had their teachers, whom they called Bishops and Deacons. He takes notice that the Earl of Toulouse, who never went any whither without a New Testament, had always with him some of these ministers for his instruction and consolation.

We find in the Council of Montpellier, in the year 1214, that there was some difference between the heretics that were the pastors, and the

believers, that is to say, the people; as it is particularly taken notice of in the Preface, and in the 29th Canon of the Council of Gallia Narbonensis.

We find in Matthew Paris a letter of the Bishop of Porto, the Pope's Legate for this business of the Albigenses, written in the year 1223, to the Archbishop of Roan, where he mentions one Bartholomew, a Bishop of the heretics, who had removed himself into the country near Toulouse, where he created Bishops, and set rules to the churches of his communion. His words are these: *Etenim de Carcassona oriundus, vices illius Antipapae gerens, Bartholomaeus haereticorum Episcopus, funestam ei exhibendo reverentiam, sedem et locum concessit in villa quae Perlos appellatur, et seipsum transtulit in partes Tholosanas. Iste Bartholomaeus, in literarum suarum undique discurrentium tenore, se in primo salutationis alloquio intitulat in hunc modum, Bartholomaeus servus servorum sanctae fidei, tali salutem. Ipse etiam inter alias enormitates creat Episcopos, et Ecclesias perfide ordinare intendit.*

“For this Bartholomew, the Bishop of the heretics, Vicar to that Antipope, originally of Carcasson, paying him an unhappy reverence, yielded him his seat and his place in the village called Perlos, and removed himself into the country near Toulouse. This Bartholomew styled himself servant of the servants of the holy faith, and in his letters which he sent about amongst his flock, as also in his first salutations of those who addressed themselves to him, he always assumed that character. He also added to his other crimes that of creating Bishops, and perfidiously took upon him the government of those churches.”

Lucas Tudensis speaks of one of their Bishops that was burnt.

William of Puylaurens, in his Chronicle, at the beginning, speaks of the great respect that was given to these ministers of the Albigenses, whom he calls Waldenses, because of the holiness of their lives.

Lastly, we see in the Acts of the Inquisition of Toulouse several names of those that were pastors of the Albigenses, and who had been ordained to the holy ministry by men of their own communion. This therefore was the government of these churches, the succession whereof we cannot distinctly set down; but this ought not to surprise any body: the captains

of the croisade, and the Inquisitors, can best satisfy the world in this point, wherein we must acknowledge our inability.

As for their morals and behavior, who ever will but reflect upon the debauchery and general corruption which reigned in the eleventh century, will easily judge, that those who renounced the communion of the Church of Rome, and who called her the mystical Babylon, because of her false worship, and the horrid corruption of her ministers, must needs be more pure in their morals, and more orderly in their behavior; and indeed we find it true in the Albigenses, as well pastors as people.

The pastors recommended to the people the having of the books of the New Testament in their mother-tongue, and pressed the reading thereof with so much care and application, that Raymond, Earl of Toulouse, never stirred any whither without taking that holy book with him. This was the certain badge and mark of all these heretics, and that whereby they defended themselves. For which reason, the Council of Toulouse, fearing lest their croisades should not be able to exterminate the Albigenses, as long as they had the Bible in the vulgar tongue, took care to prohibit the having of it in these terms;

“We prohibit the permission of the books of the Old and New Testament to laymen, except perhaps they might desire to have the Psalter, or some Breviary for the divine service, or the Hours of the blessed Virgin Mary, for devotion; expressly forbidding their having the other parts of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue.”

It was by means of this purity of their morals, that, as Petrus Cluniacensis witnesseth, the Petrobusians found so much favour with many of the Clergy, of the Bishops, of the Princes, and of the laity, at the same time when they preached openly, that the Church of Rome was not the Church; but that they were the true Church, as being truly apostolical.

Indeed a cursory reflection upon the nature of the enormous crimes laid to their charge, as if those abominations had been the general character of their religion, is sufficient to discover the imposture of their accusers: for they are crimes that overturn the foundations of all society, by destroying the honor of families, and filling every place with abominable adulteries

and incests. Can any man imagine that such a sect as this could ever have been able to propagate itself throughout all Europe, as Wilhelmus Newbrigenis declares the Waldenses did, if the manners of those that profess it had been founded upon principles that trample upon the laws of nature, which have always been respected even amidst the thickest darkness of Paganism? We do not find that Manicheism went so far, even then when it caused the greatest disturbance in the world, nor that the corruption into which it plunged those that were tainted with it had any very great influence upon others: whereas we find, that the religion of the Albigenses hath spread its roots far and near, and even procured esteem and affection from those of the Romish party that were not wholly transformed into the nature of brutes and madmen, being natural consequences of that insulting spirit which has animated the Popes and the Clergy in these latter ages.

What I say here is evident from the testimony of William of Puylaurens, in his Chronicle, who owns that the Albigenses had a show of godliness, though, saith he, they denied the power of it; that they were had in extreme veneration by the people; and that more legacies were left to them than to Churchmen: whereas, on the other hand, the Romish Clergy were fallen to that extreme contempt, that laymen, instead of the common wish, *I had rather be a Jew*, used to say, *I had rather be a Chaplain*.

The case must needs have been very evident; since Pope Innocent III. who left nothing unattempted to root it out, yet could not but do them the justice to own, that they were very free from several vices.

Indeed we may easily judge of their morals and demeanour, by their constancy in suffering the most cruel torments in the defense of the truth. Matthew Paris tells us of one Robert, an Inquisitor, who buried alive, or burnt, fifty of them in two months' time; and yet not one of them renounced his faith, in the midst of the greatest violence of their torments. Perrin and Chassagnon give us great numbers of parallel examples, as well as the Acts of the Inquisition of Toulouse. Lucus Tudensis, who endeavours to ridicule this constancy of their martyrs, is at the same time a witness for it, beyond all manner of controversy.

Mezeray was juster than the Bishop of Meaux; for though he was not ignorant of the slanders cast upon them, yet he hath given this testimony, of the Albigenses, whom he calls Waldenses: he saith,

“There were two principal sorts of them; the one of them were very ignorant, and given to lewdness and villany: these men maintained gross and filthy errors; and these were indeed a kind of Manichees. The others were more learned, and less disorderly, and keeping themselves at the greatest distance from the filthinesses now mentioned, maintained much the same opinions with the Calvinists, and, to speak properly, were Henricians and Waldenses.”

This testimony, so agreeable to truth, may well make those blush who copy the forgeries of the Jesuit Mariana, who, to make the Albigenses pass for Atheists and Epicureans, has changed the title of Lucus Tudensis's book, which was only in these terms, *Concerning another Life, and Controversies of Faith*, by adding to it, *against the errors of the Albigenses*.

CHAPTER 21

Concerning the persecutions

which the Albigenses have suffered from the Pope and his party.

MY design is not to enlarge here upon a particular description of their persecutions. This would be too vast a field to enter upon in a work of this kind which I have undertaken: but withal, I should think myself to blame, if, after having shewed with how much zeal the Albigenses maintained the truth of the Gospel by their preaching, and practiced the morals thereof in their conversation, I should not give a short account of what persecutions they have suffered, and with what constancy, by their martyrdom, they have borne witness to the same truth.

We have already taken a view of the persecutions exercised against Peter de Bruis and Henry his disciple, at the solicitation of Peter de Clugny, and Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, who caused them to be sacrificed to the interest of the Church of Rome, which, after the eleventh century, begun to persecute with sword and fire all those who durst be so bold to oppose her greatness by undervaluing her decrees. It was in compliance with this method, that Petrus Cluniacensis, writing to the Archbishop of Arles and Ambrun, and to the Bishops of Die and Gap, concerning the Petrobusians and Henricians, tells them,

“It is your duty to drive out the heretics from those places, (where they rejoice to have found lurking-holes,) not only by your preaching, but also, if need be, by armed force of laymen.”

The Council of Toulouse, assembled in 1119, where Calixtus II. was present, gave occasion to these bloody executions. The third chapter enjoins all powers to repress the heretics, and that those that favor them be subject to the same condemnation.

In the year 1163 the Council of Tours, assembled by Alexander III. had ordained, that the Bishops of those provinces, where any of them were found, should not suffer any one to harbour or shelter them; that no commerce should be held with them about the things of common

conversation; and ordered temporal princes to imprison and condemn them, and confiscate their estates and goods.

In the year 1179 the same Pope Alexander III. renewed the same orders, forbidding also their being buried in places set apart for the burial of Papists.

In 1181 Henry, who, from Abbot of Clairvaux, had been made Bishop of Alby, having, as Legate, gathered together some considerable forces by his preaching, went to visit them with armed force; but they, to avoid the storm that threatened them, pretended to abjure their errors: but no sooner was the storm blown over, but they lived as they did before. So that the contagion spread itself through several provinces on both sides of the Loire: and one of their false apostles, called Terric, who had hid himself a long time in a cave at Corbigny in the diocese of Nevers, was taken and burnt; and many more suffered the same punishment in several other places.

This was that sweetness of the Church of Rome, which the Bishop of Meaux so much boasts of, and which she put in practice long before she came to conferences, which served only for a prelude to the utter ruin of the Albigenses, which the Popes had designed long before.

Accordingly Innocent III. as Mezeray tells us in the History of Philip Augustus, finding himself unable to reduce the heretics of Languedoc, who had almost gained that whole province, resolved to make an example of Raymond, Earl of Toulouse, because he was their chief favourer, and because he had caused Peter de Chasteauneuf, a Cistercian Monk, and the first that ever exercised the function of Inquisitor, to be put to death: he excommunicated the Earl, absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and gave his lands to the first that should seize them, yet so as without prejudice to the right of sovereignty of the kings of France.

Whereupon the Earl was so frightened, that being come to Valence, to meet with Milo, the Pope's Legate, he wholly submitted himself to him, and gave eight strong places for ever to the Church of Rome, as a security of his conversion; and the year following, to obtain absolution, he suffered himself to be lashed with rods before the gate of the church of St. Giles, where Peter de Chasteauneuf was buried, and afterwards to be dragged to

the tomb of that Monk by the Legate, who put a wooden yoke about his neck, before twenty Archbishops and an infinite multitude of people: after this he took upon him the croisade, and the year following joined himself with those that took his own cities, and those of his confederates.

But it was not his repentance that engaged him to endure so dreadful a disgrace, but the apprehension he had of a terrible tempest that was just then breaking over his head: for the Pope turning his torrent of zeal against the heretics, which pushed the people on to the deliverance of the Holy Land, had this same year ordered the croisade to be preached up against the Albigenses, and a great number of noblemen, bishops, and common people, had already listed themselves in that service, the King himself furnishing fifteen thousand men, maintained at his own charges.

It is worth our taking notice, first, that Pope Innocent III. to encourage the lords and people to the holy war, granted a plenary remission of all their sins to all those who took up the badge of the cross, vouchsating also the protection of the holy see to their persons and goods, as may be seen in his Epistles. He absolved the cities that had sworn to the Earl of Toulouse from their oath of allegiance, upon that excellent principle of the Church of Rome, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, because they do not keep theirs with God or the Church. Secondly, that the Earl of Toulouse was not guilty of the murder of Peter de Chasteau Neuf; for we read, that Earl Raymond went to meet King Philip, to obtain of him letters of recommendation from the Pope, that he might be fully acquitted of the murder of the Monk Peter de Chasteau Neuf, whereof they had most unjustly obliged him to confess himself guilty, only because the said murder had been committed in his territories, for which the Legate Milo had imposed upon him a most unjust and unheard of penance. From the court of the King of France he went to Rome, where he received absolution immediately from the hands of Pope Innocent III. This being a case reserved to him, the Pope received him very civilly, presented him with a rich robe and a ring of great value, and granted him plenary remission and absolution from the said murder, declaring that he looked upon him as sufficiently cleared upon that account.

In the year 1209, the army of these crossed soldiers, which consisted of no less than five hundred thousand men, entered Languedoc, and attacked the

city of Beziers, being one of the strongest places the Albigenses had, took it by force, and put all they found in it to the sword; so that above sixty thousand persons were killed there, as Mezeray informs us.

There happened one thing very remarkable at the taking of this city, which was, that the zeal of these consecrated soldiers was such, that they put to the sword all the Papists and Romish Clergy that were in the city. The Earl of Beziers came out of the city, and cast himself at the feet of the Legate Milo, begging his grace in behalf of his city of Beziers, and entreating him that he would not involve the innocent in the punishment of the guilty, which would certainly come to pass, in case the city should be taken by force, (which would soon be done by such a great and powerful army, that was ready to scale the walls in every part round the whole city:) that it could not be otherwise but that in this case much blood would be spilt on both sides, which he might prevent. That there were in Beziers great numbers of good Catholics, who would be involved in the same ruin, contrary to the Pope's intention, whose design was only to chastise the Albigenses. That if he did not think fit to spare his subjects for their own sakes, that at least he would be pleased to take pity of his age and profession, since the loss would be his, who was under age, and an obedient servant of the Pope, as having been educated in the Church of Rome, in the which he was resolved to live and die. That if he was offended that such persons as were enemies to the Pope had been tolerated in his territories, that this ought not to be imputed to him, because he had no other subjects but such as his deceased father had left him; and that in this his minority, and during the short time that he had been master of his estate, he had neither been able, by reason of his incapacity, to discern the evil, or to suit a remedy to it, though indeed this was his intention; and that he hoped, for the time to come, to give all manner of satisfaction to the Pope and the Church of Rome, as became an obedient son of both.

