



LIBRARY  
Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

No. Case, *III*

No. Shelf, *3*

No. Book, *II*

The John M. Krebs Donation.

BR 445 :M613--1632 v.1  
Moshaim, Johann Lorenz,  
1694?-1755.

An ecclesiastical history,  
ancient and modern

500  
#12 100  
1









AN

# **ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, ANCIENT AND MODERN;**

IN WHICH

THE RISE, PROGRESS, AND VARIATIONS OF CHURCH POWER, ARE CONSIDERED IN THEIR  
CONNEXION WITH THE STATE OF LEARNING AND PHILOSOPHY, AND THE  
POLITICAL HISTORY OF EUROPE DURING THAT PERIOD;

BY THE LATE LEARNED

**JOHN LAURENCE MOSHEIM, D. D.**

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GOTTINGEN,

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN,

AND ILLUSTRATED WITH NOTES, CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES, AND AN APPENDIX,

**BY ARCHIBALD MACLAINE, D. D.**

---

A NEW EDITION—IN TWO VOLUMES,  
CONTINUED TO THE YEAR 1826.

BY CHARLES COOTE, L. L. D.

AND FURNISHED WITH

A DISSERTATION ON THE STATE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH,

BY THE RIGHT REV.

DR. GEORGE GLEIG, OF STIRLING.

---

**VOL. I.**

---

BALTIMORE.

PUBLISHED BY PHEONIX N. WOOD & CO.

1832.





## THE TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

---

I CANNOT persuade myself, that the complaints which we hear frequently of the frivolous nature of the public taste in matters of literature, are so far to be relied on, as to make me despair of a favourable reception of the following work. A History of the Christian Church, composed with judgment, taste, and candour, drawn with uncommon discernment and industry from the best sources, enriched with much useful learning and several important discoveries, and connected with the history of arts, philosophy, and civil government, is an object that will very probably attract the attention of many, and most undoubtedly excite the curiosity of the judicious and the wise. A work of this nature will be considered by the philosopher, as an important branch of the history of the human mind; and I need not mention a multitude of reasons that render it peculiarly interesting to the Christian. Besides, there has not hitherto appeared, in English, any complete history of the church, that represents its revolutions, its divisions, and doctrines, with impartiality and truth, exposes the delusions of popish legends, breathes a spirit of moderation and freedom, and, keeping perpetually in the view of the reader the true nature and design of the Christian religion, points out those deviations from its beautiful simplicity, which have been too frequent among all orders of men and in all ages of the world.\*

\* \* \* \* \*

How far justice has been done to this excellent work, in the following translation, is a point that must be left to the decision of those who may think proper to peruse it with attention. I can say, with the strictest truth, that I have spared no pains to render it worthy of their gracious acceptance; and this consideration gives me some claim to their candour and indulgence, for any defects they may find in it. I have endeavoured to render my translation faithful, but never proposed to render it entirely literal. The style of the original is by no means a model to imitate, in a work designed for general use. Dr. Mosheim affected brevity, and laboured to crowd many things into few words; thus his diction, though pure and correct, became sententious and harsh, without that harmony which pleases the ear, or those transitions which make a narration flow with ease. This being the case, I have sometimes taken considerable liberties with my author, and followed the spirit of his narrative without adhering strictly to the letter. Where, indeed, the Latin phrase appeared to me elegant, expressive, and compatible with the English idiom, I have constantly followed it; but, in all other cases, I have departed from it, and have often added a few sentences, to render an observation more striking, a fact more clear, a portrait more finished. Had I been translating Cicero or Tacitus, I should not have thought such freedom pardonable. The translation of a classic author, like the copy of a capital picture, must exhibit not only the subject but also the manner of the original: this rule, however, is not applicable to the work now under consideration.

When I entered upon this undertaking, I proposed rendering the additional notes more numerous and ample, than the reader will find them. I soon perceived that the prosecution of my original plan would render this work too voluminous; and this induced me to alter my purpose. The notes I have given are not, however, inconsiderable in number; I wish I could say as much with respect to their merit and importance. I would only hope that some of them will be looked upon as not altogether unnecessary.

*Hague, Dec 4, 1764.*

---

\* We omit the intervening part of Dr. Maclaine's Preface, because its insertion is rendered unnecessary by the biographical sketch which the Editor has given

## THE EDITOR'S PREFACE.

---

IN every civilized country, the ministers of religion, from the nature of their education, may be expected to be conversant in literature: but in no country do they appear to be so fond of imparting their thoughts to the world, by the medium of the press, as in Germany. The greater part of their productions, indeed, pass silently into the gulf of oblivion, while some remain, and excite continued attention. To the latter class may be assigned the History of the Christian Church, written by Dr. John Laurence von Mosheim.

Academical honours and ecclesiastical dignities have frequently been obtained by persons who were born in the lowest sphere of life; and it may therefore be supposed that Mosheim might have obtained such honours and rewards by his abilities and erudition, even if he had been the son of an ordinary tradesman, of a low mechanic, or a rude peasant: but that was not his fate; for he was born (in the year 1695) of a family that boasted of high rank and noble blood. Lubeck was the place of his birth; but, in the short accounts of him which have fallen under our notice, the scene of his academical education is not mentioned. He gave early indications of a promising capacity, and of a strong desire of mental and literary improvement; and, when his parents proposed to him the choice of a profession, the church suggested itself to him as a proper department for the exercise of that zeal which disposed him to be useful to society.

Being ordained a minister of the Lutheran church, he soon distinguished himself as a preacher. His eloquence was impressive: he could wield with force the weapons of argumentation; and his language was neat, perspicuous, and accurate. He did not bewilder his auditors in the refinements of doctrine, or the profundities of speculation, but generally contented himself with stating the chief doctrinal points of Christianity, while he enforced the useful precepts of practical religion, recommending pious feelings, benevolent affections, an orderly demeanour, correct morals, and virtuous habits.

His reputation as a preacher, however high, was local and confined: but the fame of his literary ability diffused itself among all the nations of Christendom. The Danish court invited him to Copenhagen, and rewarded his merit by the grant of a professorship in the university of that capital. The duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbittel afterwards patronised him; and, having solicited his return to Germany, not only procured for him the theological chair at Helmstadt, but appointed him counsellor to the court in the affairs of the church, and invested him with authority over all the seminaries of learning in the duchy. Even king George the Second, who, though a respectable prince, was not distinguished as an encourager of literary merit, entertained a high opinion of the character of Dr. Mosheim, and selected him for the dignified office of chancellor or president of the university of Gottingen. He discharged the duties of that station with zeal and propriety, and his conduct gave general satisfaction. His death, therefore, was sincerely lamented by all ranks of people, particularly as it did not occur in the extremity of age; for he had not completed his sixty-first year.

His literary labours were principally connected with his theological profession. He wrote, in the language of ancient Rome, an account of the affairs and state of the Christians before the reign of Constantine the Great;—a vindication of the early discipline of those votaries of pure religion;—a narrative of the chief incidents of the life of the unfortunate Servetus, the martyr of

Calvinistic bigotry;—dissertations on various subjects of a sacred nature;—and a translation of the celebrated work of Dr. Ralph Cudworth upon the intellectual system of the universe, accompanied with erudite remarks and judicious illustrations.

