Black

SOME REMARKS UPON The Ecclesiastical History OF THE Ancient Churches OF PIEDMONT.

By *P. ALLIX*, D. D.

Imprimatur.

Sept. 23. 1689. *Z. Isham, R. P. D. Henrico Episc. Lond. à Sacris.*

LONDON,
Printed for *Richard Chiswell*, at the Rose and Crown in St. *Paul's Church-Yard*, MDCXC.

COLL. REG. OXON. BIBL.

TO THE KING.

May it pleaſe Your Majeſty,

IF Your Majeſty, following the Example of Your Glorious Anceſtors, did not think it an Honour to maintain the Reformed Religion, I ſhould never have undertaken to preſent your Majeſty with a Treatiſe of this nature. This Defence 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*

Hero's 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 alwaies 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. 'Tis 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,

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, whilest 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, whilest 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

of Zeal for the Interests of His Saviour, 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 Defence of these illustrious Confessors of the Truth, whom their Enemies have endeavoured to bear down with their Calumnies, after having born 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, whilest 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 Favour 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

the choicest of his Blessings and Favours, 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

THE

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the First Rise and Original of the Churches of *Italy*. *Pag.* 1.

CHAP. II.

The State of the Christian Religion in the Diocess of *Italy*, until the end of the Fourth Century. *p.* 6.

CHAP. III.

Opinions of Authors of the Diocess of *Italy*, in the Fourth Century, concerning Matters of Faith and Worship. *p.* 14

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Faith of the Churches of the Diocess of *Italy* during the Fifth Century. *p.* 23

CHAP. V.

Opinions of the Churches of *Italy* during the Sixth Century. *p.* 27

Place this between the Epistle Dedicatory and the Preface.

CHAP. VI.

Opinions of the Diocess of *Italy*, during the Seventh Century. p. 33

CHAP. VII.

Some Reflections upon the Liturgy of this Diocess, called the *Ambrosian Liturgy*. p. 36

CHAP. VIII.

Opinions of the Churches of *Italy*, during the Eighth Century. p. 45

CHAP. IX.

Opinions of the Church of *Italy*, during the Ninth Century. p. 57

CHAP. X.

The Faith of the Churches of *Italy* in the Tenth Century. p. 80

CHAP. XI.

An Enquiry into the Opinions of *Gundulphus* and his Followers, before the year 1026. p. 93

CHAP. XII.

Reflections upon some Practices of the Churches of the Diocess of *Italy*. p. 101

CHAP. XIII.

That the Diocess of *Italy* was an Independent Diocess, till after the midst of the Eleventh Century. p. 109

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Concerning the Separation of the Churches of the Diocess of *Italy*, from the Church of *Rome*; and of the Faith of the *Paterines*. p. 118

CHAP. XV.

Concerning the Belief of the *Manichees*, of their rise in *Italy*, their growth, and their establishment. p. 129

CHAP. XVI.

Concerning the *Cathari* spoken of by *Evervinus* and St. *Bernard*, and their Distinction from the *Paterines*. p. 139

CHAP. XVII.

A Continuation of the History of the *Cathari* in *Italy*, as elsewhere, and their Distinction from the *Paterines*. p. 149

CHAP. XVIII.

That the *Paterines* and *Subalpini* were not *Manichees*, as is evident from their Writings, and from their Opinions in the Twelfth Century. p. 159

CHAP. XIX.

That the Churches of *Italy* were not founded by *Peter Waldo*. p. 175

CHAP. XX.

Whether the *Waldenses* were at first only Schismaticks. p. 183

CHAP. XXI.

Concerning the State of the Church of *Rome*, at the time of the Separation of the *Paterines* or *Waldenses*; together with the Accusations charg'd upon them

them by the said Church, and the Idea they had conceived of her. p. 198

CHAP. XXII.

Concerning the Belief and Conduct of the *Waldenses* in *Bohemia*. p. 211

CHAP. XXIII.

Some instances of the Arguments which the *Waldenses* of *Bohemia* waged in their Disputes with the Church of *Rome*. p. 221

CHAP. XXIV.

Concerning the Government of the Churches of the *Waldenses*, and of the succession of their Ministers. p. 238

CHAP. XXV.

Concerning the Persecutions which the *Waldenses* have suffered since the XI. Century. p. 256

CHAP. XXVI.

An Instance of the Calumnies of some Inquisitors. p. 269

CHAP. XXVII.

That the Church of the Valleys of *Piedmont* have constantly perseverd in the same Faith, until the Time of the Reformation. p. 280

CHAP. XXVIII.

Containing the Conclusion of this Treatise. p. 292

TO

THE

PREFACE.

THE *Bishop of* Meaux *has lately published a Treatise, entituled* [The History of the Variations of Protestants.] *He had formed the draught of it some Years ago, to engage the* French *Court to recal the Edict of* Nantes, *without any Scruple or Hesitation. The pretence 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 it self to stand in need of so vain a pretence, 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 bosome of the Romish Church, and whom the same violence keeps there, against the sense of their Conscience.*

This Prelate had before endeavoured in his Exposition of the Roman Faith, where he employs his utmost Artifice to sweeten, disguise and dissemble the matters and difficulties in Controversie, 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 colours. And now in this his History of their Variations, he endeavours to represent to them the Belief of the Reformers, and most illustrious Protestant Doctors, in the strangest colours 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 endeavoured 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 remain'd among the Primitive Christians, upon several points of Divinity; and some of them being no other than meer 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 Controversie, 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 imagin 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

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 expos'd them to so many Miseries; or the profession whereof hindred their settlement in the World. Those who have been forc'd 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 Persecuters 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 censur'd 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'll 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 seduc'd 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 her self 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 Præliminaries, whereas the ground it self has been disputed above these 150. *Years.*

In a word, whatsoever the Reformers may have been, yet 'tis but just that the Church of Rome, *being accused of Heresie, Idolatry and Tyranny, should clear her self 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*

wicked person, and an Hypocrite; and tho' 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 oppos'd 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 lookt 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 examin 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

I know well enough that the strength of our defence 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 Schismaticks, 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 defence 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 Church, should we not take care to justifie their Memory, when we see it so maliciously bespattered and torn.* 3. *That to justifie the* Waldenses *and* Albigenses, *is indeed to defend the Reformation and Reformers, they having so long before us, with an exemplary Courage endeavoured to preserve the ancient Christian Religion, which the Church of* Rome *all this while has endeavoured 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 Murtherer from the beginning; Innocence ought at least to have leave to defend her self against their Calumnies, whilst she willingly resigns to God the vengeance of the Injustice and Violence of those who have oppressed her.*

'Tis 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 ruine about two or three years ago.*

'Tis for those that live in the Neighbourhood 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 perswaded 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 destroy'd the flourishing Flocks of the Province of* Languedoc, *a Country where the Reformation met with so easie a Reception at first, because of the Remainders of the Doctrin 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 endeavour, by making out the Succession of these Churches, as well with respect to their Doctrin 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

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 satisfie 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 practise, is truly Apostolical, cease not to wrangle and prevaricate, upon pretence that we cannot shew 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* Alpes *and* Pyrenæan *Mountains, that they might be exposed to the view of four or five Kingdoms all at once. I begin with the Churches of* Italy.

SOME

ERRATA

PAge 3. lin. 36. *his* r. *thise*, p. 12. l. 13. *cares* r. *care which*, and l. 25. *Theodosius* r. *Gratianus*, p. 27. l. 22. *peccatores* r. *peccatores*, p. 51. l. 15. *venundati* r. *venundati*, and l. 29. *approaching* r. *reproaching*, p. 58. l. 23. *bring* r. *was*, p. 64. l. 20. *mintem* r. *montem*, p. 102. l. 4. *found* r. *has founded*, and l. 6. r. *is unknown*, p. 111. l. 17. r. 556. p. 126. l. 23. r. *Paschasius Radbertus*, p. 130. l. 11. put out *as*, p. 159. l. 28. *which* r. *whose*, p. 254. l. 11. r. *whatsoever has been said*, p. 287. l. 22. r. *who never*, l. 23. *not only*, r. *either*, for *but* r. *or*, p. 290. l. 32. *to be* r. *as*.

SOME REMARKS UPON THE Ecclesiastical History Of the Ancient Church of Piedmont.

CHAP. I.

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 Prætorian Prefect. These Provinces were *Liguria*, *Æmilia*, *Flaminia*, *Venetia*, the *Alpes*, both *Cottian* and *Greek*, and *Rhætia*, or the Country of the *Grisons*. There were three Legions amongst the Troops of the Empire, which peculiarly had the name of *Italick*, because probably at first they had been raised in that Diocess; whereof *Milan* was

the capital City, and the place of Residence of the Lieutenant, we have just now mentioned.

An. 51. n. 54. *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 referrs to the year 51 of our Saviour Jesus Christ; that is, to the 49 year, if we rectifie 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 antient 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 VIII. 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.

Liturg. Pamel. pag. 386. 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 Diocess. 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 Learnedst men of the Church of *Rome* have, in a manner, wholly banished these

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 VIII. Century; as we have hinted. *Baronius* therefore ought to have called to mind here that Judicious Maxim, with reference to History; which he himself alledgeth elsewhere, *Quod sine antiquo Authore 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 writ the Originals of the Churches of *Liguria*; yet I shall take heed of making use of it, my aim being not to gain any thing 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. *Chrysostome*, give not him the same allotment that the later Historians of *Milan* have done. Euseb. hist. l. 3. c. 1. 2. I find it was a thing wholly unknown in the time of St. *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, as also to Pope *Innocent* the First, in the beginning of the Fifth Century. 3*dly*, I do not find that any of the Authors who lived in that Diocess, 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*ly*, *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 his Remarks will not make a greater impression, than all those Fables on which *Baronius*, and

De Præscript. p. 237, & 238 Epist. 1. ad Decent.

Opusc. 5. p. 32.

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* maintain'd, 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 alledged, *Nascentes ex matricibus Apostolicis deputantur ut soboles 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 Diocess 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 *Lions* and *Vienna* were already famous in the second Age, by reason of their Martyrs, Apostolick men having first of all preached in the capital Cities, that the Gospel from thence, as the head Spring, might diffuse it self throughout the whole Diocess, 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 Apostolick Church, to plant the Faith amongst the *Gauls*, did also cultivate the Diocess 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 neighbouring to *Rome*, pursu'd their Victories as far as *Milan* and its Diocess.

I don't think any man can precisely define the time of their preaching, those first Disciples having been much more careful

careful to preach the Gospel, than to write the History of it. For, we cannot relie 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 shew, (as some reformed Divines do) That the *Baganda*, of whom mention is made in the time of *Diocletian*, 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 *Thebæan* Legion, which seems to be confirmed by the life of St. *Babolenus*, published by *Chifflettius* at the end of *Bede*. But this Foundation is of no strength. The Martyrdome of the *Thebæan* 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 St. *Babolenus*, is a ridiculous Legend, being no waies 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 *Baganda*, 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 Diocesses, amongst the *Gaules*, 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 endeavours of his Predecessors; we may very well judge, that the first Preachers of *Milan* and its Diocess, had not subjected *Milan* to the Bishop of *Rome*.

This

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 shew the independence of that Diocess 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.

CHAP. II.

The State of the Christian Religion in the Diocess of Italy, *until the end of the Fourth Century.*

FOrasmuch as we have scarce any Author of this Diocess, 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 Diocess, any other way than by considering the state of the Neighbouring Diocesses, 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. *Ire-*

St. *Irenæus* tell us. Neither did they, without doubt, own any other Tradition, besides that of St. *Irenæus*, 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*.

'Tis 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 lookt upon as Hereticks 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 setled; 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 *Whitsunday*, 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

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 Hony 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 Saviour 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 lookt 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 don't 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 Hereticks, for the Emperours 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 administred the lesser Churches, but so as that their behaviour, as well as their ordination, depended on the Bishop and his Clergy, who exercised Discipline upon the Delinquents. They were the Bishops Counsel, they

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 Three hundred twenty five, 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 endeavoured to introduce the usage of Ecclesiastical Celibacy, and to make it pass into a Law for his Diocess.

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, Murther 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 publick 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 Laicks: oftentimes by their Sollicitations 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 Church-yards 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 Reliques, was carried so far, after the midst of the Fourth Century, that in divers 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 honour of them.

Conf. Ff. Lib. 6. c. 2. St. *Austin* in his Confessions observes that his Mother, willing to observe this *African* Custom at *Milan*, was reproved therefore by St. *Ambrose*, as being a Heathenish, Custom,

Custom, and that she acquiesced in the Bishops 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 Church-yards, afterwards they began to bury in places adjoyning 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 praise worthy.

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 joyned 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 publick 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 Antient 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 cares 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 priviledge 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* endeavoured to attribute and preserve to themselves this Authority, though they could never bring it about, but by means of the favour of the Emperours *Theodosius*, 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 humane 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,

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 Antient 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 Diocess; notwithstanding the Excommunications of one Diocess, did not hinder, but that those who could prove the injustice thereof, might communicate with those, whom the Bishops of another Diocess had Excommunicated.

Sixthly, That every Diocess was lookt 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 perswaded, 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 Diocess of *Italy* in particular, we shall proceed to what farther information we can get from those Authors who have wrote and lived in this Diocess.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Opinions of Authors of the Diocess 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 Diocess 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 Diocess, about the Articles which the Church of *Rome* rejects or receives in common with Protestants. Our business, to speak properly, being only to enquire 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 Diocess, were either altogether ignorant of, or formally rejected 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 easie to convince an unprejudiced Reader, by examining Century after Century the writings of the Ecclesiastical Authors of that Diocess. I begin with St. *Ambrose*, who died *Anno* 397. after having possess'd 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, Arcem Fidei, Oratorem Catholicum*; the Bishop of Virtues, the Castle of Faith, the

the Catholick Orator) can inform us, whether or no his Diocess 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 Fulness 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, satisfie and answer the Questions of Believers. *Lib.* 1. *de fide, ad Gratian. c.* 4.

Would you know, according to what Standard he believ'd 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. *& 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 à 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 Pœnit. c.* 6. And indeed, How could he have spoke otherwise, after the Apostasie of *Liberius* to the Heresie 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 Jacob. & vita beata, lib.* 1. *c.* 5, 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 Offences. *De Bono Mortis, c.* 2.

He

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, & ideo nemo glorietur 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, own'd 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. *& 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, *Savour 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; *Stephen* touched him, because he sought him in Heaven. Jesus Christ is present, according to the manner of our seeking him.

'Tis 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

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 Extream Unction practis'd 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 'tis with respect to the same that he proves, That the Holy Ghost is God, because he has Temples. *De Spir. 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 *bid 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* worshipt Jesus Christ, and not the Wood of his Cross, which she had found; for that is a Pagan Errour, 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 our selves, 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 Hereticks, 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 *Psal.* 118. *serm.* 17.

He sets down for a certain Maxim, That we are bound to separate our selves from a Church that rejects the Faith, and does not possess the Foundation of the Preaching of the Apostles. *Lib. 6. in Lucam, cap. 9.*

We may see, that he was wholly estranged from that Maxim which the Papists have maintain'd these last 600 years, That the Church hath the Power of deposing a Prince who is turn'd Heretick; for he maintains, That the Church has no other Arms but Prayers and Remonstrances, or at the most Excommunications.

T.4.B.P.p.12. 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 determin'd the number of the Canonical Books, which only ought to be read in the Church. *Hær.* 40.

It is plain, he did not believe the Church of *Rome* to be exempt from Error, if he minded what he said; because, *Hæres.* 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 belong'd only to the Church of *Rome* to condemn Heresies, which power she arrogates to her self at this day; because he observes, concerning several Heresies, That the particular Bishops or Councils of the Diocess, where the Heresie 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 Heresie 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, *Hæres.* 89, 90. One may see

see by this whether he was like to have rejected the same upon the Popes determination.

We cannot find that he believ'd Transubstantiation, for giving an account of the Heresie 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 alledged, *Hæres.* 27. And we ought to make the same Reflection on the 30*th.* Heresie 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 attack'd, by the Idolatry which would have been committed by adoring the Water in the Sacrament.

He would never have imployed in defence of the Real Presence, the Acts of St. *Andrew*, which they now adays object to us, to establish the Carnal Presence of Jesus Christ, forasmuch as he maintains, *Hæres.* 40. that those Acts had been feigned by the Manichees.

We find not, when he speaks of *Aëtius*, *Hæres.* 25. that he lookt upon his Opinion against Prayers for the Dead, to be an Heresie.

It is evident, he did not approve of the Principles of Idolworshippers, because he calls their Opinion an Heresie, who thought that man was the Image of God, according to his Body, and not according to his Soul. *Hæres.* 49.

It appears from *Hæres.* 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, *Hæres.* 60, 61, That the *Christian Faith* is more ancient than the *Jewish*; which can no longer now be maintain'd, 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 expresly, That the Sacrifice of the Church is a Sacrifice of Bread *in Mysterium Christi*, to be a Mystery of Jesus Christ. *Hæres.* 96.

He was so sensible with the Protestants, that the Children of Believers have a Right to the Covenant, that he maintains, *Hæres. 69.* That formerly the Patriarchs, Judges, and other Believers, were sanctified in their Mothers Belly. A Doctrine which has so extreamly disgusted the *Romish* Censors, that they thought fit to guard the Margent with a *Cautè lege.*

He asserts, *Hæres. 74.* That he who call'd 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, *Hæres. 77.* That it is by the sole Mercy of Jesus Christ we are saved, *non virtute & justitiâ condignâ*, not by any condign Virtue and Righteousness of our own.

It does not appear that he own'd a Purgatory, such as the *Romanists* do, because, *Hæres. 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 her self, were to pass, at the end of the World: Which Opinion has been since rejected in the *West.*

It appears from *Hæres. 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 Saviour Jesus Christ into Hell, *Hæres. 22.* but in *Hæres. 73.* he terms their Opinion an Heresie, who maintain, That

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 sence, 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 Catholick, according to the famous Maxim of *Vincentius Lirinensis.*

And, forasmuch as St. *Gaudentius* succeeded *Philastrius*, whom he calls a most Apostolical Man, 'tis 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 shewed 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 Priviledge 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'll 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 Re-

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 & vini reficit 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 encreases in times of Peace, and decreaseth in times of Persecution; that she decreaseth with respect to her fulness, but not with respect to her brightness. He seems after her fulness, to which she was arrived, to foresee her wain and decrease, which he had already had a view of, during the Reign of *Arianism*.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Faith of the Churches of the Diocess 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 Cypr.* p. 552, & 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 Diocess. 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 lookt upon as an Article of Faith; yet the Fathers, as well those that

went

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* his 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.*

P. 53. 8. But however, we may observe, that *Rufinus* expresly 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 cum 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 differ'd from that which is now professed by the Church of *Rome*. He plainly asserts the perspicuity of the Scriptures, when he accuses the Hereticks and Jews of darkening it by their perverse Explications, *Serm.* 2. *pag.* 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 favour the *Origenists*, St. *Chromatius* took

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 Bishoprick 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, *pag.* 169. *A.* He owns no other Union in the Church, but the Unity of the Catholick 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. *Conc.* 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, *pag.* 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 eating of it, and that the expression he useth of *à corpore 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, *pag.* 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

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 Diocess of *Italy* was at the same time ravaged by the *Huns*. *Attila* rased *Aquileia*, destroyed *Milan*, *Pavia*, and divers other places. Some years after, *Odoacer* invaded the said Diocess; and not long after, the *Goths* marched through it under the Command of *Theodorick*, 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.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

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 Bishoprick of *Novara* to that of *Milan*, about the year 507. We have three of his Pieces, which he preached upon his return to his See, after the destruction of *Milan*, and his own Banishment.

The first is a Sermon upon the *Canaantish* 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 Remission of Sin, save only a lively compunction, without so much as one word of the Priests Absolution, *pag.* 24. [*Sed dicis, feci peccata multa & magna. Et quis est de hominibus qui non peccet? Tu dic; erravi super omnes homines, sufficit mihi in Sacrificio ista confessio. Dic tu prius iniquitates tuas, ut justificeris: cognosce quoniam peccatores; habe tristitiam cum converteris; esto ac si desperatus & mœstus, sed & lachrymas compunctus effunde. Numquid aliud aliquid fuit in Meretrice, quam lachrymarum effusio? & ex hac profusione invenit præsidium, & acceptâ 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 maist be 'justified; acknowledge thy self to be a Sinner: be full of 'sorrow in this thy Conversion; yea, be grieved, and as 'without hope: moreover, pour forth Tears of compuncti-

 'on.

'on. Do you find ought else in her that had been a com-
'mon 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, pag. 25. [*Et quomodo ausa est mulier Legis ignara, tam iniqua, sic abruptè 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 pœnitentiæ patrocinium, & sola currit, tenet eum in voce ac dicit, miserere mei Domine fili David. Ideo descendisti, ideo carnem suscepisti, ut & ego loquar ad te & cum fiducia petam, &c.*] '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 in-
'treat *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 her self
'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, *&c.* See here a very exact imitation of St. *Chrysostome*, after *Nectarius* had taken away the use of Pœnitentiary Priests.

It is worth our taking notice how he speaks of Prayers without attention, *pag.* 35. [*Sunt multi quidem qui intrant in Ecclesiam, & strepunt in oratione, confusè atque intemperatâ voce dispergunt verba sua, & egressi foras obliti sunt omnia. Hi sunt qui labiis hinniunt, & corde non concipiunt. Si tu ipse dicta tua & 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 thy self dost not know
'what thou sayest or prayest, how shall God hear thee? From whence

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, pag 36. [*Grandis sermo est miserere mei Deus, brevis quidem sed virtute plenus. Nam & si foris fueris, clama & dic, miserere mei Deus. Clama, non voce, sed mente; nam & tacentes exaudit Deus. Nec tam locus quæritur, quantum sensus. Hieremias in Carcere confortatur; Daniel inter Leones exultat; tres pueri in fornace tripudiant; Job nudus sub Divo triumphat, Paradisum de Cruce Latro invenit. Quid ergo si fueris in publico foro? Ora intra te. Noli quærere locum, locus ipse es, ibi ubi fueris ora. Si fueris in Balneo, ora, & ibi templum 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 atten-
'tion in Prayer. *Jeremiah* receives comfort in the Dun-
'geon; *Daniel* rejoiceth in the Lyons 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 publick Market? pray within thy self;
'don't seek for another place, thou thy self art a place; where-so-
'ever 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 quæratur per loca diversa? Deus est qui adest ubique? Si quæris hominem, dicitur tibi non est hic, aut non illic vacat: non est sic in causa Dei; hoc tantum est ut dicas, miserere mei Deus, & ipse propè est ut te liberet, & adhuc loquente te dicit, ecce adsum.*] 'What! is God a Man then
'that thou must take pains to seek him in several pla-
'ces? 'Tis 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

'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, *pag.* [*Mox ut ascendisti de fonte, vestitus es veste albâ, & unctus es unguento Mystico; facta est super te invocatio, & venit super te trina virtus, quam vas novum hâc novâ perfudit doctrina, exinde teipsum tibi statuit judicem & arbitrum.*] 'As soon as thou art come up from the Fountain, thou art 'clothed with white Raiment, and anointed with the Mysti-'cal Ointment; Prayers have been made over thee, and 'the threefold Virtue is come upon thee; after that thy new 'vessel is once fill'd with this new Doctrine, thenceforward 'he has constituted thee a judge and disposer for thy 'self.

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, & assiduè abluit crimina largientium.*] 'Christ being once dipt 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 joyn with it, that expression of his second Homily, *p.* 127. *B.* [*Asperges me aquâ 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 Consummationem mystici operis stare se debere constituit, ita ut humore vestigiorum locum suum depingeret, & longè 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, deciphred the place of his 'standing, and might be seen by those who were at a con-'siderable 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, & 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 88. 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 cœlestis 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 compos'd the Epitaph of St. *Victor*, Bishop of *Noarre*, where we read these Verses;

Hic reddens tumulis cineres, ad celsa vocatus
Spiritus, æthereâ 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

And forasmuch as we see that he in divers places commends St. *Ambrose* and his Successors for Orthodox Bishops, I shall not trouble my self 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 hominum causas Deus voluit per homines terminari, sed Romanæ sedis præsulem, suo, sine quæstione, reservavit arbitrio.* 'Other Mens 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 Judi-'cial Tryal. But they signifie 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* his 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* his 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 shews that he lookt upon himself, as the Head of a Diocess, which was as exempt and separate from the Pope of *Rome's* Jurisdiction, as the Dioceses

Dioceses of the Patriarchs of the East were. *Baronius ad Annum* 546. §. 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 Heretick, 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 Emperour having ordered them to be present at the Council of *Rome*, they were dispensed with by the same Emperour, 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 perswaded at that time of the Popes 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.

CHAP. VI.

Opinions of the Diocess 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 VII. 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.* 1. Of the second we have an Epistle to the Emperour *Constantine*, set down in the same Council. The Union of them both, with the Bishops of *Rome*, for the defence of the Faith against the *Monothelites*, is a strong assurance of their purity in the Faith. Their Opinions are these that follow.

Maurus who stiles 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 Diocess; 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. pag.* 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. pag.* 96. [*Unum omnibus & singulare est Redemptores Dei, & Domini nostri Jesu Christi concessum Remedium ad animarum nostrarum salutem, ut ea quæ per Apostolorum prædicationem percepimus, & Patrum doctrinam, proculdubio teneamus.*] 'The only 'and particular Remedy granted to all for the Salva'tion 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 favour of the *Monothelites*, being supported by the Credit of the Emperors.

Maximus, Bishop of *Aquileia*, expresseth the same Opinions; and moreover expresly 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 conven'd 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 Diocess, under the Reigns of *Perthari* 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 antient Doctors of the Church, *Leo* I. St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, St. *Basil*, &c. *Quicquid hi docuerunt*, saith he, *sapuerunt, prædicaverunt, vel defensores extiterunt, nos eorum acta vel statuta omni devotione suscipimus.* 'Whatsoever they have taught, judged, preach'ed or defended, all that we receive 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 IV. and V. 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 Ambrosius Mediolanensis Ecclesiæ Præsul.* '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 Diocess.

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 endeavoured to make it pass for doubtful: whence it

 appears

appears that in *Italy* they held it for an inviolable Maxim:

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

Secondly, That none were to continue in Communion with him, save only so far 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 Diocess; yet have we something that seems more authentick, *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 Diocess, 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.

CHAP. VII.

Some Reflections upon the Liturgy of this Diocess, 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

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. L.* 5. *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 endeavoured to maintain it. But however we cannot deny the truth of what follows.

First, That this Liturgy has the Psalms, and divers other Texts of Scripture of the ancient Version called the *Italick*.

Secondly, That *Walafridus 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 divers Dioceses fixed a form of Divine Service, to be observed in the respective Churches of the same Diocess; whereas before, *viz.* in the Fourth and Fifth Century every Bishop had the Liberty of prescribing the form himself; so that of *Milan*, conform'd 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.

'Tis 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 publick Offices which

which changes have been introduced with more ease, since the Latin began to be lookt upon as a Barbarous Language.

We have an illustrious proof hereof, in the *Ambrosian* Office, for *Good Fryday*, 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; 'tis 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
P. 301. 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 lookt upon as a Capital inconvenience.

A third proof hereof we have in the Feast of S. *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 ruines, which is a Story drawn from Legends of no ancient standing.

But after all, it is easie 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 XII. 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 favour of

of the Emperour *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. *Regulæ Canonicorum cap.* 18. *Ad primam Clero congregato donant confessiones, suas vicissim dicentes, confiteor Domino & 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,

1. That this Rule, for the most part of it, is borrowed from that of St. *Bennet*, who lived in the Popes Diocess.

2*ly*, That the same has been almost wholly transcribed in the Acts of the Council of *Aix la Chapelle*, in the Year 816.

3*ly*, 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*, *pag.* 224. *& seq.*

Secondly, I maintain that there was nothing in this Liturgy, which imply'd 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 favours 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 favours are begged of God *per preces & 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

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 Fœlix culpa quæ tantam meruit salutem*! 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 practised 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*, *pag.* 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 antient of the School-men, 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, *pag.* 175. *Ut offeram tibi Sacrificium quod instituisti, & offerri præcepisti in commemorationem tui pro salute nostra; suscipe verò istud, quæso, 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

is commonly enough known, that the *Romish* Church has hatch'd that Article her self; 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 contain'd no office for the *Fridays* in *Lent*, which shews, 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, *pag.* 310. *Pignus vitæ æternæ capientes, humiliter te Domine imploramus, ut apostolicis fulti Patrociniis, quod in imagine contigimus Sacramenti, manifestâ perceptione sumamus.* 'Having 'received this pledge of eternal Life, we humbly beseech 'thee, O Lord, that being assisted with Apostolical Suffra'ges, what we have now touched in the Image of the 'Sacrament, we may by manifest perception take and re'ceive. 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 it self.

We find there the Communion under both kinds, *p.* 207. as well as the preservation of those two kinds, 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 oblationem suscipias in sublimi altari tuo, per manus Angelorum tuorum, sicut suscipere dignatus es munera Pueri tui justi* Abel, *&c.* '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*, *pag.* 302, 303. Which Clauses have made the Schoolmen to sweat Blood and Water, in endeavouring to reconcile them with the notion of the Real Presence.

We find there also this Prayer, which absolutely decides the question; *Aeterne Deus supplices implorantes, ut sicut nobis Jesus Christus, qui secum sine seculi fine promisit fidelibus assuturum, & præsentiæ corporalis Mysteriis, non deserat quos redemit, & majestatis suæ 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 Mysteries; he may not deprive those, whom he has 'redeemed, of the Mysteries of his Corporal Presence, nor 'leave them destitute of the Blessings of his Majesty. It seems evident, that these words, the Mysteries of his Bodily Presence, signifie plainly, that Jesus Christ is absent, with respect to his Flesh, though his body be present in its Image, which represents it to us.

Lib. 5. de Sacram. c. 5. 'Tis commonly supposed from the Testimony of the Books of the Sacraments, attributed to St. *Ambrose*, that the *Ambrosian* Liturgy had this Clause: *Fac nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis & 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* his 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 sixtieth Title, where he sets down the words of Consecration, cites the place of St. *Ambrose* with the word *figura*. 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 cœlestibus consecratur, accipe quæ sunt verba. Dicit sacerdos, fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationem ascriptam, rationabilem & acceptabilem, quod est figura corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.* This passage has been corrupted in other Editions, but *Paschasius* his 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,

lieve, that these Books of the Sacraments, were writ 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 this Prayer was taken out of the Office or Liturgy of St. *Ambrose*. What passages I have already cited, are sufficient to shew, that the Carnal Presence was not then believed by the Diocess 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 100 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 serv'd for a Foundation to establish a Worship, which the Church had publickly own'd and practis'd.

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 shewed. The *Prayer for the Dead*, *pag.* 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, & in Timoris Dei observatione defunctis domicilium perpetuæ fœlicitatis 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 Man-

'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 Bosome 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*, *pag.* 341. we find the anointing of the Sick and possessed Persons mention'd, 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, præsentis olei confirmes, nobilitesque substantiam, ut quicquid ex eo in humano genere tactum 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 practis'd since the fourth Century, as an Appendix to Baptism; neither do we look upon that Ceremony as blame-worthy, 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, introduc'd 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 beg'd of God, calling him *non æstimator meriti, sed veniæ donator*; *Not a regarder of Merit, but a giver of Pardon*: Which expression one of the most famous Schoolmen has lookt upon as absolutely contrary to the Doctrine of Merit, as it is held at present. So likewise, *pag.* 298. we find these words, *Iniquitates meas ne*

ne respexeris, 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 therein contained, and to be able to pass a certain Judgment concerning them. I return now to the method I have prescrib'd to my self.

CHAP. VIII.

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 *Fœlix* 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 conven'd there by the orders of *Charles* the Great; he knew not that it belonged to the Pope alone to regulate matters

T. 7. Concil. p. 1002.

p. 315.

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 Priviledge 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 plenaria Synodi judicium*, upon Judgment past by a full Council.

p. p. 316. & 319.

I acknowledge, that he seems to give great deference to the Authority of Pope *Adrian*, when he saith, That the followers of *Felix* and *Elipandus* ought to be excommunicated with their Masters, *Reservato per omnia Juris Privilegio summi Pontificis Domini & Patris nostri, Adriani, primæ sedis Beatissimi Papæ*: 'The rightful Priviledges of the High Priest 'our Lord and Father *Adrian*, the most blessed Pope of 'the principal See, being alwaies reserv'd intire. But it is plain, that he makes use of this Condescention 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 endeavours to maintain them. All Authors of the IX. Century, and next following, do unanimously testifie, That the Council of *Francfort*, where *Paulinus* and his fellow-Deputies of the Diocess 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

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 exprest by *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans*, upon the same occasion, *lib.* 1. *pag.* 539, & 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 Emperour; 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, *pag.* 1766. *&c. initio.* He affirms, That the Eucharist consists of Bread; he calls it, *Buccella & 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 referrs 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 *Anathema's* against all humane Satisfactions, maintaining, That the Blood of none of those that have been redeem'd themselves, is capable to blot out the least Sin, and that that is the Priviledge of our Saviour Jesus Christ alone, *pag.* 1792.