The Pope's Legate's answer was, that all his excuses should be of no use to him, and that he might shift for himself the best he could.

The Earl of Beziers, being returned to the city, called the people together, and represented to them, that, after having submitted himself to the Pope's Legate, he had interceded for them, without being able to obtain any thing, but a pardon, upon condition that those who professed the faith

of the Albigenses should abjure their religion, and promise to live according to the laws of the Church of Rome. The Roman Catholics beseeched them to give way to this extreme violence, and not to be the cause of their death, because the Legate was resolved not to pardon one of them, except they all unanimously resolved to live under the same laws. To which the Albigenses answered, that they would never forsake their faith for the base price of this frail life: that they were well assured that God could protect them, if it seemed good unto him; but withal, neither were they ignorant, that, if he rather chose to be glorified by the confession of their faith, it would be an exceeding honor to them to die for righteousness' sake: that they had much rather displease the Pope, who could only destroy their bodies, than offend God, who could destroy body and soul together: that they detested the thought of being ashamed of or denying that faith by which they had learned to know Christ and his righteousness; and for fear of eternal death to embrace a religion which entirely takes away the merit of Jesus Christ, and destroys his righteousness: that therefore they might make the best terms for themselves they could, without promising any thing that was contrary to the duty of true Christians.

As soon as the Roman Catholics understood this, they sent their Bishop to the Legate, to beseech him not to comprehend them in the same punishment with the Albigenses, they having always adhered to the Church of Rome, and of whom he who was their Bishop had good knowledge; judging also, that the rest had not gone so far from the ways of repentance, but that they might be reduced by a sweetness well becoming the Church, which takes no delight in shedding blood.

The Legate, being enraged at this, with horrible threats and oaths protested, that except all that were in the town did acknowledge their fault, and submit themselves to the Church of Rome, they should all be put to the sword, without any regard had to Catholics, to sex, or age, but that all should be exposed to fire and sword; and immediately commanded the city to be summoned to surrender at discretion: which being refused, he commanded all the warlike engines to play, and to discharge their instruments, and to cast stones, ordering them at the same time to give a general assault, and to scale the city round, so that it was impossible for those within to sustain the shock: for being pressed upon by above an hundred thousand pilgrims, they at last, saith the compiler of the Treasure

of Histories, discomfited those within the city, and entering in all at once, killed vast numbers of all sorts, and afterwards putting fire to the city, they burnt it to ashes.

When the town was taken, the Priests, Monks, and Clerks came in procession out of the great church of Beziers, called St. Nazari, with the banner, cross, and holy water, bareheaded, clothed in their ecclesiastical vestments, singing *Te Deum*, in token of their rejoicing for the city's being taken and purged of the Albigenses. But the pilgrims, who had received an express order from the Legate to kill all, rushed in amongst this procession, cutting off the heads and arms of the Priests, striving who could do most, till they were all cut to pieces.

These cruelties exercised upon the city of Beziers, upon the Papists themselves, yea, and upon their very Clergy, having opened the Earl of Beziers's eyes to see that the Pope, under the pretense of religion, had a mind to ruin the Earl of Toulouse, his uncle, as well as himself, he shut up himself in his city of Carcasson, with a resolution to defend it against the Legate and his pilgrims. The King of Arragon, his kinsman, having discoursed with him, the Earl plainly declared, that he knew this to be the Pope's design, because when he was treating for his subjects of Beziers, he refused to receive his Catholic subjects into his favor, nay, would not so much as spare the Priests, who were all cut in pieces in their sacerdotal ornaments, under the banner and the cross; that this example of cruel impiety, joined with what they exercised upon the village of Carcasson, where they had exposed all to fire and sword, without any distinction of age or sex, had fully convinced him that there was no mercy to be looked for from the Legate or his pilgrims; and that accordingly he would choose rather to die with his subjects, defending themselves, than to be exposed to the mercy of an inexorable enemy, such as he had found the Legate to be: and though there were in the city of Carcasson many of his subjects of a belief contrary to that of the Church of Rome, yet that they were persons that had never done any injury to any one; that they had always assisted him in time of need; and that for this their good service he was resolved never to abandon them, as they, on their parts, had promised him to hazard life and estate in his defense: that he hoped that God, who is the reliever of those who are oppressed, would assist them against this great multitude of ill-advised men, who, under the pretence of meriting heaven,

had quitted their own habitations to come and burn, pillage, ravage, and murder, in the habitations of others, without either reason, judgment, or mercy.

The King of Arragon returned with this remonstrance to the Legate, who assembled a great number of Lords and Prelates to hear what he had to say, who declared to them, that he had found the Earl of Beziers, his ally, extremely scandalized at their inhuman proceedings against his subjects of Beziers and of the village of Carcasson; and that he was fully persuaded, seeing they had neither spared the Roman Catholics, nor the Priests themselves, that it was not a religious war, as was pretended, but a kind of robbery under the color of religion: that he hoped God would be so favorable to him, as to make his innocence, and the just occasion he hath had to defend himself, sufficiently known: that they must not hope now to have them surrender at discretion, since they had found that there was no other to be expected from them, but that of killing all they met with: that it had never been found good policy to drive an enemy to despair: wherefore if the Legate would be pleased to afford any tolerable composition to the Earl of Beziers and his subjects, that mildness would be a better method to reduce the Albigenes to the Church of Rome, than extreme severity: and that he ought also to remember that the Earl of Beziers was a young man, and a Roman Catholic, who might be very serviceable in reducing his subjects, who had so great confidence in him, to their obedience to the Church.

The Legate told the King of Arragon, that if he would withdraw a little, they would advise what were best to be done. The King being called in again, the Legate told him, that in consideration of his intercession, he would receive the Earl of Beziers to mercy; and therefore, if it seemed good to him, he might come forth, and eleven with him, with his goods and baggage: but that as for the people that were in the city of Careasson, they should only deliver to his discretion, of which they ought to have a very good opinion, he being the Pope's Legate; and that accordingly they should come forth all stark naked, men, women, and children, without shirts or any other covering on their bodies. Also that the Earl of Beziers should be delivered into sure hands, and that all his estate should be surrendered up to the future lord of his territories, who should be chosen for conservation of the same.

The King of Arragon having endeavored to bring the Legate to easier terms for the young Earl, the Legate told him, that these conditions were very favourable: and yet what follows is still more infamous. The Legate employs a person of quality to endeavor to draw the Earl of Beziers out of Carcasson, and to bring him to him, with assurance under oath, that he would send him back to his city of Careasson, in case he should not be satisfied with the Legates proposals. The Count of Beziers, upon this assurance, comes to the Legate, and represents to him, that if he would think fit to treat his subjects with more kindness, he would easily induce them to comply with his desire, and recall the Albigenes from their error to the Church: that the terms which had been mentioned to him were shamefull and undecent, for those who were to keep their eyes chaste, as well as their thoughts: that he knew his people would rather die, than see themselves reduced to so scandalous an ignominy, and therefore entreated him to come to easier terms: and that he did not question but to make his subjects accept of any other more tolerable conditions.

The Legate's answer was, that the people of Carcasson might consider what they had to do; that he would concern himself no further, since the Earl was his prisoner, and should continue so till the city were taken, and his subjects acknowledge their duty.

When Simon, Earl of Montfort, was made general or the Church, he was so careful to destroy the Albigenes, that he seized upon all the places belonging to Popish lords, that lay convenient for him, so that the King of Arragon was forced to complain to the Pope of these his proceedings, in some letters yet extant, to oblige him to make restitution. And for the merciful temper of this renowned Earl, take but this one instance of it. After a siege of six months the city of Lavour was taken by storm and scaling of the walls, and all that were found in it were put to the sword, except fourscore gentlemen whom the Earl caused to be hanged and strangled, and Almericus was hanged on a gallows higher than the rest. The lady of Lavour was cast alive into a pit, and there stoned to death.

The conduct of the Pope and the Lateran Council, in the year 1215, is worth taking notice of, because it was nothing but a confirmation of all these proceedings. Mezeray gives this account of it. Prince Lewis took upon him the badge of the cross to go against the Albigenes, and assisted

in the expedition of Languedoc; the Earl of Montfort met him at Vienne, and the Legate at Valence. When he was come to St. Gilles, Montfort, who accompanied him, received bulls from the Pope, who, pursuant to the decree of the Council of Montpellier held some months before, had given him the whole territory of Toulouse, and all the rest he had conquered with his crossed pilgrims, provided he could get investiture from the King, and would pay him the accustomed homage: so that we may say, that the Pope nominated him to his dignity, and the King, in compliance with the said nomination, conferred it upon him. From thence Lewis went to Montpellier, and then to Beziers, where he gave order for the demolishing of the walls of Narbon and Toulouse. In the mean time the Council of Lateran, notwithstanding the pitiful remonstrances of the Earl of Toulouse, who was present there in person with his son, adjudged the propriety of his lands to Montfort, reserving only the lands he had in Provence for his son, and four hundred marks of silver a year for his own subsistence, and that too upon condition of his being obedient to the Church. After this, Montfort assumed the title of Earl of Toulouse, and came and received his investiture from the King in the city of Melun.

I should never have done, should I barely mention all the cruelties and barbarities which the Romish party exercised for near twenty years together by their continual croisades, against a people who were taken to be heretics, as soon as they found a New Testament in the vulgar tongue about them.

I shall conclude this chapter with setting down the laws which the King of France enacted in the year 1228, against the Albigenses.

“Wherefore because the heretics have now of a long time spread their poison in your parts, polluting our mother the Church after several manners; we do in order to their utter extirpation decree, that all heretics deviating from the Catholic faith, by what name soever they are called, as soon as they are condemned of heresy by the Bishop of the place, or by any other ecclesiastical person that hath power to do it, be without delay punished; ordaining also, and firmly enacting, that no man do presume to harbour or protect the said heretics, or favor or trust them; and that if any one do presume to commit any thing contrary to these premises, he be

made incapable of being a witness, or of any honor whatsoever, as also of making a will, or inheriting any thing. Moreover, we enact, that all his goods, real or personal, be, *ipso facto*, confiscated, never to return to him or any of his posterity. We also enact and command, that all barons of the land, and our bailiffs, and other our subjects present and future, be careful and diligent to purge the land of heretics and heretical contagion, commanding them to be very industrious in searching them out, and faithful in discovering them, and as soon as they have found any of them, to present them without delay before the persons above named, that so being convict in their presence of error and heresy, they may, setting aside all hatred, entreaties, rewards, fear, favor, and love, give sentence against them. And that those who are diligent and careful in the searching for and seizing of heretics, may not want the encouragement of honor and reward; we do enact, will, and command, that our bailiffs, in whose bailiwicks the said heretics shall be seized, pay to the taker for every heretic, two marks in silver, for the term of two years, and after that time expired, one mark only.”

Hitherto we have taken a view of what was charged upon the magistrates and lords, to whom the execution of these laws was committed. Let us now consider what other means the Church of Rome made use of; which was, the erecting the tribunal of the Inquisition, the maxims and conduct whereof Pope Gregory XIII. thought good to make known to the world by publishing the Directory for Inquisitors. This tribunal, erected by the Popes for the extirpation of the Albigenses, is a thing in itself so very horrid, that it strikes the Papists themselves with horror, that are not used to it; and yet such as it is, it hath justly been esteemed, and is still to this day thought to be the right hand of the Church of Rome. One may see from some of the published registers of these Inquisitors, and by some of their trials of the Albigenses, the horrid impostures of these Inquisitors, and the terrible punishments they have inflicted upon the Albigenses in all places, where from age to age they have been able to discover them.

CHAPTER 22

*That the doctrine of the Albigenses spread itself in England,
and continued there till the time of the Reformation.*

HENRY KNIGHTON tells us, that the Albigensian heretics came over into England in the reign of King John, and that some of them were burnt alive. But yet we must not think that their doctrine by this means was wholly extinguished; for we find the same appearing again in the persons of the Lollards and Wicklefites. I distinguish the Lollards from the Wicklefites, as being more ancient than they, having appeared in Flanders and Germany from the beginning of the 14th century, as appears from the testimonies of Johannes Hoesemius and of the Abbot Trithemius; though the same name was afterwards given to the Wicklefites, as is evident from the writings of Walsingham and William Thorn. They seem to have come from the Waldenses and Albigenses, by what Kilianus tells us; *Lollardus quoque dicitur hereticus Waldensis:*

“A Lollard is also called a Waldensian heretic.”

I need only therefore speak of their numbers, which, as Knighton assures us, covered all England: but since they have been charged with most horrid crimes, because they spoke against the images of the saints, and the rest of the Romish superstitions, as well as the vices of the clergy; it will be absolutely necessary to clear them from these false imputations, in the most authentic manner that may be.

Let us therefore examine the calumnies charged upon them by Trithemius, in his Chronicle of Hirsauge, on the year 1316, as they were copied by Natalis Alexander, a jacobite Friar, in his Ecclesiastical History. The heads of the heresies which Trithemius reckons up are these:

“**I.** That masses were vain things, to which neither any reverence was due, nor were they of any use or profit.”

“**II.** That Lucifer, with his devils, being unjustly driven out of heaven, should be restored to bliss again; and that Michael, with all the angels,

should be sentenced to everlasting punishment; and that all those that were not of their sect should be damned after the same manner.”

“**III.** That the blessed Virgin Mary, if she continued a virgin after her delivery, must have brought forth not a man but an angel.”