His history of the church was at first a small work, which appeared under the title of *Institutiones Historiæ Christianæ*, and passed through several editions. He was repeatedly urged by his learned friends to extend a work which they represented as too meagre for the importance of the subject. He acknowledged the applicability of the objection; but alleged various avocations, as an excuse for non-compliance. To the wish of the public he at length acceded; and, having employed two years in the augmentation and improvement of his history, he published it in the year 1755, with a dedication to Burchard Christian baron Behr, one of the counsellors of regency to his Britanic majesty for the electorate of Hanover. In the preface, he solemnly thanked God for having given him strength and ability to finish a difficult and tedious work (*opus difficile, non unâ de causâ, et tædii plenum.*) He, at the same time, lamented that he was almost worn out with labours and cares. Thus did he seemingly predict his speedy dissolution; and, before the end of that year, his honourable and useful life was closed by the will of Providence.

Being desirous of procuring, for a work so replete with information, a more general perusal than its Latin dress would allow, Dr. Maclaine, a learned minister of the English church in Holland, undertook the task of translating it; and the attempt was by no means unsuccessful. For his translation there is a permanent demand; and a new edition is therefore submitted to the public eye, after that revision and correction which appeared to be necessary. A continuation is subjoined, that the reader might not regret the want of a religious and ecclesiastical history of recent times; and the translator's appendix has been enriched with a judicious essay, the offspring of the spontaneous zeal of a distinguished divine of the Episcopal church in Scotland.

C. COOTE.

May 15, 1826.

## THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

---

THE different editions of my Elements of the Christian History met with such a favourable reception, and so great was the demand for them, that they were soon out of print. On this occasion, the worthy person, at whose expense they had been presented to the public, advised that a new edition should be given of the same work, improved and enlarged. The other occupations in which I was engaged, and a prudent consideration of the labour I must undergo in the correction and augmentation of a work in which I myself perceived so many imperfections, prevented my yielding, for a long time, to his earnest solicitations. But the importunities of my friends at length prevailed upon me to undertake the difficult task; and I have assiduously employed my hours of leisure, during two years, in bringing the work to as high a degree of perfection as I am capable of giving to it; so that now these Elements of Ecclesiastical History appear under a new form, and the changes they have undergone are certainly advantageous in every respect. I have still retained the division of the whole into certain periods; for, though a continued narration would have been more agreeable to my own taste, and had also several circumstances to recommend it, yet the counsels of some learned men who have experienced the great advantages of this division, engaged me to prefer the former to every other method; and indeed, when we examine this matter with due attention, we shall be disposed to allow, that the author, who proposes comprehending in one work all the observations and facts which are necessary to an acquaintance with the state of Christianity in the different ages of the church, will find it impossible to execute this design, without adopting certain general divisions of time, and others of a more particular kind, naturally pointed out by the variety of objects that demand a place in his history. And, as this was my design in the following work, I have left its primitive form entire, and made it my principal business to correct, improve, and augment it in such a manner, as to render it more instructive and entertaining to the reader.

My principal care has been employed in establishing upon the most solid foundations, and confirming by the most respectable authority, the credit of the facts related in this history. For this purpose, I have drawn from the fountain-head, and have gone to those genuine sources from which the pure and uncorrupted streams of evidence flow. I have consulted the best authors of every age, and chiefly those who were contemporary with the events which they record, or lived near the periods in which they happened; and I have endeavoured to report their contents with brevity, perspicuity, and precision. Abbreviators, generally speaking, do little more than reduce to a short and narrow compass those large bodies of history, which have been compiled from original authors. This method may be, in some measure, justified by several reasons, and therefore is not to be entirely disapproved: hence, nevertheless, it happens, that the errors, which almost always abound in large and voluminous productions, are propagated with facility, and, passing from one book into many, are unhappily handed down from age to age. This I had formerly observed in several abridgements: and I had lately the mortification to find some instances of this in my work, when I examined it by the pure lamps of antiquity, and compared it with those original records which are considered as the genuine sources of sacred history. It was then that I perceived the danger of confiding implicitly even in those who are the most generally esteemed on account of their fidelity, penetration, and dili-

gence; and it was then also that I became sensible of the necessity of adding, suppressing, changing, and correcting several things in the small work (already mentioned) which I formerly published. In the execution of this necessary task, I can affirm with truth, that I have not been deficient in perseverance, industry, or attention; and yet, with all these, it is exceedingly difficult to avoid mistakes of every kind, as those who are acquainted with the nature of historical researches abundantly know. How far I have approached to that inaccessible degree of exactness, which is chargeable with no error, must be left to the decision of those whose extensive knowledge of the Christian history entitles them to pronounce judgment in this matter. That such may judge with the greater facility, I have mentioned the authors who have been my guides; and, if I have in any respect misrepresented their accounts or their sentiments, I must confess that I am much more inexcusable than some other historians, who have met with and deserved the same reproach, since I have attentively perused and compared the various authors to whose testimony I appeal, having formed a resolution of trusting to no authority inferior to that of the original sources of historical truth. In order to execute, with some degree of success, the design I formed of rendering my abridgement more perfect, and of giving the history of the church as it stands in the most authentic records, and in the writings of those whose authority is most respectable, I found myself obliged to make many changes and additions. These will be visible through the whole of the following work, but more especially in the third book, which comprehends the history of the Christian, and particularly of the Latin or western church, from Charlemagne to the rise of Luther and the commencement of the Reformation. This period of history, though it abound with shining examples, though it be unspeakably useful as a key to the knowledge of the political as well as religious state of Europe, though it be singularly adapted to unfold the origin and explain the reasons of many modern transactions, has nevertheless been hitherto treated with less perspicuity, solidity, and elegance, than any other branch of the history of the church. Many writers have attempted to throw light upon this interesting period; but the barbarous style of one part of the number, the profound ignorance of some, and the partial and factious spirit of others, are such as render them by no means inviting; and the enormous bulk and excessive price of the productions of some of the best of these writers must necessarily make them scarce. It is farther to be observed, that some of the most valuable records that belong to the period now under consideration, remain yet in manuscript in the collections of the curious (or the opulent, who are willing to pass for such,) and are thus concealed from public view. Those who consider these circumstances will no longer be surprised, that, in this part of the subject, the most learned and laborious writers have omitted many things of consequence, and treated others without success. Amongst these, the analists and other historians, so highly celebrated by the church of Rome, such as Baronius, Raynaldus, Bzovius, Manriques, and Wadding, though they were amply furnished with ancient manuscripts and records, have nevertheless committed more faults, and fallen into errors of greater consequence, than other writers, who were far inferior to them in learning and credit, and had much less access to original records than they were favoured with.

These considerations induce me to hope, that the work which I now present to the public will neither appear superfluous nor be found useless. For, as I have employed many years in the most laborious researches, in order to acquire a thorough acquaintance with the history of Christianity from the eighth century downwards, and as I flatter myself that, by the aid both of printed works and manuscripts too little consulted, I have arrived at a more certain and satisfactory knowledge of that period than is to be found in the

generality of writers, I cannot but think that it will be doing real service to this branch of history to produce some of these discoveries, as this may encourage the learned and industrious to pursue the plan that I have thus begun, and to complete the history of the Latin church, by dispelling the darkness of what is called the Middle Age. And indeed I may venture to affirm, that I have brought to light several things hitherto unknown; corrected from records of undoubted authority accounts of other things imperfectly known, and expressed with perplexity and confusion; and exposed the fabulous nature of many pretended events that deform the annals of sacred history. I here perhaps carry too far that self-praise, which the candour and indulgence of the public are disposed either to overlook as the infirmity, or to regard as the privilege of old age. Those, however, who are curious to know how far this self-applause is just and well grounded, have only to cast an eye on the illustrations I have given on the subject of Constantine's donation, as also with respect to the Cathari and Albigenes, the Beghards and Beguines, the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit (whose pestilential fanaticism was a public nuisance to many countries in Europe during a period of four hundred years,) the Fratricelli or Little Brethren, the controversies between the Franciscans and the Roman pontiffs, the history of Berenger and the Lollards, and other matters. When my illustrations of these subjects and points of history are compared with what we find concerning them in other writers, it will perhaps appear, that my pretensions to the merit of some interesting discoveries are not entirely without foundation.