He

He lays it down as a Rule, that the humane nature in Christ is so circumscribed, as to be only in one place, *pag.* 1833. *Natura namque altera, hoc est hominis, erat in terra tantummodo; altera ubique in Cœlo & in terra, hoc est divina. Potuit ergo quod duo erant, divinum sc. & humanum aliud in Cœlo & ubique esse, & aliud in terra solummodo. Non tamen potuit ille qui unus erat, filius videlicet Dei & hominis, non totus ubiq; esse, in Cœlo pariter & in terra. Ubiq; sanè totus quia unus est & omnipotens Deus; unus idemq; omnipotentis Dei, & hominis filius. Humana namq; natura non descendit, nec fuit ibi prius quam, in Deum assumpta, ascenderet corporaliter in Cœlum. Filius autem hominis quia unus idemq; ipse est filius Dei, & de Cœlo descendit, unde nunquam discesserat, & in Cœlo erat, cum loqueretur in terra; & in terram venit ubi erat; & in Cœlum ascensurus erat per id quod homo est, & ibi ascendit ubi erat prius, per id quod Deus est. Domini namq; sunt verba dicentis; Nemo ascendit in Cœlum, nisi qui descendit de Cœlo, filius hominis qui est in Cœlo.* 'One of his natures, the humane, 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 Humane, 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 Humane Nature did not come down from Hea'ven, 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 be'fore; for they are the words of our Lord; No Man 'ascends up into Heaven, but he that came down from 'Hea-

'Heaven, even the Son of Man, who is in Heaven. Which is the same opinion we find exprest 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 shews what his Belief was concerning the Oral Manducation of the Body of Jesus Christ, *pag.* 1836. *Vel quâ ratione si adoptivus filius est, qui non manducat Carnem filii hominis, & non bibit ejus sanguinem, non habet vitam æternam? Qui manducat*, inquit, *meam Carnem, & bibit meum sanguinem habet vitam æternam, & ego resuscitabo eum in novissimo die. Caro mea verè est cibus, & sanguis meus verè est potus. Resuscitandi in novissimo die potestas, nulli alio nisi verò permanet Deo. Caro namque & sanguis ad humanam, per quam filius hominis est, non ad divinam referri potest naturam. Et tamen si ille filius hominis cui hæc Caro & sanguis est, pro eo quod unus idemq; sit Dei & hominis filius, si Deus verus non esset, caro ejus & sanguis manducantibus & bibentibus se, nullo modo vitam præstaret æternam. Unde & Johannes Evangelista ait, & sanguis filii ejus lavat nos ab omni peccato. Aut cujus caro & sanguis dat vitam manducantibus & bibentibus se, nisi filii hominis, quem Deus signavit Pater, qui est verus & omnipotens Filius Dei. Nam & panis vivus pro nobis descendit de Cœlo, qui dat vitam mundo; quiq; ex eo manducaverit non moritur in æternum: ipse enim dicit, Ego sum panis vivus qui de Cœlo descendi. Sic quippe descendit panis vivus de Cœlo, qui semper manebat in Cœlo, sicut filius hominis descendit de Cœlo, qui quoniam unus idemq; erat Filius Dei, nunquam desernit Cœlum.* '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 eter'nal 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 hu-
'mane 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 al-
'so alwaies staid 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, *pag.* 1790. *Mediator igitur ab eo quod medius sit intra utrasq; dissidentium partes, & reconciliet ambos in unum, &c. Deniq; non Paulus Mediator, sed Legatus fidelis mediatoris; legationem, inquit, fungimur pro Christo, reconciliamini Deo. Advocatus namq; est, qui jam pro reconciliatis interpellat, quemadmodum idem redemptor noster fecit, cum humanam Deo patri, in unitate Dei, hominisq; personæ naturam ostendit. Hoc est enim Deum patrem pro nobis interpellare. Joannes non interpellare, sed ipsum etiam esse propitiationem pro peccatis nostris declarat.* 'Wherefore he is called the Me-
'diator, because he is a middle person between both the
'disagreeing Parties, and reconciles them together in one, &c.
'Lastly, *Paul* is not a Mediator, but a faithful Ambassador
'of the Mediator. We are Ambassadors for Christ, and
'*the Sum of our Ambassy* is, Be ye reconciled to God. An Advo-
'cate is one that intercedes for those that are already re-
'conciled,

'conciled, even as our Redeemer doth, when he shews his
'humane 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 shews in the same place, pag 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. *Etenim omnipotentis Dei filius, omnipotens Dominus noster, quia pretio sanguinis sui nos redemit, jure redemptor, verus omnium redemptorum vocibus prædicatur, non inquam ille redemptus, quia nunquam captivus; nos vero redempti, quia fuimus captivi, renundati sub peccato, obligati nimirum in eo Chirographo decreti, quod ipse tulit de medio, delens sanguine suo, quod nullius alius redemptorum delere potuit sanguis adfixit 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 hand-
'writing that was against us, which he took away, blot-
'ting it out with his Blood, which the Blood of no other
'Redeemer could do, and fixed it to his Cross, openly trium-
'phing over it in himself.

It plainly appears, that he had no other notion concerning the obscurity of Scripture, than we have, by his approaching *Fœlix*, that he had done according to St. *Peter*'s Discourse concerning the Writings of St. *Paul*, pag. 1795, & 1796.

He doth not own, that the Church was founded on St. *Peter*, but on Jesus Christ, pag. 1800, & 1801. *Et licet esset primus in ordine Apostolorum, ideo tamen aiu silvit, quia non Dominus quid illi, pro quibus solus Petrus responsurus erat, sed quid homines de filio hominis æstimarent, explorare dignatus est.* 'And
'though he were the first amongst the Apostles, yet he did not

 'speak

'speak for some time, because the Lord did not enquire '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, *pag.* 1808, *ad finem.* *Ipse quippe solus & singulariter de Spiritu sancto conceptus, & natus ex Virgine, à vulva sine peccato prodiit Deus & 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 honoured with the Favour of *Charles* the Great. We have several of his Pieces, but I shall content my self 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 daies of the year, by the order of *Charles* the Great, and which that Emperor authorized by his approbation.

He

He tells us, in the Life of St. *Gregory*, That a *Roman* Lady, who was us'd to make the Bread her self, which she offer'd for the Communion, smiling when St. *Gregory* offer'd 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 shews them the top of his little finger stain'd with Blood, [*Ac mulieri dixit, disce, inquam, veritati vel modo jam credere contestanti, panis quem ego do, caro mea est, & sanguis meus verè est potus. Sed præscius conditor noster infirmitatis nostræ, eâ potestate, quâ cuncta fecit ex nihilo, & corpus sibi, ex carne semper virginis, operante sancto spiritu fabricavit, panem & vinum aquâ mixtum, manente propria specie in carnem & sanguinem suum, ad Catholicam precem, ob reparationem nostram, spiritus sancti sanctificatione convertit:*] 'and said to the Woman; Learn, I say, 'from henceforward at least to believe Truth it self, 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 'mix'd with Water, still remaining under their own kind, 'into his Flesh and Blood, at the Catholick Prayer, for 'our Salvation. This done, he commanded all the People to beg of God, *ut in formam pristinam sacrosanctum reformaret mysterium, quatenus mulieri ad sumendum 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

'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 entituled *Vitæ 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 signifie 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 inferr 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 enquiring 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'll instance in a very notable one: A *Severian Heretick* having lockt up the Eucharist, that his Servant, who was a Catholick, 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 return'd again, and did it afterwards bring forth Ears of Corn? Those of the *Romish* Church are very far from believing any such thing. 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

who had preferr'd 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 *Melanius*, and was then received by *Marsus*.

Besides, *Paulus Diaconus* himself shews 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 Relicks of the Apostles and Martyrs, that St. *Gregory*, instead of the Relicks they desired, gave them only some pieces of consecrated Cloth, which he severally put up into Boxes, and deliver'd them unto the Ambassadors, having first sealed the Boxes with his own Seal. And adds, That the Ambassadors being seiz'd with a curiosity, on their journey homeward, to know what those Boxes contain'd, 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 apertissimè sic suam potentiam patefacere, ut quid mereatur fides, evidentius minus creduli & ignorantes possint cognoscere: Et data oratione accepit cultellum qui temeraverat signa, & super altare corporis sancti Petri, acceptam unam panni portionem per medium pungens secuit, ex qua statim sanguis decurrit, & omnem eandem portiunculam cruentavit. Videntes autem suprascripti Legatarii, & omnes populi stupendum & arcanum fidei sacræ miraculum, ceciderunt proni in terram, adorantes Dominum dicentes; Mirabilis Deus in sanctis suis, Deus Israël, ipse dabit virtutem & fortitudinem plebi suæ, 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 & sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu, cum ob sanctificationem reliquarum in honore Apostolorum vel martyrum ipsius quibus specialiter assignabantur, supra sacrosanctum*

ctum 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; where-'upon 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 wor-'shipped 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. *Gre-'gory* said unto them, who before had undervalued these 'venerable Relicks, Know ye Brethren, that in consecra-'ting the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, when 'for the sanctification of Relicks in honour of the Apo-'stles or Martyrs, whose they were, Drink-offerings were 'offered on the holy Altar, their Blood, which was shed 'for the Name of Jesus Christ, alwaies entered these 'pieces of Cloth. This is that they call *Brandeum*, 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, 'tis very surprizing 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 conceiv'd this to have been the Doctrine of the Primitive Church. We find indeed in this his Collection some Homilies of St. *Leo*, *Feria* 2, 3, 4. and some others,

others, which treat of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ substituted instead of the Passover: But we find this matter so dryly handled in them, that it is hard to conceive how these Expressions of Antiquity could satisfie a man, who had been ting'd 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.

CHAP. IX,

Opinions of the Church of Italy *during the Ninth Century.*

WE are now come to the Ninth Century, wherein after this Diocess 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 Diocess, at the Council of *Francfort*, oppos'd themselves to Superstition, which then began to gather strength. But we shall perceive this more clearly in the sequel of

 this

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 encrease 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 Diocess of *Italy*, where God had placed him, and that by this means he has been extreamly 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.

Ripmont. in his Hist.

This *Claudius* was born in *Spain*, he had been a Disciple of *Fœlix* 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* being advanced to the Empire, he caused him to be ordained Bishop of *Turin*. It will probably be imagined that he had borrowed from *Fœlix* 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 *Fœlix* 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, shew 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 25 of St. *Mat-*

St. *Matthew* ver. 31. is decisive in this matter, and yet he expresseth himself more strongly, if it be possible, on *Matt.* ch. 22. ver. 2. Neither is it less easie to purge him of another Calumny, which was cast upon him after his death, by *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans*, who in his Preface to King *Charles* the Bald, accuseth him for having endeavoured to revive the Sect of *Arius*. I thought, at first, that this was only a fault of the Transcriber, who had writ *Arius* for *Aërius*; but the manner of *Jonas*'s expressing himself has made me retract my first conjecture: however, it is no less easie 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 *Mat.* 12. *ver.* 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 meer 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 *Drutteramnus* 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 Pius*, 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 Abby 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 Pius*, 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 Biſhoprick, but a very conſiderable Metropolis in the Dioceſs 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 ſhewed himſelf to be very free from thoſe Errors which at this day are in vogue in Romiſh Communion.

We

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 ſeem'd 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 honour 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. *B. P. edit. Pariſ. T. 1. p. 789, 800, 801, 803, 805, 806, 807, 809, 810, 814.*

He overthrows the Doctrine of Merits in ſuch a manner as overthrows all the nice Diſtinctions of the Papiſts on that ſubject.

He pronounces *Anathema*'s 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 extreamly provoked the Church of *Rome* againſt *Luther*, who aſſerted the ſame thing. Ib. p. 823.

He holds the Church to be ſubject to Error, oppoſite to what at this day the Romaniſts pretend in ſo unreaſonable a manner. Ib. p. 829.

He denies, That Prayers after Death may be of any uſe to thoſe that have demanded them. Ib. p. 844.

He very ſmartly laſht the Superſtition and Idolatry, which then began to be renewed, being ſupported by the Authority of the Roman See. p. 842.

Theſe things we find in his Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the *Galatians*; but the other Writings of this great man, Manuſcript and Printed, ſhew us yet more of his mind. Indeed, we find him giving very publick 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 ſhewing that he was, as to that matter, at the fartheſt diſtance from the Opinions which

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. Theyer*, are these:

Lib. 3. cap. 14.

Cœnantibus autem eis, accepit Jesus panem & benedixit ac fregit, deditq; discipulis suis, & ait, Accipite & Comedite, hoc est corpus meum, Finitis paschæ veteris solemniis quæ in commemorationem antiquæ de Ægypto liberationis populi Dei agebantur; transiit ad novum, quod in suæ redemptionis memoriam Ecclesiam frequentare volebat: Ut videlicet & pro carne agni ac sanguine sui corporis sanguinisq; sacramentum substituaret, ipsumq; se esse monstraret, cui juravit Dominus & non pœnitebit eum: Tu es sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedec. Frangit autem ipse panem quem discipulis porrigit, ut ostendat corporis sui fractionem non absq; sua sponte ac procuratione venturam; sed sicut alibi dicit potestatem se habere ponendi animam suam, & potestatem se habere iterum sumendi eam. Quem videlicet panem certè quoq; gratia sacramenti, priusquam frangeret benedixit. Quia naturam humanam quam passurus assumpsit, ipse una cum patre & spiritu sancto gratia divinæ virtutis implevit. Benedixit panem & fregit quia hominem assumptum ita morti subdere dignatus est, ut & divinæ immortalitatis veraciter inesse potentiam demonstraret. Ideoq; velocius eum à morte resuscitandum esse doceret. Et accipiens calicem gratias egit, & dedit illis, dicens, Bibite ex hoc omnes. Cum appropinquare passioni dicitur, accepto pane & calice, gratiam egisse perhibetur; gratias ita; egit qui flagella alienæ iniquitatis suscepit. Et qui nihil dignum percussioni exhibuit, humiliter in percussione benedixit. Ut hinc videlicet ostendat, quid unusquisque in flagello culpæ propriæ facere debeat si ipse æquanimiter flagella culpæ portat alienæ; ut hinc ostendat, quid in correptione faciat subditus, si in flagello positus patri gratias agit æqualis. Hic est enim sanguis meus novi Testamenti qui pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Quia panis corpus confirmat, vinum verò sanguinem operatur in carne; hic ad corpus Christi mystice, illud refertur ad sanguinem. Verum quia & nos in Christo, & in nobis Christum manere oportet, vinum Dominici calicis aqua miscetur. Attestante enim Johanne, aquæ populi sunt. Et neque aquam solam, neq; solum vinum, sicut nec granum frumenti solum sine admixtione aquæ & confectione, in panem cuiquam licet offerre, ne videlicet oblatio talis quasi caput à membro secernendum

dum esse significet, & vel Christum sine nostræ 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 & 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 Cœlestia melioribus hostiis quam istis, juxta quod Apostolus per totam ad Hebræos Epistolam, inter Legem distinguens & Evangelium, pulcherrima expositione ac plenaria ratione declarat. Dico autem vobis non bibam amodo de hoc genimine vitis usq; in diem illum cum illud bibam vobiscum novum in regno Patris mei. Vitem sive vineam Domini appellatam esse synagogam, & omnis sparsim scriptura & apertius testatur Isaias in Cantico de illo cantato, Vinea, inquiens, Domini Sabaoth, Domus Israel est. De qua nimirum vinea Dominus multo tempore bibebat, quamvis pluribus ramis in amaritudinem vitis alienæ conversis, quod tamen etsi multis in illa plebe exorbitantibus à recto fidei itinere non defuere plurimi toto legis tempore, quorum piis cogitationibus summisque virtutibus delectaretur Deus. Verum passo in carne Domino ac resurgente à mortuis, tempus fuit ut legalis illa & figuralis observatio cessaret, atque ea quæ secundum literam 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 apertè dicat: Non ultra Carnalibus Synagogæ Ceremoniis delectabor, in quibus etiam ista Paschalis agni sacra locum tenuere præcipuum: aderit enim tempus meæ resurrectionis: aderit dies ille cum ipse in regno Dei positus, id est gloria vitæ immortalis sublimatus, de salute populi ejusdem fontes gratiæ spiritalis regenerati, novo vobiscum gaudio perfundar. 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 qui vetus homo appellatur Corpus susceperat, 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

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 & nos dicit Apostolus resurrexisse cum Christo ut spe rei futuræ jam lætitiam præsentem afferat: quod autem de hoc genimine vitis etiam illud novum esse dicit, significat utique eadem Corpora resurrectura secundum innovationem Cœlestem, quæ nunc secundum vetustatem moritura sunt. Si hanc vitem de cujus vetustate nunc passionis Calicem bibit, ipsos Judæos intellexeris. Significatum est etiam ipsam gentem ad Corpus Christi per novitatem 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 & saturabuntur; & laudabunt Dominum qui requirunt eum: Potest autem & hymnus etiam ille intelligi quem Dominus secundum Johannem patri gratias agens decantabat, in quo & pro seipso & pro Discipulis & pro eis qui per verbum eorum credituri erant, elevatis oculis sursum precabatur. Et pulchrè Discipulos sacramentis sui Corporis ac sanguinis imbutos, & hymno piæ intercessionis patri commendatos, in mentem educit olivarum, ut typicè designet nos per acceptionem sacramentorum suorum, perque opem suæ Intercessionis, ad altiora virtutum, ut carismate Sancti Spiritus in corde perungamur, conscendere debere.

'The Apostles being sate down at Table, Jesus Christ took 'Bread, blessed and brake it, and gave of it to his Disci'ples, saying to them, Take this and eat it, this is my Bo'dy. The ancient Ceremonies of the Antient 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 shew 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 *Melchi*'*zedeck*. 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 'con-

'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 bles'sed the Bread before he brake it, to assure us, that he 'intended to make a Sacrament of it; and forasmuch as he 'had taken humane Nature upon him, that he might suf'fer, 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 humane Nature 'he had taken upon him, to Death, he would make it ap'pear, that the said Humanity was possest of a true and na'tural power to raise it self: 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 Hu'mility, 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 our selves 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 un'der 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 be'comes 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

'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 'signifie, 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*, 'tis 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 ex'cellent Sacrifices, according to what the Apostle S. *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 Expli'cation, *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.* 'Tis 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 Pra'ctice

'ctice 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 sence, and have been con'firmed 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 car'nal Ceremonies of the Synagogue, amongst the number 'of which, the great Festival of the Paschal Lamb was 'one of the chiefest; 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 '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; '*tis for this reason that by the Sacrament of Wine he recom'mends to us his Blood.* What are we to understand by this 'New Wine, but the Immortality of our Renewed Bo'dies? 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 spo'ken of the same time, but as importing that the Disci'ples 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 af'ford us present Joy? And whereas he saith *of this Juice 'of the Vine*, and calls it also new, this for certain sig'nifies

'nifies, that the same Bodies must be raised again, accor-
'ding to the Rules of an altogether Heavenly Renovati-
'on, 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 an Hymn, they went to the
'Mount of *Olives.* This is that which we read in the Psal-
'mist; *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 Fa-
'ther, wherein he prayed for himself, for his Disciples, and
'for all those who should believe at their preaching. And
''tis 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 recommen-
'ded them to his Father, by the Hymn of a ten-
'der 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 endur'd some Contradiction, upon other Articles, yet he never was impleaded about that of the Eucharist, which shews that that Truth, at that time, was yet in possession of its own rights, and that those who quarrel'd 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,

mentary 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 Diocess, from the hanckering 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, *Analect. T. I.*
'I have undertaken it, not as for your Instruction, but for *pag.* 36, 37,
'your Satisfaction. But it is your duty to judge of it with 38, 39.
'more truth, and to stir up your self by your Examples,
'to the practice of a true Charity, which is the most ex-
'cellent of all Virtues. And I assure my self, that I
'may more easily attain to the possession of that vertue, 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 inclin'd 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 dot suffer her self to be overtaken
'by night, she does not shut up her self in shadows,
'and doth not expose her self to our Bodily Senses: She
'is near unto all those that turn themselves to her, from
'all parts of the World, and who love her indeed, she is
'Eternal

'Eternal to all; she is not limited by any places, she is eve-
'ry where: She advertiseth abroad, she instructs
'within, she changes and converts those that behold
'her: She doth not suffer her self to be violated by
'any person. No Man can judge of her, no body can
'judge well without her. In this Idea of my Faith, I se-
'parate 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 con-
'tinue present; because it is she alone that can say to the
'Spirit of Man, 'Tis I who am the Lord, and 'tis of her
'alone we can say with truth, he 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 our selves in a very pernicious Er-
'ror. For as long as we shall endeavour 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 ar-
'rive 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 immedi-
'ately to become happy by the same means, he finds another
'is become so, that is, by the enjoyment of this univer-
'sal and unchangeable truth. Neither can a Man become
'prudent by the Prudence of another, or valiant by
'the valour, or temperate by the temperance, or just
'by the justice of another; but by forming and fashion-
'ing his Mind by the immutable Rules and Splendors
'of those Virtues, which without alteration shine forth in
'this common universal Truth and Wisdom: In imita-
'tion of whom he formed and squared his manners, whom
'we

'we propose to our selves as a Pattern to imitate, and
'whom we look upon as a living Copy of that Eternal
'Wisdom. Our will fastning it self 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 sepa-
'rates it self from this unchangeable and common good,
'and seeks her own particular good, or directs her self
'to any outward or inferiour good, she sins.

After this he quotes an excellent Passage of St. *Austin*, from his Treatise concerning the True Religion. 'Where-
'fore we owe no Religious worship to those who are
'departed this Life, because they 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 enlight-
'ned, rejoyce to see us made partakers of their Piety.
'We must therefore honour 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 ho-
'noured by the highest Angel, must also be honoured by
'the lowest of Men, because the nature of Man is become
'the lowest, for not having honoured him. For an An-
'gel 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 Consub-
'stantial and Coeternal with the Father, hath vouch-
'safed in order to the accomplishment of the adorable
'Mystery of our Salvation, to take our humane 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

St. August. de vera Relig. c. 55.

'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 hap-'pineſs, becauſe they are more active than we, and be-'cauſe they enjoy the viſion of God, without being mo-'leſted 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 ho-'nour them with our charitable reſpects; but not like 'Slaves: we build no Temples to them, neither will 'they be honour'd 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 defence 'of which truth, I am become a reproach to my Neigh-'bours, 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 Conſo-'lations, has comforted us in all our Afflictions, that we 'might be able, in like manner, to comfort thoſe that are 'preſt with ſorrow and affliction; we rely upon the Pro-'tection of him who has armed and fortified us with 'the Armour 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 *Ludovicus Pius*'s Court, for having broke down Images throughout his Dioceſs, and for writing, in defence of himſelf, a Treatiſe againſt the adoration of Images, the worſhip of Saints, Pilgrimages, the worſhip of Reliques, 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

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 paſt in *Ludovicus Pius*'s his Palace, after the Aſſembly of *Paris*, in the year 825. about the matter of Images, as a thing which happened two years before. In his Book he accuſeth *Claudius* for taking upon him, after 820. years and more, to reprove thoſe things that were paſt 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 offence that was taken at his Behaviour and Opinions, which he did ſo effectually as not to have any need to write another Treatiſe upon the ſame Subject.

However 'tis *Dungalus* himſelf who has preſerved the Extracts of the Apologetical anſwer, which *Claudius* made about that time to the Abbot *Theodemirus*; which Apologetick he begins in this manner: 'I have received (ſaith he to *Theodemirus*) 'by a particular bearer thy Letter, with 'the Articles, wholly ſtuffed with babling 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 Antient Catholick Faith, which is moſt ab-'ſolutely 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 De-'vil, *&c.* For I teach no new Sect, as keeping my ſelf '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,

'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 thy self the resemblance of any thing, either 'in Heaven or on Earth*, &c. 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 pourtraitures 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 Mens hands, and adore them in honour of those, whose resemblances we say they are? for 'if the Image you worship is not God (for not only he 'who serves and honours 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 Mens hands?

'But mark what the followers of the False Religion and 'Superstition do alledge; They say 'tis in Commemoration 'and in honour of our Saviour that we serve, honour and 'adore the Cross, whom nothing pleaseth in our Saviour, but 'that which was pleasing to the ungodly, *viz.* The reproach 'of

'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 fastned 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 don't they then on the same score worship all that are Virgins, because a Virgin brought 'forth Jesus Christ? Why don't they adore Mangers, and 'old Clouts, because he was laid in a Manger, and wrapt 'in Swadling-cloaths? Why don't 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 don't 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 'Launces, 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 your 'selves 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 Cru-'cifie 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 Sacriledge 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 'your self, 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 Pe-'nance, 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 hindred them? 'What have you to say against this sentence, That whoso-'ever 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 cast 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 pretence 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 be-'long to all the true Superintendents and Pastors of the 'Church, who discharge the same, as long as they are in 'this World, and when they have pay'd the debt of 'Death, others succeed in their places, who enjoy the same 'Authority and Power.

Return,

'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* (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 'tis '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 In-'tercession of an Apostle. What think you would St. *Au-'gustin* say of you, whom we have already so often 'quoted. *&c.*

'The fifth thing you reproach me for, is, That it displeaseth 'thee, that the Apostolick Lord (for so you are pleased to 'call the late Pope *Paschal* deceased) had honoured me 'with this charge; but forasmuch as the word, *Apostolicus 'dicitur quasi Apostoli custos*, may intimate as much as the Apo-'stles Keeper, Know thou, that he only is apostolick, 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* sate 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 Abby 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* his death; whereupon I desire the Reader to consider, *First*, That notwithstanding *Dun-galus* and *Jonas* did both write by the order of Kings, and that they make mention of a Condemnation of *Claudius* past-

past 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 Worshippers of Idols.

Secondly, That the Fathers of the Assembly of *Paris*, in the year 825, had justified most of the Principles maintain'd by *Claudius*, this great man having been only engaged to carry the matter farther than they, for being nearer to the Diocess of *Rome*, he saw the danger so much the nearer, in which his Flock were, of falling into Idolatry.

Thirdly, That to go to the bottom of the matter, *Agobardus* Archbishop of *Lions*, push'd that Point as far as *Claudius* himself; as appears from his Treatise against Pictures. 'Tis a pleasure to see how Father *Raynand* torments himself to justifie *Agobardus*, whom the Church of *Lions* honours 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. Raynand*, are not sufficient to keep *Agobardus* in the Martyrology of *Lions*; or, that they serve very profitably, at the same time, to enroll *Claudius* in that of the Church of *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 reign'd 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

which were diametrically opposite to the definitions of the *Iconolatræ* 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 Diocess, 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 *Roverco*, have owned, That the Vallies of *Piedmont*, which did belong to the Bishoprick 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 Diocess, 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 endeavours, 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 Priviledges 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 Diocess of *Aquileia* was no more united with that of the Pope, during the time of the Controversie 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 *Combefis* has published this Letter. *Auct. Novissi.* p. 527. *&c.*

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

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 our selves 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*, *Baronius*, 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 Diocess, as well by reason of the Invasion of the *Huns*, as by the Divisions happening between several Princes, who endeavoured to make themselves Masters of that part of *Italy*, after the death of *Charles* the Great.

Tom. 2. *Spic.* p. 161. *& seq.*

But Providence has preserved us two Authors of this Diocess, the one is *Ratherius*, who alone might have been sufficient to inform us very exactly about the state of *Italy*. This *Ratherius* Bishop of *Verona*, who from being a Monk in the Abby of *Lobe*, near to *Liege*, was advanced to the See of *Verona*, in the year 928, and being chas'd 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 Heresie of the *Anthropomorphites* began to appear again in the Diocess of *Italy*, during his Pontificate, and that he was obliged to write against them. And indeed, we find a large Digression of *Ratherius* upon this occasion in his first Sermon of *Lent*. He observes, that the Priests of the Diocess of *Vicenza* were of this Opinion, which they grounded upon the following pas-

passages of Scripture, *Psal.* 33. 16, *Job* 10. 8. and *Genes.* 1. 26. He acknowledges, that other People of his Diocess 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, array'd 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 Diocess: They believed that St. *Michael* the Archangel celebrated the Mass of the second *Feria*, whence they were perswaded, that the Mass of St. *Michael*, called the second *Feria*, was far more excellent than any other Mass whatsoever. 'Tis worth our observing, how he confutes this phantastical Opinion; *First*, He maintains from *Revel.* 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 endeavour'd to disabuse them, were very well inform'd 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 *Lanfranc*, *Guismond*, 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 divers 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.

p. 258. On the one hand he tells the Priests of his Diocess, in his Synodical Epistle, *Paranda cordium nostrorum habitacula, venturo ad nos, per corporis & 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.

p. 259. 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.

p. 181. 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 *Thamar*, in these words: *Omnium corruptè viventium Diabolus pater est, & ô quam non manducat verendam carnem Domini, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, in quo Diabolus per tria ista vitia, hoc est superbiam, hypocrisin atq; luxuriam requiescit, licet communicare cum fidelibus videatur, Domino dicente, qui manducat meam carnem, & bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, & ego in eo. Cum & per conversionem ita hoc possit resolvi; qui in me manet, & ego in eo, ipse manducat carnem meam, & bibit sanguinem meum. In quo enim Deus manet, & ipse in Deo, quomodo in eo Diabolus dormire possit non video: dormit verò in eo qui per hypocrisin, vel elationem umbrosus & vacuus, per luxuriam existit humectus. Quid ergo manducat, quando communicat? Judicium si respondes, Apostolo connivès, & intelligere me pariter commones, quia pro eo judicabitur, id est damnabitur; quia cum indignus existeret, Christi*

Christi est ausus carnem manducare, & sanguinem bibere; ac propterea quod debuerat illi fore salvatio, est factum damnatio. De substantia verò corporali quam sumit, cum sit mea nunc quæstio, mihi nunc quoq; ipsi loquar, ita succumbo; cum sit enim dignè sumenti vera caro, panis licet quod olim fuerat, videatur & sanguis, quod vinum; indignè sumenti, id est non in Deo manenti, quid sit, nedum dicibile, incogitabile fateor mihi, & altiora te, ne quæsieris, & profundiora te ne scrutatus fueris, dictum putare hinc quoque mihi. '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*, *Hypocrisie*, 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 Hypocrisie 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 enquiry at present, is, concerning the Bodily Substance he receives, I must now answer my self, 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 unconceivable by me; and therefore in this case, I ought to take 'that word as spoke to me, Don't seek after things too high 'for thee, nor search out things too deep for thee.

This seems to be very full, and yet, *pag.* 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 referrs himself to the Belief of St. *Chrysostom*, who calls the Sacrament a Spiritual Food, and to that of St. *Austin*, *Tr.* 61, & 62. *in Johannem*, *vid. pag.* 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, *pag.* 322.

Whatsoever may be his Opinion in this matter, in those Writings I have before produc'd, he seems to have spoken more plainly in favour of the Real Change of the Eucharist of the Body and Blood of Christ, in his Epistle published by *D' Achery*, in the 12 Tome of his *Spicilegium*; but at the same time he gives this advantage, that he furnisheth us with a new Defender of that figurative sence 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 sence, than as they are understood by the Protestants; upon which 'tis natural to take notice of Two things, the first, That the Disciples of *Paschasius* have had great trouble to oppose directly the Opinion of St. *Austin*, who lays it down alwaies, 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.*

Edit. Paris. p. 277.

We ought not to forget, that in his *Perpendicular Volume*, *pag.* 183, he attributes the force of the Consecration to Prayer; which the Church of *Rome* at present condemns.

P. 258, 262, 305, 308, 312, 320, 330.

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

p. 261.

But we are to observe, concerning this matter, first, That he expresly forbids private Masses.

p. 264, 282, 283.

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

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 *Laicks*, in order to carry it to the Sick, was not yet abolished, though it began then to be condemned. p. 260.

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 believ'd that it could not be celebrated without Communicants. The Church did not believe it to be only an heap of Accidents, because She believ'd, that the taking of the Sacrament did break the Fast. The Church of *Rome* could not leave the Sacrament in the hands of *Laicks*, 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 administred 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. p. 260.

As to Baptism, and its necessity, it appears by his Synodical Epistle, that he was against having the Custom abrogated of Baptizing only on *Easterday* and *Whitsunday*, except in case of necessity, that is, danger of Death. p. 262.

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 publick Sinners; which shews that the ancient Discipline was yet in practice: And he would have the Priests of his Diocess to be furnished with a *Pœnitential*, that they might follow the Canons thereof; so far was he from owning them for Absolute Judges, who could pronounce without Appeal. p. 262, 264, 265.

He

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: *Purgatorii pœna non est statuta pro criminibus sed pro peccatis levioribus, quæ utiq; per lignum, fœnum & stipulam designantur*: 'The Punishment of Purgatory is not appointed for 'Crimes, but for lighter Sins, which are intimated by Wood, 'Hay and Stubble.

p. 290.

We shall now proceed to the examining of some other Points, the better to inform our selves 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 vicem tenent in Ecclesiis*. 'All Bishops 'are *Peter's* Vicegerents in their Churches, & *pag.* 168, 169, 173. & 229.

p. 164.

Secondly, They did not believe that the Pope had power to remove Bishops from one Bishopsick 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*.

Pag. 171.

Thirdly, They were very sensible of the inconvenience of the Sovereignty which the Pope endeavoured to usurp over the Church. See what *Ratherius* speaks of it. *Si Papa sit nequam, perjurus, adulter, venator, ebriosus, quid fiet de quærimoniis ad ipsum delatis? Ridebit querulos, favebit sibi similibus*. 'If the Pope should prove a wicked Man, perjur'd, an 'Adulterer, a Hunter, a Drunkard; what will become of the 'complaints made to him? He will laugh at those that 'complain, and favour those that are like himself.

Pag. 173.