“**IV.** They boasted themselves to have twelve Apostles, who every year visited the whole empire; and that two of these being elders in order and profession, did every year enter paradise, and there receive from Enoch and Elias the power of binding and loosing, which they afterwards communicated to the other professors of their sect.”

“**V.** They derided the sacrament of Baptism; saying, if baptism be a sacrament, then every bath is a sacrament, and by consequence every keeper of a bath must be God.”

“**VI.** They shamefully abused the sacrament of Penance, by confessing their sins not to Priests but laymen, and expressing them only in general, and not in particular, and yet they hoped by this their confession, to obtain full and perfect forgiveness both of guilt and punishment.”

“**VII.** The sacrament of the Lord’s body they did not believe at all, calling the consecrated Host, a God made with hands.”

“**VIII.** They called the sacrament of Matrimony that was sworn to, fornication.”

“**IX.** They derided the sacrament of Extreme Unction; and being examined what they thought of it, they unanimously answered, We believe that herbs, the more they are laid in oil, the better they are: and they vilified all the consecrations and blessings used in the Church, as so many vain and useless ceremonies.”

“**X.** They blasphemously asserted, that God neither knew nor punished any sins that were committed under the earth, for which reason they used to meet in caves and places under ground, where fathers committed filthiness promiscuously with their daughters, and brothers with their sisters.”

“**XI.** That the Church of Rome was not the Church of Christ, but of infidel heathens; and they despised all ecclesiastical laws, together with all the Bishops and Ministers of the Church.”

“**XII.** Fasts they mocked at, eating flesh at all times, Good-Friday not excepted.”

“**XIII.** They kept no holydays, but wrought even upon Easter-day.”

“**XIV.** They denied that perjury was a sin.”

“**XV.** They denied that the merits or intercessions of the saints could prevail with God for the pardon of men’s sins. And he says, that beside these they professed many other errors, which he omits, for fear of being tedious to his readers. He adds also, that this heresy did so far prevail, that in Austria, Bohemia, and the neighboring provinces, there were above fourscore thousand men who were sworn to the profession of this sect. From these dregs of heresy, saith he, Bohemia being then infected, continues tainted with the same to this day. He subjoins, that many of these heretics were at the same time burnt in divers places of Austria, who all of them continued obstinately in their heresy, with great cheerfulness, until death. Walter, a chief man of that sect, was burnt at Collen in the year 1323, as Trithemius tell us in his Chronicle of the monastery of Hirsaugen, in the diocese of Spire.”

Nothing can be imagined more horrid than these calumnies, and we need not doubt but they were supported by many pretended convictions made by the Inquisitors of Germany: but it is easy to demonstrate, that there is scarce any ground for all these accusations, which therefore is a plain proof of what I have elsewhere maintained concerning these persecuted persons, who used it for a proverb in England, *He lies like a Monk*.

We have an authentic piece of the Lollards, which Roger Dimmock, a jacobite Friar, hath confuted in a manuscript, whereof there are two copies at Cambridge, the one in the public library, and another, older than that, in Trinity college. They presented this confession of theirs to the Parliament, which gave occasion to this Monk to insert it in English, together with his Latin translation, into a book which he dedicated to King Richard II. I need only set down the original, with the Latin translation of Roger Dimmock, which will be sufficient to confound all the calumnies of the Inquisitors.

The Petition of the Lollards

| LATIN | ENGLISH |
|---|---|
| <p>Nos pauperes homines thesaurarii sive thesaurus Christi et Apostolorum ejus, denunciamus vobis Dominis et Communibus praesentis Parliamenti certas quaestiones et veritates pro reformatione sanctae Ecclesiae Anglicanae, quae caeca extitit et leprosa annis plurimis per manutenentiam superbae praclaciae supportatae adulationibus privatarum religionum, sive privatae religionis multiplicatae ad magnum onus, et est effectus populis onerosus in Anglia.</p> <p>Secunda conclusio hanc continet sententiam.</p> | <p>We pore men tresorers of Christ and his Apostels, denouncyn to the Lordes and Commens of the Parliament, certeyn conclusions and treuthes for the reformation of holi Church of Ingland, the which hath ben blend and leprouse many yere, be the mayntenance of the proud prelaci, born up with flaterying of privat religion. The which is multiplied to a grete charge, and onerous to pepil here in Ingland.</p> |
| <p>Quando Ecclesia Anglicana incoepit delirare in possessione temporalium secundum novercam suam magnam Romanam Ecclesiam, et Ecclesiae mortificatae erant sive occisae per appropriationem diversorum locorum: fides, spes, et caritas, coeperunt fugere extra Ecclesiam nostram, quia superbia cum sua prole perversa peccatorum mortalium vendicabant Ecclesiam nostram titulo haereditario. Ista quaestio est genemlis, et probata, ut dicunt, experientia et more, ut</p> | <p>Whan the Chirch of Ingland began to dote in temperalte after hir step-moder the grete Chirche of Rome, and the Chirches were slayn be appropriacion to divers places: feythe, hope, and charite, begon for to fle out of our Chirch, for pride wit his sori genealogy of dedely sinnes chalangith it, be title of heritage. This conclusion is generale, and is proved by experience, custum, and manner, as you shall heryn affter.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| audies in sequentibus. | |
| <p>Haec est secunda quaestio: sacerdotium nostrum usuale quod incoepit in civitate Romana ficta altioris potestatis potestate angelica, non est sacerdotium a Christo suis discipulis ordinatum. Probatur sic Haec quaestio, sacerdotium Romanum fictum cum signis et ritibus ac Episcoporum benedictionibus, est pravae virtutis, nullibi in sacra Scriptura exemplatum: quia ordinalia sive rubricae Episcoporum pravae sunt fidei vel autoritatis in Novo Testamento, et nescimus videre quod Spiritus Sanctus dat dona sua propter aliqua talia signa, quia ipse et nobilia dona sua stare non possunt cum peccato mortali in aliqua una persona.</p> | <p>The second conclusion is this: our usuell priesthode, the which began in Rome, feyned of a power heyer than angels, is not the priesthode, the which Christ ordeyned to his Apostells. This conclusion is proved; for the priesthode of Rome is marked with signes, rites, and Bishopes blessyns, and that is of litel vertu, no whet ensampled in holi Scripture. For the Bishopes ordinals in the New Testament ben litel of record, and we can not se that the Holi Gost for any such signes gifbs any gifts: for he and his holy giftes mai not stond with dedely synne in no manner person.</p> |
| <p>Corrolaria hujus quaestionis est, quod valde extraneum sive novum est pluribus hominibus sapientibus videre Episcopos ludere cum Spiritu Sancto in suorum ordinum collatione, quia coronas conferunt in caracteribus loco servorum alborum, et illa est libemta Antichristi sive ejus signum in istam Ecclesiam introductum ad otium palliandum.</p> | <p>The correlary of this conclusion, that it is full unketh to many that be wise, to se Bishopes play with the Holi Gost in makyng of her orders, for thei gif crownes in carecters in stede of whit hertes, and that is the liveray of Antichrist brought into holi Church to colour idleness.</p> |
| <p>Tertia quaestio dolorosa est ista, lex continentiae sacerdotio annexa quae in praedictum foeminarum</p> | <p>The trid conclusion sorowful to here, is that the law of continence enexed to priest-hode,</p> |

fuit primitus introducta, inducit sodomiam in universalem sanctam Ecclesiam: sed per Bibliam excusamus nos propter suspectum decretum quod dicit quia nempe non deberemus nominare id peccatum: ratio et experientia hanc probat quaestionem, quia deliciosi cibi et potus ecclesiasticorum requirit necessariam purgationem naturalem vel pejorem, experientia occultac probationis talium, ergo non habent delectationem in mulieribus, et cum talem repereris, nota eum bene, quia ipse est unus ex illis. Correlaria hujus quaestionis est quod dignum valde esset adnullare privatas religiones hujus peccati incoeptores: sed Deus ex sua magna potestate de peccatis privatis manifestam sumat vindictam.

that in prejudice of wymmen was frst ordeget, inducyth sodomy in all holi Chirch: bot we excuse us be the Bible, for the suspecte decre that saith, that we shall not it. Reson and experience provyth this conclusion, for delicious metis and drynkes of men of' holi Chirch, will haf nedful purgation of kind or wers. Experience for the privy asay of such men is, that thai lik no wymmen, and whan thow provest such a man, mark him wele, for be is on of tho. The correlary of this conclusion, that the privat religions begynners of this synne, were most worthi to ben anulled: but God of hys might of prive synnes send open vengeance.

Quarta quaestio quae plus damnificat populum innocentem, est quia fictum miraculum sacri panis inducit omnes homines, paucis exceptis, ad idolatriam, quia ipsi acstimant quod corpus Domini quod nunquam exhibit coelum, virtute verborum sacerdotis sit in exiguo pane quem ipsi populo ostendunt; sed utinam vellent credere quod Doctor evangelicus dicit in suo Trialogo, quia *panis altaris est habitualiter corpus Christi*; quia supponimus quod

The ferth conclusion, that most harmeth the innocent pepel is this, that the feyned miracle of the sacrament of bred inducyth al men but a few, to idolatre; for thai wen that Goddis bodi that nevere schal out of heven, bevirtu of Priestis wordes be closed essentiali in a litel bred, that thai shew to the people: but would God they would believe what the Doctor evangelicus seis in his Trialoge, quod panis altaris est habitualiter corpus

isto momento potest quilibet vir et foemina in lege divina conficere sacramentum panis sine aliquo tali miraculo. Correlarium hujus quaestionis est, quod si corpus Christi sit dotatum gloria actema, officium corporis Christi compositum per Sanctum Thomam non est verum, et depictum plenum falsis miraculis; et hoc non est mirum, quia Frater Thomas illo tempore tenens cum Papa, voluit fecisse miraculum de ovo gallinac; et bene novimus quod quodlibet mendacium aperte praedicatum, cedit illi in verecundiam et injuriam qui semper est fidelis et sine defectu.

Christi. For we suppose that on this wise, mai every trew man and womman in Goddes law, mak the sacrament of this brede without any such miracle. The correlary of this conclusion is, that if Christes bodi be dowid with everlasting joi, the servys of corpus Christi, made be Frere Thomas, is untrew, and peynted ful of fals miracles; and that is no wonder, for Frere Thomas that same tyme holdyng with the Pope, wold haf mad a miracle of an hen egge: and we know well, that every lesyng openly preached, turneth him to vilany that ever was trew, and without default.

Quinta quaestio est Haec, exorcismi, sanctificationes, consecrationes sive benedictiones factae in Ecclesia sancta vini et panis, aquae, olei, salis, cerei incensi, sive thuris, mensae altaris, murorum Ecclesiae, vestimentorum mitrac, baculi pastoralis, baculorum peregrinorum et hujusmodi, vena practica sunt nigromanciae potius quam sanctae theologiae.

The fift conclusion is this, that exorsyms and holowyng mad in the Chirch of wine, brede, and way-water, salt, oyle, and encense, the stone of the altar, upon vestment, myter, croys, and pilgrim staves, be the veray practis of nygromancy, rather than of the holi theologi.

Haec quæstio probatur sic, per tales exorcismos et consecrationes creaturæ sunt onemta esse altioris virtutis quam sunt ex natura propria, et nihil mutationis

This conclusion is proved thus; for be such exorsymes creatures be charget to be of heyer vertu then her own kynd, and we see nothing of change in no such