The accessions to ecclesiastical history could not be exhibited with the same brevity that I have observed in treating other subjects, which had been amply enlarged upon by others; for this would have been incompatible with the information of the curious, who would have received imperfect and confused notions of these subjects, and would have made me, perhaps, pass for a fabulous writer, who advanced novelties, without mentioning either my guides or my authorities. I have, therefore, not only explained all those points of history which carry with them an air of novelty or recede considerably from the notions commonly received, but have also confirmed them by a sufficient number of observations and testimonies, so as to establish their credibility on a solid foundation. The illustrations and enlargements, which, generally speaking, have an appearance of disproportion and superfluity in an historical abridgement, were absolutely necessary in the present case.

These reasons engaged me to change the plan laid down in my former work, and one peculiar consideration induced me to render the present history more ample and voluminous. The elements before mentioned, were principally intended for the use of those who are appointed to instruct the studious youth in the history and vicissitudes of the Christian Church, and who stand in need of a compendious text to give a certain order and method to their prelections. In this view I treated each subject with the utmost brevity, and left, as was natural and fitting, much to the learning and abilities of those who might think proper to make use of these elements in their course of instruction. But, in reviewing this compendious work with an intention of presenting it anew to the public, I imagined it might be rendered more acceptable to many, by such improvements and enlargements as might adapt it not only to the use of those who teach others, but also of those who are desirous of acquiring, by their own application, a general knowledge of ecclesiastical history. It was with this view that I made considerable additions to my former work, illustrated many things that had been there obscurely expressed for the sake of brevity, and reduced to a regular and perspicuous order a variety of facts, the recital of which had been more or less attended with perplexity and confusion. Hence it is, that, in the following work, the history of the calamities, in which the Christians of the first ages were in

volved, and the origin and progress of the sects and heresies which troubled the church, are exhibited with an uncommon degree of accuracy and precision.

Hence the various forms of religion, which have sprung from the excessive love of novelty, are represented without prejudice or partiality, and with all possible perspicuity and truth. It is also in consequence of this change of my original design, that I have taken the utmost pains to state more clearly religious controversies, to estimate their respective moment and importance, and to exhibit the arguments alleged on both sides; nor must I omit mentioning the care and labour I have employed in giving an exact narration of the transactions, wars, and enterprising measures, of the Roman pontiffs, from the reign of Charlemagne to the present time.

Those, therefore, who are prevented from applying themselves to a regular study of ecclesiastical history through want of leisure, or by not having at hand the sources of instruction, and are nevertheless desirous of acquiring a distinct knowledge of certain events, doctrines, or ceremonies, may consult the following work, in which they will find the information they want; and those who are inclined to push their inquiries still farther, will see the course they must pursue, and find the authors mentioned whom it will be proper for them to consult.

It would betray an unpardonable presumption in me to imagine, that in a work, whose plan is so extensive, and whose contents are so various, I have never fallen into any mistakes. But, as I am conscious to myself of having conducted this undertaking with the most upright intentions, and of having employed all those means which are generally looked upon as the best preservatives against the seductions of error, I would hope that the mistakes I may have committed are neither so frequent nor so momentous as to be productive of any pernicious effects.

I might add more; but nothing more is necessary to enable those to judge of this work, who judge with knowledge, impartiality, and candour. I therefore conclude, by offering the just tribute of my gratitude to Almighty God, who, amidst the infirmities of my advanced years and other pressures under which I have laboured, has supplied me with strength to bring this difficult work to a conclusion.

*Göttingen, March 23, 1755.*

## INTRODUCTION.

---

I. THE Ecclesiastical History of the New Testament is a clear and faithful narration of the transactions, revolutions, and events, that relate to that large community, which bears the name of JESUS CHRIST, and is commonly known under the denomination of the Church. It comprehends both the *external* and *internal* condition of this community, and so connects each event with the causes from which it proceeds, and the instruments which have been concerned in its production, that the attentive reader may be led to observe the displays of providential wisdom and goodness in the preservation of the church, and thus find his piety improved, as well as his knowledge.

II. The church, founded by the ministry and death of Christ, cannot be represented with greater perspicuity and propriety than under the notion of a society subjected to a lawful dominion, and governed by certain laws and institutions, mostly of a moral and spiritual tendency. To such a society many external events must happen, which will advance or oppose its interests, and accelerate or retard its progress toward perfection, in consequence of its unavoidable connexion with the course and revolutions of human affairs. Moreover, as nothing is stable and uniform where the imperfections of humanity take place, this religious society, besides the vicissitudes to which it must be exposed from the influence of external events, must be liable to various changes in its internal constitution. In this view of things, then, it appears, that the history of the church, like that of the state, may be divided with propriety into two general branches, which we may call its *External* and *Internal* History.

III. The *External History* of the Church comprehends all the changes, vicissitudes, and events, that have diversified the external state and condition of this sacred community. And as all public societies have their periods of lustre and decay, and are exposed to revolutions both of a happy and calamitous nature, so this first branch of Ecclesiastical History may be subdivided into two, comprehending, respectively, the *prosperous* and *calamitous* events that have happened to the church.

IV. The *prosperous* events that have contributed to extend the limits, or to augment the influence, of the Christian church, have proceeded either from its rulers and leaders, or from the subordinate members of this great community. Under the former class, we rank its *public* rulers, such as princes, magistrates, and pontiffs, who, by their authority and laws, their liberality, and even their arms, have maintained its cause and extended its borders; as also, its more *private* leaders, its learned and pious doctors, whose wise counsels, pious exploits, eminent examples, and distinguished abilities, have contributed most to promote its *true* prosperity and lustre. Under the latter class, we may comprehend the advantages which the cause of Christianity has derived from the active faith, the invincible constancy, the fervent piety, and extensive charity, of its genuine professors, who, by the attractive lustre of these amiable virtues, have led many into the way of truth, and engaged them to submit themselves to the empire of the Messiah.

V. Under the *calamitous* events that have happened to the church, may be comprehended the injuries it has received from the vices and passions of its friends, and the bitter opposition and insidious stratagems of its enemies. The professors of Christianity, and more especially the doctors and rulers of the church, have done unspeakable detriment to the cause of religion, by their ignorance and sloth, their luxury and ambition, their uncharitable zeal, animosities and contentions, of which many shocking examples will be exhibited in the course of this history. Christianity had *public* enemies to encounter, even princes and magistrates, who opposed its progress by penal laws, and blood-thirsty persecution; it had also private and inveterate adversaries in a certain set of philosophers, or rather sophists, who, enslaved by superstition, or abandoned to atheism, endeavoured to blast the rising church by their perfidious accusations, and their virulent writings.