Fourthly, They without fear laugh'd at the Pope's Excommunications, and his *Anathema's*, of which he began already to be very liberal. *Ratherius* gives us an instance of it in his Apologetick; *De quodam clerico venalem illam, ut ait Salustius, adiens urbem, prætio, ut omnia antiquitus, ibi emptas, quasi Apostolicas deferens chartas Anathematis tam me, quam successores omnimodis meos mulctavit mucrone; ut quivis abhinc Episcoporum si de*

Pag. 231.

si de clericorum se infra mitteret 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 Mony, as of old, he smote 'me, as well as all my Successors, with the edge of the 'Anathematical Sword; so that any Bishop from hence 'forward, 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 Univeral did of right belong to the Bishop of *Rome*. *Vestræ Paternitatis provolvens Genibus, Domnæ venerandissime Archipræsul, Archiepiscope, &, si de nilil mortalium jure dici possit, Universalis Papa nominande*. 'Prostrating my self at the 'Knees of your Paternity, most Reverend Lord, Arch-'prelate, Archbishop, and if it may of Right be said of 'any mortal, Universal Pope———. *Ratherius* being banished from his Church, gives us a very ludictous notion of it. *Ait, tædet me esse Universalem Episcopum, id est, Gyrovagum & sine sede*. 'It troubles me, saith he, to be an Uni-'versal Bishop, that is, a wanderer about, without a 'See.

Pag. 246.

Pag. 252.

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

Pag. 253.

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 mountains, nor yet at Jerusalem*, &c. 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 generalem contemptum Canonum à Laico, ad Summum (pro nefas!) Pontificem*.

Pag. 168.

He

Pag. 188. 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.

Pag. 218. *Secondly*, He observes that most of the Clergy were either Sodomites or Adulterers. *Quam perdita tonsatorum Universitas tota, si nemo in eis 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?

Pag. 241. *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 Mony no more, as he was wont to do. *Manasses*, Bishop of *Milan*, who had five Bishopricks, sold that of *Verona*, and turned out *Ratherius*. Pag. 249,250.

Pag. 270. *Fourthly*, He takes notice of such extreme ignorance in the Priests of his Diocess, 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 Saint *Athanasius*.

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

Sixthly, He cannot dissemble the way which some of these Priests took to deceive Souls, by maintaining that none that had been baptized could ever be damned. pag. 289.

Seventhly, Lastly he exclaims, That Christianity was perisht 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 the Faith.* Pag. 289.

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

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. Pag. 169.

3. By his lamenting the Liberty which was given to the Clergy to marry. Pag. 170,179.

4. In that he joyns the married Bishops, with the most corrupt and profligate of that Order. Pag. 172.

5. By his charging the Clergy with a great crime, for having refused to obey the Edict of the Emperor, which condemn'd the marriage of Ecclesiasticks.

6. From his falsly 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*. Pag. 217.

7. From his expelling the married Monks out of his Abby, and placing Canons in their place. Pag. 236.

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 Laicks 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 Diocess 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 addrest to the Priests of his Diocess, almost all borrowed from that of *Theodulphus*, who was an *Italian* born, that he charged them to learn *Athanasius* his 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. Cap. 4.

Cap. 7. He forbids the Celebration of Masses without any Communicants; and shews them that this is contrary to the Canon of the Liturgy.

Cap. 23. & 24. 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 introduc'd by an Opinion, That the Dead received some help from the Prayers of their Relations.

Cap. 30. He absolutely forbids the Ordination of Priests without Title, which shews that he did not look upon the trade of Sacrificing the Body of Jesus Christ to be so necessary and authoriz'd, 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.

Cap. 57. 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*.

Cap. 58. 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.

Cap. 59. 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

Cap. 74, 75. that is fallen down, and concerning him that vomits again after three days; which plainly shews, that they supposed it to nourish really and truly, notwithstanding that it was Consecrated Bread.

It appears evidently, that publick Penance had not yet

Cap. 90. given place to the practice 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

He reduceth the matters of Faith, which Believers ought Cap. 97.
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 Cap. 100.
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 divers Shreds to stuff out her Breviary, and their Lives of Saints.

We may now take a view of his Doctrine in his Pag. 45.
Treatise of the Judgments of Bishops. He maintains, That the Church is founded on the Confession of the Apostolick 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 Saviour'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 trepan'd into the Snare, which had been set 150 years before, by a suppositious obtrusion of the false Decretals of Antient Popes, the end of which was to appropriate the Cognizance of the Trials of Bishops to the Pope, under pretence of preventing their Oppression. In particular, he shews himself very angry against those who obliged the Bishops to terminate the quarrels they had with Laicks, by providing a Champion to fight it out for them.

He pretends that the Scripture of the New Testament p. 50.
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 p. 55, & 56.
the Church's Interest; which the Popes have practis'd but very badly.

He seems to suppose, that the Order of Bishops, and that p. 63.
of Presbyters, were not two different Orders in St. *Paul*'s time, and that they were distinguished afterwards.

p. 64. He asserts, That *Laicks* have Right to judge of the Behaviour of Bishops, as it is their Right to have a share in their Election.

He imploys 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 noblenes of their Blood, and electing many that were yet meer Children.

Epist. 2. He declares in one of his Letters, that some Heresies were already crept into his Diocess, which he had already hinted in the 48. chap. of his Capitulary, and he seems to point at a Branch of the *Manichean* Heresie.

He shews, That in his Diocess they would not fast on *Saturdays*; which he finds fault with, notwithstanding the *Saturdays* Fast was not known in St. *Ambrose*'s time, in the Diocess of *Milan*.

He quotes a Law of the *Lombards*, to shew, That the Marriage of a Godson with his Godmother was unlawful: and the definition he afterwards gives of Marriage, shews, 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 publick, 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 Diocess, and that Error and Superstition, by little and little, began to take their Places, in spight 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.

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

An Enquiry 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 Diocess 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 imployed the Terror of Punishments, against those who were suspected of Heresie, to which *Gerard* attributes the seeming Piety those *Italians* made shew of: We may also gather this from *Glaber*, l. 4. c. 2. where he speaks of a certain Heresie 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: Tom. 13. Spicil.

First,

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 practised the same *verbo & 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 Saviour, 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 reverenced, we find, that being interrogated upon these Heads by *Gerard*; they answer distinctly as follows.

First, To that which the Bishop told them, that Jesus Christ had established the necessity of *Baptism*, *John* 3. *Except a man be born again, &c.* they answer, *Lex & Disciplina nostra quam à magistro accepimus, nec Evangelicis decretis, nec Apostolicis sanctionibus contra ire videbitur, si quis eam diligenter velit intueri. Hac namq; hujusmodi est, mundum relinquere, carnem à concupiscentiis frenare, de laboribus manuum suarum victum parare, nulli lesionem quærere, Charitatem cunctis quos Zelus hujus nostri propositi teneat, exhibere. Servatâ igitur hac justitiâ nullum opus esse Baptismi, pravaricatâ verò istâ, Baptismum ad nullam proficere salutem. Hæc est nostra justificationis summa, ad quam nihil est quod Baptismi usus superaddere possit, cum omnis Apostolica & Evangelica institutio hujusmodi fine claudatur. Si quis autem in Baptismate aliquod dicat latere sacramentum, hoc tribus excausis evacuatur: Una, quia vita reproba ministrorum, Baptizandii nullum potest præbere salutis Remedium. Altera quia quidquid vitiorum in fonte renuntiatur, postmodum in vitio repetitur. Tertia, quia ad Parvulum non volentem, neque currentem, fidei nescium, suæque salutis atque utilitatis ignarum, in quem nulla Regenerationis petitio, nulla fidei potest inesse confessio, aliena voluntas, aliena fides, 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 look'd into. This Discipline consists in leaving 'the

'the World, in bridling carnal concupiscence, in providing 'a livelihood by the labour of our hands, in hurting no 'body, 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 *Ratherius*. There is one thing observable about their other Reasons, which is, That the Bishop objects to them, in order to perswade them of the necessity of Baptism, the Custom of washing one anothers Feet, which they called *Mandatum*; whence it is easie to judge, that they lookt 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

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 shews, 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 Diocess 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 Italicum*.

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 shieness they exprest to Churches is evident, from their reproaching the Idolatry that was practised in them in point of Images and other matters.

The fourth is about the Altar to which they refused to bow or shew any reverence, as the practice was then, after it was consecrated with Holy Oyle; 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 honour or respect to the material things that had received them.

The

The Fifth is of the same kind concerning those censings, which were then used in imitation of the Ceremonies of the *Mosaical* Law; the Unction with Oyle practised upon those that were possest, 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* lookt 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 satisfie the Divine Justice.

This appears more clearly from the Tenth Article, which shews 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.

O The

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 Diocess, 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 pretence 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 Mens Hands.

The Fifteenth Article concerned the Image of our Saviour on the Cross, that of the Blessed Virgin, and those of the Saints and Angels, *&c.* 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 *Præpositi*, the Model of which Government they pretended to derive from the Angelical Hierarchy treated of by *Dionysius* the *Arcopagite*.

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

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 *Latine*, 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 threatned 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 *Latine*, 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, whilest he endeavours to separate himself from errors. St. *Cyprian* rebaptized those who had been baptized by Hereticks; *Stephen* received the Baptism of all Hereticks without distinction. Several Diocesses 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*

dulphus 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, shew the reason why they were accused of being meer Seculars, and shall make it appear, that at the bottom this was nothing else but a pure Calumny, founded upon an unjust prejudice.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Reflections upon some Practices of the Churches of the Diocess of Italy.

WHAT I have already represented in the foregoing Chapters, makes it evident, as far as can be desired, that the Diocess 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 favours these Errors or Superstitions; now we know, that we ought to judge of a Church, by the publick 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 Diocess.

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 1. is, Prayer for the Dead. 2. Doting on the Reliques 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 Ecclesiasticks. 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 Diocess.

I own

I own that Prayer for the Dead was used in this Diocess even before the Fourth Century: but withal I find it was practised there under another notion, than it is in the Church of *Rome*, which since *Gregory* I. found the belief of it wholly upon the Doctrine of Purgatory, 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 priviledge 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 joyned 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 philosophise 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

I own likewise, that the Veneration of Reliques appeared in this Diocess, from before the end of the Fourth Century, and since that, by little and little, got strength there, as it is customary for humane 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 Interment 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 Church-yards, 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 Reliques of Martyrs under the Altar. This is what we find was practis'd by St. *Ambrose*, with so much pomp, in reference to the Reliques of St. *Gervasius* and St. *Protasius*, and which he believ'd founded upon a Revelation. In process of time, they took care to fill the Churches with the Bodies of Martyrs, those of whom no Reliques 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 fix'd to certain daies, as were those that were kept on the same account

count 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 consider'd Fasting only as an indifferent action, which was to be back'd 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 conceiv'd of it in these later times.

We cannot deny, but that a single State was observ'd 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 maintain'd 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 maintain'd, that the People of old were also oblig'd to abstain from their Wives for some few daies, in order to their partaking of the Sacrifices. The words of St. *Ambrose* on this occasion are these: *Quod eo non praeterii, quia in plerisq; abditioribus locis, cum Ministerium gererent, vel etiam sacerdotium, filios susceperunt, & id tanquam usu veteri defendant, quando per intervalla dierum sacrificium offerebatur: & tamen castigabatur etiam populus per biduum vel triduum, ut ad sacrificium purus accederet, ut in veteri Testamento legimus, & lavabat vestimenta sua. Si in figura 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

'or *Priests*, did beget Children; and this they maintain 'from what was in use under the old Law, when they 'offer'd Sacrifices with some intervening distance of time; 'and yet even the People themselves were to use Abstinence for two or three daies, 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 us'd in the Figure, how much 'more in the Truth it self?

Whence it appears, first, That the greater part of the Clergy of the Diocess of *Milan*, were not bound to observe the Law of *Cœlibacy*, which *Paphnutius* had hindered the Council of *Nice* from imposing upon the Bishops and 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 choice, and without any necessity. Thirdly, That the cause of St. *Ambrose*'s so highly recommending the Cœlibacy 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 *Syricius*, 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 82 Epistle written to the Church of *Verceil*, where after having given the sence of the words of St. *Paul*, which concern the Virtues of Ministers, he adds, *Hoc posui quae cavenda acceperim. Virtutum autem magister Apostolus est, qui cum patientia redarguendos doceat contradicentes qui unius uxoris virum praecipiat esse, non quo exsortem excludat conjugii, nam hoc supra legem praecepti est, sed ut conjugali castimoniâ servet ablutionis suae gratiam. Neq; iterum ut filios creare Apostolicâ invitetur auctoritate, habentem enim dixit filios, 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 reproved 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.

'Tis difficult to determine what were the Opinions of *Servatianus* and *Barbatianus*, of whom St. *Ambrose* makes mention in that 82 Epistle. He tells us, that they came out of the Monastery of *Milan*, whence they betook themselves to *Verceil*; 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 inferiour 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 *Cœlibacy* 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 ungovern'd zeal does often put men upon,

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 perswade 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 alledg'd, 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 oblig'd 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 past through these first Orders, their Marriage proving no obstacle to their promotion.

However it be, in process of time, this rigor, which concern'd only the Clergy, was slackened in this Diocess; 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 Diocess, 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*

gory 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. 'Tis 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 consider'd fully of that kind of life, before they engaged themselves therein.

Furthermore 'tis good to observe, that the rashness and imprudence of those, who thus quitted this state, seem'd 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 Diocess 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 publick too, had preserved the true Faith and the true Worship which the Christian Religion prescribes to us.

Our business at present is to shew, 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 endeavoured to subject it to his *Authority*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

That the Diocess of Italy *was an Independent Diocess, till after the midst of the Eleventh Century.*

IN order to the thorow 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 favour 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 Diocess of *Milan* did continue independent until the midst of the Eleventh Century, at which time the *Waldenses* were obliged more openly to testifie their aversion for the Church of *Rome* as an Antichristian Church. It will be easie enough for me to perform what I have proposed to my self, in following the History of the Church.

Before the Council of *Nice*, we find the Diocess of *Italy* very distinct from that of *Rome* which contained the suburbicary 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 lookt upon as Orthodox or not. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 30.*

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*: *Merocles*, Bishop of *Milan*, as Head of his Diocess being nominated by the Emperor, as well as *Melchiades*. *Euseb. Hist. l. 10. c. 5. Optat. l. 1. cont. Parmen.*

The

The Council of *Nice* confirmed this ancient custom of the Metropolitans, who had enjoyed the Right of convening the Synods of their Diocess, and ordaining the Bishops belonging to the same. This we see in the Sixth Canon: Each Diocess then formed a Council, which was called by the Metropolitan. Every Metropolitan ordered the Affairs of his Diocess, 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 Diocess so far independent on any of its Neighbours, 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 my self 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*.

Sulpit Sev. l. 2. Hist. 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 *Cæsaraugusta*, is a certain proof hereof.

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

far were they from depending on the Pope as their Patriarch.

We find the same thing also acknowledged by those of *Africa*, who sent Legats 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. *Can.* 57. & 58. *Baron. An.* 431. §. 182.

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 1556. that the Diocess of *Milan* and its Bishops, stood resolutely to the Party that rejected the Fifth General Council, and though Pope *Pelagius* strongly sollicited *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 Diocess alone writ to *Constantine* the Emperor, which sheweth 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 Diocess of *Italy*, which she arrogated to her self over other Churches, where she had already gained some Preeminence by means of her Vicars.

We

Cap. 3. Tit. 7. We have an unquestionable proof of what I here alledge in the *Diurnus Romanus*. All the Bishops that belonged to the Pope's Jurisdiction, by reason of their being in his Diocess, 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 endeavoured 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 *Vghellus* in the Life of *Angilbertus*. *Angilbertus Pustrella ejusdem nominis superiori successit 827. Hic ille Angilbertus est, quem tantæ dignitatis corrupit fœlicitas; cum aliquamdiu moderatione antea usus, prudenter Mediolanensem administrasset Ecclesiam; suffultus enim (ut quidam narrant) Magni Caroli privilegiis & gratiis, charusque Ludovico Pio Imperatori, Lotharioque ejusdem filio, à Romana Ecclesia ita defecit, ut per inauditam 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 abduxerit 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 Dig-'nity corrupted, after having used moderation for some 'time, he had prudently governed that Church: For be-'ing upheld (as some tell us) by the Priviledges and 'Favours 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 past over to his Suc-'cessor, *T. 4. Ital. Sacr. p. 3.*

'cessor: so that for two hundred Years together they 'were led astray and infected by this Contumacy.

We are not to admit that which *Vghellus* would fain insinuate, that this was a rebelling against his Patriarch. This is a meer 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 pretence of putting a stop to the Simony into that Diocess, 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 *Anselm*, Bishop of *Lucca*, to *Milan*, who subjected that Diocess, obliging them to receive the Laws of the Popes Synod, whereas before they had only owned the Laws of the Oecumenical 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. *Pet. Dam. Opusc. 5.*

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 Pall, he refused it, in the Year 1125. for fear of subjecting his Church to that of *Rome*. See how *Landulphus*, *cap.* 38. relates the matter; as we find it set down by *Ughellus*.

Tom. 4. p. 189. *Anselmus Pustrella hujus nominis Quintus Archiepiscopus adlectus est Anno* 1123. *De Profectione ejusdem Romam ad Honorium II. Anno* 1125. *ac de iis quæ ibi peregit, hæc Landulphus capitulo* 38. *Sed cum idem Archiepiscopus secutus consilium quorundam Capellanorum & Primicerii, Petri verò Terdonensis Episcopi, contra publicum interdictum cleri, & Populi Mediolanensis, Romani ivit: mihi quidem non sedit.... veruntamen ipse, ceu vir prudens & sapiens cum Papa Honorio, & Cardinalibus ejus multa contulit, & conferendo Ecclesiasticas consuetudines Ambrosianæ Ecclesiæ, & honores ejus Archiepiscopatûs & Urbis, vivis & bonis rationibus defendit. Unde ipse Papa huic Prudenti viro dixit: Frater, meditatus & Episcopus venisti; sed si vis frui Authoritate Archiepiscopi, in temporibus meis, necesse est ut stolam suscipias è manibus meis; aut sicut ego 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 Romæ stolam, & Ecclesiæ Mediolanensi prepararet hanc novam & gravissimam quam Honorius Papa dicebat sibi, imponere mensuram. Mediolanum igitur ipse Archiepiscopus sine stola rediit, & 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 Ecclesiæ Mediolanensis, consensit, & quod ipsum Albensis ille Episcopus Roboaldus, auctoritate suâ confirmavit. Deinde Pontifex iste Anselmus, sedem & Castella Archiepiscopatûs in beneficio Cleri & 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, *chap.* 38. But when the said Archbishop, following the Council of some of his Chaplains, 'and

'and of his *Primicerius*, and of *Peter*, Bishop of *Terdon*, 'contrary to the publick 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 Prero-'gatives of that Archbishoprick and City. Whereupon 'the Pope said to this Prudent Man, Brother, you that 'are a Bishop come hither well provided with Argu-'ments; but if you have a mind to enjoy the Archiepisco-'pal Dignity during my time, it is needful that you 'receive the Pall from my hands, or as I my self have 'received it at the Altar of St. *Peter*. Then the Bishop 'of *Milan* conjured *Roboaldus*, Bishop of *Alba*, to advise 'him in this case; 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 and 'hard 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 Seat, until *Ubertus de Me-'regnano* his Secretary had sworn that his Lord *Anselmus* 'had not consented to the least diminution of the Prero-'gatives 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 Archbishoprick, 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 endeavoured to foment some ages since, as if they were the Patriarchs of all the West; in consequence whereof their Flatterers have endeavoured to make the World believe, That the suburbicary Churches, whereof mention is made in the Sixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, do signifie 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 Diocess of *Milan* have met in Synods with the Pope and his Council, as if they had belong'd 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 easie 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 belong'd 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 endeavour'd 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 neighbouring Diocesses, 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 entring into the examination of

of what this Concession did import, we are to observe first, That this Pall was no more than a politick Subtilty of the Court of *Rome*, to establish amongst the barbarous and stupid Western People, the Edict of *Valentinian* the Third, in favour 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 *Hincmar* has very well observ'd with respect to all the Pope's Priviledges, save that the Pope did not take away a Right, whereof those to whom he granted the priviledge, 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 Diocess has been since the Popes have made use of this Snare, that the Ecclesiastical Liberty of that Diocess 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 Diocess of *Italy*, is so clear, that after an Hundred Treatises of the Learned of the Church of *Rome*, who have maintain'd, That by the Suburbicary 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 Diocess 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 Diocess of *Milan*, in the midst of the Ninth Century, pretended to be independent, as we find it in his Notes

Tom. 3. Notes upon the Council of *Pavia*, under *Leo* IX. He very expresly observes, that this Diocess did not own the Laws which the Popes published in their Councils, as pretending not to depend upon their Regulations.

CHAP. XIV.

Concerning the Separation of the Churches of the Diocess of Italy, *from the Church of* Rome; *and of the Faith of the* Paterines.

WHat I have already related concerning the Independence of the Diocess of *Italy* on the Pope, was a thing very displeasing and troublesome to the Church of *Rome*; She could not, without regret, see a Diocess so near to her, preserve its Liberty, whilst a great number of other Diocesses, 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 *Simoniacks*, and that of the *Nicolaitans*, who did not believe themselves bound to observe *Celibacy*, by a meer humane 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 ordain'd, for the use of the Bishops and Archbishops, and without paying which, there was scarcely any Ordination to be had.

Opusc. 5. *Petrus Damianus* himself tells us, That upon his arrival at *Milan*, the Clergy stirr'd up the People to express their dis-

discontent against the design of this Legation: *Non debere Ambrosianam Ecclesiam Romanis legibus subjacere, nullumque judicandi vel disponendi jus Romano Pontifici in illa sede competere. Nimis indignum ut quæ sub progenitoribus nostris SEMPER extitit libera, ad nostræ confusionis opprobrium, nunc alteri, quod absit, Ecclesiæ 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 ALWAIES free in the time of our Forefathers, 'should now, to our great reproach and confusion, be for-'ced 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 Metropolis, 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 Hereticks. 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 Diocess from the Heresie of the *Nicolaitans*, which began to spread it self there. These are the Arguments he makes use of and adds a passage out of a Book, *De sacerdotali dignitate*, falsly attributed to St. *Ambrose*, wherein the Author makes profession of his following the Church of *Rome* in all things, as his Mistress.

'Tis

'Tis pleasant to see this Impostor congratulating himself, that he had asserted the Prerogative of the Church of *Rome* to so good purpose. This so very Evangelical Sermon smoothi'd all the Rubs he met with at first. He examins 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 Heresie 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 II of *Nice*, concerning the worshipping of Images, which, it appears, that Diocess 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 waies 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 *Lambecius* tells us, *lib. 2. Comment, Bibliothecæ Vindobonensis*, p. 790 *Et de Stephano Godefredi Regis Germano, & qualiter ejus temporibus patarea apud Mediolanum exorta est, & 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 Sence of this Bishop, signifies the pretended Heresie of the *Patarines*.

The

The account which *Sigonius* gives us of this matter, is this: *Cum multæ aliæ Ecclesiæ novæ de Simoniacorum atque Nicolaitarum Hæresi decreta repudiarunt, tum maximè Mediolanensis; ut quæ jampridem Romanæ Ecclesiæ authoritate relictâ, præceptis ejus haud quaquam obtemperaret, & tamen, si qua alia retrò 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 Cottæ, populi præfecto auctor fuit, ut eam palam oppugnandam aggrederetur. Id verò cum facere secundis populi auribus, animisque cœpisset, Wido Archiepiscopus contrariam partem suscepit, favore maxime nobilitatis innixus. Itaq; res eo usque infamiæ, mutuis altercationibus jurgiisque deducta fuit, ut sacerdotes qui uxores haberent, præ pudore separatim à cæteris rem divinam facere cogerentur in loco qui Patria dicitur, unde vulgo à Pueris Patarini ad contumeliam dicebantur.* 'Whereas many other Churches rejected the 'new Decrees made against the Heresie of *Simoniacks* 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 Pre-'cepts, and yet was rather more infected with the Poison 'of these Heresies than any other; Therefore one *Arial-'dus*, as was said of the Family of the *Alciati*, and one of 'the chief Clerks, conceiving this a matter as well hainous 'in it self, as reproachful to the repute of the Clergy of *Milan*, 'he perswades *Landulfus Cotta* the Prefect of the People, 'openly, and with force, to oppose himself against the 'same; which when he had undertaken, upon the Peoples 'appearing in favour of his Design, *Wido* the Archbishop 'takes upon him the defence of the contrary Party, rely-'ing chiefly upon the Favour 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 ori-'ginal of the name of *Patarines*. I shall in the sequel ob-'serve, First, That they have given this nick name of *Pata-*

rines,

Opusc. 18. *rines* to the *Waldenses*, because the *Waldenses* were those *Subalpini* in *Peter Damian*, who at the same time maintain'd the same Doctrines in the Archbishoprick of *Turin*. Secondly, That the *Waldenses* have alwaies constantly maintain'd, that the Church could not deprive Ministers of the Liberty of Marrying, forasmuch as God had never depriv'd 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 Hereticks.

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 justifie 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 Diocess, 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 favouring Idolatry, according to the definition of their Ancestors at *Francfort*.

Cap. 4. p. 234. *Fourthly*, Because it appears by the Book of *Lanfranc* against *Berengarius*, that some Schismaticks maintain'd 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 Heresie, had already almost corrupted all the *French*, *Italians*, and *English*. When he speaks of a Corruption

ruption in these Diocesses about this matter, it is evident, that he means that they treated the Popes as Innovators and *Paschasians*, and that they kept to the Primitive Faith of the Church, which the Popes had endeavoured 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 err'd, by reason of Ignorance, and that the Church remain'd 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* expos'd to the same Calumnies, 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. *T.* 6. *Bib. Pat.* p. 216.

Seventhly, Because it appears from what is left us of the Writings of *Bonizo* Bishop of *Sutrium*, who took Pen in hand in defence of the Popes Pretensions over this Diocess, that his aim was to assert the self-same Roman Doctrines, which in process of time we find constantly oppos'd by the *Waldenses* in that Diocess. See here one of his Notes, taken out of his Paradise of St. *Austin*, *De Baptismi sacramento, & de corporis & sanguinis Domini Eucharistia* —— *scrutare viriliter*. *Tom.* 1. *Lamb.* pag. 791.

In his Eighth Abridgment he treats about, *Quid sit infernus, & utrum in inferno mali tantum, an etiam boni mansuri sint, & an corpora possint esse in ustione ignis perpetua, & quibus sacrificium prosit post mortem, & qualiter mortui in somniis viventibus appareant, & de oblatione vel eleemosyna pro defunctis, & 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 Burn-'ings; and to whom the Sacrifice of the Mass is available 'after death; and how the Dead may appear to the Living 'in P. 792.

'in their Dreams; and about Offerings and Alms for the 'Dead; and that *Adam* was deliver'd 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 entring 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.

Ibid. p. 798.

Two things more may be added to what I have already observed; the first is, That it is apparent, that tho' the Abbot *Gezo* had endeavoured 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 *Sigebert*, *ad Ann.* 1081, in the Edition of *Miræus*, in the year 1608. *Istis diebus Francia turbabatur per Berengarium Turonensem, qui asserebat Eucharistiam, quam sumimus in altari, non esse revera corpus & sanguinem Christi: unde contra eum & pro eo multum à multis & verbis & scriptis disputatum est.* 'In those days there were Disturbances in *France*, 'by means of *Berengarius* of *Tours*, who maintain'd, That the 'Eucharist which we receive on the Altar, is not the true Bo'dy and Blood of Christ: which occasion'd great Disputes 'both for and against him, as well by writing Books as by 'publick Disputations.

Sur. ad April 22. cap. 6.

We

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 & Sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, multis hoc, nonnullis illa* * [*prius*] *sentientibus. Maxima si quidem pars panem & vinum per sacra orationis verba, & sacerdotis consecrationem, Spiritu Sancto invisibiliter operante, converti sub substantialiter in Corpus Dominicum de Virgine natum, quod & in Cruce pependit, & in Sanguinem, qui de ejus latere militis effusus est lancea, asserebat,* [*atque authoritatibus Orthodoxorum Patrum, tam Græcorum, quam Latinorum defendebat*] *Quidam verò cæcitate nimiâ & longâ perculsi figura tantum* † *substantiale illud corpus in dextera Patris sedens esse, seque & alios decipientes, quibusdam cavillationibus conabantur adstruere. Verum ubi cœpit res agi, prius etiam quam tertia die ventum fuerit in* * *Synodo, defecit contra veritatem niti pars altera, nempe Spiritus Sancti ignis emolumenta* † *palearum consumens, & fulgore suo falsam lucem diverberando obtenebrans, noctis caliginem vertit in Lucem.* 'All of them therefore being met together 'in St. *Saviours* 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 Opi'nion. For the greatest part of them maintained that 'the Bread and Wine by means of the sacred words and 'the Priests 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 gush'd from his 'Side when pierced with the Soldiers Spear †[and 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, endeavoured 'to prove by Sophistical Cavillation, that it was figura'tively only * the substantial Body sitting at the right 'hand of the Father, deceiving themselves and others. 'But

T. 10. Concil. Edit. Lib. pag. 379.

* Hæc vox abest à Codice MS. Thesaurus Conciliorum quem habeo præ manibus. Inclusa non habentur in MS. Codice Concil.

† MS. atque.

* MS. Synodum.

† MS. Elementa.

* These words are not found in the MS. Book of the Council

† These words are not found in the MS. Copy.

* MS. and that the substantial Body was sitting, &c.

'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 'darkning it, changed the darkness of the Night into 'Light.

* MS. Elements.

This is the account of what past 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* and *Radbertus*, had occasioned that Division; whereof the Book of *John Scot*, which was burnt at *Verceil*, was an authentick Testimony.

But I believe I have sufficiently made out in the foregoing Chapters, that the Dioceses 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 overflow'd the Romish Church, and the greatest part of the Western Churches. We had also a particular information, in what manner *Italy* separated it self 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 Superiour as Inferior Clergy, and the founder part of the People,

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 favoured the Interests and Pretensions of the Pope and the separation of those *Subalpini* in the Bishoprick 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 Dioceses, 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 shew 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 diffame *Wido*, than so many Popes, who have destroyed their opposers, by the way of Arms, that being the Custom of these Barbarous Ages.

Annal. Eccl. ad b. A. §. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21.

But we are to make our Observation upon the Endeavours 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 Legats to *Milan*, who confirming what *Petrus Damianus*, Cardinal of *Ostia*, had done, past the same into Orders and Regulations that were to be strictly observed, as being pronounced in

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.

Lib. 1. *Epist.* 15. But we find by the Epistles of *Gregory* VII. to the *Lombards*, that the Clergy of *Milan*, only laught 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 look'd upon as justly deposed.

Epist. 23. *Lib.* 4.

Lib. 1. *Ep.* 11. We find the same *Gregory* endeavouring 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 *Simoniacks*, only because they were willing to maintain the Emperors Rights, in reference to investitures, against the Enterprises of some Popes that were before him.

Lib. 1. *Epist.* 12. *Lib.* 1. *Epist.* 15. *Lib.* 1. *Ep.* 29.

The following Year he summons the Suffragans of the Bishoprick of *Milan*, and the Abbots of that Diocess to come up to *Rome*, and to be present at the Council.

Lib. 1. *Epist.* 43.

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 shew, 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

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. *Giraldus Cambrensis*, who wrote in the Year 1200. accuseth the *Patareans* and *Cathari*, with rejecting the carnal presence. *Dist.* 1. *cap.* 2. *Gemma Eccles. MS. Lambethani. Vincentius Bellucensis Specul. Histor. l.* 30. *cap.* 7. attributes several Heresies to these *Milanese*.

CHAP. XV.

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 Diocess, 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 dream'd of whilest awake. It was at the end of the same Century, and the beginning of the next, that Manicheism, the most wild Heresie the Devil could ever suggest, found many followers in *Italy* and *Aquitain*, 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 as 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 Schismaticks: 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 sway'd 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 shew that about the Year of our Saviour 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 Hereticks, 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

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. *Epiph. Her. 66*

2. They lookt 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 hindred it to the utmost of their power, by condemning Marriage. *S. Aug. l. 15. cont. Faust. c. 4, 5, 6, 7 & l. 19. c. 29.*

3. They rejected the Old Testament, maintaining, that he who spake to *Moses*, was the Prince of Darkness. *S. Aug. lib. de Heres.*

4. They maintain'd, 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. *S. Epiph. Her. 66. S. Aug. L. de duab. anim. S. Aug. de Her.*

5. They denied Free-Will, because otherwise God would be the Author of Sin. *S. Aug. de lib. Arb.*

6. They maintain'd, That the New Testament had been falsified, and under this Pretence they admitted only of so much of it as pleased them. *S. Aug. l. 17. cont. Faust. c. 3.*

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 Saviour's Resurrection. *S. Epiph. Her. 66. & Thiod. l. 1. Her. Fab. c. 26.*

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. *S. Aug. l. 4. cont. Faust. c. 2.*

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. *Id. vide l. 20. c. 20.*

10. They rejected Baptism, as unnecessary to Salvation. *Id. lib. de Her.*

Id. l. 20. cont. Faust. c. 11. 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 maintain'd withal, that Wine was the Gall of the Prince of Darkness, and therefore rejected the use of Wine in the Communion.