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>videmus in hujusmodi creaturis exorcizatis vel consecratis nisi per falsam fidem, quae est principale in omni arte diabolica.</p> | <p>creature, that is so charmed but be fals beleve, the which is the principal of the develes craft.</p> |
| <p>Correlarium, si liber qui exorcizat aquam benedictam aspersam in Ecclesiam Dei esset totus verus nobis, videtur vemiciter, quia aqua benedicta in sancta Ecclesia usitata optima esset medicina, cujus contrarium experimur.</p> | <p>The correlary of this, that if the boke that charmeth hali water sprede were al trewe, us think verely, that holi water used in hali Chirch, schuld be the best medecyn to all manner of seknes.</p> |
| <p>Sexta quaestio quae sustentat multam superbiam, est, quod Rex et Pontifex in eadem persona, Praelatus et Judex temporalis causac, Curatus et Officiarius in servicio mundiali quod libet regnum reddit sine regula debita vel convenienti regimine. Haec quaestio probatur sic, potestas temporalis et spiritualis sunt duac partes totius sanctae Ecclesiae, et in eo qui se uni eorum deputavit non deberet se interponere cum altero, quia nemo potest duobus dominis servire, et nobis videtur quod Hermefodrita vel Ambidexter esset conveniens nomen talibus hominibus duplicis status.</p> | <p>The syxt conclusion that maynteneth mychel pride is, that a Kyng and a Bisshop al in on person, a Prelate and a Justice in temperal cause, a Curate and an Officer maken any roem out of gode rewle. This conclusion is oponly schewed, for temperalte and spiritualte be two partis of an holi Chirch, and therefore he that hath taken hym to that one schuld not mell him with that other, quia nemo potest, duobus Dominis servire; and us think that Hermifodrita or Ambidexter were a gode name to such manner of men of dowble estate.</p> |
| <p>Correlarium, nos procuratores Dei in ista causa instamus et prosequimur ac petimus in isto Parlamento, quod omnesmodi curatores tam alti quam bassi sint plene excusati ab omni officio</p> | <p>The correlary is, that we the procuratours of God in this cause, do prosu to this Parlemt, that al manner of Curates, both hey and low, ben fully excused of temperel office,</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>temporali, et se occupent cum curis suis, et de nullis aliis se interponant.</p> | <p>and occupy hem with her cure and not elles.</p> |
| <p>Septima quaestio quam nos potenter affirmamus, est, quod speciales orationes factae in Ecclesia nostra pro animabus defunctorum, proferendo unum ex nomine potius quam alium, est falsum fundamentum elemosinarum super quod omnes domus elemosinariae in Anglia male fundantur. Haec quaestio probatur duplici ratione; primo quia oratio meritoria et valoris deberet esse opus procedens ex alta caritate, et perfecta caritas non accipit personas, quia diligit proximum, etc. quia propter nobis videtur donatio bonorum temporalium collatorum sacerdotibus et domibus elemosinariis, est causa principalis hujusmodi orationum specialium, quae non multum distat a simonia; quia speciales orationes factae pro hominibus damnatis ad poenam actemam multum Deo displicent, et quamvis dubium sit, tamen verisimile est fideli populo, quod foundationes domorum elemosinariarum propter ipsorum venenosam dotationem pro majori parte transiissent viam latam. Correlarium, oratio valoris procedens a perfecta caritate debet se extendere in genere ad omnes</p> | <p>The sevent conclusion that we myghtily affirm is, that special praier for dede mens soules mad in owre Chirch, preferring on be name more than another, this is the fals ground of almes dede, on the which al almes houses of Ingland ben wikkidly grounded. This conclusion is proved by two skilles, on is, for praier meritory and of valew schold be a werk procedyng of hey and perfit charite, accept no persones, quia diliges proximum, etc. Wherefore us thenkes that the gift of temporel godes to Priestes and to almes-houses, is principal cause of special praier, the which is no fer fro symony. Another skil for special praier, mad for men dampned to everlastand payne, is to God gretly displesant, and thow it be dowe, it is likli to trewe Christes peple, that the fownders of almes-houses, for her venymous dotation ben for the most part passed the brode well. The correlary is, the prayer of value springand out of perfect charite schold embrace in general, al tho that God wold hal saved, and leve merchaundys now usyd for</p> |

quos Deus vult salvare, et dimittere debent mercancias orationum spiritualium modo usitatarum pro mortuis hominibus factas mendicantibus Possessionatis et aliis Presbyteris peculiaribus animarum, qui sunt populus magni oneris toti regno manutinentes in otio; quia probatum extitit in quodam libro quem Rex audivit, quod centum domus elemosinarum sufficerent toti regno, et ex hoc contingeret maximum commodum possibile parti temporali.

spiritual prayers, ymade to mendicaunts, possessioners, and other soul Priestes, the which ben a pepel of grete charge to al the reme mayntenyd in idlenes; for it was proved in a boke, that the Kyng hard that a hundreth of almes-hous suffised to all the reme, and there schold fal the gretest encrease possibil to temporel parti.

Octava quaestio necessaria referri populo decepto, peregrinationes, orationes, et oblationes, caccis imaginibus crucifixi et surdis imaginibus de ligno et lapide sunt propinqua naturac idolatriac et multum distant ab operibus caritatis sive elemosinac, et quamvis prohibitac imagines sint liber erroris. populo laicali, adhuc imagine sauctac Trinitatis usualis est maxime abominabilis. Hanc quacstionem Deus aperte monstravit, mandando opemm misericordiac fieri hominibus indigentibus quia ipsi sunt imago Dei in majori similitudine quam lignum vel lapis; quia Deus non dixit, Faciamus lignum vel lapidem, etc. sed hominem ad similitudinem nostram, quia altus honor latria a

The eight conclusion nedful to tell to the pepel begiled, is the pilgrinage, prayers, and offering made to blind rodes, and to defe ymages of tre and of ston, that be ner of kyn to ydolatri, and fer fro almes dede. And thow this forboden ymageri, be a boke of error to the lewde pepul, yit the ymage usuel of the Trinitie, is most abhominable. This conclusion God openly schews, commandyng to do almes-dede to men that be nedy, for thai be the ymage of God in a mor liknes than the stok or stone: for God sais not, Faciamus lignum ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram, bot Faciamus hominem, etc. for the hey worchip that Clerkes clepen latria, longes to

Clericis vocatus soli debetur Deitati; et honor vocatus dulia debetur homini vel angelis, et aliis creaturis inferioribus. Correlarium: officium de ligno crucis bis in anno celebratum in nostra Ecclesia est plenum idolatria, quia si lignum crucis, Christi lancea, et elavi essent tanto honore venemndi, tunc labia Judac proditoris solennes essent reliquiac, si quis posset illa obtinere: sed nos rogamus to peregrine quam oblationem facis ossibus sanctorum incrimatorum in aliquo loco ut intendis relavare indulgentiam sanctam in coelo, vel domus pauperis elemosinariae quae ita bene dotatur, qui Deus novit quomodo homines qui modo canonizantur, et ut apertius loquamur fideles Christi supponunt quod puncta propter quae moriebatur nobilis vir quem homines appellant Sanctum Thomam, non sunt causa martyrii nec fuerunt.

the godhede alone; and the low worchip that they clepen dulia, perteneth to man and to angels, and to lower creatures. The correlary is, that the service of the rode tre donn twyes every yer in our Chirch, is ful filled of ydolatrie; for if the rode-tre, nail, sper, and the crowne of God schoul be so heyle worchiped, than were Judas lippes, who so myght ham gete a wonder gret relick. Bot we pray the pilgrine us to tell, what thow offers to seintes schryned in any place, wheder releves you the seint that is in blis, or the pore almes-hous that is so well endowed for men canonized God wot how. And to speke more in plain, trew Christen men supposen, that the point of that noble man, that men clepen Seint Thomas, were no cause of martirdome.

Nona quaestio quae deprimit populum, est, quod articulus confessionis dictus necessarius hominum salvationi cum potestate ficta vel practensa absolutionis, exaltat sacerdotum superbiam, et dat iis opportunitatem occultae vocationis alterius quam dicere volumus in praesenti: quia domini

The nint conclusion that holdes the pepel low is, that the articles of confession that is said necessari to salvacion of man, with a feyned power of absolucion, enhaunceth priestes pride, and gyf hem oportunitie of prive calling, other than we will now say. For lordes and ladys

et dominac sunt arrestati propter timorem suorum confessorum qui non audent dicere veritatem: et tempus confessionis est tempus valde aptum precationi et continuatiionis peccatorum mortalium; dicunt etiam se esse commissarios Dei ad iudicandum de quolibet peccato ad deformandum et purgandum illos quos volunt. Dicunt se habere claves coeli et infemi, et excommunicare possunt vel benedicere, ligare vel solvere, secundum propriam eorum voluntatem in tantum quod propter bursellum frumenti vel duodecim denarios annuatim ipsi volunt vendere gloriam regni coelestis cum clausa warantisationis sigillata communi sigillo eorum. Haec quaestio est visa in usu, quae alia non indiget probatione.

ben arrested that for fete of here confessours they dur not seyn a trewth. And in tyme of confession is the best tyme of wowing, and of prive continuance of dedely synne. Thai seyn thai ben comissaries of God to deme of every synne, to foulen and to clense whom so thai like. Thei sai that thai have the keyes of heven and of hell, they may curse and bless, bynd and unbynd, at her own will; insomuch that for a busshel of whete or twelve pence be yer, thei will sell the bliss of heven be chartir, of clause, of warrantise en sele with the commun sele. This conclusion is so seen in use that it nedyth no other prof.

Correlarium: Papa Romanus se fingit altum thesaurarium totius Ecclesiae, habens dignum jocale passionis Christi in custodia, cum meritis omnium sanctorum coeli, per quod dat fictam indulgentiam a poena et a culpa, est thesaurarius maxime bannitus extra caritatem ex quo potest libemre omnes prisinarios existentes in poenis ad voluntatem propriam, et scriptum facere nunquam venire ibidem: sed

Correlarium, the Pope of Rome that feynet him hey tresorer of holi Chirch, havand the worthi jewel of Christes passion in hys keyping with the desertes of al hollowen of heaven, by which he geveth the feyned pardon, a poena et a culpa, he is a tresorer most banyst out of charite seyn he may deliver the prisoners that ben in payn at his own will, and mak himself so that he schall

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>quamlibet Christianus fidelis bene potest videre quod multa secreta falsitas est abscondita in Ecclesia nostra.</p> | <p>never com there: her may every trew Christen man wel se that ther mich prive falshede hid in our Chirche.</p> |
| <p>Haec est decima quaestio; homicidium per bellum, vel per legem justiciac aliquam practensam, perpetratum propter causam temporalem vel spiritualem, sine speciali revelatione, expresse est contrarium Novo Testamento, quod est lex gratiac et plenum misericordiac. Haec quaestio manifeste probatur exemplo Christi pracdicantis hic in terra, qui maxime docuit dimittere inimicis et misereri adversariorum, et non occidere eos: cujus ratio est, pro majori enim parte quando homines pugnant post primum, ictum dirumpitur cantas, et quicumque caritate in morte exiit, transit recta via ad infema. Et ultra hoc nos bene novimus quod nullus Clericus scit per sacram Scripturam invenire vel rationem legalem ostendere quod poena mortis est infligenda potius uni peccato mortali quam alteri; sed lex misericordiac, quacst Novum Testamentum, prohibet omne homicidium in Evangelio, dictum est antiquitus, Non occides.</p> | <p>The tent conclusion is, that manslout be batail or onn law of rigtwisenes, for temporel cause or spirituel, without special revelacion, is expresse contrarious to the New Testament, the which is a law of grece, and full of mercy. This conclusion is oponly proved be ensample of Christes preching here in erthe, the wyche most taugte for to lowe and have mercy of his enemys, and nogt for to sle hem. The reason is of this, that for the more party ther men figt affter the first stroke charite is ybroke, and who so deyth out of charite goth the hey way to hell. And over this, we know wele that no Clerk can fynde be Scripture or be reason, lawful punischment of deth, for on dedely synne and not for another. Bot the law of mercy, that is, the New Testament, forbede al manslaughte in Evangelio, dictum est antiquis, Non occides.</p> |
| <p>Correlarium est, sancta spoliatio pauperis populi, quando domini</p> | <p>The correlary is, it is holi robbing of the pore pepil whan lordes</p> |

premant indulgentias a poena et a culpa hiis qui subsidia conferunt exercitui eorum collecto ad interficiendum Christianum populum in terris remotis propter bona temporalia obtinenda sicut alias fieri vidimus, et milites qui discurrunt ad Paganiam vel Sarracenos ad obtinendum sibi magnum nomen in occisione hominum, acquirunt sibi indignationem magnam Regis pacis, quia per humilitatem et tolemntiam lex nostra extitit multiplicata, et pugnatores ac homicidas odit Christus, et eisdem minatur, dicens, Qui gladio percutit gladio peribit.

purchas indulgence a poena et a culpa to hem, that helpeth to his ost to al the Christen men in ferre londes for temporel goode as we haf seen, and knyghtes that renne to heyennes to geten hem a name, in sleying of men get mych maugre of the Kyng of pees; for be meknes and sufferaunce, our beleve was multiplied, and figters and mansleyrs, hem Christ hateth and manasseth, Qui gladio percutit gladio peribit.

Conclusio undecima verecunda; dictum votum continenciæ factum in nostra Ecclesia a mulieribus quæ sunt fragiles et imperfectæ in natura, est eausa horribilissimi peccati possibilis naturæ humanæ; quia quamvis occisio puerorum ante baptismum eorum, procuratio aborti, aut destructio seminum ante formatum foetum, facta per medicinas, sint gravia peccata valde: adhuc conjunctio mutua foeminarum contra naturam in actu camali, vel earum coitus cum bestia irrationali, vel cum creatura insensibili non viva, transcendit in demeritoria actione, dignum poenis infemi.

The elevent conclusion ys scham for to say, that the avowe of continence made in our Chirch of wymmen, the wych ben febil and unperfite in kynd, is cause of brynging of most horribel synne possible to mankynd; for thow sleying of childeren or thei ben christened, abortyfe, or stroying of kind be medicine ben ful synful: yit knowing hem self, or unreasonable best, or creature that bereth no, passyd in worthiness to ben punished in paynes of hell.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Correlarium; nos vellemus quod viduac et tales quae voverunt castitatem, investitac annulo et mantello, deliciose pastac, vel delicate nutritac, essent desponsatac, quia eas nescimus excusare de occultis peccatis.</p> | <p>The correlary is, that wydewes, and such as han taken the mantel and the ryng, deliciouslych fed, we wold thei were wedded, for we ne can excuse hem of pryvy synnes.</p> |
| <p>Duodecima quaestio: multitudo artium non necessariarum homini in nostra Ecclesia, multum peccatum nutrit in superflua curiositate et diffiguratione hominum per vestes curiosas: hoc ostendit experientia, et ratio probat, quia natura cum paucis artibus sufficeret humanac naturac.</p> | <p>The twelf conclusion is, that the multitude of crafftes nogt nedful used in our Chirche norisch mykel synne in wast curiosity and disgysing. This schewes experiance, and reason proveth, for nature with a few crafftes sufficed to nede of man.</p> |
| <p>Correlarium; ex quo Apostolus Paulus dicit, habentes victum et quibus tegamur, his contenti simus; nobis videtur quod aurifabri, et fabri armorum, et omnia genem artium non necessariarum homini secundum Apostolum, destrui debent propter augmentum virtutum: quia quamvis istac duac artes nominatac, necessariac fuerunt in veteri lege, Novum tamen Testamentum has artes cum multis aliis evacuavit.</p> | <p>The correlary is, that sais Seint Poule, we havand our bodily fode, and cleying we schuld hold us payed. Us think that goldsmythes and armorers, and al manner crafftes, not nedful to man afer the Apostel, schuld be destruyed, for the ences of virtu. For thow this twey crafftes nemed wer mych more nedful in the old law, the New Testament has voyded these and many other.</p> |

I suppose it is not necessary, after the perusal of this piece, to observe, that the Romish Clergy cast those crimes upon the Lollards, whereof themselves were guilty, and which the Lollards laid to their charge in the face of heaven and earth.