VI. Such then are the events that are exhibited to our view in the external history of the church. Its *Internal History* comprehends the changes and vicissitudes that have happened in its inward constitution, in that system of discipline and doctrine by which it stands distinguished from all other religious societies. This branch may be properly termed the *History of the Christian Religion*. The causes of these internal changes are to be sought principally in the conduct and measures of those who have presided and borne rule in the church. It has been too frequently their practice to interpret the truths and precepts of religion in a manner accommodated to their particular systems, or even to their private interests; and, while they have found, in some, implicit obedience, they have met with warm opposition from others. Hence have proceeded theological broils and civil commotions, in which the cause of religion has often been defended at the expense both of justice and humanity. All these things must be observed with the strictest attention by an ecclesiastical historian.



VII. The first thing, therefore, that should be naturally treated in the *Internal History* of the church, is the history of its ministers, rulers, and form of government. When we look back to the commencement of the Christian church, we find its government administered jointly by the pastors and the people. But, in process of time, the scene changes, and we see these pastors affecting an air of pre-eminence and superiority, trampling upon the rights and privileges of the community, and assuming to themselves a supreme authority, both in civil and religious matters. This invasion of the rights of the people was at length carried to such a height, that a single man administered, or at least claimed a right to administer, the affairs of the whole church with an unlimited sway. Among the doctors of these early times, there were some who acquired, by their learned labours, a shining reputation and an universal influence; they were regarded as oracles; their decisions were handed down to posterity as sacred rules of faith and practice; and they thus deserve to be mentioned, with particular distinction, among the governors of the church, though no part of its public administration was actually in their hands.\*

VIII. After giving an account of the rulers and doctors of the church, the ecclesiastical historian proceeds to exhibit a view of the *laws* that are peculiar to this sacred community, which form, as it were, its centre of union, and distinguish it from all other religious societies. These *laws* are of two kinds. The first are properly called *divine*, because they are immediately enacted by God himself, and are contained in those sacred books, which carry the most striking marks of a divine origin. They consist of those *doctrines* that are the objects of faith and reason, and those *precepts* which are addressed to the heart and the affections. To the second kind belong those *laws* which are merely of human institution, and derive their authority only from the injunctions of the rulers of the church.

IX. In that part of the sacred history which relates to the doctrines of Christianity, it is necessary, above all things, to inquire particularly into the degree of authority that has been attributed to the sacred writings in the different periods of the church, and also into the manner in which the divine doctrines they contain, have been explained and illustrated. For the true state of religion in every age can only be learned from the point of view in which these celestial oracles were considered, and from the manner in which they were expounded to the people. As long as they were the only rule of faith, religion preserved its native purity; and, in proportion as their decisions were either neglected or postponed to the inventions of men, it degenerated from its primitive and divine simplicity. It is farther necessary to show, under this head, what was the fate of the pure laws and doctrines of Christianity—how they were interpreted and explained—how they were defended against the enemies of the Gospel—how they were corrupted and adulterated by the ignorance and licentiousness of men. And, finally, it will be proper to inquire here, how far the lives and manners of Christians have been conformable to the dictates of these sacred laws, and to the influence that these sublime doctrines ought to have upon the hearts of men; as also to examine the rules of discipline prescribed by the spiritual governors of the church, in order to correct and restrain the vices and irregularities of its members.

X. The *Human Laws*, that constitute a part of ecclesiastical government, consist in precepts concerning the external worship of the Deity, and in certain rites, either confirmed by custom, or introduced by positive and express authority. *Rites* and *ceremonies* regard religion either *directly* or *indirectly*; by the former, we understand those which are used in the immediate worship of the Supreme Being, whether in public or in private; by the latter, such pious and decent institutions as, beside direct acts of worship, have prevailed in the church. This part of sacred history is of a vast extent, both on account of the great diversity of these ceremonies, and the frequent changes and modifications through which they have passed. This consideration will justify our treating them with brevity, in a work which is only intended for a compendious view of ecclesiastical history.

XI. As bodies politic are sometimes distracted with wars and seditions, so has the Christian church, though designed to be the mansion of charity and concord, been unhappily perplexed by intestine divisions, occasioned sometimes by points of doctrine, at others by a variety of sentiments about certain rites and ceremonies. The principal authors of these divisions have been stigmatized with the title of *Heretics*, and their peculiar opinions of consequence distinguished by the appellation of *Heresies*.† The nature therefore and progress of these intestine divisions or *heresies* are to be carefully unfolded; and, if this be done with judgment and impartiality, it must prove useful and interesting in the highest degree, though at the same time it must be observed, that no branch of ecclesiastical history is so painful and difficult, on account of the sagacity, candour, and application that it requires, in order to its being treated in a satisfactory manner. The difficulty of arriving at the truth, in researches of this nature, is extreme, on account of the injurious treatment that has been shown to the heads of religious sects, and the unfair representations that have been made of their tenets and opinions; and this difficulty has been considerably augmented by this particular circumstance, that the greatest part of the writings of those who were branded with the name of heretics have not reached

\* By these our author means the *Fathers*, whose writings form still a rule of faith in the Romish church, while, in the Protestant churches, their authority diminishes from day to day.

† A term innocent in its primitive signification, though become odious by the enormity of some errors, to which it has been applied, and also by the use that has been made of it, to give vent to the malignity of enthusiasts and bigots.

our times. It is therefore the duty of a candid historian to avoid attaching to this term the invidious sense in which it is too often used, since it is the invective of all contending parties, and is employed against truth as frequently as against error. The wisest method is to take the word *Heretic* in its general signification, as denoting a person, who, either directly or indirectly, has been the occasion of exciting divisions and dissensions among Christians.

XII. After thus considering what constitutes the *matter* of Ecclesiastical History, it will be proper to bestow a few thoughts on the *manner* of treating it, as this is a point of too much importance not to deserve some attention. And here we may observe, that, in order to render both the External and Internal History of the Church truly interesting and useful, it is absolutely necessary to trace effects to their causes, and to connect events with the circumstances, views, principles, and instruments that have contributed to their existence. A bare recital of facts can at best but enrich the *memory*, and furnish a certain degree of amusement; but the historian who enters into the secret springs that direct the course of outward events, and views things in their various relations, connexions, and tendencies, gives thus a proper exercise to the *judgment* of the reader, and administers, on many occasions, the most useful lessons of wisdom and prudence. It is true, a high degree of caution is to be observed here, lest, in disclosing the secret springs of public events, we substitute imaginary causes in the place of real, and attribute the actions of men to principles they never professed.

XIII. In order to discover the secret causes of public events, some general succours are to be derived from the *History of the Times* in which they happened, and the *Testimonies of the Authors* by whom they are recorded. But, beside these, a considerable *acquaintance with human nature*, founded on long observation and experience, is extremely useful in researches of this kind. The historian, who has acquired a competent knowledge of the views that occupy the generality of men, who has studied a great variety of characters, and attentively observed the force and violence of human passions, together with the infirmities and contradictions they produce in the conduct of life, will find, in this knowledge, a key to the secret reasons and motives which gave rise to many of the most important events of ancient times. An acquaintance also with the *manners and opinions* of the persons concerned in the events that are related, will contribute much to lead us to the true origin of things.