L. de Her. & lib. de Morib. Manich. c. 19, & 20. St. *Augustin* ascribes to these Hereticks 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 Murther, and their Bosoms pure and chast, because their Elect gloried in their observing perpetual Chastity, and rejecting the use of Marriage.

S. Aug. l. 20. cont. Faust. c. 21. As for his attributing to them, That they had an Aversion for the Reliques of the Saints; this seems to be a Consequence of their Opinions concerning the Original of the Body, which they lookt upon as proceeding from the evil Principle.

S. Aug. l. de Her. 12. They condemned Husbandry, attributing to Trees and Plants a sensitive Life.

Id. l. 22. cont. Faust. c. 74. & seq. 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

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*, advertizing 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 Enterprizes. *In Biblioth. Pat.*

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 oppos'd 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 comprizeth 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 sence, with reference to his actions.

IV. That they deny the Cross of Jesus Christ.

V. That

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*, *Catechef.* 6. out of whom he has transcrib'd many long passages.

I will not trouble my self 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 Diocess 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*.

2 *p. direct. q.* 13. *pag.* 274.

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 Hereticks that were of her Communion, and publickly taught that they could not be saved in the Communion of *Rome*.

The

The Fourth Article is, That all the Sacraments of the Church of *Rome*, which were instituted by our Saviour 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 feigned 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 Blest 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 maintain'd, 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 herein they had the same Power that St. *Peter* and St *Paul*, with the other Apostles of our Saviour 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 Hereticks, or in the abundance of Consolati-

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 humane Body, nor the true Flesh of Man, as other men take it from Humane Nature; that he never truly suffer'd or died on the Tree of the Cross, that he never truly rose again, nor ascended into Heaven with a Body of Humane 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 Saviour Jesus Christ: they deny also that she was a carnal Woman, but maintain'd, that their Sect was, that *Mary* that Virgin, the true Penance, that she was chast, 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 humane 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 kill'd 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 Heresies of the *Manichees*, which *Emericus* sets down after another manner than they are described by

by *Archelaus*, S. *Cyril*, S. *Epiphanius*, S. *Augustin*, *Theodoretus*, and *Petrus Diaconus* of *Sicily*. 'Tis visible, that some part of these Heresies were only *Chimera's*, occasion'd by some allegorical expressions of those who then preached against the Romish Church, but however, most maliciously and falsly attributed to the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*.

Notwithstanding, this *Emericus* his mistake in the account he gives us of the original of this Sect, sure it is, that it owns 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 it self 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 Heresies of the *Paulicians* (or *Publicani*,) for so *Anastasius* calls them. *Theoph.*

We find in the Ninth Century, *A.* 811, that the Emperor *Nicephorus* favoured the *Manichees*, called *Pauliciani* & *Acingani*, who lived in *Phrygia* and *Lycaonia*: *Michael Rangabe* being Emperor, persecuted them, kil'd some, and banish'd 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 *Zonaras*. *Zonar. T. 3. in Joan. Zimisce, p. 167.*

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 *Cathavini*, the *Germans* calling them *Ketters*. And 'tis probable that from this School came those *Manichees*, that appeared in *Italy*, as well as *Glab. Radul. l. 3 c. 8.*

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 deriv'd his Ordination from *Bulgaria*, who afterwards, at the sollicitation of one *Nicetas* Pope, come from *Constantinople*, he took Orders of him, and entred into the Order of *Druncaria*. Afterwards he represents the different Parties and different Opinions amongst them. We find also, that *Raynerus*, who in the XIII Century gives us a description of their Churches, makes three sorts of *Cathari* in *Lombardy*, observing that those who had setled themselves at *Tholouse*, 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 call'd Hereticks, 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 falsly 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 pretence to condemn those pretended Hereticks for half *Manichees*, who according to the Principles of the *Manichees*, conceal'd 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 condemn'd the Baptism of Infants.

Fourthly,

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 evidenc'd, 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 pretence 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 call'd 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.

CHAP. XVI.

Concerning the Cathari *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*, *Præpositus* of *Steinfield*, in the Diocess of *Cologne*. It is evident, that he has described the same Hereticks, whereof *Egbertus* Monk of *Schonange* 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 charg'd 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:

T. 3. *Annal.* p. 453. *& seq.*

'THere have been lately some Hereticks discovered amongst us, near *Cologne*, whereof some with satisfaction return'd 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 Heresie 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 skilful in their Belief, promising to return to the Church, provided they should find their Master's 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 entred 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

'bers of the Devil could with such Courage and Constancy persist in their Heresie, as is scarcely to be found in the most Religious in the Faith of Christ.

'Their Heresie 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 Apostolick 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 aboad, 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 for what is necessary to support our Lives, we maintain our selves 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

'ac

'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; Alledging 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 baptise 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 endeavoured 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 tryal 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

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 Hereticks 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 it self 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 it self of the power of Consecrating, which was so great in *Peter*; and what it has not it self, the Archbishops and Bishops, who live like Men of the World, cannot receive from it, *viz.* the power of Consecrating others: To this purpose alledging 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, alledging 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 Saviour, 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 these words of our Saviour, which he speaks to the *Jews*, in answer to what they objected

to

'to him, about the Bill of Divorce, *from the beginning it was not so*; and the following words, *Whosoever marries her that is divorced, commits adultery*; and that of the Apostle; *Let marriage be honourable to all, and the bed undefiled.*

'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 lyes*: 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 Bulworks, 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 defence they made for themselves told us, That this their Heresie 'had

'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 Hereticks 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 Apostles 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.

Farewel in the Lord.

This is the Letter of *Evervinus*, whence St. *Bernard* took occasion to refute these Hereticks, in his 65. and 66. Sermons upon the *Song of Solomon*. And indeed we find, that the beginning of his 65. 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, *pag.* 759. *Edit. Paris. A.* 1623. *p.* 760.

2. He supposeth that their endeavour 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. An forte nec Paulum recipitis? De quibusdam ita audivi; non enim inter vos omnes per omnia concordatis, etsi à nobis omnes dissentiatis.* Probably you reject *Paul* also: for so I have heard of some of you; for neither do you all agree amongst your selves, though you all differ from us.

5. He accuseth them for falsly 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 unblamable in their Carriage and Behaviour; yet triumphs over them in this point, accusing them of giving offence to their Neighbour, *pag.* 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 termis, *Vile nempe hoc genus & rusticanum, ac sine literis & prorsus imbelle*, 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 Catholicks; or what he had learnt from those, who were entred 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 behaviour of the Apostles. The other, That their dwelling with Women not married, was a proof of their Impurity. The good Father, whilest he discourses thus, did not consider the rigour of the Persecution they were under; and he had forgot that *Robertus* of *Arbrissel* had practised the like continence with Women.

Gofrid. Vind. L. 4. *Ep.* 47.

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.

p. 762. 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 *Tim.* 4.

p. 764. 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

imputation before, when he says, *Quare cum illius secta authorem neminem dabunt.* Wherefore since they can produce no Author of their Sect. p. 763.

4. He saith, That some amongst them, allowed marriage only, where both the Parties were Virgins. p. 763.

5. He chargeth them with abstaining from meats. *Horrent lac & quicquid ex eo conficitur; postremò quicquid ex coitu generatur.* 'They abhor Milk and all that is made 'of it; and last of all, whatsoever is generated by Co-'pulation. In which point he suspects them of Manicheism p. 764.

6 He accuseth them of consecrating the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, at their common Tables: *Ad nutriendum se in corpus Christi & Membra*, to feed themselves into the Body of Christ and Members. p. 765.

7. He accuseth them of looking upon themselves as the only Successors of the Apostles. p. 765.

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 slandring Ecclesiastical Orders, of rejecting Church-Ordinances, contemning the Sacraments, and disobeying her commands, under pretence that the Popes, the Archbishops, the Bishops and Priests were sinners incapable of administring or receiving the Sacraments. p. 766.

10 Here he stops, as asserting that no body 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. *Quæsiti fidem* (*NB.*) *cum de quibus suspecti videbantur, omnia prorsus suo more negarent, examinati aquæ 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 Lyers: and being no longer 'able to deny it, because they were found guilty, by 'the Water not admitting of them, they confessed their

 Crimes,

'Crimes, offered themselves to defend them to the death, 'and were knockt 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 quæstum*, for their interest sake, and who alledged it as reason, that they could not condemn persons that were neither convict, nor confest 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 employ'd 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 satisfie 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 Manichees 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 *Albigenses*, we should confound matters by treating of them here. CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

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 XII. and XIII. 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 Dioceses 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 fore-mentioned 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 design'd 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 Hereticks, 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 learnt more of their Opinions from those who had renounc'd 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 Catholick Faith, which 'like Moths they corrupt and destroy. And yet he adds, That

That they were divided into several Sects, and maintain'd their Opinions by the Authority of Scripture. 'They are 'armed with the words of Holy Scripture, which any ways 'do seem to favour their Opinions, and with these they 'know how to defend their Errors, and to oppose the Ca-'tholick Truth; though indeed they be altogether igno-'rant 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, p 897. *adversum Hæreses*, lib. 1. *Prophetatum dudum tempora*; whereas the Title of it contains a long description of these *Manichean* Heresies: *Adversus pestiferos fœdissimosque Catharorum (qui Manichæorum Hæresim innovarunt) damnatos errores ac Hæreses Egberti Presbyteri, primo Ecclesiæ Collegiatæ Bunnensis, Coloniensis Diœceseos Canonici, demum verò professi monachi* Schonaugiensis *monasterii, utilissimi sermones, ex penetralibus Evangelicis, & aliarum divinarum Scripturarum armario depromptis. Ex quibus proculdubio fructum plurimum metet diligens lector & candidus. Breve ex Augustino de Manichæis 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 encreased to those multitudes throughout all 'Coun-

Strm. 1. p. 898. *in Bib. PP. Colon. edit.*

'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 Leprosie, '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 forbad Marriage, and all eating of Flesh, who rejected Baptism with Water, and instead thereof, substituted a false one, *in spiritu sancto & igne, With the Holy Ghost, and with Fire*; and who concerning the Eucharist, entertained the notions of the *Manichees*, and who in particular maintain'd, 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 Hereticks, of whom he makes mention. p. 889.

De animabus mortuorum, talem sententiam habent, quod in ipsa hora exitûs sui, vel transeunt ad æternam beatitudinem, vel ad æternam damnationem. Non enim recipiunt, quod credit universalis Ecclesia, viz. esse quasdam Purgatorias pœnas, in quibus animæ quorundam electorum, ad tempus examinantur pro peccatis suis, de quibus in hac vita per condignam satisfactionem ad plenum purgatæ non sunt: Propterea ergo arbitrantur superfluum & vanum esse pro mortuis eleemosynas dare, missas celebrare, & irrident pulsationes campanarum, quas facimus, quæ tamen piâ ratione in Ecclesias fiunt, ut videlicet vivi ad orandum pro mortuis commoneantur, & ad memoriam propriæ mortis excitentur. Missas quæ in Ecclesiis celebrantur, omnino spernunt, & pro nihilo ducunt.

tunt. Nam si fortè cum populo, in quo habitant, ad audiendum Missas, sive etiam ad percipiendam Eucharistiam accedunt, omnino hoc simulatorie faciunt, ne infidelitas eorum possit notari. Ordinem quippe sacerdotii in Rom. Ecclesia, & cunctis Ecclesiis Catholicæ 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 Purga'tory 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 Mas'ses; 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 ta'ken notice of; for they maintain, that the Sacerdotal Or'der is altogether perished in the Church of *Rome*, and 'all other Catholick Churches, and that true Priests are only 'to be found in their Sect.

p. 859. 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 doctrinæ magistri sui, quæ inter hæreses illius non inveniuntur. Divisi etiam sunt contra semetipsos, quia nonnulla quæ ob aliquibus eorum dicuntur, ab aliis negantur.* 'Yet have they also many things mingled with their Ma'ster's Doctrine, which we do not find amongst his Here'sies. They are also divided amongst themselves; so what 'some of them say, is again denied by others. We may see from hence, whether our Author herein deals with that candour as he ought to do, when without distinguishing between the different Sects whereof he treats, he endeavours 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 pretence, that there was something of conformity in their Opinions, though they differ'd 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 XII. Century have made mention of the *Cathari*, with this kind of confusion.

Ughellus tells us, in the Life of *Galdinus* Archbishop 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. *Ital. Sacr.* T. 4. p. 222.

D'Achery has published the Writing of an Author, who pretends to discover the Doctrine of the *Cathari*, 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 Hereticks, the *Cathari*, the *Passagii*, and the *Arnoldistæ*, whose Doctrines he refutes; but a wise Reader *Spic.* Tom. 13.

der 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, &c. 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 maintain'd by the *Paterines*, who were Enemies to the Romish Idolatry: As for example, That the *Cathari* maintain'd *Crucem esse characterem Bestiæ, quæ in Apocalypsi esse legitur, & abominationem stantem in loco sancto. Beatum Sylvestrum, dicunt Antichristum fuisse, de quo legitur in*
2 Thess. 2. 4. *Epistolis, Filius perditionis est, qui extollitur super omne quod dicitur Deus; à tempore illo dicunt Ecclesiam esse perditam.* '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 extolls himself above every thing '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 *Waldenses*, 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 endeavour to defend 'this their Errour by Testimonies drawn from the New 'Testa-

'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. p. 84.

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 XII. 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* attributes to the *Cathari* almost the very same Opinions, in his first Book against Hereticks 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 differ'd 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 later, you may see in what follows.

He affirms, that some of these Hereticks believ'd 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. Ch. 39. Ch. 41. Ch. 43.

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

Chap. 47. He tells us, That some of them believ'd, 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

Ch. 50. Penance is of no use for the Remission of Sins, because that is a Work of Grace.

Ch. 52. He gives us an account of the Opinion of others of them, who maintain'd it was sufficient for them to confess their Sins to God.

Ch. 57. He takes notice, that they rejected the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; and that they condemned it, as being

Ch. 59. an Article that was not to be found in any Creed of the Church.

Ch. 66,67,68. He saith, There were others amongst them that rejected Confirmation, Orders, and Extreme Unction, pretending that they were no Sacraments of the Gospel.

Ch. 69. That there were others of them that had no regard for Churches, and refused to own them for the House of GOD.

Ch. 72. 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 63. 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 *Cathari*, 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

ries 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 easie to perceive, that he sets forth the Errors of the *Cathari*, with allusion to the Opinions of the Church of *Rome*: She believ'd the absolute necessity of Baptism, and she held it for an Error either to deferr Baptism, as formerly had been practis'd, 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 *Hereticks*, and in *Alanus*; and he calls those *Hereticks* 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, *Omnis utriusq; sexus, &c.* and yet in the mean time the Doctrine of Contrition, as restoring a Sinner to Grace and Favour, was still in use. This is that which is own'd by *Mathond in Pullum Cardinalem*, 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 *Laick*, is of the same nature; the Church of *Rome* admitted of it, and there have been a Thousand Examples of it in Shipwracks, 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 *Albigenses* 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 *Albigenses* were meer *Manichees*; 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 Disciplin.

Secondly,

Secondly, That writing to the Earl of *Montpellier*, he seems rather to have had an eye to the *Albigenses*, than to the *Waldenses*, whom he distinguisheth from them, and sets upon in his Second Book.

But here, first of all, we are to take notice, that the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses* had both of them the same belief, as I shall be able to justifie with God's assistance. Secondly, We are to observe, that his Design being to set forth the *Cathari* in their colours, without distinguishing them, as *Evervinus* and *Petrus Cluniacensis* have done, he rak'd together all the Discourses that had been made against them, without troubling himself about the examining of them. Thirdly, That since there were some *Manichees* in the Country of the *Albigenses*, he made it his business to confound them with the true *Albigenses*, 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 connexion and incompatibility. Fourthly, We are to observe, that tho' 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 comprized 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 lookt upon only as Schismaticks, 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 Cambrensis* saith, That the Errors of the *Paterines* or *Cathari*, were principally about the Eucharist. 'Tis in a MS. Treatise of his entituled, *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, where we find these words, *Deus*

MS. in Bibl. Lambeth.

Deus itaque qui in omnibus operibus suis magnus est, & merito magnificandus, in duobus hic præcipuè se magnificum ostendit: quod in illis mundi partibus, in quibus Heretici illi nostri temporis, qui Patari seu Catari dicuntur, & circa hanc præcipuè articulum, scilicet de corpore Christi conficiendo, errare noscuntur, scilicet in Flandriæ finibus, magis abundant, hoc declaravit. 'God therefore, who in all his Works is great, 'and worthily to be magnified, has in these two particu-'lars chiefly glorified himself by declaring this in those 'parts of the World, *viz.* on the Borders of *Flanders*, in 'which those Hereticks of our time, who are called *Pate-'rines* and *Catharines*, and who are known chiefly to err 'about this Article of making the Body of Christ, do most 'abound.

CHAP. XVIII.

That the Paterines *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 justifie those called *Paterines* and those *Subalpini*, that in the Diocess of *Turin* separated themselves from the favourers 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 Heresies whose 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

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 publick Library of the University of *Cambridge*, given by Sir *Sam. Morland*, 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 è 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 Vallies of *Piedmont*.

Lib. v. cap. 6. p. 99. & seq.

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 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 honour 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

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 joyn that of our Neighbour, 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 has 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 Decalogue, 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 shewed the Judgments of God against the wicked Israelites, and his favour towards those that were good amongst them, he sets forth the sending of the Saviour into the World; the Angels message to the Virgin; the Conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost; the Virgins 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 forbad 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

bids Divorce it self; that the Law curſed thoſe who were barren, whereas the Goſpel counſels the keeping in a Single State; that the Law forbad all forſwearing of ones 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, *&c.*

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 betray'd 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 Saviour, his Wounds, his Burial, his Reſurrection, his ſhewing 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

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 lye, nor whore, nor kill, nor deceive his Neighbour, nor avenge himſelf of his Enemies, they preſently ſay, he is a *Vaudés*, 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 behavour 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 Death bed 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, *&c.* 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 my ſelf 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;
'Tis 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 offences 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 honour 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

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 Honour.
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

Now I defie 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*, perform'd 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 my self 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, entituled, *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 lye, nor commit 'Adultery, nor kill, nor steal, nor avenge himself of his 'Enemies; they presently say of such a one, He is a *Vau-'dés*, and worthy of Death. This name of *Waldensis* was given to the Disciples of *Peter Waldo*, as *Peter Vallis Cernaii* expresly 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 70 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

But it is easie 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 *Wallenses* or *Vaudés*, before his time, from the Valleys in which they dwelt. 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*. Antihar. c. 25.

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 Diocess of *Raly*, had declared their aversion from Oaths: But we have clearly shewed from *Ratherius* Bishop of *Verona*, and others, that this Opinion took place in that Diocess 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 Diocess were led by them, especially before they had examined the whole Scripture throughout, which was not an easie 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 Labour 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 XII. Century, the stile 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 XII. Century.

To

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. join'd 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 favour of the Antiquity of *The Noble Lesson*, is this: That though I cannot judge of the stile of that Piece, by comparing it with other *Italian* Monuments, of the beginning of the XII. Century, as having no MS. of that Age; nor compare it with the stile 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 XII. Century, as may be judged from this; That St. *Bernard*, who was a French man, 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, shews, 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 easie 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 spoke in *Provence*, which ows 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

occasion to help the Reader to make this comparison, tho' 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 stile, that so they may not sound uncouth and barbarous to the People, which cannot so well be done in a piece of Poetry, wherein nothing can be easily changed, without spoiling the whole composure.

I do not intend here, in order to prove the Opinions of the Diocess 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 XIII. Century. And as for the Treatise concerning the Invocation of Saints, it quotes the *Milleloquium* of St. *Austin*, which was not compos'd by *Fr. Bartholomeus* of *Urbin* till about the midst of the XIV. Century. So that it seems these Gentlemen founded their Judgments of the Antiquity of these pieces on too weak grounds.

However, it will be easie for us to make out, without the assistance of any doubtful Authorities, That the XII. 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 oppos'd 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 re-establishing

blishing the Authority of the Senate in *Rome*, and of obliging the Pope not to meddle with any thing, but what concern'd 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*.

De Gestis Frid. lib. 1. c. 21.

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 *Brescia*, for the love he bare to Learning travell'd 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 Schismatick, 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 favour of Laymen. *Dicebat enim nec clericos proprietatem, nec Episcopos Regalia, nec Monachos possessiones habentes aliquâ ratione posse salvari. Cuncta hæc Principis esse, ab ejusque Beneficentia in usum tantum Clericorum cadere oportere.* 'For he 'maintain'd, that no Clergy-men enjoying Propriety, nor 'Bishops having Regal Jurisdiction, nor Monks having any 'Possessions, could possibly be saved; that all these things 'belong'd to the Prince, and that it was only from his 'Bene-

Epist. 185, 195, & 196.

'Beneficence the Clergy were to partake of them. This same thing St. *Bernard* also reproacheth him with. Ep. 189.

Those who have been a little conversant in the History of the XI. Century, and the beginning of the XII, 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 Accusattions laid to his charge by *Otho Frisingensis*.

But there was yet a more hainous thing laid to his charge, which was this: *Præter hæc de sacramento Altaris, Baptismo parvulorum, non sanè dicitur sensisse.* 'Besides this, 'it was said of him, that he was unsound in his Judg-'ment 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 it self any farther. *Otho* tells us, that hereupon he retired out of *Italy*, and setled himself in a place of *Germany* called *Turego*, or *Zurich*, belonging to the Diocess of *Constance*; as may be gathered from the 195. 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 shews, that the Letter which St. *Bernard* writ to the Bishop of *Constance*, did not much lessen his Credit, or do him any great Prejudice.

Ital. Sacr. T. 4. p. 740.

But we proceed to the upshot of his History, which take as follows, from the relation of the aforesaid *Otho*.

'Being entred 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 Fewel 'to the Fire, that he greatly encreased it, propounding 'to the multitude the Examples of the ancient *Romans*, 'who by the maturity of their Senator's Counsels, and 'the Valour and Integrity of their Youth, made the whole 'World their own. Wherefore he perswaded 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 hainous a Crime against Persons extreamly jealous of their Tyranny.

'And as he for many days, that is, from *Cœlestine's* 'death, to these times unceslantly and irreverently proceeded in these and such like Enterprizes, 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 'preserv'd for the Princes Trial, he was at last, by the 'Prefect of the City hang'd, 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 '*Tyber*.

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 couragiously undertaken to maintain against the Tyranny of the Popes, who without any Title or Right, except that of their Ambition, endeavoured to subject *Rome* to their Power, and to set up themselves for Soveraigns there.

We

We find a Confirmation of all this in *Guntherus*, who in Verse has describ'd 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 Partizans 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 Soveraignty of *Rome*, which they so much affected, and he so briskly opposed, fill'd 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. Lib. 3.

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 lookt upon it as a crying piece of Injustice, the guilt whereof did lye upon the Bishop of *Rome*, and his Clergy, who were the Procurers thereof. The good man, it seems, was not over well inform'd, 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 Soveraign 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. *Tom.* 13. *Spic.* p. 85.

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*.

In-

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 suppreſt 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.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

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 Dioceſs of *Italy*, and particularly in the Dioceſs of *Turin*, and in the Valleys thereabout, was the Work of these *Paterines* and *Subalpini*, and that we cannot with any shew of Justice attribute the same to *Peter Waldo*. What kind of person this *Waldo* was, whether a simple *Laick* or a *Manichee*, 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 divers Protestant Authors, that it is scarce possible fully to satisfie our Readers, without shewing 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 perswade men, that before *Waldo* began to contradict the Bishop of *Lions*, and to propound new Doctrines, which happened a little before the end of the XII. Century, there was never a Church either in *Italy*, or elsewhere, that was of his Belief. 'Tis 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 XII. Century. The Polemical

mical 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 shew us any Author of that time, who asserts, That *Peter Waldo* ever preached in the Diocess 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 inferr, 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 XIII. Century. He ingenuously acknowledgeth, 'That the Heresie of those he calls *Waudois*, or poor People of *Lions*, '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 it self. 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 it self 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 stifly 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 alledge 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 falsly 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 justifie 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 hainous 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 ancienter 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 Criticks, 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*?

V. Papbroch.

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 acknowledgement 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 alledge this in their Disputes? Is it not the Church of *Rome* and her Partisans? If we doubt of it, we need only to read *Eberb*'s Treatise against the *Cathari*, and we shall be fully convinced of it. He wrote about the Year 1160. And since the Diocess 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

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 *Paterines*. *Rayner. cap.* 6. which is sufficient to justifie 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 joyned 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 *Lion*, 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 & 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 Bethune*, *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 *Lions*, 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 *Paterines*. True it is, that *Gualterus Mappeus*, 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 Hereticks of the Diocess 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 satisfie any equitable Reader: The First is, That whereas this *Bernard* Abbot of *Foncaud*, who was of the Order of the *Premonstré*, intitles 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 *Valenses* in his Title, *Incipit Tractatus Bernardi contra Valenses & 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 abolendum decret. Grego. Lib. V. 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 Schismaticks 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 & Paterinos, & eos qui se humiliatos vel Pauperes de Lugduno falso nomine, mentiuntur, Passaginos, Josepinos, Arnoldistas, perpetuo decernimus Anathemati subjacere. Et quoniam nonnulli sub specie Pietatis, virtutem ejus, juxta quod ait Apostolus, denegantes, authoritatem sibi vindicant prædicandi ..... omnes qui vel prohibiti, vel non missi, præter Authoritatem ab Apostolica sede, vel ab Episcopo loci susceptam, publicè vel privatè prædicare præsumpserint; & universos qui de Sacramento corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vel de Baptismate, seu de Peccatorum Confessione, Matrimonio, vel reliquis Ecclesiasticis Sacramentis aliter sentire aut docere non metuunt, quam Sacrosancta Ecclesia Romana prædicat & observat ..... vinculo perpetui Anathematis innodamus.

'In the first place we decree and judge that the *Catha-*
'*ri* and *Paterines*, and those who falsly take to them-
'selves the name of the Humble or Poor of *Lions*, lye
'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 Au-
'thority of preaching ..... whosoever are either prohi-
'bited or not sent, and nevertheless presume to preach,
'either privately or publickly, without any Authority de-
'rived from the Apostolick See, or from the Bishop of
'the Diocess: as likewise all those who are not afraid
'to entertain different Opinions, or teach otherwise con-
'cerning

'cerning 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 Heresies, which he mentions, were sprung up *modernis temporibus*, of late time, yet takes in with them the *Arnoldists*, whose rise was above 60. 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 extreamly pleased, that he had this their original to object to them, which as he supposed might serve for a Prescription, his Heresie having been condemned in the *Lateran* Council, *Anno* 1179.

2. 'Tis 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 joyn themselves with the Churches of the *Vallies* 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 *Vallies*, 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

3. That he died before the year 1179, as appears from the account *Gulielmus Mapperus* 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 65. 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*.

CHAP. XX.

Whether the Waldenses *were at first only Schismaticks.*

THE Bishop of *Meaux* maintains, That the *Waldenses* were a distinct Sect from the *Albigenses*, 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 Opi-'nions 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 *Lions*, 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, perswaded 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

Lib. 11. des variat. p 213. 214.

them

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 *Pilikdorph*, 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 barr'd 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 Jealousie, 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 encrease, 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 endeavours 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

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 *Laicks*; 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 Hereticks. So that it appears that the Bishop of *Meaux* was so wholly bent to perswade his Reader, that *Waldo* was the Founder of the Churches of *Italy*, that he has with all the care imaginable conceal'd 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 easie 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 meerly from a Spirit of Schism that they separated themselves from the Church of *Rome*, tho' 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 don't 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 main-

I maintain therefore, that the Notion which the Bishop of *Meaux* gives his Reader concerning the *Waldenses*, as if they had been only Schismaticks, 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 inform'd of this, when he condemned them, *cap. ad abolendum, pag. 97. Directorii. Conrard.* Abbot of *Ursberg*, speaking of this Condemnation, acknowledgeth, *ad Ann.* 1212, That Pope *Lucius put them into the Catalogue of Hereticks, because of some superstitious Doctrines and Observances.* Which are the very words that the Bishop alledgeth. The same thing appears from the Edict of King *Alphonses*, 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 Hereticks, 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 neighbouring 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 XII. 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 entring upon the examination of the more fundamental Articles. Indeed

deed 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 endeavoured 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 convinc'd 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* the 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* the Third. Whereupon some of this poor People looking upon the Pope, as the cause of all their Sufferings, thought they might either justifie 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 allow'd 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 return'd them, and the Pope's inciting Princes to wage War against the *Albigenses*, 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 63. & 66. Sermon upon the *Canticles*, speaking concerning the Hereticks, whom he calls *Cathari*, acknowledgeth, that they rejected Prayers for the Dead, as also those addrest to Saints. *Pamelius*

 pre-

pretends, that he spake as plainly of the *Waldenses* as any of those that have writ since against them. But possibly, the Bishop may not think these to be matters of Heresie; at least he speaks very favourably of them in his Exposition of the Roman Faith: Wherefore we shall make it appear, that they differ'd from the Church of *Rome* on other Articles.

Reynerius a *Jacobite* attributes to them 33 Errors, where-
Coussord cont. Wald. p. 125. of *Coussord*, has published an Extract in these words; *Hic fuit primus eorum error, contemptus Ecclesiasticæ potestatis. Ex hoc traditi sunt Sathanæ, præcipitati ab ipso in errores innumeros, & antiquorum hæreticorum errores suis adinventionibus miscuerunt. Et quia electi sunt ab Ecclesia Catholica, se solos Christi Ecclesiam esse, & Christi Discipulos affirmant. Dicunt se Apostolorum successores, & habere auctoritatem Apostolicam, & claves ligandi ac solvendi. Romanam Ecclesiam ferunt esse Meretricem Babylonem, omnesq; illi obedientes damnari; maximè clericos ei obedientes à tempore Sylvestri Papæ. Nulla miracula vera aiunt esse quæ fiunt in Ecclesia, quia nullus eorum aliquando miracula fecit. Omnia Ecclesiæ statuta post Christi ascensionem, dicunt non esse servanda, nec alicujus esse valoris, festa, feriarum jejunia, Ordines, benedictiones, officia Ecclesiæ & similia respuunt omnino. Ecclesias consecratas, Cœmeteria ac omnia talia infamant, & clamant ea pro avaritia solum à Clericis instituta, ut ea ad suum quæstum reducant, quo à subditis hâc occasione pecuniam & oblationes exquirant. Tum primò hominem baptizari dicunt, cum in eorum sectam fuerit inductus. Quidam eorum Baptismum parvulis non valere tradunt, eo quod nondum actualiter credere possunt. Confirmationis sacramentum respuunt: Sed eorum Magistri manus imponunt discipulis, vice illius Sacramenti. Episcopos, clericos, ac Religiosos Ecclesiæ, Scribas & Pharisæos aiunt esse, & Apostolorum persecutores. Corpus Christi & sanguinem verum esse sacramentum non credunt, sed panem benedictum, qui in figura quadam dicitur corpus Christi, sicut dicitur, Petra autem erat Christus, & similia. Quidam 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, sibique mutuò participantes sicut in cœnâ Christi. Dicunt quod peccator sacerdos aliquem solvere aut ligare non possit; cum ipse sit ligatus peccator. Et quod quilibet*

quilibet bonus & sciens laicus alium absolvere valeat, & pœnitentiam injungere. Extremam unctionem respuunt, dicentes potius maledictiones esse quam sacramentum. Matrimonium, inquiunt, fornicatio est jurata, nisi continenter vivant, quaslibet enim immundicias magis licitas habent quam conjugalem copulam. Continentiam laudant quidem, sed inurente libidine concedunt ei satisfieri debere, quocunque modo turpi, exponentes illud Apostoli, 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, quæ casta putatur, puerum peperit, occultant & tradunt eum alibi alendum, ne prodatur. Omne juramentum illicitum esse perhibent, inde verò & mortale peccatum: Sed dispensant, ut juret quis pro evadenda morte corporis, ne alios prodat, aut secretum revelet perfidiæ suæ. Prodere Hæreticum, crimen esse dicunt inexpiabile, & peccatum in Spiritum sanctum. Nec malefactores per secula e judicium occidi licere dicunt. Quidam eorum nec Bruta Animalia, veluti pisces & hujusmodi, occidenda esse putant. Cum autem ea manducare volunt, super ignem & fumum suspendunt donec moriantur. Pulices & similia animalia excutiunt extra, aut vestem ipsam in aquam calidam intingunt; & tunc ea occidisse volunt, dicuntq; ea per se mortua fuisse. Ita fictas habent conscientias, & in aliis suis observantiis, sicut & in hoc existimari potest, quia scilicet veritatem deserentes, falsis se figmentis illudunt. Nullum est, secundum eos, Purgatorium. Omnes autem morientes statim vel in cœlum, vel in infernum transeunt: Ideoque & suffragia ab Ecclesia facta pro defunctis, nihil eis prodesse affirmant, cum in cœlo non indigeant, & in inferno nullatenus adjuventur. Unde colligunt oblationes pro defunctis factas, clericis qui illas comedunt prodesse, non animabus quæ hujusmodi non utuntur. Illorum dogma est, sanctos in cœlo orationes fidelium non audire, neq; venerationes, quibus eos honoramus, attendere; quia cum corpora sanctorum hic mortua jaceant, & spiritus tam remoti sint in cœlo, orationes nostras nullo modo auditu percipere valeant vel visu. Addunt & Sanctos non orare pro nobis, & ob id suffragia illorum non esse implorandà à nobis, quoniam cœlesti gaudio absorpti, nostis intendere, aut quid aliud curare non possunt. Unde & solemnitates, quas in sanctorum veneratione facimus, irrident, & alia nobis eos veneramur. In diebus autem Festis (ubi possunt) occultè opes-*

operantur, arguentes, quod cum operari bonum sit, bona agere in die festo, malum non est. In Quadragesima & die jejuniorum Ecclesiæ, non jejunant, sed carnes comedunt, ubi audent, dicentes, quod Deus non delectetur in afflictionibus amicorum suorum, cum sine his potens sit eos salvare. Quidam autem Hæretici affligunt se jejuniis, vigiliis, & hujusmodi, quia sine talibus Sanctitatis nomen apud simplices acquirere non possunt, nec eos simulationis figmenta decipere. Vetus Testamentum non habent vel recipiunt, sed Evangelia, ut per ea non impugnentur, & se defendant, dicentes, quod superveniente Evangelio, vetera omnia sint abjicienda. Sic * Leg. *Hieron.* *& verba Sanctorum Augustini, Jovini, * Gregorii, Chrysostomi, Isidori & autoritates eorum truncatas decerpunt, ut per ea sua figmenta approbent, aut resistant, vel etiam simplices seducant facilius, pulchris Sanctorum sententiis doctrinam sacrilegam colorantes. Illas autem sanctorum sententias, quas sibi vident contrarias, quibusque error eorum destruitur, tacite prætermittunt. Dociles, inter alios complices & facundos, docent verba Evangelii, dictaque Apostolorum & aliorum Sanctorum in vulgari lingua corde formare, ut sciant & alios informare, & fideles allicere, ac demum suam sectam, pulchris Sanctorum verbis polire, quæ salubria putentur quæ persuadent: Et ita per dulces sermones, seducunt corda innocentum. Non solum viri, sed & fœminæ eorum apud eos docent, quia fœminis magis patet accessus ad fœminas pervertendas, ut per eas etiam viros ipsos subvertant; sicut per Evam serpens illusit Adam. Verbis coopertis loqui docent, ne pro veritate studeant loqui mendacium; ut cum de uno requiruntur, de alio obliquè respondeant, & ita Auditores versutè deludant, præsertim ubi per Confessionem Veritatis, errorem suum timent deprehendi. Eadem simulatione Ecclesias nobiscum frequentant, intersunt Divinis, offerunt ad Altare, Sacramenta percipiunt, confitentur Sacerdotibus, observant Ecclesiæ Jejunia, Festa colunt, ac Sacerdotum Benedictiones inclinato capite suscipiunt: quamvis hæc omnia, & similia Ecclesiasticæ institutionis statuta irrideant, & prophana judicent & damnosa. Aiunt sufficere ad salutem soli Deo & non homini confiteri. Et eos qui Sanctis offerunt Luminaria, derident. Deinde sequitur in eodem Libro:*

Incœpit autem hæc Secta circa Annum ab Incarnatione Domini 1170 sub Joanne Bellomains Archiepiscopo Lugdunensi.