It will be said, perhaps, that this petition contains several errors; I own it: but we are to observe, first, that it is part of the frailty of mankind, to fall into the contrary extreme, whilst we endeavor to avoid those things that appear to us to be mortal. Secondly, that these failings may be easily extenuated by the same charity which we commonly make use of, when we speak of the ancientest fathers of the Church.

But this, will some object, respects only the Lollards of England, and cannot be extended to the justifying of the Lollards of Germany, who might have been guilty of the crimes whereof they are accused. To this objection I answer, first, that since the Lollards, according to the testimony of Kilianus, reported by M. du Cange, were the same with the Waldenses; the Bishop of Meaux hath already drawn up their apology, by maintaining, that they differed only in a very few things from the Papists. Secondly, that if one should reject the Bishop's opinion, yet sufficient matter for their justification may be found in the writings of the more honest authors of the Romish communion, such as AENEAS Sylvius and some others, without speaking of their own writings or apologies, whereof we have some few remnants printed.

Be it as it will, to return to our English Lollards; Fox, in his Acts and Monuments, gives us a bull of Pope Boniface IX. directed to John, Bishop of Hereford, to oblige him to put King Richard II. upon persecuting of them. As likewise the bull sent to King Richard on the same subject, which imports, that he had commanded the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to prosecute them with the utmost rigour and severity; and afterwards sets down the commission of Richard II. for the trial of one Walter Brute, one of that party.

He hath also given us the history of the manner of their being hanged and burnt by the King's order in 1414. But because it will be of moment to acquaint the public in what points they chiefly differed from the Church of Rome; and because there is come into my hands a register of some of the ancient Bishops of Salisbury, wherein are contained many trials of these ancient Christians, I thought it necessary to add some of those trials at the end of this book, faithfully copied from the original. There is no doubt but that there are many of them in the registers of Canterbury, of York, and of several other sees, which could demonstrate, that the Romish

Clergy have never, till the very Reformation, omitted their utmost endeavors towards the extirpation, by fire and fagot, of all those that rebuked them for their vices, and for the corruption of their doctrine.

CHAPTER 23

Of the doctrine of Wicklef and his disciples in England.

BUT whether the Lollards maintained the doctrine of the Albigenses in England or no, certain it is, that it received new lustre from the learning of Wicklef, and those who joined with him in the defense of the truth, against the Friars and Court of Rome. My design is not to examine the whole history of Wicklef and of his disciples to the bottom: the Bishop of Meaux hath done his endeavours to blacken them, and to load them with the foulest calumnies: I only say in short, that the Bishop did not take the pains to consult what Mr. Wood hath writ on this subject, in his History of the University of Oxford; where he cites the registers of the University, which refute the greatest part of those slanders that the Romish party have published against Wicklef.

However, thus much is evident, that John Wicklef was the most renowned man of that age, both for learning and piety. He had been educated at the University of Oxford, where scholastical divinity had established its empire, by the care of Robert Grosthead, John Duns, Occam, Richard of Armagh, and divers others. He there publicly professed divinity, and was at last made Rector of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, where he died peaceably, after great and long troubles, which he suffered for the defense of the truth.

The Pope had at this time usurped almost the whole royal authority, and more especially in England, where, after King John had made himself a vassal of the Church of Rome, under Innocent III. the Popes commanded the Kings of England at pleasure. We see by the writings of Herveus Brito, who wrote at Paris about the beginning of this century, where he was Professor, that the temporal power over all the world was directly attributed to the Pope, neither did any kings oppose themselves against it. It is well known that the canonists, who had then the reputation, had no other song in their mouths but that of the Pope's divinity, his succession to the rights of Jesus Christ, and consequently his absolute empire over all the world. This we meet with in all their writings, and more especially in

those who writ in defense of the Popes, against the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria.

The Friars Mendicants, whom Cardinal Albizi did very truly call the Pope's soldiers, had usurped all the rights of the secular Clergy, and advanced their conquests for the Pope to that degree, that the authority of the Princes and Bishops signified nothing any longer in England, except only when they acted in favor of the Monks. From the time of Matthew Paris, who gives us so strange a description of their insolence, and of their attempts against the authority of the Clergy, things were carried to that height, that nothing was any longer able to oppose them.

Without doubt there was great need of courage, as great as Wicklef's was, and learning too as vast as his, to stop so impetuous a torrent. This great man set himself against it, and carried on his design after such a manner, that the effects and consequences of it continued to the very Reformation. It would take up a volume to give a particular account of what he wrote in the reigns of Edward III. and Richard II. I shall content myself to take notice only of some few particulars, and I shall afterwards treat of his doctrine, which diffused itself through Germany, and brought about a great reformation there.

1. He publicly opposed, in his Professor's chair, several errors of the Church of Rome, which the Monks and Popes by their authority endeavored to maintain and countenance; in which undertaking, he was always backed by the body of that University where he had taught so long time.
2. He maintained his doctrine by the favor of the Court, and the most illustrious and learned members thereof, and with so great a satisfaction of the people, that Knighton is obliged to acknowledge, that one half, yea, the greater part of the people owned his doctrine.
3. He had made so great progress amongst the Clergy, that he writes himself, that above a third part of the Clergy were ready to defend his doctrine with the hazard of their lives: accordingly he appeared boldly at the synod of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in February 1377, to give an account of his doctrine; where he defended himself with that vigour, that none durst gainsay him. He appeared there again the same

year in May, neither durst the Archbishop, then decide any thing against him. And when in the year 1382, they in his absence condemned some articles which he maintained, yet he was there defended by the deputies of the University of Oxford, who gave a public and authentic testimony of his piety, and his purity in the faith.

4. The University of Oxford had espoused his quarrel with the Church of Rome so far, that after his having been attacked by a council at London, in 1382, and after having maintained his doctrine from the year 1367 with public applause, his writings continued recommended by a decree of the University, to all the students, both in the public schools and colleges, and were not forced from them till after his condemnation, which happened at the Council of Constance, twenty-eight years after his death. We see the esteem Wicklef had in that University, by the testimony they gave in 1406, against those that endeavored to blemish the memory of this great man: for after they had spoken of his piety and probity, as of a thing known to all men, after they had declared that he was a courageous defender of the faith, they add, *qui singulos mendicitate spontanea Christi religionem blasphemantes, sacrae Scripturae sententiis catholice expugnavit:*

“that he had in a Catholic way, by texts of Scripture, overthrown all those, who by a voluntary poverty blasphemed the religion of Christ.”

And since the Romish party had not at that time a more formidable enemy than Wicklef, they were not wanting to muster all their forces in order to suppress his doctrine. In the year 1396, William Woodeford, a Cordelier, was chosen by Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, to write against Wicklef’s Trialogue, which he did accordingly, refuting eighteen articles of his doctrine. This book is printed in the Fasciculus.

In the year 1411, Thomas Walden, an Englishman, deputed to the Council of Constance, dedicated his Doctrinal to Pope Martin V. against Wicklef, where he accuseth him of above eight hundred errors. This Monk, as able as he was, was really one of the most passionate disputers that ever writ: but withal it is true also, that to follow his measures, we can scarcely imagine a more particular discussion of the errors, superstitions, and false suppositions, which the Church of Rome makes use of to maintain her

errors and false worship, than that which Wicklef made use of. In the account that Walden gives of it, we meet with a great knowledge of holy Scripture, and great skill in antiquity, whose authority he makes use of to confound the Romish novelties: we discover there a great strength in his way of reasoning, and an extraordinary method in his consequences; so that he seems to have fully penetrated the weakness of the Romish cause, and overthrown its whole foundations.

One may plainly discover this, by running over the titles of the Doctrinal of Thomas Walden, upon matters of faith, upon the sacraments, upon those which he calls sacramental things, or that belong to sacraments; for we scarcely meet with any articles controverted between the Church of Rome and the Protestants, which Wicklef hath not touched and handled, and that with sufficient exactness too. This hath obliged the Papists with so much care to reprint Walden's works against Wicklef, as containing a body of their controversies against the Protestants.

I am not ignorant that Walden objects some very harsh and impious opinions to him, and that the Council of Constance has mingled several of that nature amongst the forty-five articles of Wicklef, which are there condemned. But here I must desire my reader to call to mind four things: First, that Woodeford hath objected no such thing to Wicklef, which shews that he never taught any like doctrine, but that they are only consequences drawn by a scholastical Divine, who was used to carry things too far. Secondly, that Walden wrote at a time when the Popish party had the upper hand in the Court of Henry V. who had condemned the Wicklefites as guilty of high treason, which Walden takes notice of in his dedication to Martin V. Thirdly, that it is very probable that this catalogue of forty-five articles was drawn up by Walden himself, who was present at the Council of Constance on purpose to promote Wicklef's condemnation. Fourthly, that the Council of Constance was the first, where by public consent that maxim, *that faith is not to be kept with heretics*, was ever put in practice. Now let any one judge what equity or truth can be expected from villains of such profligate principles, who think it an honor to act in every thing according to them?

After all this I might well excuse myself from setting down the opinions of Wicklef, or from saying any thing for his justification; but I am willing to

do both the one and the other, for the honor of this great man, and for the reader's satisfaction. The opinions of Wicklef, with relation to the doctrine of Protestants, are these.

CHAPTER 24

*Of the calumnies that have been unjustly charged upon
Wicklef by the Papists.*

1. WICKLEF owns but twenty-two canonical books of Scripture, excluding all the rest, which he calls apocryphal.

2. He teaches that the Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation.

“Forasmuch,” saith he, “as in Scripture all truth is contained, it is evident that all disputes that take not their rise thence are profane. We are not to admit any knowledge or conclusion, which hath not its testimony from Scripture.”

3. He affirms, that every well-disposed Christian may understand the holy Scripture.

“God hath appointed the common sensible Scripture to the comprehending of the catholic sense, whereof God can never be wanting, because he always enlighteneth some particular men, to which illumination holiness of life conduceth very much, and it is the duty of divines to continue it in our mother the Church, which ought to keep within her bounds; so that it is not lawful for divines to frame strange doctrines, besides the faith of catholic Scripture.”

For which end he lays down several rules for the understanding of the Scriptures.

4. He asserts that the Scriptures ought to be translated into the vulgar tongue.

“The truth of God,” saith he, “is not more confined to one language than to another. Jesus Christ delivered the Lord’s Prayer in a known language. Why then may not the Gospel and other parts of Scripture be writ in English? The Clergy ought to rejoice that the people know the law of God.”

It was for this reason that he translated the whole Bible, whereof several copies are still to be found in the King's library, and in several other libraries in England.

We may easily know what he thought of tradition from these words:

“We have a perfect knowledge of all things necessary to salvation, from the faith of Scripture. Decrees, statutes, and rites, that are added according to human traditions, are all inseparably sinful, because they make the law of God more difficult to be kept, and hinder the course of God's word. Traditions are hateful to God and the Church, except only so far as they are grounded on Scripture. Men's own inventions are chiefly to get money: they all sound for the Church's gain.”

1. See what he saith of the Pope's authority.

“In Constantine's time the priesthood was removed; and it was not decreed, that the Bishop of that Church should necessarily have a primacy over all others, as is here supposed. Neither do I believe that any Catholic is so foolish as to believe, that when Christ's vicar writes, Let it be done, and he who spake the word and all things were made, doth not approve of it, he hath any right to command, because of him alone it can be said with truth, So I will, and so I command; let my will stand instead of reason.”

And accordingly he was condemned by the Council of Constance for believing, that it is ridiculous to suppose the Pope to be the highest Priest; and that Christ never approved of any such dignity, neither in Peter nor in any one else.

2. Of the power which the Popes assume to themselves over the temporalities of kings, Wicklef wrote a particular treatise, entitled, *De Civili Dominio*, to overthrow their claims, where he speaks thus:

“In civil power there cannot be two lords of equal authority; the one must be principal, and the other subordinate. We will not subject our King in this matter to him, when he, bestowing any mortmain, reserves to himself the capital dominion.”

3. He did not believe the Pope's infallibility.

“The Pope may sin as head of the Church. He may sin by nature, having a capital Lord above him. There is no doubt but that an error may be committed in the election of a Pope, and yet more in his following conversation. He may err in feeding the churches, or in articles of the faith. Many Popes have been corrupted with heretical pravity. He believed it was probable, *that all the Bishops of Rome, for three hundred years and more before his time, were fully heretics*”.