XIV. There are, however, beside these general views, particular considerations, which will assist us still farther in tracing up to their true causes the various events of sacred history. We must, for example, in the external history of the church, attend carefully to two things; *first*, to the political state of those kingdoms and nations in which the Christian religion has been embraced or rejected; and, *secondly*, to their religious state, *i. e.* the opinions they have entertained concerning the divine nature, and the worship that is to be addressed to God. For we shall then perceive, with greater certainty and less difficulty, the reasons of the different reception Christianity has met with in different nations, when we are acquainted with the respective forms of civil government, the political maxims, and the public forms of religion that prevailed in those countries and at those periods in which the Gospel received encouragement, or met with opposition.

XV. With respect to the *Internal History of the Church*, nothing is more adapted to lay open to view the hidden springs of its various changes, than an acquaintance with the *History of Learning and Philosophy* in ancient times. For it is certain, that human learning and philosophy have, in all times, pretended to modify the doctrines of Christianity; and that these pretensions have extended farther than belongs to the province of philosophy on the one hand, or is consistent with the purity and simplicity of the Gospel on the other. It may also be observed, that a knowledge of the forms of civil government, and of the superstitious rites and institutions of ancient times, is not only useful, as we remarked above, to illustrate several things in the *external* history of the church, but also to render a satisfactory account of its *internal* variations, both in point of doctrine and worship. For the genius of human laws, and the maxims of civil rulers, have undoubtedly had a great influence in forming the constitution of the church; and even its spiritual leaders have, in too many instances, from an ill-judged prudence, modelled its discipline and worship after the ancient superstitions.

XVI. We cannot be at any loss to know the sources from which this important knowledge is to be derived. The best writers of every age, who make mention of ecclesiastical affairs, and particularly those who were contemporary with the events they relate, are to be carefully consulted, since it is from credible testimonies and respectable authorities that history derives a solid and permanent foundation. Our esteem for those writers, who may be considered as the sources of historical knowledge, ought not however to lead us to treat with neglect the historians and annalists, who have already made use of these original records, since it betrays a foolish sort of vanity to reject the advantages that may be derived from the succours and labours of those who have preceded us in their endeavours to cast light upon points that have been for many ages covered with obscurity.\*

XVII. From all this we shall easily discern the qualifications that are essential to a good writer of ecclesiastical history. His knowledge of human affairs must be considerable, and his learning extensive. He must be endowed with a spirit of observation and sagacity; a habit of reasoning with evidence and facility; a faithful memory; and a judgment matured by ex-

\* The various writers of ecclesiastical history are enumerated by Sever. Walt. Sluterus, in his *Propylæum Historiæ Christianæ*, published at Lunenburg, in 4to., in the year 1696; and by Casp. Sagittarius, in his *Introductio ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam, singulasque ejus partes*.

perience, and strengthened by exercise. Such are the intellectual endowments that are required in the character of a good historian; and the moral qualities necessary to complete it, are, a persevering and inflexible attachment to truth and virtue, a freedom from the servitude of prejudice and passion, and a laborious and patient turn of mind.

XVIII. Those who undertake to write the history of the Christian church are exposed to the reception of a bias from three different sources; from *times*, *persons*, and *opinions*. The *times*, in which we live, have often so great an influence on our manner of judging, as to make us consider the events which happen in our days, as a rule by which we are to estimate the probability or evidence of those that are recorded in the history of past ages. The *persons*, on whose testimonies we think we have reason to depend, acquire an imperceptible authority over our sentiments, that too frequently seduces us to adopt their errors, especially if these persons have been distinguished by eminent degrees of sanctity and virtue. And an attachment to favourite *opinions*, leads authors sometimes to pervert, or, at least, to modify, facts in favour of those who have embraced these opinions, or to the disadvantage of such as have opposed them. These kinds of seduction are so much the more dangerous, as those whom they deceive are, in innumerable cases, insensible of their delusion, and of the false representations of things to which it leads them. It is not necessary to observe the solemn obligations that bind an historian to guard against these three sources of error with the most delicate circumspection, and the most scrupulous attention.

XIX. It is well known, nevertheless, how far ecclesiastical historians, in all ages, have departed from these rules, and from others of equal evidence and importance. For, not to mention those who lay claim to a high rank among the writers of history in consequence of a happy memory, loaded with an ample heap of materials, or those whose pens are rather guided by sordid views of interest than by a generous love of truth, it is too evident, how few in number the unprejudiced and impartial historians are, whom neither the influence of the sect to which they belong, nor the venerable and imposing names of antiquity, nor the spirit of the times and the torrent of prevailing *opinion*, can turn aside from the rigid pursuit of truth *etoué*. In the present age, more especially, the spirit of the times, and the influence of predominant opinions, have gained with many an incredible ascendancy. Hence we find frequently in the writings, even of learned men, such wretched arguments as these:—*Such an opinion is true; therefore it must of necessity have been adopted by the primitive Christians.—Christ has commanded us to live in such a manner; therefore it is undoubtedly certain, that the Christians of ancient times lived so.—I certain custom does not take place now; therefore it did not prevail in former times.*

XX. If those who apply themselves to the composition of Ecclesiastical History be careful to avoid the sources of error mentioned above, their labours will be eminently useful to mankind, and more especially to those who are called to the important office of instructing others in the sacred truths and duties of Christianity. The history of the church presents to our view a variety of objects that are every way adapted to confirm our faith. When we contemplate here the discouraging obstacles, united efforts of kingdoms and empires, and the dreadful calamities which Christianity, in its very infancy, was obliged to encounter, and over which it gained an immortal victory, this will be sufficient to fortify its true and zealous professors against all the threats, cavils, and stratagems, of profane and impious men. The great and shining examples also, which display their lustre, more or less, in every period of the Christian history, must have an admirable tendency to inflame our piety, and to excite, even in the coldest and most insensible hearts, the love of God and virtue. Those amazing revolutions and events that distinguished every age of the church, and often seemed to arise from small beginnings, and causes of little consequence, proclaim, with a solemn and respectable voice, the empire of Providence, and also the inconstancy and vanity of human affairs. And, among the many advantages that arise from the study of Ecclesiastical History, it is none of the least, that we shall see therein the origin and occasions of those ridiculous rites, absurd opinions, foolish superstitions, and pernicious errors, with which Christianity is yet disgraced in too many parts of the world. This knowledge will naturally lead us to a view of the truth in its beautiful simplicity, will engage us to love it, and render us zealous in its defence; not to mention the pleasure and satisfaction that we must feel in researches and discoveries of such an interesting kind.

XXI. They, more especially, who are appointed to instruct the youth in the public universities, and also such as are professionally devoted to the service of the church, will derive from this study the most useful lessons of wisdom and prudence, to direct them in the discharge of their respective offices. On the one hand, the inconsiderate zeal and temerity of others, and the pernicious consequences with which they have been attended, will teach circumspection; and in the mistakes into which even men of eminent merit and abilities have fallen, they will often see the things they are obliged to avoid, and the sacrifices it will be prudent to make, in order to maintain peace and concord in the church. On the other hand, illustrious examples and salutary measures will hold forth to them a rule of conduct, a lamp to show them the paths they must pursue. It may be farther observed, that, if we except the arms which Scripture and reason furnish against superstition and error, there is nothing that will enable us to combat them with more efficacy than the view of their deplorable effects, as they are represented to us in the history of the church. It would be endless to enumerate all the advantages that result from the study of Ecclesiastical History; experience alone can display these in

all their extent; nor shall we mention the benefits that may be derived from it by those who have turned their views to other sciences than that of theology, and its more peculiar utility to such as are engaged in the study of the civil law. All this would lead us too far from our present design.