Hæc

Hæc sunt, Candide Lector, quæ ex antiquo libro membraneo, manuque ante ducentos nonaginta sex annos, per prædictum fratrem Raynerium conscripto, fideliter transcripsimus. Ex quibus videre est hanc Valdensium Sectam, & præcipuas, penéque omnes (quæ nunc vigent) hæreses, non recenter inventas fuisse, sed easante trecentos sep naginta 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, mix-'ing the erroneous Doctrines of the Hereticks of old, 'with their own inventions. And being cast out of the 'Catholick Church, they affirm that they alone are the 'Church of Christ, and his Disciples. They declare 'themselves to be the Apostles Successors, to have Aposto-'lical 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 *Sylvester*. 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 con-'secrated Churches, Church-yards and other things of 'like nature; declaring that they were the inventions of 'Covetous Priests, to encrease their gains, by spunging 'the People by this means of their Money and Oblati-'ons. 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 Persecu-'tors of the Apostles. They don't believe the Body and 'Blood

'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, can-'not bind or loose any one, as being himself bound: and 'that any good and knowing Lay-man, may absolve an-'other, and impose penance. They reject Extreme 'Unction, declaring it to be rather a Curse than a Sa-'crament. Marriage, say they, is nothing else, but sworn 'Fornication, except the Parties live continently; and 'account any filthiness more lawful than conjugal Copu-'lation. 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, *'tis better to marry, than to burn*; thus, that it is 'better to satisfie ones Lust, by any filthy art, than to 'be tempted therewith in the heart. But this they con-'ceal as much as possible, that they may not be re-'proached 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 Smoak till they die. 'Fleas and such sort of Insects they shake off their Cloaths, 'or

'or else dip their Cloaths 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. Ac-'cording 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 re-'lieved by them. And from hence they inferr, That the 'Offerings that are made for the dead, are only of use 'to the Clergy-men that eat them, and not to the 'deceased, who can't be profited by them. They hold, 'That the Saints in Heaven, do not hear the Prayers of 'the Faithful, or regard the Honours which are done to 'them; because their Bodies lye 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 Ho-'nours 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 honour of the Saints, 'and all other instances of our Veneration for them. Ac-'cordingly, whereever they can do it, they secretly work 'upon Holy days; arguing, That since working is good, 'it cannot be evil to do that which is good on a 'Holy-day. They do not observe Lent or other 'Fasts of the Church; alledging, That God does not de-'light in the afflictions of his Friends, as being able to 'save without them. Some Hereticks indeed afflict them-'selves 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 feigned Hypocrisie. They don't receive the 'Old Testament; but the Gospel only, that they may not be 'overthrown by it, but rather be able to defend them-

 'selves

'selves 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*, *Jeronymus*, *Gregory*, *Chrysostome* 'and *Isidore*, that with them they may support their Opi-'nions, oppose others, or the more easily seduce the 'simple, by colouring 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 Fa-'thers, which oppose and destroy their errors. Those 'who are teachable and eloquent amongst them, they in-'struct 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 Be-'lievers, and beautifie their Sect with goodly words of 'the Saints; that the things they perswade and recom-'mend, 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 endeavour 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, ob-'serve the Church fasts, celebrate Festivals, and receive 'the Priest's blessings, reverently bowing their heads: Thô 'in the mean time, they scoff at all these Institutions of the 'Church, and look upon them as profane and hurtful. '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

'Lord's Incarnation 1170. under *John Bellomains*, Arch-'bishop of *Lions*.

'This is that, Courteous Reader, which I have transcribed 'out of an old MS. Parchment Book writ 296. Years 'ago by Fryer *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 in-'vention, but have continued already above 376. Years. 'Whose Authors afterwards, (as appears in the Sequel) 'were condemned.

Ivonet, in his *Summa*, *Part* II. *cap.* 2. accuseth them of above Thirty Errors, as we find it recorded by *Pegna* upon the Directory of the Inquisitors, *pag.* 280.

Æneas Sylvius, who flourished in the Year 1451. makes a vast Catalogue of them, in his original of those of *Bohemia*, who we know were a Colony of the *Waldenses*, *cap.* 35.

Emericus, who lived in 1370. in his Directory, sets down a List of Twenty Errors of the *Waldenses*, *part.* 2. *q.* 14. *pag.* 278: We find the same in *Bernard* of *Luxemburg*, who lived about the Year 1520. *Voce Pauperes de Lugduno & 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 & Leonistis*; and he follows his Text, in his Confutation of the *Waldenses* and Protestants, as being almost the same. p. 125.

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 500. Years together, who all unanimously deposed, That the *Waldenses* were looked upon as Hereticks.

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 Seyssellus*, Archbishop of *Turin*, wrote

 against

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 Schismaticks, 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 you shall only pass for a Schismatick. *Garnerius* the Jesuit, makes it as great a Crime in *Nestorius*, that he deny'd 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 Schismaticks, because, as he saith, they own'd 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 satisfie 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? Truely 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,

Secondly, What can the Bishop say to the Confessions of Faith of the *Waldenses*, wherein they formerly reject this Doctrine.

The Bishop here offers two things, which sway'd him, so easie 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 pen'd very exactly. This he confirms by several Tryals 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 meer 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.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

Concerning the State of the Church of Rome, *at the time of the Separation of the* Paterines *or* Waldenses; *together with the Accusations charg'd 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 pretence of the Bishop of *Meaux*, who supposeth that the *Waldenses* were only Schismaticks. 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 endeavour to obviate the Objections they may frame against the Churches of *Piedmont*.

1. They will probably alledge, That the *Paterines* 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 Heresies, 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 alledged by the *Paterines* in Justification of their separating from the Church of *Rome*, *viz.* That the *Waldenses* declared the Pope to be Antichrst, 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

It will be an easie matter to satisfie 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 Diocess of *Milan*, with divers Bishops at the head of them, were obliged to separate themselves from it. There is a foolish perswasion entertained by the generality of those of the Romish Communion, that their Church has ever continued in the same State: whence they naturally inferr, 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 declin'd 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 Schoolmen 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* Abot of *Clugny* against the *Petrobus.* *Hugo de Sancto*

Sancto Victore, *Richardus de Sancto Victore*, *Petrus Comestor*, Cardinal *Hugo*, *Nicolaus de Lyra*, *Brito* the *Franciscan*, *Thomas Aquinas*, *Joannes Semeca*, *Ocham*, *Hervaus*, 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 put 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 reduc'd 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 *Venerius*, Bishop of *Verceil*, the Works of *Ocham*, upon the Deposition of the Emperor *Lewis* of *Bavaria*, of *Peter d' Ailly*, *Aineas 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 Deathbeds 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,

Indulgences, which came into request some time after the Separation of the Dioceses 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 Publick 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 Priests 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 humane 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* his Disputation: We Read also, that *Henry* II. King of *England*, adored the Cross on his Deathbed, 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 enjoin'd, 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

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 School-men, 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 Custom 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.

'Tis 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. *Thiers Differt.* p. 49.

'Tis but since *Lewis* IX. his time that the Consecration of Images was brought in use, as may still be seen in the Pontifical. *Gaufridus de Bello loco de vita Ludovic.* IX. *cap.* 36.

'Tis 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 fastned to it, as it is at this day. *Thiers cap.* 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 XII. Century, very few Foundations of Dirges or Masses for the Dead were heard of; but since that time the *Mendicant* Fryars 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 satisfie the Obligations they take upon them of saying so many Masses.

For

For the multiplication of new Festivals of the Saints, we are beholden to the XV. 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, *pag.* 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 *Paterines* 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 encreased 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 Diocess.

3. Whether the Popes had Power to annul the Ministry of the married Clergy?

4. Whether the worshipping of the Saints, Relicks, 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. Wha-

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 mention'd; except only, as I have before observed, that the said Questions were afterwards multiplied proportionably to the Encrease of the Romish Corruptions.

As to what concerns the Calumnies wherewith some have endeavour'd to disfigure them, and to make them the Horrour and Detestation of People, we may truly averr, 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 divers 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 endeavouring 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 pretence, 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, *Chap.* XV. with their Opinions, as they are reported to us by St. *Epiphanius*, St. *Austin*, *Theodoret*, and by *Peter* of *Sicily*, in the IX. Century.

I acknow-

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 Lyes concerning those that are Enemies of the Faith.

2. That the Church of *Rome* has been alwaies 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 own'd the Innocence of the *Vaudois* Churches. No, 'tis a far more easie and convenient way to assert, That the *Waldenses* have chang'd 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 Heresies of the *Waldenses* or *Vaudois*, have only followed their first Leaders, *viz.* *Alanus* and others, without troubling themselves to enquire 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 look'd upon it as a great Crime, to change their Judgment in a matter they had allow'd of and establish'd: Neither indeed could it be done without incurring the danger 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 cast

an

an eye upon what *Sigebert* tells us concerning the *Greeks* of the XI. Century, we shall find that Calumny is a Trade the Romish Party is perfectly well vers'd in. *Leo* IX. saith he, sent his Legates to *Constantinople*, to refute the Heresies of the *Greeks*, who like *Simoniacks*, sold the Gift of God; like the *Valesians*, took their Guests and gelt them, and so promoted them to Bishopricks; like the *Arians*, they re-baptized 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 *Azymites*, and persecuting them, shut up their Churches; that they sacrificed with leaven'd 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 declaming 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 acquit-

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 stile 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 encrease 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 conceiv'd and publickly propos'd this notion, since the time of *Gregory* VII. *Wolfius* 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 star'd in the Eyes of all men, since the XII. 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

Powers of *Europe*; and, the third was, the fury and violence of the Persecution the Church of *Rome* employ'd to support her Tyranny, her false Doctrine and Worship, and to crush whatsoever did in the least offer to oppose it self against her Usurpation.

1. The Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*, which had suffer'd a great shock at the Council of *Francfort* in 794, but notwithstanding, that still encreased every day, and more especially after that the darkness of the X. Century had forc'd 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 XII. 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 look'd 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 it self the Pope's Vassal, before the year 1200. He endeavours to confirm this Truth by the publick 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*, *Muscovia*, *England*, and *Ireland*. Hereupon we may make this obvious and natural reflection: The Christians alledge 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 antient Oracles; and by an Argument *à pari*, we inferr thus; The Kings that were to succeed to the Ruines of the Roman Empire

Empire have given their Kingdoms to the Pope; wherefore the Pope must needs be he whom St. *John* has mark'd 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 own'd to be such.

3. The violence of the Persecution She has managed throughout all the parts of *Europe*, and whereof the poor *Laudois* alwaies met with the greatest share. The Popes, who had enslav'd 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 anathematiz'd.

Now it is certain, first That since the X. Century, wherein *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 XI. Century very lavishly bestowed it upon one another. This Example was followed in the XII. 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 *Wolfius* 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 XII. Century, upon these words of the Apocalypse; *and cause that as many as would not worship the Image of the Beast, should be put to death. Ita Christus non facit neq; prophetæ ejus, neq; Apostoli docuerunt, neq; Reges Christiani jam facti, hoc acceperunt ut occiderent & sanguine cumulandum existiment Christi servitium; verus namq; Deus non coacta sed spontanea servitia vult. Ergo & in hoc, in hoc maximè palam faciet sensum habentibus, quod verè sit Antichristus, quod verè 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 easie matter for the *Paterines* and *Vaudois*, being oppreſt 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 Horrour for the Church of *Rome*, which has alwaies hindred them from reuniting with her, notwithstanding all the ways of violence She has made use of to oblige them to it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII.

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 endeavoured 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 XIV. 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. *Hist. Script. Bohem.* p. 222. *& seq.*

The other is *Æneas 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* his Treatise, who wrote in *Lombardy* about the year 1250, which shews, that they had the same Opinions at the end of the XIV. Century, which their Ancestors had in *Lombardy* about the middle of the XIII. 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 Hereticks; 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 induc'd 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 alledgeth 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 cast into the Church.

2. 'That

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 Per-'secution 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 burthensome.

8. 'That the Pope is the Head and Captain of all 'Errour.

9. 'That the Prelates are the *Scribes*, and seeming religious '*Pharisees*.

10. 'That the Pope, and all his Bishops, are Murthe-'rers, 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. *Mat. But* '*ye all are Brethren*.

13. 'That no man ought to kneel to a Priest; *Rev.* the 'Angel saith to St. *John*, *See thou do it not*.

14. 'That Tythes 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, *Deut. 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 en-'joy any Prebends.

17. 'That Bishops and Abbots ought not to enjoy any 'Regalia.

18. 'That neither the Land nor People ought to be divi-'ded into Parishes.

19. 'That

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, *&c.* That no Man ought 'to be compell'd by force in matters of Faith. They con-'demn all Ecclesiastical Offices, and look upon them as 'Null and Void. They despise the Priviledges of the 'Church, and disregard the immunity of the Church, and 'of Persons and Things belonging to it. They con-'temn Councils and Synods, and say, That all Parochial 'Rights, are only Inventions. And that all the Obser-'vances of the Religious are nothing else but Pharisaical 'Traditions.

'As to the second Part of their Errors; they condemn 'all the Sacraments of the Church. Concerning the Sa-'crament of Baptism, they say, That the Catechism sig-'nifies nothing, that the Absolution pronounced over In-'fants avails them nothing: that the God-fathers and 'God-mothers do not understand, what they answer the 'Priest. That the Oblation which is called *al wegen*, is 'nothing but a meer invention. They reject all Exor-'cisms and Blessings. They wonder why none but the 'Bishops alone should have power to confirm. Con-'cerning the Sacrament of the Eucharist they say, That 'a Priest, guilty of mortal sin, cannot celebrate that Sa-'crament; but that a good Lay-man, yea a Woman, if 'she knows the Sacramental words, may. That Transub-'stantiation 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. Malach. *In every place shall a pure offering be offered to 'my name.* They condemn the Custom of Believers com-'municating no more than once a Year, whereas they 'communicate daily. That Transubstantiation is performed 'by words utter'd in the vulgar Tongue. That the Mass 'signifies nothing: that the Apostles knew nothing of it, 'and

'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 sing-'ing in the Church, to be no better than heliish howling. 'They despise Canonical hours. That the offering made 'by the Priest in the Mass, is of no value. They re-'ject the kiss of Peace, that of the Altar, of the Priests 'Hands, and Popes Feet. They say, concerning the Sa-'crament of Penance, That none can be absolved by a 'wicked Priest. That a good Lay-man hath the power 'of absolving; and that they by laying on of their hands 'can forgive sins, and conferr the Holy Ghost. That it 'is much better to confess to a good Laick, 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 publick Penances and Chains they disap-'prove of, especially in Women. That a general Con-'fession ought not to be made every year. They con-'demn the Sacrament of Marriage, declaring, That those 'who enter into the state of Marriage without hope of Chil-'dren, are guilty of mortal sin. *Compaternity*, they say, 'signifies nothing, as to the hindring of Marriage, nei-'ther have they any regard to the degrees of Carnal or 'Spiritual Affinity, which the Church observes, nor to 'the impediments of order and publick decency, or to 'the prohibition of the Church in that matter. That a 'Woman after Child birth 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 Extream 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 eve-'ry good Lay-man is a Priest; the Apostles themselves 'being all Lay-men. That the preaching of a wicked 'Priest, cannot profit any Body. That what is uttered 'in

'in the Latin Tongue, can be of no use to Lay-men. 'They mock at the tonsure of Priests. They reproach 'the Church that she raiseth Bastards, Boys and notori-'rious sinners to high Ecclesiastical Dignities That every 'Lay man, yea and Woman too may preach. *Corinth. For you may all Prophesie one by one, that all may be edified.* 'Whatsoever is preached without Scripture proof, they ac-'count 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 admini-'ster 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 Lay-men, who choose them-'selves 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 Reliques of the Saints. They abhor the Wood of 'the Holy Cross, because of Christ's suffering on it, nei-'ther 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 Tra-'ditions of the Pharisees; and that greater stress is laid 'on the Observation of humane Tradition, than on the 'keeping of the Law of God. *Matth. 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

'Their Errors of a third rank are these; They contemn 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-Fryday. They despise the Feast of '*Easter*, and all other Festivals of Christ and the Saints, be-'cause of their being multiplied to that vast number, and 'say, that one day is as good as another, and work upon Holy-'days, where they can do it, without being taken notice of. 'They disregard the Church-Fasts, alledging that of *Isai.* 58. *Is this the Fast that I have chosen?* 'They deride and 'mock at all Dedications, Consecrations and Benedicti-'ons of Candles, Ashes, Palm-branches, Oil, Fire, Wax-'candles, *Agnus Dei*, Women after Child-bearing, 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 *Stein-'haus*, 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, *Matth.* 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 cloath rotting upon Stones, and that Christ never 'gave to his Disciples Vests, nor Rockets, nor Miters. 'They celebrate the Eucharist in their Houshold Cups, and 'say, that the *Corporal* or Cloth on which the Host is 'laid, is no holier than the Cloth of their Breeches. Con-'cerning 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

'not in the Musick. They deride the cries of the Lay-men '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 publick Interdict, because then they corrupt ma-'ny saying, That they are forced to go to Church, for out-'ward gains sake; for they themselves also go to Church, 'and hypocritically offer, confess and communicate. They 'dissuade People from going on Pilgrimage to *Rome*, and o-'ther 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 Sepulchre, as well as those of the 'Saints; and condemn the burying in Churches, *Matth.* 23. '*Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, because ye build the Tombs*, '&c. 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 Con-'fraternities of Clergy-men and Lay men, which is called '*Zech*; and declare that all these are only invented for 'lucres 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. *Eccles.* 11. *Which way soever the tree falleth, there it must be.* 'That a good Man stands in no need of any Intercessions, 'and that they cannot profit those that are wicked. That 'all

'all sins are mortal, and none at all venial. That once pray-'ing of the Lord's Prayer, is of more efficacy, than the 'ringing of ten Bells, yea than the Mass it self. That all 'swearing is a mortal sin, *Matth. 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 di-'vulge secrets: yea they account him worse than a Mur-'therer, that compels another to swear; as likewise he 'that conferrs Confirmation, because he exacts an Oath 'from the Party that is confirmed, and a Judge of Wit-'nesses in Law, as likewise doth the Inquisitor, and the 'Priest that force Men to abjure their sins, by which 'means many become perjur'd. 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, *Rom.* 12. *Vengeance is mine, I will repay it, saith the Lord.* Matth. 13. *Suffer them both to grow together, till the time of Harvest.* 'They say that all 'Ecclesiastical Courts, held by Clergy men are not main-'tained for the correction of evil doers, but for the profit 'which they bring along with them.

Æneas Sylvius gives us the following account of the *Vaudoises* 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 Vertue only give the Pre-'ference. That the Souls of the deceased are either im-'mediately 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 meer invention of Priestly Co-'vetousness. 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 *Men-'dicants* 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 pretence of avoiding a greater 'evil.

Hist. Bohem. p. 141.

'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 Auri-'cular 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 Church-yards is vain, 'and nothing but a Covetous invention. That it's 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 reign-'ing with Christ in Heaven, because they cannot help us. 'That it is to no purpose to spend ones 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 Holy-days 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. 'Tis too sensible not to be suddenly perceived. 2. That the Dominican Fryer 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 *Æneas Sylvius* was very far.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIII.

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 *Lions*, 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 Apostles 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, *&c.* they say, That 'the Doctrine of the Gospel and the Apostles is sufficient to 'Salvation, and that the Canons are meer Traditions.

Matth.

Matth *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 burthensome and many, whereas those of Christ are few and easie. 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. Deut *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, *Deut.* That the Eastern Church doth not regard the Statutes of the Church of *Rome.* *Item*, That they who make them, do not observe them, *Matth. 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, *&c.* That the Laws of Christ are finite, whereas those of the Church are infinite.

'They declare the Pope to be Head and Ring-leader 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, *Numb. Moses said, Would to God that all the Lords people were Prophets*; and the Apostle St. *Paul, For ye may all prophesie one by one, that*

that all may be edified. Luk. *If these should hold their peace, the stones would cry out.* Revel. *Let him that hears, say, Come.* 'And because the Apostles themselves were Lay-men, therefore because if a Lay man 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. Matth. *Call ye no man Father upon earth, for One is your Father, &c.* They deny also that they ought to be obeyed in whatsoever they command. 'They reject kneeling to Priests, alledging, that of the Angel forbidding *John* to kneel to him.

'They contemn 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 Murtherers, by reason of the Wars, which they maintain and stir up against Christians, Pagans, and Hereticks: And they condemn those that preach up the *Holy War*, because they say the Turks and Pagans ought not to be forc'd to embrace the Faith by the Sword, but to be allur'd by Preaching.

'Some of them are in an Error concerning Baptism, holding, That Infants cannot be saved by it; *Matth. 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

'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; *Psal. The Lord hath heard the desire of the Poor*, That which gave occasion to this their Error, is, because the *Levites* ministred the Body of the Lord; as *Laurentius* and *Tharsinus*, who suffered at *Rome*. Some also receive the Eucharist in any form; some of wild Grapes, some of Bread dipt 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 gaming or drinking all night, has been known to celebrate the Eucharist the next morning in his Shirt. Witness *Goth*, one of the Arch-hereticks, 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 publick Sinners, and denied to the worthy, as to Nuns and Widows, except sometimes in the Lord's Supper. Also in the Country it is seldome 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, alledging, 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

'Gain that so many Masses are sung. *Mat. Woe unto you that devour Widows houses, under a pretence 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-Musick, Infernal Melody; and that all is done for Gain; and that it is loss to men to be hindred 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; *Luk. 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, &c.* 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 *Altwegen*.

'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? Mal. *I will curse your blessings.* Luk. *Physician cure thy self.* Mat. *Cast out first the beam that is*, &c. Isa. *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 under-

'stand

'ſtand 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 In'terpreter, becauſe ſay they, publick 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 In'fants die, to undergo a publick Penance, which is uſed 'to be impoſed for the moſt common Sin, and thus ſtill 'crying, *to morrow, to morrow*, they run headlong into Sin. 'And that they are forc'd many times to bear the bur'then of many of theſe Penances, that they may be re'ſtored again to the Communion of the Church, whereas 'indeed they never had loſt or forfeited it. *Item*, Be'cauſe 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 impoſe only ſuch a number of Maſſes. *Item*, 'Becauſe ſome Confeſſors do indirectly betray their Con'feſſions, as by writing it down, that it may be read of others. 'Alſo a Wife ſecretly procuring her own miſcarriage, is ſent '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 de'rived partly from Marriage it ſelf, becauſe married per'ſons neither obſerve time, nor the bounds of Matrimo'ny;

'ny; 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 Vir'gin 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 Child'bed is damned; becauſe they deny the Bleſſing to poor 'Women that have nothing to offer at their Churching; '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 honourable to bring in more Prieſts; yet 'Extreme Unction, as well as Baptiſm and Confirmation, 'are alwaies adminiſtred only by one. *Item*, Becauſe ſome 'preach, that this Sacrament ought not to be adminiſtred 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, be'cauſe the Apoſtles were Laymen; and that Chriſt never 'gave them either Rockets, Miters, Hoods, Rings, or any 'other Ornament. They deride Tonſure, becauſe the Apo'ſtles 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 wink-'ing in the mean time at Fornication. *Item*, By her ad-'vancing 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 contemn Excommunication, and say, that it is 'nothing else but cursing. Genes. *He who curseth thee, 'shall be cursed, &c.* Eccles. *When a wicked man curseth 'the Devil, he curseth his own Soul:* Wherefore if he cur-'seth a man, he curseth himself. Cursers and Evil-speak-'kers shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. Some say, an 'unjust Excommunication doth stand good. *Item*, When-'ever there is an interdict, the Hereticks 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 deny-'ing 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 de-'priv'd 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 Tythes ought not to be given, be-'cause they were never given in the Primitive Church; 'and that if Tithes onght 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

'legal Constitutions are to be observed. They alledge al-'so, that there are but few Countries, though govern'd 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 Pro-'priety or Possessions: Deut. *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.* 'Act. *And they called nothing their own, of all that they possessed, 'but they had all things common.* They do not believe In-'dulgences; Luk. *Who can forgive Sin, save God alone?* They 'despise the Church-Absolutions, and do not mind irregu-'larity, nor have they any Faith in the Church's Dispen-'sations. 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 be-'lieve.

'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 Circumcision is to be kept for the same 'reason.

'They took offence at them, because there are no less 'than an hundred and twenty Holidays 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 Holidays. Because Holidays are transferr'd to Sun-'days for Gain. Because *Taylors* and *Carriers* are suffered 'to work then. Because there be too many Holidays, '*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 scan-'dal to the People. Because Workmen, by being hin-'dred from their work, do thereby fall to poverty. Be-'cause 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

'They despise the Fasts of the Church, for on *Good-Friday* they eat Flesh. *The Kingdom of God is not Meat, &c.* Isai. *Is this the Fast that I have chosen?* Corinth. *Let not him that eats not, judge him that eats.* The ground of their Error was, Because poor men and Labourers 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*. Act. *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. Luk. *But thou, when thou prayest, enter into, &c.* John. *Neither in this mountain nor at* Jerusalem *shall ye worship, &c.* Act. *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 shew with their fine Cloathes.

'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 Expences laid out upon Churches, which might with far greater profit be bestowed upon the Poor. Mat. *Do you see all these Buildings? there shall not be left a stone, &c.* 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 cloath 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 Houshold cup, because formerly they made use of Glass Chalices.

'They

'They reject Censings; they value Holy Water no more than common Water: Images and Pictures, they say, are Idolatry: *Exod.* 20. *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, &c.* 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-Musick, 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 contemn 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 shew no respect to Spring, as in *Drozo*; where the Priest baptizeth the Crucifix in the Spring and the People offers 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*, honouring them with Oblations. *Item*, Because no Devotion is exprest to the Saints of the Old Testament. Because the Honour which ought to be given to God, is more exhibited to Creatures than to God alone: Thus some fast every *Wednesday*, in honour of St. *Nicholas*, who do not fast on *Friday*, in honour 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 *Juliana*, 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*,

'*Sterzet*, who pretending themselves to be afflicted with di-
'vers sicknesses, declare they are suddenly recovered.

'They give no credit to the Reliques of Saints. This was
'occasioned by the false Reliques which some carry about, as
'the Milk of the Blessed Virgin, who with a small quan-
'tity of Milk suckled our Saviour, and a Salamander for
'the Garment of the Blessed Virgin, and the Sweat of Christ,
'and the Membrane in which our Saviour was wrapt, and the
'Reliques of Angels. Likewise because one of these Relique-
'mongers boasted, that he could make what Saints he pleased,
'and being asked how? answered, that he oftea 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 merchandize 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 Bo-
'dies 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 Suf-
'fering 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 it
'self. 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 Sepul-
'chre of our Lord, nor of the Saints. Matth. *Woe to you Pha-
risees, for ye build the sepulchres of the Prophets.* 'They despise
'Church-burial, for they would rather choose to be bu-
'ried 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 con-
'trary, many times Church-burial is denied to those who
'die truly contrite. Because mony is demanded for eve-
'ry one, even for Infants, who do not stand in need of
'any Suffrages, and for Lepers. Because some Saints were
'formerly

'formerly buried in Gardens as our Saviour; 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 quar-
'rels and contests arise about dead Bodies, and frequent
'Scandals both to Believers and Unbelievers. They con-
'demn all Pilgrimages, because of those many abuses,
'which they have given occasion to; as, that many Wo-
'men who go on Pilgrimages have been debauched by
'the way; and because of the false and counterfeit Pil-
'grims, 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 lyes.* 'They say, that neither Masses nor Anni-
'versaries, 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 *Corinth. 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 Tri-
'bulation 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 Lay-man, 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

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 'Lay-men. 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 Pe-'nance. Matth. *Repent.* Luke *Bring forth fruits meet for Repentance.* 'The Third Error is, That Intercessions are un-'profitable.

'They condemn Judges and Princes, saying, that Ma-'lefactors ought not to be condemned. Matth. *Judge not, lest ye be judged,* &c. Genes. *He that sheds mans blood, by man his blood shall be shed.* Exod. *Thou shalt not kill.* Matth. *Put up thy sword in the sheath, for he who smites with the sword,* &c. Matth. 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. Isai. *Woe unto you that justifie 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. Matth. *But I say unto you; Swear not at all, neither by heaven, for it is Gods throne,* &c. *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 Hereticks 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 meer calumny, some others by an ill construction of their Doctrine, as our Writers *Perrin* and *Usserius* have demonstrated.

As

As to their conduct he gives this account of them. 'Hereticks are known by their manners and words; for they 'are orderly and modest in their manners and behaviour. 'they avoid all pride in their habits, as wearing neither 'very rich Cloaths, nor over mean and ragged ones. 'They keep up no Commerce or Trade to avoid lies, 'swearing and deceit, but only live by the labour of their 'own hands, as Handycrafts-men, and Day-labourers; and 'their Teachers are Weaver and Taylors. They do not heap up 'Riches, but are content with necessaries. They are also very 'chaste. They are sparing and very temperate in eating 'and drinking; they do not frequent Taverns or Ale-'houses, neither do they go to Balls or other Vanities. 'They abstain from Anger. When they work, they ei-'ther 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, avoid-'ing 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 Question 'demanded of them. So if you ask them, Are you ac-'quainted 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 behaviour of the *Waldenses* is as follows; 'They kneel down upon the ground, before a 'Bench or such like, and continue thus in all their Pray-'ers in silence, as long as one might repeat a *Pater Noster* 'thirty or forty times, and conclude their Prayers by repeat-'ing the word *Amen* several times. And this they do every 'day very reverently, amongst those of their own per-

 'swasion,

'swasion, 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: be-'sides 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 God-'head, and as many concerning the Humane 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 de-'mands 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*, &c. 'After 'which, the eldest of the Company saith in the vulgar 'Tongue, *God who blessed the five Barly Loaves, and two Fishes in the Desart 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, Honour, 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 alwaies.* 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 return'd thanks, and prayed as before-'said, they preach, teach and exhort according to their 'way and Doctrine.

In

In the Year of our Lord 1391. the Fourth of *September* were underwritten the Errors of the Sect of the *Waldenses*. Then he gives an account of their Minister.

'First, *Nicholas* of *Poland*, the Son of a Husbandman. '*Conrad* of *Saxony*, of the Town of *Duhum*, near *Wisse-'burg*, the Son of a Husbandman. *Walrick* of *Hardech*, a 'Taylor. *Conrad* of *Gamundia*, of the County of *Swabia*, 'the Son of a Husbandman. *Simon* of *Salig*, an *Hungarian*, 'a Taylor. *Herannus* of *Mistelgen*, a *Bavarian*, by his 'Trade a Carpenter. *John* of *Drena*, a *Bavarian*, like-'wise a Carpenter. These aforenamed are called a-'monst 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 dreſt, they walk two 'and two together, an Old Man with a Young Man, 'whereever 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.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIV.