4. He made no difficulty of saying that the Pope was the chiefest Antichrist.

1. Wicklef informs us what his thoughts were of the Church of Rome, when he saith,

“It is possible that the Lord Pope may be ignorant of the law of Scripture, and the Church of England may be far truer in her judgment of catholic truth, than the whole Church of Rome that is made up of the Pope and Cardinals”

2. He maintains that the Church of Rome may err, but that this doth not hinder, but that the purity of doctrine may be preserved in the catholic Church.

“It is necessary,” says he, “that the Catholic faith be in the whole mother Church.”

3. He did not believe that wicked men were true members of the Church; and censures those who teach, that men who shall be damned are notwithstanding members of the Church, so joining Christ and the Devil:

“*They teachen together,*” saith he, “*that the men that shall be damned be members of holy Church, and thus they wedden Christ and the Devil together.*”

he saith, that unbelieving and ungodly men

“*are in the holy Church by body, not by thought, by name, not by deed; in number, not by merit.*”

As to the doctrine of justification, it is very plain, that he was not of the opinion of the Church of Rome, as these words shew:

“The merit of Christ is of itself sufficient to redeem every man from hell: it is to be understood of a sufficiency of itself, without any other concurring cause. All that follow Christ, being justified by his righteousness, shall be saved as his offspring.”

He rejects the doctrine of the merit of works, and falls upon those which say,

“that God did not all for them, but think that their merits help. Heal us Lord for nought, that is, no merit of ours, but for thy mercy: Lord, not to us, but to thy mercy give thy joy.”

As for what concerns the Lord’s Supper, we find that this great man did not believe transubstantiation. See how he expresses himself;

“This bread is fairly, truly, and really, spiritually, virtually, and sacramentally, the body of Christ; as St. John the Baptist was figuratively Elias, and not personally. As Christ is both God and man at once, so the consecrated host is the body of Christ and true bread at the same time, because it is the body of Christ at least in a figure, and true bread in its nature; or, which signifies the same thing, it is true bread naturally, and the body of Christ figuratively. He constantly affirmed that this doctrine *lasted in the Church for a thousand years, till Sathanas was unbound, and the people blinded by Friars, with the heresy of accidents without subjects.*”

1. He owned but two sacraments, as appears by the 45th, 46th, 47th, and 48th articles, condemned at Oxford, and in the Council of Constance.
2. He was against the use of chrism in Baptism.
3. He maintained that Extreme Unction was not a sacrament.

“If corporal unction were a sacrament, as now is pretended, Christ and his Apostles would not have been wanting to declare it to the world.”

4. His opinion concerning confirmation, as it is practiced amongst the Papists, he expresseth thus:

“As for the oil wherewith the Bishops anoint children, and the linen coif that covers the head, it seems to be a vain ceremony, that can have no foundation in Scripture, and that this confirmation, being introduced without any apostolical authority, is blasphemy against God.”

1. He declaimed against the use of images with great earnestness.

“We ought to preach,” saith he, “against the costliness, beautifulness, and other arts of cheating, wherewith we impose upon strangers, rather to pick their pockets, than for the propagation of Christ’s religion. The Devil by his falsehood deludes many, who sometimes suppose a miracle to have been wrought, when indeed it was nothing but a cheat. The poison of idolatry lies hid in continued imagination.”

2. One may see how he distinguisheth sins:

“Some sins are called little sins in comparison of greater, and venial, because God’s Son forgives them.”

3. He did not own the necessity of auricular confession:

“Vocal confession made to the Priest, introduced by Innocent, is not so necessary. If a man be truly contrite, all outward confession is superfluous and unprofitable to him.”

4. He wrote against the doctrine of satisfaction:

“The present Pope has reason to blush for the modern penance, established by him without any ground, since it is not lawful for any mortals, no, not for the Apostles themselves, to make the law of God difficult beyond what he himself hath limited.”

5. His judgment concerning pardons and indulgences he expresseth in these words:

“It is a foolish thing to rely upon the indulgences of the Pope and the Bishops.”

6. He gives this rule concerning fasting:

“In works of humanity we must follow Christ, by doing such works as bear some proportion with his. — We must fast forty days from sin, and, as far as is possible to nature, from superfluous corporal food.”

7. Concerning Monks and their vows, he speaks thus:

“Friars studien to be rich: they rob men by begging — Touch a great cup of gold or silver, but not a penny or farthing. They magnify more obedience to sinful men than to Christ.”

8. He approved the marriage of Priests.

9. He disapproved the practice of the Church of Rome in the matter of divorces.

“To make divorce common, innumerable subterfuges are invented.”

10. He blamed the custom of the Church of Rome, in granting dispensations for marrying in case of propinquity of blood.

“Such dispensations as these bring confusion into the Church.”

11. He condemned all equivocation, which so many casuists of the Church of Rome pretend to justify.

12. He maintains that the king ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction;

“for otherwise,” saith he, “kings would not be able fully to keep the peace in their own kingdoms.”

13. He blamed the too frequent use of excommunication.

14. He maintained,

“that a true Christian ought not to believe implicitly, but with an explicit faith, that expresses the particulars, more or less, according as they are more or less obliged by God and his gifts, and the opportunity of time.”

15. He had no great veneration for the doctrine of Purgatory, when he saith,

“Whatsoever is said of purgatory is only spoke threateningly, as so many pious lies.”

Thus we see what was Wicklef’s faith, and what his judgment was concerning the superstitious and corruptions of the Church of Rome; from whence we may gather that he came very near to the belief of the Protestant Churches.

It was no difficult matter therefore for Dr. James to justify him against the horrid calumnies of Walden, by consulting his manuscript works, which are to be found in several libraries in England.

1. They objected against him, that he taught, that if a Priest or a Bishop ordains or consecrates the Sacrament of the Altar, or administers Baptism whilst he is in mortal sin, it can do him no service.

But the falsehood of this objection appears from Wicklef’s own words, which assure us of the contrary:

“Except a Christian,” saith he, “be united to Christ by grace, he hath not Christ the Savior; nor without falsehood can he pronounce the sacramental words, *though they may do good to those who are capable of them*: for it behoves the Priest that consecrates, to be a member of Christ; and, as some holy men express it, to be in some sort Christ himself.”

They objected against him, that he had asserted, that it was not lawful for any ecclesiastical person to have any temporal revenue.

But nothing is more false, for Wicklef only saith, that the goods of the Clergy are temporal things, what way soever they come by them; and that the possession of them is to be regulated by the laws, as well as the estates of laymen;

“*The goods of spiritual men, saith he, be temporal, in what manner soever they come to them, and must be ordered after the temporal law, as the goods of temporal men must be.*”

They said that it was his opinion, that no Prelate ought to excommunicate any person whatsoever, unless he knew that God himself had excommunicated him.

But Wicklef only speaks of those rash and precipitate excommunications, which never fail to produce bad effects, and which are only discharged from carnal respects.

“They, like the High Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees, do not only eat the flesh, but the very bones too; they do not water what is dry with the word of God, but endeavor to cut and break what is fat and full of marrow.”

He saith also,

“that excommunications are the fruit of pride, *to terrify poor laymen.*”

They accused him of teaching, that a man could not be either a Bishop or Priest, as long as he continued in mortal sin.

But no such thing can be inferred from Wicklef’s words; for he, still aiming at the reformation of the Clergy, which was very corrupt in his time, did not carry it too far when he said,

“that it is not the name that makes a Bishop, but the life.

Whosoever has only the name of a Priest or Bishop, and does not endeavor to add to that name the reason of it, he is in truth neither Bishop nor Priest.”

They affirmed, that he had taught that sovereigns might deprive the Clergy of their possessions, if they thought good, as often as they committed any fault.

But Wicklef never pretended, that the Clergy ought to be deprived of the goods they possessed for slight faults. True it is, he did not think the government was obliged to maintain so many useless Monks: but as to the Bishops and Priests, he never taught that they ought to be deprived of their benefices, except they made themselves unworthy of them by a perfectly scandalous life.

He taught, say they, that tithes were only alms, and that the parishioners might keep them back, and put them to what other uses they pleased.

I own that Wicklef often said, that tithes were nothing else but mere alms; but it is false that ever he asserted, that the parishioners might keep them back: on the contrary, he saith,

“It belongs to parishioners, for the good of their souls, to minister tithes and oblations to whom they are due. The Priests of Christ ought to withdraw the word of God from those who are not rightly disposed for it; that is, if the people should be so obstinate and disobedient to holy mother the Church, as either to forbid or not to minister the necessaries of life to him who preaches the Gospel to them.”

They object against him, that he despised temporal things too much, for the love which he had for those that are eternal; and that he joined himself to the Mendicant Friars, approving their poverty, and commending their perfection. A strange crime indeed!

It is a surprising thing to see them accuse Wicklef upon this account; but it is no less astonishing to hear them assert, that he had great inclination for the Begging Friars: to be convinced of the falsity whereof, we need only read the complaint he made to the Parliament, and his treatise against the order of Begging Friars.

He held, say they, that Churchmen ought to beg.

Whereas, on the contrary, he maintained, that God had condemned beggary, in the Old and New Testament. See the fifth chapter of his book against the order of Friars Mendic.

They accuse him for condemning lawful oaths.

But this is for want of having read his works; for it appears by his Latin *Exposition of the Third Commandment*, and by his book *Of the Truth of Scripture*, that he condemns all manner of equivocations and ambiguous expressions, whether with oaths or without. He will not have any one to lie for a world, or to save an infinite number of souls, and much less to swear falsely.

He taught, say they, that all things come to pass by an absolute necessity.

We may easily see what Wicklef believed concerning this matter.

“God promiseth no man either reward or punishment, but under either a tacit or express condition. Though all future things do happen necessarily; yet God wills that good things happen to his servants through the efficacy of prayer.”

He taught, said they, doctrines tending to sedition; as, that the magistrate ceaseth to be a magistrate whilst he is under mortal sin; and that it is lawful for the people to chastise their princes whenever they commit any fault. This accusation is only founded upon this, that Wicklef put the king and all other inferior magistrates in mind, that they did not bear the sword in vain. He saith,

“If a king fails to do his duty, and despiseth the engagements that lie upon him to govern his subjects well, that he is not properly nor truly king, that is to say, he doth not perform the duty of a king;”

perdens nomen officii et ordinis in effectu;

“losing in effect the name of his office and order:”

which are the very terms of Bracton, the most renowned lawyer of England, who was never accused of endeavoring to incline the people to rebellion.

They accused him of not having the modesty that a Divine ought to have, and that he was too much given to raillery.

I grant that when he was a young man he was blamed for this fault, which he returned in a very edifying manner.

“I take God to witness,” saith he, “that I principally intend the glory of God, and the good of the Church, out of a veneration for the Scripture, and observance of the law of Christ; but if with this intention there may have crept in any sinister aim of vain-glory, worldly profit, and desire of revenge, I am sorry for it, and by the grace of God shall endeavor to avoid it for the time to come.”

They accused Wicklef that he was wont to dissemble his opinions, to avoid the danger which he might otherwise have drawn upon himself.

But we may with truth give him this testimony, that he was so little acquainted with dissembling in matters of religion, that he was ready to suffer death for most of the opinions that he maintained against his enemies.

“I am not suspected,” saith he, “of being afraid to own these conclusions; it shall appear, by the grace of God, that I am not afraid to answer him and his complices, either to his face or in the Schools. If God will give me a teachable heart, a persevering constancy, and charity towards Christ, towards his Church, and towards the members of the Devil, who tear the Church of Christ, that so I may rebuke them out of pure charity, how glorious a cause should I have to die for!”

They say that his rage against the Church of Rome was because the Archbishop of Canterbury had deprived him of a benefice.

But besides that we cannot build much upon the testimony of Monks, who invented this fable; Wicklef himself protests all along, that he had no particular aim in all his writings, and that he only disputes for the honor of God and the edification of the Church.

Lastly, they objected against him, that he maintained that every creature was God; and that God could not hinder himself from obeying the Devil.

But the first part of this objection is ridiculous, and raised by men in a rage, who put a perverse sense upon the following words:

“The word [God] is to be taken in a twofold manner, absolutely, Lord of lords; but when it is contracted, or specified by a mark of diminution, so it signifies any good that a man loves most.”

And the second part of it is wholly grounded upon his manner of explaining the doctrine of providence in the case of sin; which is a subject wherein it would be an easy matter to prove against the Papists, that they have maintained propositions that sound as ill as any thing of his; and nothing but the spirit of slander can impute it as a crime to Divines, that they make use of some improper expressions in a matter which is so difficult to be handled, without seeming to contradict the ideas which we have of the holiness of God, and his hatred of sin.

CHAPTER 25

*That the doctrine of the Albigenses was propagated in Spain,
and that it continued there till the Reformation.*

WHATEVER persecutions have been exercised against the Albigenses by their enemies, yet we are not to think that they were ever utterly destroyed. We find that this persecution continued in a manner without interruption, until the time of the Reformation. Frison, a Divine of Paris, in the Life of Spondanus, Bishop of Pamiers, reports, that that Bishop found a Church of them in the Pyrenaean mountains, where they had found a safe retreat from the violence of their persecutors, and where they lived apart by themselves.

We find the same thing also in Spain, where they spread themselves in great numbers. I grant indeed that there they were very cruelly persecuted under the reign of Alphonso, whose edicts against them and the Waldenses are still to be seen: but their calamities were doubled upon them after the Inquisition was set up, which was not long before the middle of the thirteenth century.