XXII. As the history of the church is *External* or *Internal*, so the manner of treating it must be suited to that division. As to the first, when the narration is long, and the thread of the history runs through a great number of ages, it is proper to divide it into certain periods, which will give the reader time to breathe, assist memory, and also introduce a certain method and order into the work. In the following history the usual division into centuries is adopted in preference to all others, because most generally approved, though it may be attended with difficulties and inconveniences.

XXIII. A considerable part of these inconveniences will be however removed, if, beside this smaller division into centuries, we adopt a larger one, and divide the space of time that elapsed between the birth of Christ and our days into certain grand periods, which were distinguished by signal revolutions or remarkable events. It is on this account that we have judged it expedient to comprehend the following History in Four Books, which will embrace four remarkable periods. The First will be employed in exhibiting the state and vicissitudes of the Christian church, from its commencement to the time of Constantine the Great. The Second will comprehend the period that extends from the reign of Constantine to that of Charlemagne, which produced such a remarkable change in the face of Europe. The Third will contain the History of the Church, from the time of Charlemagne to the memorable period when Luther arose in Germany, to oppose the tyranny of Rome, and to deliver divine truth from the darkness that covered it. And the Fourth will carry down the same history, from the rise of Luther to the present times.

XXIV. We have seen above, that the sphere of Ecclesiastical History is extensive, that it comprehends a great variety of objects, and embraces political as well as religious matters, so far as the former are related to the latter, either as causes or effects. But, however great the diversity of these objects may be, they are closely connected; and it is the particular business of an ecclesiastical historian to observe a method that will show this connexion in the most conspicuous point of view, and form into one regular *whole* a variety of parts that seem heterogeneous and discordant. Different writers on this subject have followed different methods, according to the diversity of their views and their peculiar manner of thinking. The order I have observed will be seen above in that part of this *Introduction*, which treats of the subject-matter of Ecclesiastical History; the mention of it is therefore omitted here, to avoid unnecessary repetitions.

# ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

## BOOK I.

CONTAINING THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, FROM ITS ORIGIN, TO THE TIME OF CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

### PART I.

COMPREHENDING THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the Civil and Religious State of the World at the Birth of CHRIST.*

I. A GREAT part of the world was subject to the Roman empire, when JESUS CHRIST made his appearance upon earth. The remotest nations which had submitted to the yoke of this mighty empire, were ruled either by Roman governors invested with temporary commissions, or by their own princes and laws, in subordination to the republic, whose sovereignty was to be acknowledged, and from which the conquered kings, who were continued in their dominions, derived their borrowed majesty. At the same time, the Roman people and their venerable senate, though they had not lost all shadow of liberty, were in reality reduced to a state of servile submission to Augustus Cæsar, who, by artifice, perfidy, and bloodshed, had acquired an enormous degree of power, and united in his own person the pompous titles of emperor, sovereign pontiff, censor, tribune of the people, proconsul; in a word, all the great offices of the state.\*

II. The Roman government, considered both with respect to its form and its laws, was certainly mild and equitable.† But the injustice and avarice of the prætors and proconsuls, and the ambitious lust of conquest and dominion, which was the predominant passion of the Roman people, together with the rapacious proceedings of the publicans, by whom the taxes of the empire were levied, were the occasions of perpetual tumults and insupportable grievances; and among the many

evils which thence arose we may justly reckon the formidable armies, that were necessary to support these extortions in the provinces, and the civil wars which frequently broke out between the oppressed nations and their haughty conquerors.

III. It must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that this supreme dominion of one people, or rather of one man, over so many kingdoms, was attended with many considerable advantages to mankind in general, and to the propagation and advancement of Christianity in particular; for, by the means of this almost universal empire, many nations, different in their languages and their manners, were more intimately united in social intercourse. Hence a passage was opened to the remotest countries, by the communications which the Romans formed between the conquered provinces.\* Hence also the nations, whose manners were savage and barbarous, were civilized by the laws and commerce of the Romans. And by this, in short, the benign influence of letters and philosophy was spread abroad in countries which had lain before under the darkest ignorance. All this contributed, no doubt, in a singular manner, to facilitate the progress of the Gospel, and to crown the labours of its first ministers and heralds with success.‡

IV. The Roman empire, at the birth of Christ, was less agitated by wars and tumults, than it had been for many years before; for, though I cannot assent to the opinion of those who, following the account of Orosius, maintain that the temple of Janus was then shut, and that wars and discords absolutely ceased

\* See for this purpose the learned work of Augustin Campianus, entitled, *De Officio et Potestate Magistratum Romanorum et Jurisdictione*, lib. i. cap. i. p. 3, 4, &c. Geneva, 1725.

† See Moyle's Essay on the Constitution of the Roman Government, in the posthumous works of that author, vol. i. as also Scip. Maffei Verona illustrata, lib. ii.

\* See, for an illustration of this point, *Histoire des grands Chemins de l'Empire Romain*, par Nicol. Berger, printed in the year 1728. See also the very learned Everard Otto, *De Tutela Viarum publicarum*, part ii.

‡ Origen, among others, makes particular mention of this, in the second book of his answer to Celsus.

throughout the world,\* yet it is certain, that the period, in which our Saviour descended upon earth, may be justly styled the *Pacific Age*, if we compare it with the preceding times; and indeed the tranquillity that then reigned, was necessary to enable the ministers of Christ to execute, with success, their sublime commission to the human race.

V. The want of ancient records renders it impossible to say any thing satisfactory or certain concerning the state of those nations, who did not receive the Roman yoke; nor, indeed, is their history essential to our present purpose. It is sufficient to observe, with respect to them, that those who inhabited the eastern regions were strangers to the sweets of liberty, and groaned under the burthen of an oppressive yoke. Their softness and effeminacy, both in point of manners and bodily constitution, contributed to make them support their slavery with an unmanly patience; and even the religion they professed riveted their chains. On the contrary, the northern nations enjoyed, in their frozen dwellings, the blessings of sacred freedom, which their government, their religion, a robust and vigorous frame of body and spirit, derived from the inclemency and severity of their climate, all united to preserve and maintain.†

VI. All these nations lived in the practice of the most abominable superstitions; for, though the notion of one Supreme Being was not entirely effaced in the human mind, but showed itself frequently, even through the darkness of the grossest idolatry; yet all nations, except that of the Jews, acknowledged a number of governing powers, whom they called gods, and one or more of which they supposed to preside over each particular province or people. They worshipped these fictitious deities with various rites; they considered them as widely different from each other in sex and power, in their nature, and also in their respective offices; and they appeased them by a multiplicity of ceremonies and offerings, in order to obtain their protection and favour; so that, however different the degrees of enormity might be, with which this absurd and impious theology appeared in different countries, yet there was no nation, whose sacred rites and religious worship did not discover a manifest abuse of reason, and very striking marks of extravagance and folly.

VII. Every nation then had its respective gods, over which presided one more excellent than the rest, yet in such a manner that this supreme deity was himself controlled by the rigid empire of the fates, or what the philosophers called *Eternal Necessity*. The gods of the East were different from those of the Gauls, the Germans, and other northern nations. The Grecian divinities differed widely from those of the Egyptians, who deified plants, animals, and a great variety of the produc-

tions both of nature and art.\* Each people also had a particular manner of worshipping and appeasing their respective deities, entirely different from the sacred rites of other countries. In process of time, however, the Greeks and Romans became as ambitious in their religious pretensions, as in their political claims. They maintained that *their gods*, though under different names, were the objects of religious worship in all nations, and therefore they gave the names of their deities to those of other countries.† This pretension, whether supported by ignorance or other means, introduced inexpressible darkness and perplexity into the history of the ancient superstitions, and has been also the occasion of innumerable errors in the writings of the learned.