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 easie for us to make it appear, 1. That they have alwaies 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, Bishop, 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 specifie 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 shews, that the Body of that Church had a fixt Ministry before the end of the XII. 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

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. 54. *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. *Pilickdorph*, whom the Bishop of *Meaux* quotes, shews, 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 administring the Sacraments, though nothing be more obvious in the Writings of their Adversaries than this Charge. *Bib. Pat. Par. p. 752.* *Var. p. 223.*

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 conferr'd Orders in the City of *Aquila*. We find the same thing in *Bohemia*, in the Confession of Faith they presented to *Uladislaus*, *p.* 838. *Ordinandi majoribus aut minoribus ordinibus, promovendi vitâ virtuosâ in Christi fidè, &c.* The same is observed in an ancient abridgment of the Opinions of the *Waldenses*, recorded by *Wolfius*, *Lect. Memor. ad Ann.* 1160, pag. 380. *They absolutely deny the Pope's 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 retain'd in the Church, but those of Priests, Deacons, and Bishops.* *Guido Carmelita* attributes to them the same Discipline, according to the report of *Alphonsus à Castro*, *lib.* 12. *pag.* 337. And we find the same in *Claudius Seyssellus 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.* *Leg. T. 2. p. 22.*

We

We find their close adhering to this ancient Constitution from the History of *Commenius*, who was the only Surviver 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 *pag.* 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 satisfie 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 another, 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 explain'd 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, conferr'd 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, *pag.* 75, he further confirms,

firms, 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 *Commenius*, 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 happi'ly enlightned with the light of the Gospel, by the Mini'stry 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 ligh'ted 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 oppress by violence. Whereupon all those who 'were yet left of *Huss*'s Followers, being inflam'd 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 *Wal*'*denses* on the other hand commending their purpose ad'vised them, that if they desired to have those Assemblies 'that embraced the pure Doctrine of the Gospel, to be pre'served 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

'ordain Pastors for them, but rather ordain them them-
'selves, 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 Bi-
'shops, conferring upon them them the power of ordain-
'ing Ministers, though they did not think fit to take up-
'on them the name of Bishops, because of the Antichri-
'stian 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 proves, 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 declamed 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

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 perswaded 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 Schismaticks and Hereticks, 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, *pag.* 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 antient *Waldenses*. See the account *Comenius* gives us in the year 1660, at which time he was one of their Bishops, in his Preface to the Book of the Disciplin of *Fratres Bohemi*; and see *pag.* 167, & 168. of *Leger*. pag. 209.

As for the manner of their discharging the Function of the Ministry, we can sufficiently justifie 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 Dioceses 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 angelick Chorus, a Quire of Angels, and that they shinn'd as a conspicuous Senate of their Church. All that T. 3. *Opusc.* 18.

obliges

obliges him to change this good opinion, is only that he was told those Clergymen were married. One can't enough admire the fury with which he aggravates this pretended Crime, neither the care he takes to bear 'em 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 Pontifs.

It is an easie 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 publickly, being authorized in them by the publick 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 Dis'soluteness and Lust; they received the Order of Priest'hood against their wills, and opposing themselves against 'it; whereas we either buy our Priesthood with Money, 'or obtain it by force, or by the favour of some tempo'ral Prince, and other sinister ways, and for no other end, 'but to satisfie 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 affrighted with labours 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 admini'ster the Divine Grace to others; whereas we set all holy 'things,

'things, yea, the very Treasures of God's Church to sale. 'And in a word, (that I may not insist on all the parti'culars which with a most profligate confidence they up'braid us with) we confound all things both humane 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 colours.

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 past 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 3*d.* 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 administring the Sacraments.

I say therefore, That these Churches had their Ministry from the ancient Churches of the Dioceses of *Italy*. To make out this, we need only examine the Cause of the Separation which the Popes were the occasion of in this Dioceses, 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 installment, and the Eastern Patriarchs in like manner, a Custom confirm'd 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 Ordina-

Ordination in the Registers of the Church: as may be seen in the same Novel, *Ch.* 3.

In process of time, when Benefices were conferr'd 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 Laymen, laid hold on this favourable occasion, to execute their design. The pretence was very specious, they decry'd this Custome for a real *Simony*, yea, they pushed the matter yet further, by defining it to be an Heresie, and maintaining, that such Ordinations were null and void. This is the notion *Petrus Damianus*, Legate of *Nicolaus* II. gave publickly of this matter in the Diocess of *Italy*, by re-ordaining, 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 administred by these *Simoniacks*, to shew their zeal for the Pope's Definitions.

This is the first Heresie the Popes formed by their Definitions. The second Heresie the Popes made, bore the name of *Nicolaitans*: This Heresie consisted in owning that the Ministers of the Church might be married, and that the Cœlibacy, which the Popes at that time endeavoured 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 Cœlibacy of Ecclesiasticks 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 thundring Treatise against the Sodomy of Ecclesiasticks, 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,

fices, and because they could not wholly obtain their aim by Temporal Authority, they imployed 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 administred by them to be null and void, and in making them to be lookt upon as meer 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 return'd 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 ordain'd by those 'that were so. Wherefore also at this day some are found, 'who arguing falsly, 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 ordain'd 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 Simoniacks themselves, or ordained 'by such.

This is the Question to which we must endeavour to give an Answer. And how does he answer this difficulty?

1. He supposeth that the Simoniacks no more than other Hereticks were able to conferr 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

2. He maintains, That the Sacraments conferr'd by Simoniacks are null and void, and embraceth the Opinion of those who in *Gregory* VII. time obstinately maintained this Doctrine, in the case of Simoniacks and married Priests.

3. He asserts, That there were alwaies some or other that were not guilty of Simony, though perhaps it was not known.

Maurus Marchisio 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 concer-'ning the Sacraments administred by Simoniacks and He-'reticks, which the Author maintains to be null and void, 'and therefore determines, that they are not to be look'd 'upon as good and valid, but ought to be repeated. The 'Author indeed confesseth, that some Sacraments of Simo-'niacks and Hereticks are valid, and need not to be re-'peated, to wit, those which with a good intent are recei-'ved from the hand of an unknown Simoniack or Here-'tick. By which means he obviates the Calumnies of some, who from this position, That the Sacraments of Simoniacks 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 Simoniack 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 conferr 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 Simoniacks or ordained by such, whence then are you who now are? You must needs derive your Ordination from these Simoniacks: for there is no other way, for they who ordained you, were ordained by them.

Now

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 endeavour to answer. Towards the end of this Treatise he concludes, That these Objectors were mistaken, because at that time there were many conceal'd Simoniacks, 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 conferr'd by a known Simoniack; 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 Simoniacks, is not to be admitted, except only in that sence 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 Simoniack; 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. à num.* 2. but that Ordination, though simoniacally conferr'd, and the Sacrament though simoniacally administred, in it self 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, & 4, but also long since by *Bernaldus Presbyter* in his Letter to *Bernard*, the Master of the Schools of *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 convey'd by Simoniacks and Hereticks 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 endeavour 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 200 years, that the Pope's Creatures have pretended, that those who had been deposed in *Italy*, by the unjust Laws of Popes, were become Laicks, uncapable of administring 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 Simoniacks, 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 defie the most able of their Doctors to make it appear, that their Popes were not Simoniacks; 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 Dioceſs of *Italy*, the Bishops, which *Rome* called Hereticks, 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 re-union of the Dioceſs 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 131. Epistle of St. *Bernard*, who was the Pro-

Promoter of that re-union, in order to advance the Interest of the Emperor *Lotharius* against *Conrard*, and those who took part with *Conrad* against *Lotharius*, and who continued in their Aversion to the other Papal Errors.

3. That these Ecclesiasticks and People of *Italy* being thus reduc'd to a contemptible condition, by reason of their small number, in comparison of the Body of the Dioceſs, continued in that separated state, exercising their Ministry as formerly they did.

4. That they who had embrac'd the Papal Party, look'd upon them only as meer Laicks, 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. *De Sac. Ordin. Part 3. Exerc. 5. c. 1.*

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 alledged, and I think my self 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 Schismaticks, 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 join'd with the *Paterines*, or with those to whom that name was given in the Diocess of *Italy*.

It will be an easie matter to satisfie 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 Diocess 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 lookt upon as a strange thing, that their business being to depose *Gregory* VII, who was the great Enemy of the Diocess of *Italy*, they should all of them equally concurr, without opposition, to have him deposed, for several Crimes mentioned in their Judgment past upon him; though some *Italians* might at the same time believe, that he was unjustly accused of Heresie, 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.

Præfat. ad Joan. Paris Determin. de corpore & sang. Christi.

Neither is the second Difficulty any better grounded. I know well, that after that re-union, the Popes endeavoured 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 vers'd in the History of those Times, may easily observe, that the Council which condemned *Berengarius* had been very probably on purpose conven'd at *Verceil*, in the Diocess 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

They may conclude the same from the printed Account we have in the Council, instead of the Acts of the Roman Council, in 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 & sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, multis hæc, nonnullis illa* [prius] *sentientibus. Maxima siquidem pars panem & vinum per sacra orationis verba & sacerdotis consecrationem, spiritu sancto invisibiliter operante, converti substantialiter in corpus Dominicum de Virgine natum, quod & in cruce pependit & in sanguinem qui de ejus latere militis effusus est lancea asserebat* [atque authoritatibus orthodoxorum patrum tam Græcorum quam Latinorum modis omnibus defendebat.] *Quidam verò excitate nimia & longa perculsi figuram tantum * substantiale illud corpus in dextera patris sedens esse, seque & alios decipientes quibusdam cavillationibus conabantur adstruere. Verum ubi cœpit res agi, prius etiam quam tertia die ventum fuerit in * Synodo, defuit contra veritatem niti pars altera, nempe spiritus sancti ignis * emolumenta palearum consumens, & fulgore suo falsam lucem diverberando obtenebrans noctis caliginem verti in lucem.*

T. 10 Conc. edit. Lab. p. 379

This word *Prius* is not in the MS. of *M. Theyer*, which is now in the hand of my L. Bishop of *London*.

These words are not in the MS

*The MS adds *atque subst.*

* *MS. Synodum*

* *MS. elementa.*

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 daies, 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 referr'd to the Disciples of *Berengarius*, but to those who maintained the same Doctrine with him in *Italy*, since the contrary Doctrin being set forth by *Paschasius Radbertus*, gave occasion to the Division upon that matter, of which *Joannes Scotus*'s Book, that was burnt in *Verceil*, was an authentick Testimony.

Moreover

Moreover, they cannot be ignorant how that Diocess 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 Antipopes, who succeeded one another, troubling themselves about little else, but who should have the mastery; and those who are lookt upon as the true Popes, being not in a condition to concern themselves with ought, but what might be for their own defence against the Antipopes, who were supported by that Emperor.

The Third Objection is this: That whatsoever we cannot point to those precisely, who have succeeded to the Bishops, who separated themselves in this Diocess of *Italy* from the Communion with the Popes, since the year 1134. when the Diocess of *Milan* was reconciled with them, by the endeavours of St. *Bernard*.

But yet, as I remark'd before, this is very clear, That there was nothing but an horrid disorder and confusion in that Diocess, by the Intriegues 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 Diocess, than Questions upon Elections of Bishops or other Clergy-men.

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 Diocess as Intruders and Schismaticks, 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 favoured 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 Hereticks and Schismaticks; we ought not to be surprized, if when *Rome* considered them as Laymen, they on the contrary may pretend

tend to have a true Ordination of Bishops, Priest, 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.

'Tis 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. Eccles.* 11. 2. But from that time till the English Conquest, (which was above 500 years after) they cannot find the name of any one of their Successors, nor any name of any one Churchman in that Diocess 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 Bishop's Opposition to Popery, which we can plainly and certainly prove, did not prevail in that Country till the *English Conquest*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXV.

Concerning the Persecutions which the Waldenses *have suffered since the XI. 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 XII. Century, the name *Paterine* 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 oppos'd it self against their Authority.

And the same happened to the word *Vallenses*, which signified nomore than *Inhabitants of the Valleys*; which their Enemies would needs derive from *Waldo*, and which at last they impos'd 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 seem'd 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 serv'd for a Rule to the Persecutors, how they were to behave themselves therein. The first Law I have here set down, is equally levell'd against the *Paterines*, and the Poor of *Lions*, 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

The Decree of Pope Lucius III. *against Hereticks.*

'TO abolish the malignity of divers Heresies, which 'of late time are sprung up in most parts of the 'World, 'tis 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 Malapertness of the Hereticks, in their false designs, 'may be crushed, and the Truth of Catholick Simplicity 'shining forth in the Holy Church, may demonstrate her 'pure and free from the execrableness of their false Do'ctrines. Wherefore we being supported by the Presence 'and Power of our most dear Son *Frederick*, *the most Illu'strious Emperor of the* Romans, *alwaies Encreaser of the Em'pire*, with the common Advice and Counsel of our Bre'thren, and other Patriarchs, Archbishops, and many Prin'ces, who from several parts of the World are met to'gether, do set our selves against these Hereticks, who 'have got different names from the several false Doctrines 'they profess, by the Sanction of this present general De'cree, and by our Apostolical Authority, according to the 'Tenor of these presents, we condemn all manner of 'Heresie, by what Name soever it may be denomi'nated.

'More particularly we declare, all *Cathari*, *Paterines*, and 'those who call themselves the *Humbled*, or *Poor of Lions*, '*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 per'petual *Anathema*, all those who either being forbid or not 'sent, do notwithstanding presume to preach publickly or 'privately, without any Authority received either from 'the Apostolick See, or from the Bishops of their respe-

 'ctive

'ctive Dioceſſes: 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 whom the ſame Church of *Rome*, or 'the ſeveral Biſhops in their Dioceſſes, 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 'neighbouring Biſhops, ſhall judge to be Hereticks. And 'we likewiſe declare all Entertainers and Defenders of the 'ſaid Hereticks, and thoſe that have ſhewed any Favour, 'or given Countenance to them, thereby ſtrengthening 'them in their Hereſie, whether they be called *Comforted*, '*Believers*, or *Perfect*, or with whatſoever ſuperſtitious 'Names they diſguiſe themſelves, to be liable to the ſame 'Sentence.

'And though it ſometime happens, that the Severity of 'Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, neceſſary to the coercion of 'Sin, is condemn'd by thoſe who do not underſtand the 'vertue of it, we notwithſtanding by theſe Preſents de-'cree, That whoſoever ſhall be notoriouſly convicted of 'theſe Errors, if a Clergy-man, or one that endeavours '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 Ca-'tholick Faith, and ſubmits publickly to abjure his Errors, 'at the diſcretion of the Biſhop of the Dioceſs, and to 'make ſuitable ſatisfaction. And as for a Lay-man, who 'ſhall be found guilty either publickly or privately of any 'of the aforeſaid Crimes, unleſs by abjuring his Hereſie, and 'making ſatisfaction, he immediately returns to the Ortho-'dox Faith; we decree him to be left to the Sentence of 'the ſecular Judge, to receive condign Puniſhment, according 'to the quality of his Offence.

'And

'And as for thoſe who are taken notice of by the Church 'as ſuſpected of Hereſie, 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 abjur'd their Errors, or clear'd 'themſelves upon Examination, to their Biſhop, ſhall be found 'to have relaps'd into their abjur'd Hereſie; 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 Hereticks be included, be 'by all Patriarchs, Archbiſhops, and Biſhops, renewed and 'repeated in all the chief Feſtivals, and on any publick '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 Admini-'ſtration.

'Furthermore, with the Counſel and Advice of Bi-'ſhops, and Intimation of the Emperor and Princes of 'the Empire, we do add, That every Archbiſhop or Bi-'ſhop, 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 'Hereticks dwell, and there cauſe two or three men 'of good credit, or if need be, the whole Neighbourhood, 'to ſwear, that if they know of any Hereticks there, or 'any that frequent private Meetings, or differ from the 'common Converſation of Mankind, either in Life or 'Manners, they will ſignifie the ſame to the Biſhop or 'Archdeacon: The Biſhop alſo or Archdeacon ſhall ſum-'mon before them the Parties accuſed, who except they 'at their diſcretion, according to the Cuſtom of the Coun-'try, 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.

'discretion. And if any of them, by a damnable Superstition, shall refuse to swear, that alone shall suffice 'to make them Hereticks 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 Hereticks, and their complices, and endeavour 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 Honours and Charges, and be 'rendred 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 'Commonition 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 Favourers of Hereticks, 'as men stigmatiz'd with perpetual Infamy, shall be incapable of being Attorneys or Witnesses, or of bearing 'any publick Office whatsoever. And as for those who 'are exempt from the Law of *Diocesan* Jurisdiction, as 'being immediately under the Jurisdiction of the Apostolick See; nevertheless as to these Constitutions against 'Hereticks, 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 'Apostolick See, the immunity of their Priviledges notwithstanding.

Ilde-

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*. Part 2. q. 14. p. 281.

The Edict of King Ildephonsus, *against the* Waldensian *Hereticks, 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* G O D, *Earls, 'Viscounts, Knights, and to all People of his Kingdom, or belonging to his Dominions, wisheth Health, and the sound Observance '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 sollicitous for the welfare and 'defence of the same; wherefore we, in imitation of our 'Ancestors, and obedience to the Canons, which determin 'and ordain Hereticks, as persons cast out from the sight 'of God and all Catholicks, to be condemned and persecuted every where; do command and charge the *Waldenses, Inzabbati*, who otherwise are called the *Poor of Lions*, 'and all other Hereticks, who cannot be numbred, being 'excommunicated from the Holy Church, Adversaries to 'the Cross of Christ, Violaters and Corrupters of the 'Christian Religion, and the avow'd 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 Hereticks, of whatsoever Profession, into their Houses, or to be present at their pernicious Sermons, or to afford them Meat, or any other 'favour, shall incurr thereby the Indignation of Almighty

'God,

'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 per-'petual Constitution be publickly 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 through-'out all our Dominions: And that the same be observed 'by Vicars, Bailiffs, Justices, *Merins*, and *Zonalmedins*, 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 lingring, shall any way 'plague, despitefully use or distress them, (wounding un-'to 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 'incurr any Penalty thereby, that he may be sure rather 'to deserve our Favour. 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, cudgel'd, and shame-'fully and ill entreated.

'The Seal ✠ of *Ildephonsus* King of *Arragon*, Earl of *Bar-'celona*, 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 *Tarracona*, 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.* MCXCIV. and 'compared with the Original; witness *Martinus de Scribas*, 'Notary.

Inno-

Innocent III. caus'd 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 extreamest 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 Encreaser of the Empire, To all Mar-'quesses, Earls, and all People under our Government, Health 'and Grace.*

'Forasmuch as nothing can conduce more to the Ho-'nour 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*, *Circum-'cised*, and all other Hereticks of both Sexes, by what 'Names soever they are called, commanding 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 hainous Crime to offend the 'Majesty of the Eternal God, than any Temporal Prince. 'And as for those who are only suspected of Heresie, ex-'cept 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 outlaw'd; 'and if they continue so for a whole year, we condemn 'them for Hereticks.

'We

'We also ordain by this perpetual Edict, That all that 'are in Authority, Consuls and Rectors, whatsoever their 'Office may be, do publickly take an Oath, for defence 'of the Faith, that they will faithfully endeavour, to the 'utmost of their power, to exterminate all Hereticks, in 'the places subject to their Jurisdiction; so that from hence-'forward, 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 thence forward 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 give leave 'to Catholicks to possess themselves of his Lands, who 'after having rooted out the Hereticks, shall quietly pos-'sess the same, and preserve it in Piety. Provided always 'that the Rights of the principal Lord of the Fee be preser-'ved . . . . . 'but that the foresaid Law shall be wholly in force against 'those who have no such superiour Lords of the Fee.

'Moreover, we proscribe all Hereticks, Entertainers and 'Favourers of Hereticks, firmly ordaining, that as soon as 'any such, being excommunicated by the Church, shall 'contemptuously refuse to make satisfaction within a years 'time, that then he be made infamous by Law, and un-'capable of any Office, or of being a Member of any 'Council, or of having a Voice in the choice of Offi-'cers, or being a Witness: That moreover he be depri-'ved of the power of making a Will, and of succeeding 'into an Inheritance. Furthermore, that no body 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

'if a Scrivener, that the Writings drawn up by him be 'invalid.

'And we *Honorius* Bishop, Servant of the Servants 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 Man-'kind, shall any way endeavour the infraction of them, 'let him be assured, that by so doing he will incurr the 'indignation of Almighty God, and of the Blessed Apo-'stles *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 enjoy'd the least Interval of Rest. And we may add also the settling of the Inquisition, which was introduc'd 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 XIII. Century her Purple hath been died 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 250 years; and it hath been demonstrated, that the number of the Martyrs was not excessive. But *Rome* now can vaunt it self to have almost continually maintain'd 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. *Dodwel. Dissert. Cyprian.*

My design is not to draw the Picture of these Cruelties, since *Rome* has monopoliz'd the Trade of Persecution; he that would undertake this, ought to be furnisht 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 Inquisitor's 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*, *Chap.* 7. which is a pregnant
p. 203. 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
p. 127. the year 1487. recorded by *Perrin*, *Chap.* 3. in these words:

'I took notice of an extraordinary piece of Villany in 'a Process formed by the Monk *Veiletty*; for having the 'aforesaid Process in my hand, we found the short *Bil*'*lets* 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 Pro'cess, 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; *Viletty* fra'med 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 worship'ped, and to be prayed unto in our necessity? he answered, 'No:

'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 burthen of such Calamities.

Perrin gives an account how he was informed of those Villanies, 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. Wulçon* Counsellor 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 publick 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 justifie 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 villanous and wicked Calumnies.

Thirdly, They have employed the Fury of Souldiers, 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*, *Chap* 7. p. 204.

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 favour 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 defence, forcing their Adversaries to come to a Treaty with them.

Those that are desirous to be more particularly informed concerning the Behaviour 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 1460, which he mentions, which continued until the year 1487, under the conduct of the *Franciscan* Frier *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 *Pantaleon Berser*, mentioned by *Leger*; in the year 1540, & 1541, in which were involved those of *Cabrieres*, *Merindol*, and the neighbouring places; in the years 1560, & 1561, and I do not know in how many more, which are mentioned by the *Jacobines* in the Annals of their Order.

Ad ann. 1375. §.

p. 115.

p. 116.

p. 117.

p. 129. 131.

p. 156.

But we may form a truer Judgment of their Sufferings, by four very memorable new instances, the first of which is, the desolation & destruction of the Churches of *Pragela* in *Dauphiné*, 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 confirm'd 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

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 Moriand*, and Monsieur *Leger* Pastor of those Valleys.

The Fourth is, The Business of 1686, which caused the total ruine 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.

CHAP. XXVI.

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 *Dauphiné*, yet they wholly respect the *Waldenses*, because it is an acknowledged Truth, that the Inhabitants of *Dauphiné* 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

sacre 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 2d. of *August*, at *Ulcy*, the venerable *Bartholomew Paschal* 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 *Praneste*, 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 *Dauphiné*, 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 *Dauphiné*.

First, he said, That about 16 years ago, *Girondinus* his Father taught him the Faith and Heresie 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 *Sancto Loco*, 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 *Barbæ*, 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 further 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 *Barbæ* 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 *Barbæ* follow this their Faith, and meet with an infinite number of Followers, because the said Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, and Ecclesiasticks are Leaders, and the People follow them in Avarice, Luxury, Pride, Pomp, Gluttony, and Anger, and that this is the Life of all Ecclesiasticks; and that the wicked and profligate Lives of the Clergy, was the chiefest motive of their Separation.

Saying

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 Clergy man, 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 call'd together the Community, has made them *Barbæ*, 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 *Barbæ* 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 *Barba* 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 *Barbæ*] concerning the Saints, and what they preach concerning them

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 Aſſaſſine.

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 Life-time 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* hindred him, and adjur'd 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, Arch-Angels, 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 humane 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 rely'd 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 administred by Clergymen.

Saying moreover, That one may as well Pray in a Stable as in the Church, because God is every where.

Concerning Holidays, he saith, That such as are appointed by God, as the *Lord's day*, *our Saviour's Nativity*, *Easter*, *Ascension*, and *Whitsunday*, 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

are not injoined by God. Nor is any one bound to fast upon the Vigils of those Holidays.

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 vertue. Therefore the *Barbæ* of their Sect do not receive the Eucharist, but instead thereof, they bless the Bread, and say; That this Blessing is of greater vertue 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 *Barbæ* 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 *Barbæ*, 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 no body ought to swear, and that they never swear amongst themselves, neither truly nor falsly, 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 Murther.

He saith further, That when their *Barbe* are created by their Companions, the great Master assembling the rest of the *Barbæ* together, as was said before, they then take this Oath, as follows. *Thou* (such an one) *swear upon thy Faith to maintain, multiply, and encrease 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 Neighbour, which thou wouldst 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*, &c. 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 Berand*, made her appearance before *Anthony Fabri* Doctor of the Canon of *Embrun*, Inquisitor-General after Heresie throughout all *Dauphiné*, and the Counties of *Vienne*, *Valence*, and *Die*, specially thereto deputed by the Holy Apostolick 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, Sollicitor and Fiscal of *Valence*, being in this case a Promoter, in favour of the Holy Catholick Faith, and of the Deputies of the Office of Inquisition, against *Peironetta*, *&c.*

To the first Interrogatory she answered nothing, and therefore I have only set down what she answered to the second and third Interrogatories.

To

To the second Interrogatory she said and confessed, 'That 'about 25 years ago, or thereabouts, there came to the 'House of *Peter Fornerius* her Husband, two Strangers, in 'grey Clothes, who, as it seem'd 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 re-'form the Catholick 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 no body 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 Falshood, 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 Holy-days, because all other 'Holy-days were enjoined by the Church, which there-'fore 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

'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 publickly 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

'That it was as good and equally advantageous to pray 'to God in a House or elsewhere, as in the Church, because God is every where.

'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 'Holidays, 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 Clergy-men, 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

This Extract is faithfully transcribed out of a MS. in the publick Library of *Cambridge*, where it is to be seen in the original. But I thought fit to make it publick at the end of this Work that the Reader may compare those Processes, in which the Inquisitor's 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.

CHAP. XXVII.

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 defence of that Truth, which they received from their Ancestors, as a Sacred *Depositum*. 'All sorts of People, saith he, have several
Fol. 1. 'times in vain endeavoured 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 easie 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,

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 Favour, but also be deprived of the Authority he had conferr'd 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 alwaies 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 it self; as our Saviour 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

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 Saviour has warn'd us, say they, to beware of this sort of People; *Beware of false Prophets, who come to you in sheeps cloathing 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 cloathed 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 conferr 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 favourable 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 abhorrs?

Moreover, O immortal God, what wise man can ever believe that a King endow'd with the least grain of Wisdom, will bestow his Lieutenancy with Soveraign 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, reduc'd 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 imagin, 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 the 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 to 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 *Malachy* 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 tacite objection; for they might alledge, 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

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 waies, &c. 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 extreamly exaggerated.

But

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*. Fol. 14.

'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 excell 'in Royal Power, rather than Sacerdotal Sanctity; and all 'our endeavours 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 Expence 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 peoples Goods, more avaritiously 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

'the Salvation of others: whereas we buy Benefices and 'Preferments for Money, or procure them by force, or 'by the favour 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 labours, being neither affrighted with 'trouble nor with danger, that they might shew to others 'the way to Salvation: whereas we pass our time in idle-'ness, 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 humane. 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 colours; for Christ hath joined his Church to him 'to be his Bride, holy, pure, fair, adorned with the Orna-'ments and Jewels of all vertues, without spot or wrin-'kle, 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.
Fol. 18. 'We don't deny, say the *Waldenses*, according to the ac-'count *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 favour, 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

'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 barefac'd. 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 un-'doubtedly affirm, that they who commit these things are 'not the Ministers of God, but his publick and avowed Ene-'mies? 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 or-'dain them are worse than they themselves, and their 'Works openly worse than theirs? What shall we say, 'if it appears, that they have publickly and notoriously 'bought the Papacy, that they openly set to sale sacerdotal 'Functions, and that they set over the Churches, not by mi-'stake, but out of malice, those who are known to be wholly 'unworthy of that Charge; and when ever in all their 'life time did any thing worthy not only of a Priest, but 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 Saviour tell us, that we must not suffer 'our selves 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 desti-'ned to the Fire? How can he be the Vicegerent of Christ, 'who is not so much as a Christian, or a Member of the My-'stical 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 Fol. 38. 'Christ saith should not fail the Catholick Church, with 'whom he promiseth to abide for ever, is to be found amongst 'us,

'us, who imitate the Life of the Apostles, who accor-
'ding 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, nor 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; alledging 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:

Fol. 4. '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 First-fruits
'to the Clergy.

'They say, That the Consecrations of Churches, Indul-
'gences 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 Suf-
'frages of the Saints. Christ abundantly sufficing in all
'things.

'They

'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 intole-
'rable impudence, they usurp the Name of the Catholick
'Church.

Their *Barbæ*, 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 Apo-
'stle's Precepts (which their *Barbæ* 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 Au-
'thor, and approved of God, in order to obtain something of
'him. Their *Barbæ* 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 An-
'gelical Salutation to the Mother of God, alledging, 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, say-
'ing, 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 Desart?
'When the Apostles sate down to eat Bread, they blessed Fol. 55.
'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 par- 'ting from the Body, enter into Joy or Pains, and that the 'Clergy, blinded by their Covetousness, have invented Pur- 'gatory.

'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 honour them.

'They make no distinction between the Worship of *La-* '*tria*, which is due to God only, and that of *Dulia*, which 'belongs to the Saints.

'As to the Fasts, which the Catholick Church has insti- 'tuted for the Honour 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 Lye is alwaies a mortal Sin, because '*David* says, *God destroys all lyars*. 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 to be 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

'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 my self (for that 'I ingenuously confess) I think it also to surpass the capacity 'of others; but because it has alwaies appeared to me to be 'a point of that difficulty, that the most able have been fain 'to profess, That the strength of Humane Understanding 'must in this case be subject to Faith: after which he useth his utmost endeavours to perswade the *Waldenses* to embrace an Opinion, for the which they had alwaies 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 pover- 'ty, they protest that they alone observe the Life and Do- 'ctrine 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.

'Tis impossible to give them a more advantagious Testimony than what he gives them elsewhere, acknowledging, That they look'd upon it as an honourable and glorious thing to suffer the Persecutions which were raised against them by the Church of *Rome*.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Containing the Conclusion of this Treatise.

THESE are the Observations I thought my self oblig'd 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 charg'd 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 Endeavours, 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 justifie them altogether, in all the Articles, which might have been objected against them, during the time of almost 600 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

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 alwaies preserved amongst them whatsoever is necessary to the Constitution of a true Society of *Christians*.

The Church of *Rome* her self 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 tho' 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 born 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 *Anathema*'s: So that for so great an interval of time the *Waldenses* have alwaies been in the condition of Sheep led to the slaughter, by their continual and uninterrupted Martyrdom maintaining and adorning the Religion of our Saviour, which the Church of *Rome* did no longer profess, but in mode and way adapted to her corrupt

rupt 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 perswaded, 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 extream rigour of their Persecutions, we find, that God hath tenderly preserved them until the Reformation, and though he has often expos'd 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 savour 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 Rumour 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 search'd into the design and intent of those black Calumnies charg'd upon them, he own'd 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

self 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*, publickly to read the Works of the *Waldenses*, that is to say, those Pieces which since have been published by the Author of *Fasciculus rerum 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 spight of all the opposition of the Romish Party, had alwaies maintained the Truth, and preserved it in a sufficient degree of Purity, whilst the Church of *Rome* made use of her utmost endeavours 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 justifie 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 asham'd 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 conceiv'd for this Nursery, and Seed-plot of Martyrs, and for those triumphant Troops, who have so generously lavish'd 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

Judgment of St. *Hilarius*, expreſt 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 cœpit, malè Eccleſiam Dei in tectis ædificiiſque veneramini: male ſub his pacem ingeritis. Anne ambiguum eſt in his Antichriſtum ſeſſurum? Montes mihi & ſylvæ & lacus & carceres & voragines ſunt tutiores; in his enim Prophetæ aut manentes, aut demerſi Dei ſpiritu prophetabant.* P. 316. *Oper. Hilarii.*

'One thing I muſt warn you of, Beware of Antichriſt. 'Tis ill done of you to fall in love with Walls; 'tis 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 hat the Prophets prophesied from the Spirit of G O D.

Scriptum

Scriptum Inquiſitoris cujuſpiam Anonymi de Valdenſibus, ex Codice MS. G. in Publica Bibliotheca Cantabrig.