But with all this it was thought necessary to employ the pen against them, as well as fire and other torments. This appears from the writings of Lucas Tudensis, who wrote under Gregory IX. and under his successor, and who jumbles and confounds them with other heretics and with the Manichees, to countenance the method of the Inquisition, and to authorize their bloody executions. It appears from the writings of this Lucas Tudensis, that they disputed vigorously against most of those articles which we find fault with in the Church of Rome; and that to convince them, they were obliged to use other methods than those of disputing, that is, direct violence, which indeed they employed in very good earnest; and we perceive by Emericus's book, entitled, *The Directory of the Inquisitors*, that they spared neither craft nor cruelty to surprise them, and bring them to destruction.

Rainaldus tells us, that in the year 1344, one John du Moulin, Inquisitor of the province of Tholouse, prosecuting the Waldenses violently that were settled there, they retired from thence, some into Bearn, and others into

Arragon, where they were persecuted at the solicitation of this Inquisitor, who made the Bishop of Pampelona take up arms to suppress them.

But yet after all this, we find that the Albigenses were preserved there, and gave no small trouble to the Inquisitors. We have an illustrious testimony hereof in the work of a Friar Inquisitor, of the order of Cordeliers, who wrote in the year 1461 his *Fortalitium Fidei*. In the 11th book, which he entitles, *De Bello Haereticorum*, he sets down these heresies, which he afterwards refutes.

The third heresy is that which some enemies of Christianity do profess, who pretend, that confession has no virtue of its own to procure the remission of his sins to any man. This they prove after this following manner:

First, They say it is clear, that when God pardons sin, he doth it not with any respect to the merit of any man, but of mere grace; whence it follows evidently, that the remission of sins cannot be attributed to a man's confessing of them; for if it were so, we must own that the remission is no longer of free-gift, but that it is a recompense given by God to the merit of him that confesseth.

Secondly, They say, if it be confession that procures a man the pardon of his sins, what will become of that passage in the third chapter of the Epistle to Titus, where it is expressly declared, that *God hath saved us of his mercy, and not according to the works of righteousness that we have done?* Or how shall we explain that in the ninth of the Romans, that *it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy* We know, that the first grace that God works in us is the remission of sins: now if this grace be absolutely the effect of the mercy of God, it cannot be the effect of confession, which by consequence is not necessary to salvation.

And having thus endeavored to defend their opinion by reason, they endeavor also to back it by the authority of the Fathers, and quote St. Ambrose, who saith upon Luke, *St. Peter wept, because his sorrow was so great, that it did not permit him to speak; we find that he wept, but not that he said any thing; I read his tears, but I find nothing of his confession.*

The fourth heresy is of those who acknowledge that we ought to confess, but add, that we are not to confess to man. What need is there, say they, to confess to a man, now under the covenant of grace, seeing that even under the law it was sufficient to confess to God by a single act of contrition? They allege also the authority of St. Chrysostom, who saith, upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, *It is not said, that you need publish what your sins are to the world, neither need you accuse yourself before all mankind; you are only enjoined to practise the exhortation of David in the 136th Psalm, That you spread all the parts of, your life in the presence of God, that you confess to him who is your true Judge, and that you rather express your. repentance by the secret groans of your conscience, than by the abundance of words: this is the true way to obtain grace from Heaven.*

They make use also of another passage of the same Father, were he saith, *If thou desirest to have thy sins blotted out, confess them; but if thou beest ashamed to discover them to any body, repeat them every day in the secret of thine heart: it is not necessary to tell them to men; they might, it may be, afterwards reproach thee with them; but declare them rather to God, who only can give thee such a remedy as thou wantest: and though thou shouldst not confess them to him, yet he still sees thee, he was present, and looked upon thee whilst thou didst commit them.* From all which he concludes, *that we ought to confess our sins only to God.* And this detestable heresy, which is practiced in secret assemblies, hath already infected a great number of people.

The sixth heresy is of those who maintain that it is not necessary to confess to a Priest, when a man can confess himself to a layman.

The seventh heresy is, that we ought to obey none but God alone. This is the error of a certain arch-heretic, called Waldo, from whom the heretics that we now call Waldenses derive their name. This miserable wretch, without being sent from God, took upon him of his own head to form a new sect; and without the permission of any Bishop, without inspiration, without knowledge or learning, set up for a preacher; so that we may well say of him, as Alanus doth in his book against heretics, that he is a wise man without reason, a prophet without a vision, an apostle without being sent, and a doctor who never had instruction. See here how his followers undertake to defend his heresy.

“We see,” say they, “in the fifth chapter of the Acts, that St. Peter and St. John, speaking to the Scribes and Pharisees, tell them, *Judge ye whether it be reasonable to obey you rather than God, and not to do what he commands us, because you forbid us?*”

Moreover, these heretics maintain,

“that if we obey a man when we ought not to obey him, we commit a sin, because then we do not obey God: Samuel,” say they, “saith to Saul, in the 15th of the First Book of Samuel, that *disobedience (or rebellion) is as the sin of witchcraft.*”

Now he that addicts himself to witchcraft, doth in a manner renounce God; but he that refuseth to obey a man, doth not therefore commit the sin of witchcraft, which sin is not committed but where a man refuseth to obey God. We ought therefore to obey God, and not man, because in disobeying man we are not guilty of that sin, but only when we disobey God.

The eighth heresy is what these same Waldenses profess, that supposing we ought to obey any man, it must be such a man as is not under sin himself, and that good Priests only have the power of binding and loosing. This also was one of the errors of John Havel, that is to say, Wicklef, an Englishman, who, amongst many others which he taught, maintained, that a temporal Lord, a Bishop, or Prelate, have no authority as long as they are under mortal sin. And he hath been followed by another fox, who asserted the same thing, John Huss, a Bohemian; and by another viper, Jerome of Prague, who were both of them condemned for heretics in the Council held at Constance in the year 1414, in the presence of Martin V. They say therefore that we ought to be obedient to good Prelates, that is to say, to those who are no less successors of the Apostles in their lives and conversation, than in their charge and function; but as for those whose life and conversation has nothing in it apostolical, they are hirelings, and no true shepherds: they endeavor to support this their error first, by the words of St. Austin, in his book of Baptism;

“That God pardons sins either immediately by himself, or by the members of his Dove, and that the saints can either absolve us of our sins or retain them.”

He saith also upon Exodus, speaking of the plate of gold, which was to be always upon the forehead of the High Priest:

“This plate was the testimony of a good life, and that he only who hath the testimony of a good life, not in a figure, but in truth and reality, can forgive sins.”

So likewise St. Gregory declares,

“That they only in this world have the power of binding and loosing, so as the Apostles had, who retain their doctrine, and imitate their examples.”

And Origen, speaking of the power of St. Peter, saith, that the same is also granted to those who imitate him, because all those that follow the footsteps of St. Peter can also lawfully bind and loose. Lastly, It is said in Malachi, Chapter 2. *I will curse your blessings*; and in Ezekiel, Chapter 13. *Wo to those that quicken the dead souls, and who declare those dead that do not die*. If God, say the heretics, do curse the blessing of wicked Pastors, and declares that the souls which they pretend to quicken do not live; how can he communicate his grace through their channel?

The ninth heresy is professed by the same heretics, who maintain, that it is neither the office nor the order, but only the merit of a good life, which confers the power of binding and loosing, of consecrating and blessing; so that this is their conclusion: The merit of a good and holy life, say they, is of greater efficacy to confer upon any one the right of consecrating and blessing, of binding and loosing, than the order or office: and therefore they have not received any orders; yet they believe themselves to be just, and to have the merits of the Apostles, and so they take upon them to bless as the Priests do, and say, that they can consecrate, bind, and loose: because it is the merit, and not the office, that confers this power. And because they pretend to be the Apostles' vicegerents, they say, that their merit gives them this charge. In this it is that they chiefly oppose the faith of the Church, and declare themselves to be heretics. But they endeavor to defend their heresy by the authority of Esicius, who saith, that the Priests do not bless by their own authority, but only because they represent Jesus Christ; and that it is because Christ is in them, that they can bestow their plenary benediction. And they say, moreover, that not only a Priest,

but every one that hath Christ in himself, and represents him in his life, as Moses did, has the power of conferring blessings.

The tenth heresy is likewise taught by the same heretics, who maintain that the dispensations or indulgences which a Bishop grants at the consecration of a church, or upon any other occasion, are not of any value. Their reason is this; Suppose, say they, that a man be obliged to a penance of three years, at the consecration of a church, and one Bishop releases him of a third part of his penance; a second and third Bishop may do the like, and thus for three half-pence a man shall be released of this three years' penance: and which is more, these sorts of dispensations are unjust, for there is no proportion between a half-penny or a crown, and one whole year's penance.

The eleventh heresy is, that the prayers which are made for the dead, by those who are in any mortal sin, are unprofitable. For, say these heretics, how can these prayers do any service to the dead, since they can do none at all to those who make them? Can prayers, which are hurtful to them that make them, be of any advantage to the person for whom they are designed? *Item, in 3 q. in gravioribus*, it is said, When a judge is solicited for his favour to a malefactor, by any one that he hath no liking to, it serves only to incense him so much the more, and to make him pronounce a more severe sentence: so in like manner, if any man prays without devotion, it is the same thing as if he desired his own condemnation; for how can any man, whose very prayer is sin, obtain by that prayer any good thing for his neighbor? or how can he, whose prayer deserves nothing at the hand of God but punishment, pray profitably for another, seeing God saith to the sinner, Psalm 49. *What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or why dost thou take my covenant into thy mouth?* They call also reason to their assistance; When a Priest, say they, celebrates the Mass, he being in mortal sin, the action that he doth is evil, and deserves eternal punishment, and by consequence he cannot merit for another the pardon of his sins, because it is impossible to merit good and evil, reward and punishment, by the self-same action. They quote the canon law also, which forbids us to assist at the Mass of a Priest, who we are sure keeps a concubine. They prove likewise, by another authority, that men ought not to pray or sing Psalms in the Church, as long as they are under mortal sin.

The twelfth heresy is of those who deny purgatory, and who say, that it is a mere invention of the Church to make the people give alms and offerings, and to be at the charge of pompous funerals for the souls of the deceased, or other things of that nature.

I confess he does not mention the Albigenses by name, and that he confounds these pretended heresies of the Albigenses with others that are much more heinous, and some that were peculiar to some few Monks, and that he attributes some of them in particular to the Vaudois, as if they had been proper to them only.

But one may justly imagine that this Monk, who compiled this work from the writings of other Monks or Doctors of the Church of Rome, had his eye upon the Albigenses, because he acquaints us that he follows Alanus, and that he copies his arguments. Now we know that Alanus wrote against the Waldenses and Albigenses, as the manuscript titles of his books inform us, though, like the author of the *Fortalitium Fidel*, he confounds them in his treatise with the Arians, Manichees, and other pernicious heretics, to render the Waldenses and Albigenses suspected of defending all those heresies which he opposes.

It may be thought strange perhaps, that this Monk did not imitate Alanus, in attributing to the Albigenses the rejecting of transubstantiation, and the consequents thereof; but the wonder will cease, if we consider, that he designed hereby to deprive the Jews, against whom he disputes, of an advantage which they might reasonably draw from some Christians rejecting that opinion, though they owned Jesus Christ to be the Messiah, and the books of the New Testament to be of Divine authority at the same time; and therefore he rather chose to refute the arguments against transubstantiation, as coming from the mouths of the Jews, than as objections made by the Albigenses.

And indeed, except the tenth argument of the Jews against transubstantiation, which supposes the Christians who teach this doctrine to be no better than brute beasts, as not having sense enough to know that Jesus Christ, being a Jew by birth, could not, by the circumstances of his institution of the Eucharist, intend any thing but a figurative meaning, as opposed to a real, and that his Apostles, being Jews likewise, could not form any other meaning in all this ceremony, but such as was figurative;

there is scarce any other which this Monk hath not borrowed from the disputes which the Albigenses and Vaudois have held with those of the Romish party.

We cannot but look upon Petrus Oxoniensis, a Doctor of Salamanca in the year 1479, as a disciple of the Albigenses in divers points, especially those nine conclusions which this author was forced to retract by Sixtus IVth's order, who authorized the Archbishop of Toledo to condemn them. Any man that reads these nine propositions which Caranza sets down, would think that it was only these opinions that offended the Archbishop of Toledo; but if we will but read the bull of Sixtus IV. which has been published by Alphonsus a Castro, we shall find that this Doctor opposed many other points of Popery. The Pope's words, which are very remarkable, are these: *Et alias propositiones, quas propter earum enormitatem, ut illi qui de eis notitiam habent obliviscantur earum, et qui de eis notitiam non habent, ex praesentibus, non instruantur in eis, silentio praetermittendas duximus.*

“And there are other propositions which are of so foul a nature, that we think it convenient to pass them over in silence, that so those who know them may forget them, and those that do not know them, may not be instructed in them by these our letters.”

CONCLUSION

THESE are the remarks I thought fit to make upon the history of the Churches of the Albigenses. I suppose the reader will own that I have deduced their succession from the Apostles, and their independence on the see of Rome with care enough, though the barbarity of the enemies of the truth has done its utmost endeavors to abolish all the monuments, which these illustrious witnesses of it had left in these dioceses.

Neither do I believe, that the Bishop of Meaux will have any pretense for the future, to accuse them of Manicheism, nor to reproach the Protestants, that they can find no other predecessors in antiquity, but a parcel of men whose doctrine and lives were equally execrable. Nothing but a spirit animated with such a rage and fury as produced those crusades, can obstinately maintain such horrid calumnies, after all that we have here alleged for their justification.