VIII. One thing, indeed, which, at first sight, appears very remarkable, is, that this variety of religions and of gods neither produced wars nor dissensions among the different nations, the Egyptians excepted.‡ Nor is it, perhaps, necessary to except even them, since their wars undertaken for their gods cannot, with propriety, be considered as wholly of a religious nature.§ Each nation suffered its neighbours to follow their own method of worship, to adore their own gods, to enjoy their own rites and ceremonies; and discovered no displeasure at their diversity of sentiments in religious matters. There is, however, little wonderful in this spirit of mutual toleration, when we consider, that they all looked upon the world as one great empire, divided into various provinces, over every one of which a

\* See the discourse of Athanasius, entitled, *Oratio contra Gentes*, in the first volume of his works.

† This fact affords a satisfactory account of the vast number of gods who bore the name of Jupiter, and the multitudes that passed under those of Mercury, Venus, Hercules, Juno, &c. The Greeks, when they found, in other countries, deities that resembled their own, persuaded the worshippers of these foreign gods, that their deities were the same with those who were honoured in Greece, and were, indeed, themselves convinced that this was the case. In consequence of this, they gave the names of their gods to those of other nations, and the Romans in this followed their example. Hence we find the names of Jupiter, Mars, Mercury, Venus, &c. frequently mentioned in the more recent monuments and inscriptions which have been found among the Gauls and Germans, though the ancient inhabitants of those countries worshipped no gods under such denominations. I cannot think that this method of the Greeks and Romans has introduced so much confusion into mythology as Dr. Mosheim here imagines. If indeed there had been no resemblance between the Greek and Roman deities, and those of other nations, and if the names of the deities of the former had been given to those of the latter in an arbitrary and undistinguishing manner, the reflection of our historian would be undeniably true. But it has been alleged by many learned men, with a high degree of probability, that the principal deities of all nations resembled each other extremely in their essential characters; and if so, their receiving the same names could not introduce much confusion into mythology, since they were probably derived from one common source. If the Thor of the ancient Celts was the same in dignity, character, and attributes, with the Jupiter of the Greeks and Romans, where was the impropriety of giving the same name?

‡ Ingenious observations are to be found upon this head in the *Expositio Mensæ Isiaccæ* of Pignorius.

§ The religious wars of the Egyptians were not undertaken to compel others to adopt their worship, but to avenge the slaughter that was made of their gods, such as crocodiles, &c., by the neighbouring nations. They were not offended at their neighbours for serving other divinities, but could not bear that they should put theirs to death.

\* See Jo. Massoni *Templum Jani, Christo nascente, reseratum, Roterodami*, 1705.

† “*Fere itaque imperia (says Seneca) penes eos fuere populos, qui mitiore cælo utuntur: in frigora septentrionisque vergentibus inmansueta ingenia sunt, ut ait poeta, suoque simillima cælo.*” Seneca de Ira, lib. ii. cap. xvi.

certain order of divinities presided; and that, therefore, none could behold with contempt the gods of other nations, or force strangers to pay homage to theirs. The Romans exercised this toleration in the amplest manner; for, though they would not allow any changes to be made in the religions that were publicly professed in the empire, nor any new form of worship to be openly introduced, yet they granted to their citizens a full liberty of observing, in private, the sacred rites of other nations, and of honouring foreign deities (whose worship contained nothing inconsistent with the interests and laws of the republic) with feasts, temples, consecrated groves, and the like testimonies of homage and respect.\*

IX. The deities of almost all nations were either ancient heroes, renowned for noble exploits and beneficent deeds, or kings and generals who had founded empires, or women rendered illustrious by remarkable actions or useful inventions. The merit of these distinguished and eminent persons, contemplated by their posterity with an enthusiastic gratitude, was the reason of their being exalted to celestial honours. The natural world furnished another kind of deities, who were added to these by some nations; and as the sun, moon, and stars, shine forth with a lustre superior to that of all other material beings, so it is certain, that they particularly attracted the attention of mankind, and received religious homage from almost all the nations of the world.† From these beings of a nobler kind, idolatry descended into an enormous multiplication of inferior powers; so that, in many countries, mountains, trees, and rivers, the earth, the sea, and the winds, and even virtues, vices, and diseases, had their shrines attended by devout and zealous worshippers.‡

X. These deities were honoured with rites and sacrifices of various kinds, according to their respective nature and offices.§ The rites used in their worship were absurd and ridicu-

lous, and frequently cruel and obscene. Most nations offered animals, and some proceeded to the enormity of human sacrifices. As to their prayers, they were void of piety and sense, both with respect to their matter and their form.\* Pontiffs, priests, and ministers, distributed into several classes, presided in this strange worship, and were appointed to prevent disorder in the performance of the sacred rites; but, pretending to be distinguished by an immediate intercourse and friendship with the gods, they abused their authority in the basest manner, to deceive an ignorant and wretched people.

XI. The religious worship we have now been considering, was confined to stated times and places. The statues and other representations of the gods were placed in the temples,‡ and supposed to be animated in an incomprehensible manner; for the votaries of these fictitious deities, however destitute they might be of reason in other respects, avoided carefully the imputation of worshipping inanimate beings, such as brass, wood, and stone, and therefore pretended that the divinity, represented by the statue, was really present in it, if the dedication was duly and properly made.‡

XII. But, besides the public worship of the gods, to which all without exception were admitted, certain rites were practised in secret by the Greeks and several eastern nations, to which a very small number had access. These were commonly called *mysteries*; and the persons who desired to be initiated therein, were obliged previously to exhibit satisfactory proofs of their fidelity and patience, by passing through various trials and ceremonies of the most disagreeable kind. These secrets were kept in the strictest manner, as the initiated could not reveal any thing that passed on those occasions, without exposing their lives to the most imminent danger;§ and that is the reason why, at this time, we are so little acquainted with the true nature, and the real design of these hidden rites. It is, however, well known, that in some of those *mysteries*, many things were transacted which were contrary both to real modesty and outward decency. And, indeed, from the whole of the pagan rites, the intelligent few might easily learn, that the divinities generally worshipped were rather men famous for their vices, than distinguished by virtuous and worthy deeds.‖

XIII. It is, at least, certain, that this religion had not the least influence towards exciting or nourishing solid and true virtue in the minds of men. For the gods and goddesses, to whom public homage was paid, exhibited to their worshippers rather examples of egregious crimes, than of useful and illustrious vir-

\* See concerning this interesting subject, a very curious and learned treatise of the famous Bykers-hock, entitled, *Dissertatio de cultu peregrinæ religionis apud Romanos*. This dissertation is to be found in the *Opuscula* of that excellent author, which were published at Leyden in the year 1719.