UT vobis Reverendiſſimo in Chriſto Patri & Domino, Domino Roſtagno Ebredunenſi Archiepiſcopo, Vobiſque Reverendis Patribus & Dominis fratri Laurentio Ciſtaricenſi Epiſcopo, & Thomæ Paſchalis Orlianenſi Officiali, Commiſſariis Apoſtolicis, Regia & Dalphinali auctoritate ſuffultis ad cauſam eorum pauperum de Lugduno quos vulgus Valdenſes appellat, dictos *à Valdeo cive Lugdunenſi*, in loco dicto vulgariter *Val grant* moram faciente, Qui homo dives Hæreſiarcha, primus hæreſis ſectæ Valdenſium Inventor fuit, ſecundum Scripturam, *Qui bonis temporalibus renuncians*, cœpit cum ſuis complicibus vitam Apoſtolicam cum Cruce & 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 & merito per *milii autem Eccleſiam damnati, ſed non radicitus extirpati, quia Lugduno fugientes ad ultimas Dalphinatus partes, ſe transferentes in Ebredunenſi & Taurinenſi diœceſibus in Alpibus & intra concava montium acceſſu difficilia, plures ibi ex ipſis habitaverunt*, ubi paulatim procurante ſatore *Zizaniæ*, in copioſo numero excreverunt, & demum Palmites ſuos tiſtes in Liguriam, Italiam & ultra Romam in Apuliam tranſmiſerunt: & quemadmodum Chriſtus Redemptor noſter diſcipulos ſuos binos mittebat ad prædicandum; ſic & Idiota & beſtialis illius ſectæ Magiſtrius alios Magiſtros inferiores per ipſum creatos & probatos, quos vulgo *Barbas* dicimus, ad do-

cendum & prædicandum hujusmodi sectæ doctrinam, hinc inde *binos mittere solitus* fuit, hi siquidem Barbæ cleari solent per eorum supremum in civitate *Ac,uila* in Regno Neapolitano, & in eorum creatione quædam solet fieri solemnitas. Nam *in derisum Romani Pontificis*, eis nomina mutantur cum ad magisterium hujusmodi afficiuntur, cujus siquidem damnatissimæ hæresis cultores quibus viri & mulieres vallis Clusionis Taurinensis diœcesis & omnes mares & fœminæ vallis Frayxineriæ, ac plures vallium Argenteriæ & Loysiæ Ebredunensis diœcesis à tanto tempore *quod non est memoria hominum*, in contrarium fuerunt proni plusquam centum numero ex ipsis sponte confessi fuerunt, sequentes articulos contra fidem nostram, tenuerunt tenentque & immobiliter observant. Et ut de eo constet & liquidius appareat, Procurator fidei juncto Procuratore Patriæ & locorum circumvicinorum patriæ Briantonensis & Ebredunensis pro manutentione fidei Christianæ & honoris patriæ relevatione contra omnes & singulos dictæ vallis Frayxineriæ, dat & facit sequentes titulos quos petit admitti ad probandum, citra tamen onus superfluæ probationis ad quod se astringere non intendit, de quo & de expensis contra eos omnes & singulos solemniter protestatur.

In primis ponit & dicit ac probare intendit, quod ipsi homines vallis Frayxineriæ fuerunt *à centum annis citra ultra*, ac per tempora ipsa & alia à tanto tempore cujus *initii memoria hominum non existit*, fuerunt & de præsenti sunt hæretici, & sequentes articulos contra catholicam fidem tenuerint & tenent; & hoc est verum, notorium, publicum & manifestum.

Item & quod fuerunt & de præsenti sunt pro hæreticis & Valdensibus habiti, tenti & reputati communiter, & ab omnibus de eisdem & eorum vita, moribus & conversatione notitiam habentibus; & hoc fuit & est verum, notorium, publicum & manifestum.

Item & quod de præmissis fuit & est publica vox & fama, nedum apud circumvicinos, imo & apud omnes à centum leucis & ultra distantes à dicta valle; & hoc fuit & est verum, notorium, publicum & manifestum.

Item

Item & quod fuerunt & de præsenti sunt ubique terrarum de hæresi & damnatissima Valdensium secta fidei Christianæ contraria diffamati; & hoc fuit & est verum, notorium & manifestum.

Item & quod propterea homines locorum circumvicinorum, licet catholici & Christiani ac Christi fideles ex ipsorum de Frayxineria labe ubique terrarum dehonestantur & improperia quamplurima. . . . . atque damna & interesse, quia ab honoribus multis commodis rejiciuntur ex suspicione ipsorum de Frayxineria; & hoc fuit & est verum, notorium, publicum & manifestum.

Item & quod dicti de Frayxineria hæretici dicuntur, & visi sunt mali & obstinati & fidei catholicæ contrarii, iniqui ac perversi, ac pro talibus habiti, tenti & reputati, articulos sequentes contra fidem Christi tenentes; & hoc est verum, notorium, publicum & manifestum.

Item & pro eo, quia Ecclesiam Romanam dicunt Ecclesiam malignantium, & eam diffamant & reprobant, & ita credunt damnabiliter & contra fidem catholicam; & hoc est verum, notorium, publicum & manifestum.

Item & pro eo, quia credunt & crediderunt quod in ipsis tantum sit Ecclesia Dei qui vivunt in paupertate, in *eorum symbolo* credentes in sanctam Ecclesiam sine macula & ruga constitutam; & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia damnabiliter credunt & crediderunt quod eorum Magistri & Barbæ potestatem habeant ligandi & solvendi, & quod illis & non Presbyteris Romanæ Ecclesiæ confitenda sunt peccata; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod non licuit nec licet Prælatos Romanæ Ecclesiæ habere *patrimonium* aut Jurisdictionem temporalem in hoc seculo, & quod à Beato Silvestro non fuit verus Papa; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod quantam quis habet sanctitatem, tantam habet facultatem & potestatem in Ecclesia, & non ultra; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod Sacramenta per Presbyteros Romanæ Ecclesiæ ministrata nullius sint efficaciæ seu virtutis; contra fidem nostram, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod eisdem Presbyteris Romanæ Ecclesiæ *non sunt solvendæ decimæ*, neque eis sunt dandæ oblationes, propter præmissa; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod de Censuris & pœnis per Prælatos Romanæ Ecclesiæ inflictis curandum non est, quoniam non arctant neque ligant propter defectum sanctitatis, quia non servant vestigia Christi, contra fidem & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod Romana Ecclesia est *Domus confusionis, Babylon, Meretrix, & Synagoga Diaboli*; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod eidem Romanæ Ecclesiæ, seu Prælatis eisdem non est obediendum; & quod omnes eis obedientes sunt damnati; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod *nullum est Purgatorium* in alio seculo, sed tantum purgantur viventes in præsenti, & quod dum quis moritur, statim avolat ad Paradisum, vel labitur in Infernum, asseverantes Ecclesiam Romanam cupiditate ductam, Purgatorium invenisse, & quod pro mortuis ideo non est orandum; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod pro quacunque re vera vel falsa non licet jurare; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod licitum est libidinose convenire, & participare etiam cum omni persona sibi in quovis consanguinitatis vel affinitatis gradu conjuncta, saltem quando conveniunt cum aliis ejusdem sectæ in eorum prædicationibus, & extinctis luminibus; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod tantum prodest Deum orare in stabulo, quantum in Ecclesia; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod *solus Deus orandus est*, non autem Virgo Maria, non Sancti & Sanctæ, quia cum sint à nobis remoti non possunt audire preces nostras; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod aquæ pluviales sunt ejusdem virtutis sicut sunt *aquæ benedictæ* in Ecclesia, quia omnes aquæ fuerunt à Deo benedictæ; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod etiam *Dominis temporalibus non est obediendum*, nisi sint de eorum Secta; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item quod pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod detegere aliquem de dicta secta est peccatum irremissibile, contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod extra eorum sectam nemo salvatur, & qui sunt de eorum secta sancti esse dicuntur; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod de *festivitatibus Sanctorum & Sanctarum* per Romanam Ecclesiam introductis non est curandum, quod licitum est omni die opus servile exercere; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt quod ubicunque licet & permissum est *vesci carnibus* & quocunque tempore anni, & quod Jejunia per Ecclesiam Romanam introducta non sunt servanda, eorum quadragesimam incipiendo secunda feria post primam Dominicam quadragesimæ; contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & pro eo, quia crediderunt & credunt quod non *licet hæreticis eorum sectæ* cum catholicis matrimonia contrahere, & multa alia erronea & nefaria tenuerunt, crediderunt & prædicaverunt, prout confessi fuerunt, & contra fidem, & hoc est verum.

Item & quod propterea Reverendissimi dudum Pontifices & Prælati Ebredunenses cum Inquisitoribus hæreticæ pravitatis retroactis temporibus, magnos assumpserunt labores ut hæreticam ipsam sectam à partibus illis avellerent, usque ad tempora Rev^mi in Christo Patris & Domini Domini Joannis Archiepiscopi Ebredunensis novissime vita functi, & hoc est verum.

Item

Item & quod Præfatus quondam Reverendissimus Dominus Joannnes Ebredunensis Archiepiscopus statim post ejus assumptionem & de An. Dom. millesimo quadringentesimo sexagesimo primo, ne sanguis eorum de suis manibus exquireretur, ad corrigendos illorum excessus, & ad extirpandam illam hæreticam sectam per monitiones, exhortationes & commendationes cœpit diligenter insurgere, sed intervenientibus impedimentis, non potuit ad finem perducere; & hoc est verum.

Item & quod propterea, de Anno Domini millesimo quadrigentesimo septuagesimo tertio, Frater Joannes Veylleti Ordinis Minorum, sacræ Theologiæ Doctor, & Inquisitor authoritate Apostolica deputatus contra ipsos de Vallibus Frayxineriæ, Argenteriæ & Vallis Loysiæ processus formavit, ex quibus detecta est dicta hæretica secta, qua pro insertis articulis sponte confessi sunt credidisse; & hoc est verum.

Item & quod successive præfatus quondã Reverendissimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus de Anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo tertio cum viris catholicis & aliis eorum complicibus usque ad numerum Nonaginta *novas informationes sumpsit*, ex quibus apparet quod omnes illi de Frayxineria & multi de valle Loysia & Argenteria diffamatissimi & suspectissimi de dicta hæretica secta apud omnes habebantur; & hoc est verum.

Item & quod propterea præfatus Reverendissimus quondam Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus, & de Anno millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo sexto & diebus decima octava & vigesima nona Junii, & tertiò die nona Julii ejusdem anni eos generaliter moneri fecit infra terminum in litteris contentum & per litteras patentes debite executas quibus parere neglexerunt; & hoc est verum.

Item & quod propterea & successive & de mense Augusti præfatus quondam Reverendissimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus mandavit eos omnes nominatim suspectos citari responsuros de fide, offerendo illis gratiam si redire vellent ad gremium Ecclesiæ, qui contumaciter comparere neglexerunt; & hoc est verum.

Item

Item & quod successive de Anno prædicto & die decima quinta Septembris præfatus quondam Reverendissimus Dominus Joannes Archiepiscopus litteras patentes laxavit & excommunicatorias in eorum perfidiam & obstinatam contumaciam executas die decima septima ejusdem Septembris, & quam excommunicationem sustinuerunt usque ad diem sextam mensis Februarii Anni Domini millesimi quadringentesimi octuagesimi septimi, & à longe ultra in excommunicatione sorduerunt. Inter quos nominatus fuit Angellinus Palloni, qui tanto opere nunc ad veritatem occultandam suis mendaciis elaborat; & hoc est verum.

Item & successive Reverendissimus Pater Dominus Albertus de Cappitaneis Archidiaconus Cremonensis in utraque facultate non mediocriter peritus, authoritate Apostolica deputatus contra eosdem processit & informationes sumpsit, & de Ann. millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo octavo & die sexta Februarii, & se informavit cum quatuor ex complicibus eorum concludentibus in effectu cum aliis per præfatum Reverendissimum quondam Dominum Joannem Archiepiscopum super his examinatis, ex quo formatis processibus certis motus respectibus à sede Apostolica obtinuit procedere *non vocato Ordinario*, & tandem nominatim citari mandavit eosdem responsuros de fide, eisdem benigne oblata gratia, si redire vellent ad Ecclesiæ unitatem. Quibus citationibus ipsi obstinati hæretici comparere contempserunt; ex quo undecima Februarii successive pro secunda vice citati per literas debite executas, iterum contumaciter comparere neglexerunt. Et ideo contra eosdem & merito literas excommunicatorias laxavit debite executas & publicatas, sed excommunicationem ipsam & aggravationem semper magis eorum perfidia sustinuerunt, ex quo per literas patentes citati fuerunt visuri loca ad quæ ipsis declinare contingebat supponi ecclesiastico interdicto, qui pariter comparere postposuerunt; & hoc est verum.

Item & quod successive præfatus Dominus commissarius sæpius misit ad eos plures viros Deum timentes & salutem animarum hæreticorum illorum quærentes, ut eos ad viam lucis & gratiæ reducerent, sed illos tanquam obstinatos.

natos ad postulandum veniam nullo modo flectere potuerunt; & hoc est verum.

Item & quod successive ac propterea antefactus Dominus Commissarius eos nominatim citari mandavit, ut coram eo compararent audituri definitivam sententiam per ipsum ferendam per literas debite executas die secunda Martii Anno supradicto, qui contumaciter semper magis comparere neglexerunt, & ideo nemine comparente, præfatus Dominus Commissarius cernens cor eorum induratum esse, nec in eis signa aliqua pœnitentiæ apparere, cum peritorum consilio, visis omnibus præcedentibus, ad suam definitivam processit sententiam per quam eos ut hæreticos pertinaces & rebelles brachio seculari reliquit; & hoc est verum.

Item quod propterea ex commissione extremi Parliamenti Dalphinalis pro brachio seculari implorati, strenuus Miles Dominus Hugo de Palude Comes de Varax Locumtenens Dalphini, & Magnificus Jurium doctor, & Dalphini Consiliarius Dominus Joannes Rabboti, servatis de jure servandis, processerunt contra eosdem qui proprias relinquentes domos cavernas & latibula montium ac ruptuas rupum sibi pro fortalicio elegerunt: sed interim dicti Domini Commissarii Apostolicus & Dalphinales iterum eis gratiam & Ecclesiæ Gremium obtulerunt; proviso quod puro corde & fide non ficta redirent. Ipsi verò tunc quasi omnes de rupibus sponte non ligati, non quæstionati descendentes qui voluerunt venire mares & fœminæ ad gratiam benigne recepti fuerunt per eundem Commissarium Apostolicum, & confessi fuerunt gratis & sine metu torturæ se fuisse & esse Valdenses, seu pauperes de Lugduno, & illorum hæresim seu sectam tenuisse, ac illi & illius articulis supra descriptis credidisse, & inter cereros *Angellinus Palloni* qui materiam prosequitur ad præsens, ac testante processu præsenti justificando in forma probante; & hoc est verum.

Item & quod reliqui, duodecim vel quindecim numero, in eorum turma existentes, qui contenti gratia & venia, Diabolico Spiritu imbuti ab aliis aufugerant cùm essent plus obstinati, banniti fuerunt; & hoc est verum, notorium & manifestum.

Item

Item & quod alii ad gratiam admissi de se sponte confessi, dictam damnatissimam Valdensium Sectam & Hæreticam pravitatem supra declaratam abjuraverunt & quamcunque aliam solenniter post prædicationem, & in eorum abjurationibus expresse promiserunt inter alia nusquam receptare seu occultare prædictos banitos, sed illos dum venirent repellere, & Ecclesiæ intimare, atque eis injungendas sententias satisfactorias pro peccatis efficaciter adimplere constante processu; & hoc est verum, & sub pœna relapsus in processu contenta.

Item & quod pro pœnitentiis fuit eis specialiter injunctum post abjurationem supradictam, quod viri qui fuerant in cavernis rupum se defendentes, ad quinquenium, alii vero qui non ibi fuerant, ad biennium deferrent cruces duas telæ crocei coloris in superiori veste ante & retro consutas, & talia fuerunt eis injuncta Ebreduni ubi fuerunt ante fores majoris ecclesiæ; & hoc est verum.

Item & quod successive dicti abjurati post eorum abjurationem Ecclesiæ mandatis & monitionibus, abjurationibus & monitionibus & promissionibus factis parere pertinaciter contempserunt; & ideo nominatim citati fuerunt visuri testes prædicti jurare & examinari contra eos per Procuratorem fidei producendos, quibus non comparentibus ac testibus in eorum contumacia examinatis, iterum citati fuerunt visuri attestationes publicari, qui comparere renuerunt; ex quorum quidem testium tam Presbyterorum quam aliorum Catholicorum bonorum fide dignorum, & suorum complicum depositionibus luce meridiana clarioribus apparet eosdem de Frayxineria fuisse & esse *ficte conversos* & relapsos, quia hæreticos banitos receptaverunt, & pœnitentias eis injunctas non impleverunt, vocati venire noluerunt, quinimo Barbas & Magistros Valdensium postmodo receperunt, & eis more pristino confessi sunt; & hoc est verum.

Item & quod successive authoritate Apostolica deputatus fuit Inquisitor in dictis vallibus frater Franciscus Plorerii Ordinis Minorum sacræ Theologiæ professor, qui de Anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo nono, & die prima Januarii intelligens quod ipsi de Frayxineria de relapsu essent diffamati signanter informatus à Curato loci

 &

& à pluribus de dicto loco Frayxineriæ ac cum veris Catholicis & etiam complicibus usque ad numerum sexaginta sex, quorum dictorum apparuit quod dicti de Frayxineria non impleverunt eis impositas pœnitentias, nec detulerunt cruces in suis superioribus vestibus: quinimo receptaverunt Hæreticos banitos, nec revelarunt ecclesiæ, 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 poterat, per literas patentes eos omnes nominatim citari mandavit responsuros de fide & de relapsu, qui suspectissimi se excusaturos, executos de Anno Domini millesimo quadringentesimo octuagesimo nono & die vigesima quarta Maii: qui tamen comparere postposuerunt, ex quo per alias literas legitime executas secundo citati fuerunt eodem anno & die vigesima octava Maii, sed comparere contempserunt, duobus exceptis qui nominibus propriis comparuerunt, & ideo non comparentes fuerunt. Et tertio per literas die septima Junii ejusdem anni debite executas vocati & non comparentes, in eorum contumacia excommunicati, & crescente contumacia aggravati, & quam excommunicationis sententiam in eos ut præmittitur latam, indurato animo sustinuerunt & adhuc sustinent, propter quod per alias vestras legitime executas anno prædicto & die vigesima octava Junii citati fuerunt audituri, & visuri se veluti pertinaces hæreticos relapsos brachio seculari relinqui, & eorum bona à die commissii quævis confiscata fuisse declarari; qui & iterum citati anno prædicto & die quinta Julii, ac iterum vocati anno quo supra & die sexta Septembris audituri sententiam contra eos ferendam, nunquam ut obstinati comparere curaverunt, ex quo rectè & ritè jure suadente damnati fuerunt, ex quo nunc audiendi non sunt, cum sint excommunicati, & interdicti, & pro talibus ac hæreticis pertinacibus declarati per sententias in rem judicatam transactas, nulla appellatione suspensas, adversus quas dicere aliquid admitti posse non videtur, nisi prius parito monitionibus, & judicatis, & ecclesiæ mandatis ac solutis expensis, super quibus dictus Procurator tanquam super articulo præjudiciabili petit jus dici & interloqui, jusque & justitiam ministrari, officium vestrum humiliter implorando.

Processus

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 venerabilis Dominus Bartholomæus Paschalis Canonicus & Pidancerius ac Locumtenens venerandi Domini de Turrellis, vicarii generalis reverendissimi in Christo Patris & Domini Domini Joannis Michaelis miseratione divina Episcopi Prænestini, Cardinalis sancti angeli, administratoris & commendatoris inclyti monasterii Ulciensis, secum existentibus spectabilibus & egregiis Dominis Pontio Pontii Dalphinali consiliario & Oroncio Eme Judice Berniensi 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 & hæresim docuit. Et incœpit ipsum ducere per patrias.

Interrogatus per quas patrias & regiones eum eduxit? dixit quod per patrias & regiones Italiæ, videlicet Januæ, Bononiæ, Luce, & per montem Marchancone, & ipse ejus pater, qui erat Barba, ibat ad confitendum & prædicandum gentes in illis montibus.

Interrogatus cum quibus fuit, in quibus partibus, & quos perseveravit & conversatus est? dixit quod ex post secundo anno ivit ad discendum dictam doctrinam Valdensium cum viro alio Barba vocato Barnovo, qui erat de loco Perupage, & de dominio de Camerino, qui duxit ipsum spacio duorum vel trium annorum per loca supradicta.

Interrogatus cum quo ex post dictum Barnovo sequutus est dictam doctrinam, dixit quod cum quodam alio Barba nominato Josue, qui erat de loco sancto de dominio de Camerino, propè locum de Camerino, trium milliarium de Charretto. Dicens ulterius quod postquam ivit cum dicto

 Josue

Josue ad confitendum & prædicandum dictam sectam, & per dicta loca quidam alius Barba nominatus Andreas, duxit ipsum ad eorum magnum Magistrum qui vocatur Joannes Antonii, & qui suam residentiam facit in loco de Cambro de dominio Papæ.

Interrogatus quid sibi dixit dictus magnus Magister, dixit quod in primis injunxit sibi quod faceret sacramentum sub fide ipsorum & aliud insuper sibi injunxit. Super omnibus quod pro aliqua re mundi non revelaret, prorsus nec manifestaret quæ sibi dicere volebat.

Dicens sibi quod manifestare seu revelare eorum fidem erat peccatum inexpiabile & irremissibile. Dicens eidem, quod si vellet sectam tenere & insequi dictam sectam, faceret sibi multa bona.

Interrogatus si erant aliqui alii, dixit quod sic, quos vocabat Barbas, & vocabatur ipse magnus Magister eorum Barba, & dicebat quod omnes tenebant dictam fidem & quod tenerent secretè.

Et ulterius dicebat, Magnus Magister qui monebat eos, ut servarent eorum fidem & essent salvati, & ita prædicabat, 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 & sectæ? dixit quod eorum Magister dixit, & ita reperiunt dicti Barbæ eundo per mundum, quod propter malam & pessimam vitam Papæ, Cardinalium, Episcoporum, & Sacerdotum, Religiosorum, & omnium aliorum Ecclesiasticorum virorum, ipsi Barbæ sequuntur hanc fidem, & reperierint infinitos errores. Quia dicti Papa, Cardinales, Episcopi & Ecclesiastici viri, ducunt, & omnes sequuntur avaritiam, luxuriam, ac superbiam & pompas, peccatum gulæ & iræ; & in hoc omnes viri ecclesiastici errant; & eorum hoc est potissimum fundamentum, quia viri ecclesiastici male & pessime vivunt.

Dicens ulterius, quod postquam ipsi viri Ecclesiastici sunt in peccato mortali, non possunt ministrare sacramenta, nec valent ea quæ ipsi faciunt, quia quando efficiuntur sacerdotes, jurant castitatem, puritatem & virginitatem, & quando

quando committunt peccata, frangunt fidem & juramentum, & veniunt contra fidem; & ex post perdunt omnimodam potestatem, quia quando candela 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 & suum Regascum qui dormiunt cum ipsis.

Dicens ulterius, quod dictus ejus magnus magister eisdem injunxit quod prædicarent & ampliarent eam fidem; & traherent gentes quantum possint ad illam, quia hoc faciendo lucrarentur vitam æternam, cum omnes de eorum fide sunt salvati, cæteri vero damnati.

Dicens quod quando eorum magnus Magister . . . appellat communitatem; quando facit eos Barbas & dat potestatem, mutat eorum nomina, & quod ipse antequam esset Barba effectus per dictam eorum communitatem, appellabatur Franciscus, & quando fuit factus Barba, imposuit sibi nomen Martinus.

Dicens ulterius, quod constituuntur Barbæ, & vacat officium Barbarum, & 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, & quid prædicare consueverunt Barbæ per orbem, dixit quod dicebat & ipsi prædicare consueverant quod unus solus Deus est adorandus, qui creavit cœlum & terram, lunam, solem, & stellas, & aquam, & quod credant solum & dumtaxat ea quæ vident.

Interrogatus quid dicebat eorum Magister eisdem Barbis, de Sanctis, & quid prædicant de Sanctis, dixit quod credunt in S. Petrum, & post ipsum in S. Gregorium, & Sylvestrum, & 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, & dedit eidem potestatem

tem absolvendi & ligandi, & quod ipse S. Petrus fecit ipso vivente miracula, & ideo credunt in ipsum inter cætera.

Interrogatus quæ miracula fecit? dixit quod quando S. *Petrus* construi faciebat Ecclesiam Sancti Petri in Roma, Diabolus venit ad ipsum, & dixit eidem, Ego faciam construere pulchriorem domum quam tu in breviori tempore, dicens, quod in crastinum, & 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, & cum fuit in conspectu dictæ domus, quæ nunc dicitur Sancta Maria de Rotunda, cum cautela fecit signum Crucis dicendo, Et apponendo manum ad barbam, & per istam sanctam barbam: deinde ponendo manum ad Stomachum, dicendo, Per istum sanctum fontem: deinde ad brachia dextra & sinistra dicendo, Per istas spatulas, ista est domus pulchra, quo signo Crucis ut supra facto, Diabolus voluit ipsam domum destruere; sed Sanctus Petrus impedivit ipsum & adjurationem ejus fecit. Et quia dictus S. Petrus erat in valvis Ecclesiæ, Diabolus non potuit exire per Januam, sed affigens pedes in terram, dimisit vestigia, & exivit per unum foramen quod fecit in summitate Ecclesiæ, & quod foramen adhuc est nunc, nec potuit ex post reparari, & propter dictum miraculum quod videtur ocularitet credunt in S. Petrum; in aliis autem Sanctis non credunt, quia fuerunt peccatores, & non viderunt eorum miracula.

De Sancto autem Johanne Baptista dixit quia non petiit gratiam à Domino, expectatur quod in diem Judicii intercedet pro omnibus, & nescitur si est in terra vel in cœlo, & credit quod est in Paradiso terrestri.

Dicens ulterius, quod in Angelis, Archangelis, Cherubim & Seraphim credunt, quia fuerunt creati à Deo Patre in vita æterna.

De Virg. Maria autem dixit quod quia solus Deus est adorandus, non sunt certi quod Virgo Maria audiat preces nostras, quia fuit humana Creatura, & quod *Ave Maria* non est oratio sed annunciatio & salutatio, & ideo non injungunt in pœnitentiam eis qui sunt de eorum secta, quod dicant *Ave Maria*

Maria, & quod solus *Pater Noster* est vera oratio, quia à Deo facta fuit oratio illa.

De Purgatorio dixit quod nullum est Purgatorium, sed viri Ecclesiastici propter avaritiam ipsorum reperierunt ad extorquendas pecunias pro Missis & Orationibus dicendis quæ de nihilo profunt; quia postquam homo moritur, aut est salvatus, aut est damnatus.

De Aqua Benedicta dixit, quod prædicant, dicunt & credunt, quod omni anno de mensibus Maii & in die Ascensionis Domini, quod Deus benedicit cœlum, terram, aquam, herbas, flumina, fontes & omnes fructus; & quod illa benedictio est securior quam illa quæ fit à Presbyteris, quia non valet nisi sint puri & mundi ab omni peccato; & quia quamplurimum Sacerdotes sunt peccatores, ut supra dixit, & per consequens & 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 Festivitatibus autem dixit, Quòd Festa quæ sunt Præcepta à Deo, prout est Dies Dominicus, Festum nativitatis Domini, Festum Paschæ, Ascensionis, & Pentecostes, sunt celebranda; alia autem Festa Virginis Mariæ & Sanctorum sunt festicula, & qui non vult, non tenetur illa celebrare, quia non sunt Præcepta, nec Vigiliæ ipsarum festivitatum sunt jejunandæ,

De Corpore Christi dicunt, Quod quia viri ecclesiastici sunt ut supra mali & pessimæ vitæ & peccatores, quod non possunt consecrare Corpus Christi, & non valet consecratio per ipsos facta; ideo ipsi Barbæ, & qui sunt de eorum secta, non recipiunt Eucharistiam, sed loco Eucharistiæ benedicunt Panem, & dicunt, Quod illa benedictio est majoris virtutis quam dicta consecratio, ex eo quia tantum quantum quis habet bonitatis & puritatis, tantum habet & potestatis.

De Peccato Carnis autem dixit in primis, quod eundo per mundum & prædicando de nocte faciunt Congregationes & Synagogas, in quibus in primis prædicatio fit per ipsas Barbas, & facta prædicatione incipiunt festa solatia & choreas ducere invicem discurrendo per locum ubi sunt cum candela accensa, atque quod se ad invicem teneant per manus, & celebratis ipsis

ipsis festis & solatiis, alter ipsorum & nescitur quis, suffocat lumen, quo suffocato, quilibet operatur, exercet corpora super peccato carnis, 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, prædicationum & 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, & 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 prædicat, & post dimittit fieri inter ipsos eorum synagogam, ex eo quia non posset se immiscere cum parentibus suis, & aliter non se poneret in dicta synagoga, nisi haberet parentes.

Extra autem synagogam dicunt, tenent, & prædicant quod peccatum Luxuriæ non est peccatum, nisi de Matre ad Filium, & è converso; & de compatre ad commatrem, & non ultra: rationem reddens, quia à Deo est facta prohibitio de Filia ad Matrem. Nam cum Deus ascenderet ad Cœlum dixit vulgariter & formaliter ut sequitur, Crescite & multiplicate, & Saint Joanne garda te & done sariti saliiti una voulta non S. toriali pie.

Interrogatus quod declaret illa verba? dixit, Quod Deus ascendendo Cœlos dixit prædicta verba, intelligendo quod homo non debet reverti ad vulvam Matris unde exivit, & dicendo respicite S. Joannem Baptistam, quia Sanctus Joannes Baptista baptisavit Christum; & ex prædictis per Legem Divinam prohibita est, conjunctio de Filio & de commatre, unius autem alia carnalis copula permissa est, quia non est prohibita à Deo, sed solum ab Ecclesia; & ideo indifferenter cognoscunt se adinvicem; & utuntur dicta carnali copula, nec contradicunt sibi invicem, quia melius est nubere quam uri.

Dicens ulterius, quod inter ipsos est honor quando Barbæ agnoscunt eorundem Valdensium & de *secta Filias.*

Et

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 Barbæ, per eorum comites & Magistrum, Magister convocat certos alios Barbas sectæ ut supra dixit, quod addendo ad ea quæ supra deposuit; dicunt & Juramentum præstant ipsi Barbæ prout formaliter sequitur, Tu talis Jura supra la fide tua de mantenere; multiplicare & accrescere nostra lege & de non la discoperire à persona dal monde & que tu prometes de non jurare Dieu anul modo, & que garda la domenega, et que non farai altro coisino causa que non uvelho que sie fato a te, & que tu credie en Dieu, que a fat el sol & la luna, cœlum & terram, cherubim & seraphim & aquel que tu vedes, & præstito dicto juramento, magnus Magister dat eidem Barbæ, sic fato, ad bibendum modicum vini, extunc mutat sibi nomen, dicendo, desi en la la te chamaras tal, & quod ipse loquens prius vocabatur Franciscus, & nunc vocatur Martinus inter ipsos, & quod illa solemnitas habetur loco baptismi.

Dicens ulterius, Quod quando ipsi Barbæ audiunt confessiones à Gentibus de eorum secta secretam, nec confiteantur Sacerdotibus, nec recipiant Eucharistiam nisi ficte & simulate, injungunt eis quod dictam sectam teneant.

Dicens ulterius, Quod postquam exercuit Officium Barbarum dictæ sectæ per Italiam spatio sex annorum vel circa, quod à duobus annis citra transivit per montes pergendo versus provinciam Provinciæ & Regnum Franciæ, & prima vice cum quodam alio Barba vocato Antonio de Pilhocalia de Spoleto, & anno elapso ipsi duo venerunt & transiverunt

 per

per montem Cinescium, & venerunt ad Regnum Franciæ, & fuerunt in Provinciis Borbonii & de Rodes, Forest Alvernii, de Marca usque ad patriam de Bordelleis, & in dictis Provinciis prædicaverunt eorum sectam & confessi fuerunt quod plures in dictis Provinciis de dicta eorum secta ad dictam sectam traxerunt quantum potuerunt.

Dicens ulterius, Quod reperierunt se quidem alii Barbæ in loco de Lymogiis, unde Colla de Joanne Baptista, de Thomasso, Paulo de mala carne, Bartholomeo, de Mocarello, Bastiano Luce, omnes de Patria Spolitana, qui docuerunt ipsum loquentem & ejus socium & alios de eorum Secta; & docuerunt eos loca ad quæ possent accedere, & ibidem prædicare, & quod extunc juverunt ad prædicandum ad dictas Patrias & Regiones, ut supra.

Interrogatus quomodo nominantur omnes tenentes eorum sectam, dixit quod de ultra Montes in Regno Franciæ appellantur Pauperes de Lugduno, de citra vero Montes in Patria Italiæ appellantur Pauperes Mundi; isto vero anno venit cum Andrea etiam ejus socius Barba, & venerunt per patriam Januæ; deinde per Niciam & ad Civitatem Aquensem; deinde ad Patriam de Vivaresio, ubi repererunt aliquos de ista Secta.