I might perhaps have been more particular in the accounts which I have given of the bad construction the Inquisitors have put upon their belief: but besides that I have sufficiently discovered the injustice of these ministers of hell; who is there amongst the Protestants, nay, amongst the very Papists themselves, that is not fully convinced of the iniquity and profound malice of these hearts of tigers; who, under the name of defenders of the Christian faith, have racked their brains to blacken the most innocent lives of the most religious Christians; and who have made it their diversion to exterminate them by the most dismal torments?

The Bishop of Meaux may write as long as he pleases to maintain these diabolical calumnies: I am persuaded, that if any equitable members of his communion will take the pains to compare the carriage of the heathens towards the primitive Christians, with the behavior of his Church under Innocent III. and Gregory IX. against the Albigenses; and the patience of the Albigenses, slandered and persecuted by the Church of Rome, with the condition of the primitive Church, persecuted and slandered by the heathens, they will find it as difficult to look upon the Church of Rome as the daughter of the primitive Church, as it will be easy for them to

acknowledge the Albigenses as the genuine offspring of those primitive Christians.

I did not think it necessary for my design, to tie myself step by step to every particular, which I might justly have found fault with in the book where the Bishop of Meaux handles the History of the Albigenses: it is an endless labor to trace a man that follows false guides, and who hath nothing new besides the art and turn of expression: and because the naked truth hath always the better of works of this nature, it is sufficient to set it in a clear light, for the extinguishing that false lustre which men bestow upon lies, by ornaments put upon them only to hide their deformity.

And it is my hope after all, that as God hath illustriously displayed the care of his providence, in raising the Church of Piedmont from those ruins under which the spirit of persecution thought for ever to have buried it; so he will be pleased to vouchsafe the same protection to those desolate flocks, whom the violence of the Romish party hath constrained to dissemble their faith, by making a show of embracing the Roman religion, to avoid the extremities of their persecution.

One would think that that God, who hath wrought so many wonders for their preservation, so many ages together; and who even then, when they seemed reduced to nothing by the bloody vigilance of the Inquisitors, who age after age have gleaned this field, after the barbarous rage of the crusades was over, should be unwilling to suffer this oppressed light to be wholly extinguished, but that he will make these his witnesses rise from their graves, now after the Church of Rome has signalized her joy for their death and destruction.

God of his great mercy be pleased to restore to these afflicted flocks the same joy and the same comfort which their ancestors felt at the time of the Reformation, when they gave such public evidence of their zeal, and entered by crowds into the bosom of the reformed Church, whose principles they had maintained so many ages before the Reformation; and to open the eyes of their persecutors, giving them grace to acknowledge, that they fight against God, whilst they strive to force men's consciences, and to engage the people to own that religion as divine, which is only the product of human policy, the very sink of the corruptions of these last times, and the offspring of the spirit of error.

*Extracts of several trials of some pretended Heretics
in the diocese of Sarum, taken out of an old Register.*

In the name of the holy Trinite, Fadir, Son, and Holy Goste, his blessed Modir, and al the holy compeny of hevyn; we Austyn Stere, of.... Herry Benette of Spene, William Brigger of Thachum, Richard Hignell, William Priour, and Richard Goddard of Newbery, and every of us severally in the diocess of Sarum, gretely noted, defamed, detecte, and to you, reverend Fadir in God, Thomas, by God's grace, Bishop of Sarum, our Jugge and Ordinarie, denounced for untrew belevyng men; and also that we and every of us shold hold, afferme, teche, and defende openly and prively heresies, errorrs, singular opinions, and false doctrines, contrarie to the commen doctrine of our Modir holy Church; and with subtilites, eville soundyng, and deceyveable to the eres of true sympille understanding Cristen people, which be to us and every of us severally nowe by your auctorite procedyng of office promoted, judicially objected.

First, That I Augustyn Stere, have hold affermed and seyed, that the Church of Criste is but a sinagoge, and an house of marchandise, and that Pristis be but scribis and Pharisais, not profyting the Christen people, but disseyvng them.

Item, I have hold affermed, taught and beveled, that in the Sacramente of the Auter is not the very body of Criste. Farthermore, shewing and seyng that Pristis may bie xxx suche goddis for one peny, and will not selle one of them but for two peny.

Item, I have misbeveled, and to dyvers manyfestly shewed that ymages of seynts be not to be worshipped aftir the doctrine of a boke of Commandments, which I have had in my keping, wherein is wreten, that no man shall worship eny thing made or graven with mannys hand, attending the words of the same litterally, and not inclynyng to the sense of the same.

Item, I have spoken and diverse tymes shewed that Pristis be the enemies of Christe.

Item, I have belevyd, said and taught, that St. Petir was never Priste, but a little before his deth. Ferthermore, shewing that Simeon Magos geve hym

his tonsure of prysthode, and in spyte of hym, Goddis Vicar contempnyng hys power, called hym a panyer maker.

Fyrst, That I, Herry Benett, have hold and kepte this opinion, that pilgremaggis be not to be made moeved for this cause, for only God is to be warsshyped, and so not themmagis of sayntis, insomoch that I wold never goo a pilgremage but onys, and I have ofty n tymes reproved such as wold spend their money in pilgremage doying, seing thei myght better spend hit at home.

Item, I have not belevyd stedfastly in the Sacrament of Thauter, seying of hit this wise, that if there were thre Hostys in one pikkis, one of them consecrate, and the odir not consecrate, a mowse woll as well ete that Hoste consecrate as the odir twayn unconsecrate; the which he myght not, if there were the very body of Criste, for if there were the Fadir, Son, and Holy Goste, he myght not ete theym.

Fyrste, That I, William Brigger, have erred and mysbeleved in the Sacramente of the Auter, seyng and holdyng that there shuld not be the very body of Criste, so taught and enformed in this same grete error and heresie, by one Richard Sawyer, late of Newbery.

Item, I have spoke and hold ayenste the sacramente of Pennance, seing in this wise; If I have take a manis goode, or stole his cove, and be sory in harte, I may as well be saved as though I were shreven thereof, for it is inowe to be shryve to God.

Item, I have held and seyde ayenste the doctrine of Prystys, affermyng of them, that all Prystes techeth a false and a blynd way to bryng us all in to the myer. Ferthermore addyng herto, and seyng, howe may it be that blynde William Harper may lede anodir blynde man to Newbery, but both fall yn to the dyche, so dothe all thes Pristis to bryng us alle to dampnation.

Fyrste, That I, Richard Hignel, have hold and mysbeleved of long tyme in the Sacramente of the Auter, seyng that Christe offer'd to Simeon is the very Saeramente of Thauter, so meanyng and belevyng in myn opinion, that the Sacramente in form of brede shuld not be very Godde, but only Criste hymselfe in hevyn is the Sacrament, and none odir, and so I have

mysbelevyd and continewed in this error and heresie unto this tyme of examnacion.

Item, I have be adherente and associat with hereticks abjured, by whos doctrine I have erred, as I have afore spoken.

Fyrste, That I, William Priour, have said and hold ayenst the auctorite and power of Pristis, callyng them scribis, Pharisies, and thenmyes of Criste, not teching but disseyving the Cristen people.

Item, I have belevyd and divers tymes shewid that ymagis ofseynts be not to be wurshyped, nether oblacions to be made unto them, seyng and holding no such thing to be wurshipped that is graven or made with manys hande.

I, Richard Goddard, in long tyme here before have had grete dought howe God myght be in forme of brede in Thauter, amoste syn the yeres of discrecion; and nowe in fewe yeres thought and utterly beleved that inasmoch as God is in hevyn he shuld not be in the Sacramente of Thauter, and so in this error have continewed unto the tyme of this my present abjuracion.

Thes articules, and every of them afore rehersed, and to us Austyn Stere, Herry Benet, William Brigger, Richard Hignell, William Priour, and Richard Goddard, and to every of us severelly by you judicially objected, we and every of us singularly openly knowlege our selffe, and confesse of our fre wille to have hold, lerned and belevyd, and so have taught and affermyd to odir, which articules and every of them, as us concerneth severelly, we and every of us understand and beleve heresies, and contrary to the comen doctrine and determination of the universalle Church of Criste, and confesse us and every of us here to have be heretikes, lerners and techers of heresies, errours, opinions, and false doctrines, contrarie to the Cristen feith. And forasmoch as it is so that the lawes of the Church of Criste and holy canons of saynts be grounded in mercy, and God wol not the deth of a synner, but that he be converted and seve. And also the Church closeth not her lappe to him, that woll retorne: we therefor and every of us, willing to be partiners of this forseid mercy, forsake and renounce all thes articules afore rehersed as us concerneth particularly, and confesse them to be heresies, errours, and prohibite doctrine: and nowe

contrite, and fully repentyng them all and every of them, judicially and solemnly their forsake, abjure, and wilfully renounce for evermore, and not only them, but all odious heresies, errors, and damnable doctrines contrary to the determination of the universall Church of Christe: also that we and every of us shall never hereafter be to any such persons or person, favorers, counselors, maintainers, or of any such privily or openly; but if we or any of us knowe any such hereafter, we and every of us shall denounce and disclose them to you reverend Father in God, your successors or officers of the same, or else to such persons of the Church as hath jurisdiction on the persons so faulty, so help us God and all holy Evangelists, submitting us and every of us openly, not coerced but of our free will to the pain, rigour and sharpness of the lawe, that a man relapsed ought to suffer in such case, if we or any of us ever do or hold contrary to this our present abjuration in part, or the whole thereof: in witness whereof, we all and every of us severally subscribe with our hands, making a cross, and require all Christian men in general her present, to record, and witness against us and every of us, and this our present confession and abjuration, if we or any of us from this day forwards offend or do contrary to the same; and ye masters her present.....

Lecta et facta fuit ista abjuratio coram reverendo in Christo Patre et Domino Thoma, permissione divina Sarum Episcopo, in ecclesia parochiali Sancti Johannis de Wyndsour nova, per supra scriptos Augustinum Stere, Henricum Benet, Willielmum Brigger, Richardum Hignell, Willielmum Priour, et Richardum Goddard, xxviii die mensis Januarii, anno Domini millesimo cccc nonagesimo, praesentibus tunc ibidem venenabilibus viris magistris Laurencio Cokks, Edmundo Martyn, Johanne Mayhowe decretorum Doctoribus, Dico sacrae Theologiae Professore, Radulpho Hethcote Canonico ecclesiae cathedralis Sarum, Willielmo Thynlawe Vicario perpetuo ecclesiae praefatae, Briano et Willielmo Birley Artium Magistris, Thoma Clerke in Legibus Baccalaureo, et Johanne Wely Scriba et Registrario per dictum Reverendum Patrem in hac parte assumpto, et multis aliis.

Quibus quidem die et loco idem Reverendus Pater injunxit praefato Augustino Stere, in parte poenitentiae suae, quod ipse Augustinus nudus tibi pedes et caput, corpore toga et camisa ac foemoralibus lineis tantummodo indutus, unum fasciculum, sive fagotum super humerum

suum, et unum facem Anglice *a bronde* in manu ejus gestans diebus et locis infra scriptis, *viz.* die Sabbati, xxix die mensis Januarii, anno praedicto, circa mercatum ville de Wyndesour nova, ubi et quando fuerit populi multitudo; die dominica extunc sequenti, *viz.* ultimo die mensis ejusdem, circa ecclesiam parochialem beatae Mariac Rading; die Sabbati, quinto die Februarii, circa mercatum de Newbery; die dominica extunc sequenti, circa ecclesiam parochialem ibidem; die dominica prima quadragesimae in ecclesia cathedrali Sarum; die Martis extunc sequente, circa mercatum ibidem, cacterisque diebus diversis per loca, scil. per monasteria de Seme, Milton, Abbottesbery, Abyndon et Shirborn, necnon circa mercatum ibidem Sarum diocaceseos coram processionibus circa ecclesias, monasteria et loca praedicta, aut in eisdem locis prout acris temperies permiserit, ut moris est faciendis more humilis poenitentis incederet, finitisque hujusmodi processionibus vel cum ab aliquo Curatorum hujusmodi ecclesiarum sive locorum proceditur ad pulpitem quibusdam literis in Anglico scriptis errores et opiniones dampnabiles praedicti Augustini et ipsius abjuracionem in se continentibus, lectis et declaratis per ipsum Augustinum alta et intelligibili voce sua declarando, exponendo et recitando, ac confitendo publice, prout in eisdem literis continetur; de qua quidem poenitentia per ipsum Augustinum bene et fideliter pemcta prout sibi mandatum fuerit per curatos et alios de quibus supra sit mencio praefatus Reverendus Pater et Dominus plenarie et sufficienter fuerit certificatus; unde postea idem Reverendus Pater in tempore certificationis hujusmodi sibi factae in complementum poenitentiae suae injunxit quod singulis diebus vitae suae coram ymagine crucifixi genuflectendo diceret devote, quinquies Oracionem Dominicam, et quinquies salutationem angelicam, et semel Symbolum Apostolorum, et quod injuncto die parassephes et vigiliis beatae Mariac per unum annum integrum immediate sequentem in pane et aqua. *Item*, quod lapso termino.... dierum per dictum Reverendum Patrem assignato ad villam de Newbery, vel ad aliquem locum situatum infra septem milliaria a villa de Newbery praedicta non accideret, nisi ex licentia praefati Reverendi Patris petita primitus et obtenta.

THE END