Ibidem in Montibus Albenacii & de Privacio, ex post versus Alverniam apud Clarum montem, unde ad Montem de *Monte aureo*; in quo Monte sunt plures de dicta Secta, & ibidem multi reperiuntur, & ibidem maxime augmentatur propter malam vitam quam tenent Ecclesiastici viri

Item ulterius dixit quod ista Secta crescit & pullulat in locis de Heretable de stabulo, in Crapona & Sineria in eadem Regione Alvergniæ, & etiam in Patria Foresii in Montibus de Furniis in Foretio & de Sancto Saforino, deinde venit ad Patriam Belvosii, in qua etiam viget dicta Secta; unde in locis seu montibus prope Villam Belli Joci & prope Villam Francam, & de loco Belli Joci venerunt Lugdunum; & cum fuerunt in Civitate Lugduni ubi die ultima Maii, proxime fluxi, hospitati fuerunt retro Sanctum Nicesium in dicto loco signi forpicum, & se repererunt ibidem ex deliberatione inter eos facta octo Barbæ, unde alii sex cum ipsis duobus vocantur Pascalis de Pasco,

Pasco, Jacobus de Laro, Petrus Matthei de Capriano Hucho de Andrea, Pasturius de Jaco, & cum supradicto, Petrus de Jaco, qui præsentialiter detinetur cum dicto loquente, qui omnes octo sunt de Patria Spolitana, & ibidem adinvicem congregati habuerunt conferentiam de gestis & gerendis per ipsos, recitantes loca unde veniebant & quo ibant.

Interrogatus, Quis ipsorum sex reddebat rationem de Patria Delphinatus? dixit quod Paschalis & Pastuchinus, & dicebant, Quod fuerant in Dalphinatu, & reperierunt multos in Patria Valentiniensium in Montibus, de Secta Valdensium; & fuerunt etiam in Patria Ebredunensi & Vapincensi, ubi etiam reperiebant multos qui fuerant banniti ab eorum Patria, & ejecti ab eorum domibus, & propter maximas tribulationes quas habuerunt aliqui ex eis, dicebant quod volebant tenere bonam fidem, alii vero dicebant quod credebant habere remedium, & quod volebant habere & tenere eorum Sectam.

Dicens ulterius, Quod cum ipse & alius Andreas Barba ejus Socius, de mense Martii proxime fluxo transierent per Provinciam veniendo ab eorum domibus, In ipsa patria Provinciæ & prope Civitatem Aquensem reperierunt tres qui dicebant quod erant de Dalphinatu, qui tres agnoverunt ipsos Barbas in habitibus eorum; videlicet in Mantellis, & habuerunt invicem verba de dicta eorum Secta; & ipsi tres homines dixerunt, Quod erant banniti, & expectabant habere gratiam & restitui in eorum Bonis & Patria, & continuare in eorum proposito primo.

Item dixit Quod ipse Paschalis & Pastuchinus qui fuerunt in Dalphinatu, dicebant, Quod quantum potuerunt conati fuerunt consolari ipsos bannitos & expulsos à Dalphinatu, sed causante dura & nimia persecutione compatiebantur vecordes & remissi, alii autem erant malæ voluntatis redeundi, sperantes habere gratiam.

Dicens ulterius, Quod prænominati duo Barbæ dicebant, Quod habebant magnos persecutores, & ipsos in Patria Delphinatus, viz. Reverend. Dominum Archiepiscopum Ebredunensem, & Dominum Poncium Poncii Consiliarium & Dominum Oroncium Eme Judicem gran. quem Dominum

 Poncium

Poncium comminabantur; quod si ipsum reperirent, facerent sibi ex fato suo.

Dicens ulterius, Quod ipsi octo Barbæ discesserunt omnes à Civitate Lugduni, & ipse loquens mutavit socium, quia loco dicti Andreæ Barbæ, cepit dictum Barbam Petrum præsentialiter detentum; alii vero Barbæ discesserunt, & retrocesserunt ad eorum Patriam ex deliberatione inter eos facta, ut dicebant.

Dictus autem Petrus Barba ejus novus Socius, & ipse loquens reversi sunt ad Dominam nostram de Podio, ut supra dixit, & ad alia loca Alvergniæ, Foresii, Belli Joci, tendendo ad Civitatem d'Autun in Burgundia, in qua duo, & in quadam Valle, in qua est quoddam proximum flumen, quod discurrit à flumine de Lera; in qua Valle sunt aliqui de dicta Secta, & ex post venerunt per Patriam Belli Joci, unde prope Villam dicti Belli Joci & Villæ Francæ, ubi etiam de eorum Secta consortes multi sunt & ibidem morantur, & exinde redierunt Lugdunum ad prædictum Hospitium, & ex post arripuerunt viam apud Breffam & ad Sanctum Glaudium, & in Sancto Glaudio, & in quibusdam Montibus citra & ultra; ubi sunt plures de eorum Secta. Quilibet prædicant & eos de confessione audiunt, & exinde recesserunt & iverunt Gebennas & Niciacum, & à Niciaco ad locum Aquæ Bellæ; de Aqua Bella ad Cameram, & ibidem prope Cameram aliquos paucos comperierunt de eorum Secta; deinde venerunt ad Montem de Valono, Neuachiam & Bardonenchiam; & de Bardonenchia ad locum Ulcii: & inde Juvencellori & Salicis Ulcii usque prope Collem Costæ Planæ, transeuntes apud Pratum Jalatum, in quo Monte fuerunt capti & 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 & fama referentibus, & quod si dicti de Prato Jalato voluissent confiteri eis, audivissent eos, & quod illa spe transiverant per dictum locum animo exercendi eorum Officium & ad consolandum dictos Valdenses ibidem commorantes.

Interro-

Interrogatus, Quando audivit aliquos de confessione quomodo consueverunt ipsos absolvere? dixit & responder, Quod non faciunt more Sacerdotum, sed dicunt eis quod teneant eorum Sectam firmam, & insuper injungunt eisdem quod dicenz aliquibus vicibus *Pater noster* pro pœnitentia, non autem *Ave Maria*, neque permittunt peregrinationes Italiæ, elemosynas ex amore Dei.

Interrogatus, Si inter ipsos Barbas de ista Secta fecerunt deliberationem de se reperiendo in aliquo loco? dixit, Quod duo alii videlicet Joannes de Cristophoro & Liberatus de Coqueto se debebant reperire cum ipsis duobus, videlicet ipso loquente & ejus socio, in loco de Tortona in Lombardia.

Interrogatus, Ubi habuit colloquium cum ipsis duobus proxime nominatis, Joanne Cristophoro & Liberato 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 cohabitat Filius cum Matre, & Pater cum Filia, & cum Commatre & Compatre, extra tamen Synagogam, & quod multi confitentur perseverare in dictis peccatis, & cohabitare cum ipsis.

Dicens ulterius, Quod confitentur de septem Peccatis Mortalibus, & non de aliis Peccatis.

Sumptum

Sumptum ex ore Peyronettæ.

ISta Peyronetta citata venit, & tamen medio juramento, omnia negavit, tamen jussa mitti in carcerem, & missa, omnia sponte confessa est, videlicet, quod à viginti quinque annis eos vidit & cognovit, eorum prædicationes audivit, de non jurando per Deum, de festis aliquibus non calendis, de non potestate sacerdotum, & sæpe de Purgatorio, & 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, & unde ortum habuerit secta, & quomodo oblationes desinunt facere, quomodo vidit eos novem aut decem vicibus, & quatuor vicibus eisdem confessa est peccata sua, nec unquam confessa est Curato suo, eis credidit & fidem dedit, misericordiam petiit, & repetita fuit.

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

INquisitionalis Processus factus & formatus coram egregiis & circumspectis viris Dominis Antonio Fabri Decretorum Doctore, Canonico Ebredunensi, hæreticæque pravitatis in toto Dalphinatu & comitatibus Viennensis, Valentinensis, & Diensis, Generali Inquisitore, à sancta sede Apostolica specialiter & immediate deputato, & Christofforo de Salhiente etiam decretorum Doctore, Canonico, Vicario & Officiali Valentiæ.

Ad instantiam & prosecutionem honorandi viri Domini Valentini de Razeriis Jurium professoris Procuratorisque fiscalis Valentiæ, & in hac parte Promotoris in favorem sanctæ fidei catholicæ, ejusque officii Inquisitionis Deputati.

Contra & adversus Peyronettam relictam Petri Beraudi, alias Fornerii, loci Belli Respectus, Valentinensis Diœcesis ætatis suæ quinquaginta annorum vel circa, de nefandissima hæresi

hæresi Valdensium, seu pauperum de Lugduno, quæ in his partibus vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum secta, inculpatam & diffamatam.

In nomine Sanctæ, & individuæ Trinitatis. Ex serie atque tenore hujusmodi veri publici inquisitionalis, omnibus & singulis & Christi fidelibus tam præsentibus quam inde futuris luculenter innotescat, & in perpetuam redigatur memoriam. Ex anno nativitatis Domini millesimo quatercentesimo nonagesimo quarto & die Mercurii quæ fuit & intitulata extitit vigesima nona mensis Januarii apud locum Belli Respectus & in domo probi viri Glaudii sua hospitis ipsius loci, & in camera nova ipsius domus, coramque egregio & circumspecto viro Domino Antonio Fabri decretorum doctore, canonico Ebredunensi, Inquisitore sanctæ fidei catholicæ, authoritate Apostolica deputato, cum assistentia mei Vincencii Gobaudi Notarii, & in hac parte conscribæ; de cujus quidem Domini Inquisitoris potestate constat, literis Apostolicis in forma brevi inferius loco & ordine insertis.

Comparuit ibidem prædicta Peyronetta relicta Petri Beraudi alias, Fornerii, Belli Respectus, Valenciensis Diœcesis, quæ de mandato & authoritate ejusdem Domini Inquisitoris præcedentibus debitis informationibus contra eam ad causam hæresis pauperum de Lugduno, sive Valdensium quæ in his partibus vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum secta, quæ inculpata & diffamata existit, sumptis atque receptis factisque monitionibus generalibus 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 hæresis prædictæ, & ibidem per memoratum Dominum Inquisitorem, suo medio juramento ad Sancta Dei Evangelia præstito, & ad pœnam perjurii & criminis sibi impositi, habendi pro integraliter confessato, ac excommunicationis & viginti quinque Ducatorum auri, de veritate dicenda super his quibus interrogabitur, examinata & interrogata: quæ quidem Peyronetta prædicta volens, ut dixit, mandatis & præceptis justitiæ obtemperare, atque parere, paratam se obtulit omnem quam super his quibus interrogabitur fiverit veritatem dicere & deponere, & licet sit fœmina simplex & ignara ac ingenio grossa, tamen dixit vixisse

vixiſſe toto tempore vitæ ſuæ ad inſtar & modum fidelium Chriſtianorum, & ſecundum Sanctæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ traditionem, adeo quod non prætendit unquam à vera fide catholica deviaſſe, nec aberraſſe, nec per ea quæque dicet deviare ſeu aberrare intendit, de quo fuit ſolemniter proteſtata.

Et prælibatus Dominus Inquiſitor non obſtantibus excuſationibus ſupra per dictam Peyronettam deductis & allegatis, ex ſui officii incumbentia etiam propter notoriam diffamationem dictæ Peyronettæ, prout latius ex tenore dictarum ſecretarum informationum colligitur, ideo ipſam duxit examinandam & interrogandam per modum infra ſcriptum.

Et primo fuit prænominata Peyronetta in hac parte delata per prælibatum Dominum Inquiſitorem interrogata & examinata qua de cauſa ſeu ad quid venit? dicta Peyronetta coram eodem Domino Inquiſitore dixit & reſpondit quod ex eo quia fuit citata, & advocata perſonaliter coram eodem Domino Inquiſitore comparitura pro reſpondendo de fide catholica, aut ſe excuſando ſuper inquiſitione hæreſis ſectæ Valdenſium ſeu alias Chagmardorum nuncupatæ, contra eam ut aſſeritur formata.

Interrogata quid eſt dicta hæreſis ſive Secta Valdenſium, alias Chagmardorum? dixit & reſpondit neſcire, neque ſcire velle quid ſit.

Interrogata an ullo unquam tempore viderit ſeu cognoverit nonnullos dictæ Hæreſis ſive Sectæ Magiſtros ſeu Prædicatores qui diſcurrere ſolent per rura & loca campeſtria eundo de domo ad domum, faciendo prædicationes clandeſtinas? dixit & reſpondit quod non, nec ſcit quinam dicantur dicti Prædicatores.

Interrogata an ullo unquam tempore audiverit aliquas prædicationes ſive documenta ab aliquibus hominibus ſecrete prædicantibus, præſertim horis nocturnis? dixit & reſpondit quod non.

Interrogata ſi ſciat ſe eſſe de Secta quæ vulgo nuncupatur Chagmardorum diffamatam & inculpatam? dixit & reſpondit quod non, nec poſſe ſuper hoc caput credi, inculpari ſeu diffamari legitimo titulo aut ratione aliqua.

Inter-

Interrogata an unquam fuerit requiſita aut inſtigata per quoſpiam de tenendo ſectam ipſam, aut aliam quamcunque? dixit & reſpondit quod non.

Interrogata an ſciat aliquos de loco prædicto Belli Reſpectus fore & eſſe de ſecta prædicta Chagmardorum? dixit & reſpondit quod non.

Interrogata an ipſa Peyronetta ſit de ſecta prædicta Chagmardorum, aut alias unquam ipſam ſectam tenuerit, ſive in eadem inſtructa fuerit? dixit & 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 & 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 Peyronettæ reſponſione per prædictum Dominum Inquiſitorem, quia ſecundum mentem & tenorem informationum contra eandam ad cauſam hæreſis prædictæ ſumptarum, eidem Domino Inquiſitori viſum fuit ipſam Peyronettam nimis ſufficienter ſuper præmiſſis reſpondiſſe, veritatemque nullatenus dixiſſe: ideo volens latius cum ea inquirere, ordinavit ipſam duci apud careres Epiſcopales Valentiæ, & ibidem tutè cuſtodiri & detineri donec ſufficientius de his quibus ex tenore dictarum informationum reperitur culpabilis, reſponderit.

Demum vero anno quo ſupra & die Veneris quæ fuit & intitulata extitit ultima menſis Januarii; apud Valentiam, & Palatio Epiſcopali ejuſdem, videlicet in camera reſidentiæ prælibati Domini Inquiſitoris, ac coram eodem exiſtens & perſonaliter conſtituta prænominata Peyronetta mandato ejuſdem Domini Inquiſitoris, infra carceres Epiſcopales detenta, quæ ut dixit attendens & conſiderans exhortationes ſibi noviſſime factas de dicendo veritatem ſuper interrogatoriis tangentibus ſectam prædictam, promittendo ſibi gratiam & miſericordiam ſi id faceret, ideo meliori & ſalubriori uti volens conſilio, non obſtantibus perjuriis, & aliis variationibus

tionibus per eam superius in respondendo commissis, confidendo ad plenum de benignitate ipsius Domini Inquisitoris, paratam se obtulit omnem veritatem quam super meritis ipsius sectæ sciverit, dicere & sponte confiteri, ac suam exonerare conscientiam, rogando sibi indulgeri & parceri ratione perjurii & de vacillationibus prædictis, & inde suam depositionem sive confessionem benigniter admitti, erroresque suos, si quos habeat, caritative & gratiose corrigi, submittendo se misericordiæ & ordinationi Sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ.

Et prælibatus Dominus Inquisitor, recepto ab ipsa Peyronetta corporali juramento de veritate dicenda præstito, impositaque sibi pœna perjurii & rigorosæ sibi ferendæ justitiæ, casu quo quidquam de ipsa veritate malicioſe occultaverit, ad ipsius examen processit, in hunc qui sequitur modum infrascriptum.

In primis enim dixit & 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 Lumbardica, quos prædictus ejus maritus receperat in dicta sua domo, amore Dei: tandem ipsis ibidem existentibus hora nocturnâ post cœnam unus ipsorum legere cœpit unum parvum librum quem secum deferebat, dicendo in eodem descripta fuisse Evangelia, & præcepta legis, quæ ibidem dicebat se explicare & declarare velle in præsentia omnium ibidem circumstantium, quia dicebat se fore missum ex parte Dei ad reformanda in fidem Catholicam, eundo per mundum ad instar Apostolorum pro prædicando bonis & simplicibus gentibus de modo & forma serviendi Deo, & vivendi secundum ejus mandata.

Et inter cætera dicebant quod nemo alteri facere debet id quod sibi fieri nollet.

Item quod solus Deus erat colendus & adorandus, & deprecandus, quia ipse solus est qui nos potest juvare.

Item quod jurare pro quavis occasione vel causa Deum, pro vero vel mendacio, aut aliud quodcunque facere juramentum ubi poneretur ista locutio *per*, erat magnum peccatum.

Item

Item quod Sacramentum Matrimonii debebat fideliter & firmiter custodiri.

Item quod bona opera quæ fiunt ante mortem hominis, plus prosunt, quam omnia quæ fiunt post mortem.

Item quod Sancti & Sanctæ non erant deprecandi in nostrum auxilium, quia non poterant 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, quæ non erant de necessitate colenda, imo poterat aliquis operari in ipsis, exceptis festivitatibus Apostolorum & aliis majoribus quas non exprimebant.

Item quod viri Ecclesiastici nimias habebant & possidebant divitias atque bona ultra quam oportebat, ob quod multa mala faciebant, quorum aliqui, causantibus eorum superfluitatibus & bonorum abundantiis, erant fœneratores, usurarii, superbi, & avaritia pleni; alii vero nimis lubriciter & inhoneste vivebant, tenendo meretrices in domibus suis palam & publice, sic malum exemplum ostendendo in populo.

Item quod prædicti Sacerdotes, eorum causante mala vita, non habebant majorem potestatem absolvendi, quam habebant ipsi prædicatores, sive hujus Sectæ Magistri, imo ipsi Magistri sive prædicatores, licet essent Laici, habebant tantam potestatem quantam ipsi Sacerdotes.

Item quod summus Pontifex ex quo non observabat sanctitatem quam debebat observare, non habebat aliquam potestatem, dicendo de eodem in hæc verba, *Autant crois & autant malvais est le Pape comme nengun autre, & per se non sages de puissance.*

Item quod in alio mundo nullum erat Purgatorium, dicendo quod quando quis moritur, ejus anima tendit ad Paradisum illico & incontinenter, dummodo bene & juste vixerit; si vero male, ad infernum.

Item & subsequenter quod frustra fiebant deprecationes, cantaria & alia suffragia pro animabus defunctorum; nihilque valebat id quod faciebant Sacerdotes eundo per cœmiterium, aspergendo aquam Benedictam supra sepulturas mortuorum, dicendo, Kirie Eleyson, Christe Eleyson, &c.

Item

Item quod Deus in initio mundi omnes aquas benedixerat, & omnia alia quæ fecerat, propter quod non erat necesse iterato aquam benedicere per sacerdotes, quæ etiam nihil plus valebat quam alia aqua.

Item quod prænominati sacerdotes ex semetipsis invenerant seu reperierant, quod in alio mundo erat purgatorium, ad effectus ut faciendo cantaria & deprecationes pro defunctis, majora sibi acquirant bona ex quibus eorum malam vitam sustinerent.

Item quod melius & magis meritorium erat dare elemosynam alicui pauperi infirmo aut leproso, quam offerre in Ecclesia sacerdotibus prædictis, qui erant nimis abundantes bonis.

Item quod ita bonum & utile erat orare Deum in domo aut alibi, sicut in Ecclesia, quia Deus ubiq; est.

Item quod Sancti nec Sanctæ, quamvis propter eorum bene merita essent in Paradiso collocati, non habebant potestatem nos in aliquo juvandi, & ideo non debebant deprecari in nostrum auxilium.

Item quod in vanum erat recurrere ad Imagines Sanctorum & Sanctarum, orando coram ipsis, quia nullam habebant virtutem, cum non essent nisi res materiales & picturæ factæ in parietibus.

Item propterea nihil prodesse poterat facere Peregrinationes & Romipetagia ad orandum coram imaginibus sanctorum & sanctarum, cum nihil possint in nostrum auxilium, ut prædictum est.

Item quod non erat necesse jejunare aliquas alias vigilias, quam festivitatum Paschæ, Pentecostes, Nativitatis & aliarum magnarum festivitatum Dominicalium, & potissime diebus Veneris erat etiam jejunandum.

Item quod ipsi prædicatores sive magistri hujusmodi sectæ, & sacerdotes seu viri ecclesiastici olim solebant esse unius & ejusdem legis & ordinis, sed cum ipsi viri ecclesiastici voluerunt insequi avaritiam & vanitates hujus mundi, & ipsi prædicatores in ipsa paupertate manere voluerunt; ideo fuit facta inter eos divisio, & effecti fuerant inimici, adeoq; cum numerus ipsorum prædicatorum & aliorum hominum justorum hujusmodi sectam tenuerint, adhuc esset parvus atque rarus,

rarus, ideo eis erat necesse incedere occultè, sicut faciebant Christus & ejus Apostoli; quia nisi ipsi prædicatores ambularent caute & secrete, dubitabant ab aliis offendi & male tractari.

Interrogata de nominibus ipsorum hominum sive prædicatorum talia prædicantium? dixit & respondit nesciviſſe eorum nomina.

Interrogata an propter ea quæ dicebant, non esse orandum pro defunctis, distulerit & obmiserit portare oblationes seu offerre in Ecclesia pro ipsis defunctis? dixit & respondit quod multoties fecit oblationes in Ecclesia, quas non fecisset nisi dubitasset quod aliqui male præsumpsissent de ea, & quod sibi improperaretur quod esset Chagnarda.

Interrogata quis dedit sibi notitiam dictorum prædicatorum sive magistrorum, seu alias quomodo introducta fuit ad conversandum cum eis? dixit & deposuit verum esse quod olim ipsa loquente existente cum Telmono Paschalis, quodam dicti loci Belli Respectus, quadam die de qua non recolit, & ipsis adinvicem de multis rebus conferentibus, descenderunt in propositum de modo vivendi secundum mandata Dei, & inter cætera alia verba inter eos tunc habita, prænominatus Telmonus Paschalis dixit sibi loquenti hæc verba vel eis similia, videlicet, *Avés nous james auvi parler dung plen pung de mond, que si non era, tout le monde faria a fin*: Quæ quidem loquens sibi respondit quod ita, videlicet cuidam Domino Andreæ . . . . . de loco Pigesoni, Capellano, olim vicario ipsius loco Belli Respectus, qui quadam die Ramis palmarum, prædicando in ipso loco Belli Respectus dicebat similia verba, videlicet, *Ces ung plen pung de gent que sosten tot le mond, & si aquello gent non era, tot le monde faria a fin*; quo tunc prænominatus Telmonus Paschalis replicavit in hæc verba, *& daquelles gens vos parle jen*; dicendo sibi quod si contingeret ipsas gentes venire ad ejus domum, quod audacter loqueretur cum eis, & eorum documenta auscultaret, cum exinde melius se haberet; tamen dixit quod dictus Telmonus dubitabat ipsam, ne alicui præmissa panderet seu detegeret, ut moris est mulierum superflue loqui, ideo sibi fecit fieri juramentum super literis de non dicendo aut manifestando alicui quidquam de præmissis, prout & ipsa

ipsa loquens fecit, & ex post ipsa loquens fuit inclinata & affecta videre dictas gentes prout fecit ut supra.

Interrogata si viderit dictos Magistros sive Prædicatores, de quibus superius, ultra vicem prædictam? dixit & respondit quod à supradicto tempore viginti quinq; 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 & forma quibus superius declaravit? dixit & respondit quod ita.

Item, De dictis novem vel decem vicibus quibus dictos Magistros prædicantes vidit & audivit? dixit dicta loquens quod fuit aliquoties in domo prænominati Telmoni Paschalis & Guillielmi Paschalis, ubi ipsi Prædicatores fuerunt & fecerunt eorum prædicationes modo præmisso, præsentibus omnibus illis de eadem domo, videlicet dicto Telmono & Guillielmo Paschalis; de nominibus autem aliorum præsentium dixit se non recordari.

Item, Similiter dixit eos vidisse in domo Petri Garnerii ejusdem loci certis vicibus, de quibus nec de tempore non potest recordari, ubi etiam fuerint factæ prædicationes prædictæ, præsentibus eodem Petro Garnerii & aliis de eadem domo, quorum nomina ignorat.

Interrogata si aliqui alii circumvicini interfuerint in prædictis prædicationibus factis in domibus eorum Paschalorum, & Petri Garnerii? dixit quod non, quantum sibi potest recordari.

Interrogata an sciat quantis vicibus dicti Prædicatores fuerunt in domo sua sive sui quondam Mariti? dixit & respondit juxta æstimationem suam, quod fuerunt in dicta ejus domo quatuor aut quinque vicibus, & ibidem prædicationes assuetas fecerunt.

Interrogata qui sunt illi qui erant præsentes & audientes in dictis prædicationibus factis in domo prædicta? dixit & respondit quod Petrus Beraudi alias Fornerii ejusdem loquentisq; maritus dum vivebat; necnon aliquoties ibidem veniebant Joannes

Joannes Prodome, & aliquando Telmonus Paschalis quidam, & Guillielmus Paschalis ac Petrus Garnerii, seu eorum alter alternatis vicibus, & aliquoties duo vel tres eorundem simul.

Interrogata si unquam confessa fuerit peccata sua alicui ex dictis prædicatoribus sive magistris? dixit & respondit quod singulis vicibus quibus ipsi prædicatores fuerunt in domo sui quondam mariti, ipsa confessa est peccata sua alteri ex eis genibus flexis, ac si fuisset coram suo proprio sacerdote, & inde facta confessione, ipsam absolvebat, manum ad caput imponendo more sacerdotum.

Interrogata quam pœnitentiam sibi imponebant prædicti prædicatores sive Magistri pro peccatis confessatis? dixit & respondit quod diceret frequenter *Pater noster*, & hoc tantum quantum possem, & quod jejunaret aliquibus diebus Veneris, & faceret aliquas elemosynas secundum suam facultatem.

Interrogata quot vicibus confessa est dictis prædicatoribus? 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 & cognovisse prædictos Magistros sive prædicatores, eorumq; prædicationes audivisse? dixit & respondit quod non, quia non credebat male agere.

Interrogata si crediderit seu alias dederit fidem supradictis prædicatoribus sive Magistris & eorum documentis & doctrinæ? dixit & sponte confessa est quod tanquam mulier insipiens & innocens & facilis ad decipiendum, credidit & dedit fidem eisdem prædicatoribus & eorum doctrinis sive documentis, credendo bene & salubriter agere, nec putabat propterea errare in aliquo. Veruntamen ubi videatur aut cognoscatur ipsam in aliquo aberrasse, se submisit benignæ correctioni sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ & eorundem dominorum Inquisitoris sive Officialis, petendo de omnibus in quibus potuit hactenus in præmissis errare, veniam & misericordiam sibi impertiri.

Memoratus enim Dominus Inquisitor, audita confessione prædictæ Peironettæ, volens super eadem deliberare, nec non cum eadem latius inquirere super præmissis, terminum statuit.

tuit & assignavit eidem Peironettæ ad latius deponendum & declarandum super præmissis & aliis audiendis, deliberatione ejusdem Domini Inquisitoris hinc ad diem crastinam circa horam meridiei: & iterum ordinavit eam stare sub prædicta carcerum custodia.

Crastina autem die supra novissime per prælibatum Dominum Inquisitorem pro termino in causa hujusmodi assignata, quæ fuit intitulata Sabbati, prima mensis Februarii in Camera superius mentionata & coram præmemorato Domino Inquisitore venit & comparuit supranominata Peironetta ibidem per carcerarium Episcopalem de mandato præfati Domini Inquisitoris ad actum hujusmodi à carceribus ipsis educta, petens & humiliter requirens se à dictis carceribus relaxari, paratam se offerendo facere quæ debebit, nec non latius respondere super omnibus quibus interrogabitur: Et Dominus Inquisitor præfatus visa ipsius loquentis superius facta confessione, ad majorem veritatis corroborantiam duxit eandem super eadem & omnibus in ea contentis examinandam & repetendam, vigore juramenti per eam supra præstiti ac sub pœna qua supra. Quæ quidem Peironetta delata audito tenore jam dictæ suæ confessionis sibi per me Notarium infra scriptum de verbo ad verbum in vulgari sermone recitatis & declaratis ac per eam ut dixit, integraliter intellectis dixit, deposuit & sponte confessa est ea omnia & singula in jam dicta ipsius depositione & confessione, singula singulis, contenta & descripta fore & esse vera & veritati consona eisq; tanquam recte & legitime dictis & confessatis persistit, pro quibus omnibus & singulis se submisit misericordiæ sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ & jam dictorum dominorum Inquisitoris & Officialis, petendo & requirendo se à carceribus quibus pro præmissis detinetur relaxari: Et præterea addendo prædictæ suæ confessioni dixit audivisse à suprafatis prædicatoribus sive Magistris prædicantibus, quod sacerdotes recipientes pecunias pro missis celebrandis comparabantur Judæ qui vendidit Christum propter pecuniam: & illi qui dabant ipsas pecunias dictis sacerdotibus occasione ipsarum Missarum, comparabantur Judæis qui Christum emerunt pecuniis.

Item

Item, Addendo dixit & confessa est, quod prædicti Prædicatores dum recedebant à domo sua aliquoties dabant sibi certam quantitatem acuum sive d' Aiguilles, & ejus quondam maritus dum vivebat dabat eis pecunias pro pœna ipsorum.

Interrogata quantum dabat eis dictus ejus quondam maritus pro dicta eorum pœna, dixit nescire, quia non vidit numerari.

Interrogata qui sunt illi de dicta ejus domo qui dictos homines sive prædicatores viderunt, & audiverunt eorum prædicationes, dixit quod Fancisca ejusdem loquentis filia & Simeon Acto maritus ipsius Franciscæ?

Interrogata si fuerit unquam in loco de Bareillonia ubi dictos Magistros prædicatores audiverit prædicantes? dixit & respondit verum esse, & sibi recordari quod olim sunt decem anni elapsi vel circa quibus Petrus Fornerii ejus quond. vir ac ipsa loquens accesserunt apud dictum locum Bareilloniæ ad visitandum Fabrentes ipsius loci, quia erant & adhuc sunt affines ejus, & visitando steterunt ibidem uno vel duobus diebus, quo interim ipsa loquens & prædictus 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 prædicatoribus sive Magistris prædictis, qui ibidem præsente dicto Moneto & ejus familia prædicabant: & videns dictus Monetus ipsam loquentem & ejus virum ibidem ex incogitato intrasse & advenisse, fuit valde tristatus atque iratus de adventu ipsorum conjugum ad causam dictorum prædicatorum ibidem secreto prædicantium, & videntes ipsa loquens & dictus ejus quondam vir, eundem Monetum esse ita iratum & male contentum propter adventum ipsorum, post modicum temporis ab ipsa domo recesserunt.

Interrogata quid sibi dixerunt supradicti duo prædicatores? dixit quod nihil.

 Inter-

Interrogata si propter adventum suum & sui viri, dicti prædicatores desierint prædicare? dixit quod non.

Interrogata an ipsa & ejus vir ex tunc cognoverunt dictos prædicatores esse de consortio & conversatione ipsorum? dixit & respondit quod in verbis suis cognovit eos esse de illis.

Interrogata si unquam alias viderat dictos duos homines sive prædicatores in domo sua de Bello Respectu? dixit non posse recordari.

Interrogata quid dicebant dicti prædicatores in eorum prædicationibus? dixit non posse bene recordari, quia paucum steterant ibidem propter turbationem prædicti monetei.

Interrogata an dicti prædicatores eo tunc iverint ad domum supradicti Joannis Fabri? dixit quod non.

Amplius non fuit eo tunc interrogata, tamen prælibatus Dominus Inquisitor certis motus respectibus etiam ut dictæ mulieri parcatur laboribus & expensis, recepto prius ab eadem juramento per eam ad sancta Dei Evangelia præstito, de se repræsentando toties quoties vocabitur, impositaque sibi pœna hæreticis relapsis à jure indicta, casu quo comparere obmiserit, tandem à carceribus prædictis quibus ob causam hujusmodi detinebatur, dixit & jussit relaxandam usq; ad primam deliberationem sive novum mandatum.

Rursum vero anno quo superius & die dominica ramis palmarum, computata vigesima tertia mensis Martii, apud locum prædictum Belli Respectus, & coram nobis Henrico Dileri Capellano, & Vincentio Gobaudi Notariis publicis & causæ hujusmodi scribis, ac in hac parte commissis per egregium & circumspectum virum Dominum Christophorum de Salhiente decretorum doctorem vicariumq; & officialem Valentiæ, vivæ vocis oraculo expresse deputatis, & ibidem infra domum claustralem ipsius loci, vocata supradicta Peironetta, & ea in præsentia nostra personaliter constituta, ipsam juxta nobis commissa de & super omnibus & singulis per eam pridem superius dictis, & confessatis, eis omnibus prius lectis & in lingua vulgarica & laica de verbo ad verbum recitatis & declaratis; duximus repetendam & re-examinandam, quibus omnibus & singulis per

per eam ut dixit ad plenum perceptis, ejus medio juramento ad sancta Dei Evangelia præstito, impositaq; sibi pœna qua superius, videlicet quæ de jure hæreticis relapsis debetur de dicenda veritate, dicta Peironetta dixit & sponte confessa est ea omnia & singula supra per eam dicta, deposita & confessata, fore & esse vera, veritati consona, prout & quemadmodum scripta sunt superius, eisque omnibus & singulis tanquam recte & legitime confessatis atque depositis, persistit petendo continue veniam & misericordiam. Actum uti supra præsente venerabili viro Domino Guillielmo Blanchardi Vicario dicti loci. Quibus sic gestis dicta Peironetta virtute juramenti per eam superius sæpissime præstiti, ac sub pœnis quibus supra præmissis se repræsentare coram prælibato Domino Inquisitore ac Domino Officiali toties quoties vocabitur ex parte eorum.

Processum, sive Acta præcedentia sumpsi & recepi ego Notarius subsignatus,

GOBAUDI.

FINIS.