† The ingenious editor of the *Ruins of Balbec* has given us, in the preface to that noble work, a very curious account of the origin of the religious worship that was offered to the heavenly bodies by the Syrians and Arabians. In those uncomfortable deserts, where the day presents nothing to the view, but the uniform, tedious, and melancholy prospect of barren sands, the night discloses a most delightful and magnificent spectacle, and appears arrayed with charms of the most attractive kind; for the most part unclouded and serene, it exhibits to the wondering eye the host of heaven, in all their amazing variety and glory. In the view of this stupendous scene, the transition from admiration to idolatry was too easy to un instructed minds; and a people, whose climate offered no beauties to contemplate but those of the firmament, would naturally be disposed to look thither for the objects of their worship. The form of idolatry, in Greece, was different from that of the Syrians; and Mr. Wood ingeniously attributes this to that smiling and variegated scene of mountains, valleys, rivers, groves, woods, and fountains, which the transported imagination, in the midst of its pleasing astonishment, supposed to be the seats of invisible deities. See a farther account of this matter in the elegant work above mentioned.

‡ See the learned work of J. G. Vossius, de idololatria.

§ See J. Saubertus, de sacrificiis veterum. Log. Bat. 1699.

\* See M. Brouerius a Nideek, de adorationibus veterum Populorum, printed at Utrecht in 1711.

† Some nations were without temples, such as the Persians, Gauls, Germans, and Britons, who performed their religious worship in the open air, or in the shadowy retreats of consecrated groves.

‡ See Arnobius adv. Gentes, lib. vi.—Augustin de civitate Dei, lib. vii. cap. xxxiii. and the Misopogon of the Emperor Julian.

§ See Clarkson on the Liturgies, sect. iv. and Meursius de Mysteriis Eleusiniis.

‖ See Cicero, Disput. Tusulan. lib. ii. cap. xiii.

tues.\* The gods, moreover, were esteemed superior to men in power and immortality; but, in every thing else, they were considered as their equals.—The priests were little solicitous to animate the people to a virtuous conduct, either by their precepts or their example. They plainly enough declared, that whatever was essential to the true worship of the gods, was contained only in the rites and institutions which the people had received by tradition from their ancestors.† And as to what regarded the rewards of virtue and the punishment of vice after the present life, the general notions were partly uncertain, partly licentious, and often more calculated to administer indulgence to vice, than encouragement to virtue. Hence, the wiser part of mankind, about the time of Christ's birth, looked upon this whole system of religion as a just object of ridicule and contempt.

XIV. The consequences of this wretched theology were a universal corruption and depravity of manners, which appeared in the impunity of the most flagitious crimes.‡ Juvenal and Persius among the Latins, and Lucian among the Greeks, bear testimony to the justice of this heavy accusation. It is also well known, that no public law prohibited the sports of the gladiators, the exercise of unnatural lusts, the licentiousness of divorce, the custom of exposing infants, and of procuring abortions, or the frontless atrocity of publicly consecrating stews and brothels to certain divinities.§

XV. Such as were not sunk in an unaccountable and brutish stupidity, perceived the deformity of these religious systems. To these, the crafty priests addressed two considerations, to prevent their incredulity, and to dispel their doubts. The first was drawn from the miracles and prodigies which they pretended were daily wrought in the temples, before the statues of the gods and heroes that were placed there; and the second was deduced from oracles and divination, by which they maintained, that the secrets of futurity were unfolded through the interposition of the gods. In both these points the cunning of the priests imposed miserably upon the ignorance of the people; and, if the discerning

few saw the cheat, they were obliged, from a regard to their own safety, to laugh with caution, since the priests were ever ready to accuse, before a raging and superstitious multitude, those who discovered their religious frauds, as rebels against the majesty of the immortal gods.

XVI. At the time of Christ's appearance upon earth, the religion of the Romans, as well as their arms, had extended itself over a great part of the world. This religion must be known to those who are acquainted with the Grecian superstitions.\* In some things, indeed, it differs from them; for the Romans, beside the institutions which Numa and others had invented with political views, added several Italian fictions to the Grecian fables, and gave also to the Egyptian deities a place among their own.†

XVII. In the provinces subjected to the Roman government, there arose a new kind of religion, formed by a mixture of the ancient rites of the conquered nations with those of the Romans. These nations, who, before their subjection, had their own gods, and their own particular religious institutions, were persuaded, by degrees, to admit into their worship a great number of the sacred rites and customs of their conquerors. The view of the Romans, in this change, was not only to confirm their authority by the powerful aid of religion, but also to abolish the inhuman rites which were performed by many of the barbarous nations who had received their yoke; and this change was effected partly by the prudence of the victors, partly by the levity of the vanquished, and by their ambition to please their new masters.

XVIII. When, from the sacred rites of the ancient Romans, we pass to a review of the other religions that prevailed in the world, we shall find, that the most remarkable may be properly divided into two classes. One of these will comprehend the religious systems that owed their existence to *political* views; and the other, those which seem to have been formed for *military* purposes.—In the former class may be ranked the religions of most of the eastern nations, especially of the Persians, Egyptians, and Indians, which appear to have been solely calculated for the preservation of the state, the support of the royal authority and grandeur, the maintenance of public peace, and the advancement of civil virtues. Under the military class may be comprehended the religious system of the northern nations, since all the traditions that we find among the Germans, the Britons, the Celts, and the Goths, concerning their divinities, have a manifest tendency to excite and nourish fortitude and ferocity, an insensibility of danger, and a contempt of life. An attentive inquiry into the religions of these respective nations, will abundantly verify what is here asserted.

XIX. None of these nations, indeed, ever arrived at such a universal excess of barbarism and ignorance, as not to have some discerning

\* There is a very remarkable passage to this purpose in the *Tristia* of Ovid, lib. ii.

“Quis locus est templis angustior? hæc quoque vitet,  
In culpam si quæ est ingeniosa suam.

Cum steterit Jovis æde, Jovis succurret in æde,

Quam multas matres fecerit ille Deus.

Proxima adoranti Junonia templa subibit,

Pellicibus multis hæc doluisse Deam.

Pallade conspecta, natum de crimine virgo

Sustulerit quare quæret Erichthoum.”

† See Barbeyrac's Preface to his French translation of Puffendorf's System of the Law of Nature and Nations, sect. vi.

‡ The corrupt manners of those who then lay in the darkness of idolatry are described in an ample and affecting manner, in the first of Cyprian's epistles. See also, on this subject, Cornel. Adami Exeritatio de malis Romanorum ante prædicationem Evangelii moribus. This is the fifth discourse of a collection published by that learned writer at Groningen, in 1713.

§ See Dr. John Leland's excellent account of the religious sentiments, moral conduct, and future prospects of the pagans, in his large work entitled, *The Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation.*

\* See Dionysius Halicarn. *Antiq. Rom. lib. vii. cap. lxxii.*

† See *Petit ad leges Atticas, lib. i. tit. i.*



men among them, who were sensible of the extravagance of all these religions. But, of these sagacious observers, some were destitute of the weight and authority that were necessary to remedy those overgrown evils; and others wanted the will to exert themselves in such a glorious cause. And the truth is, none of them had wisdom equal to such a solemn and arduous enterprise. This appears manifestly from the laborious but useless efforts of some of the Greek and Roman philosophers against the vulgar superstitions. These venerable sages delivered, in their writings, many sublime things concerning the nature of God, and the duties incumbent upon men; they disputed with sagacity against the popular religion; but to all this they added such chimerical notions and such absurd subtilties of their own, as may serve to convince us that it belongs to God alone, and not to man, to reveal the truth without any mixture of impurity or error.

XX. About the time of Christ's appearance upon earth, there were two kinds of philosophy which prevailed among the civilized nations. One was the philosophy of the Greeks, adopted also by the Romans; and the other, that of the orientals, which had a great number of votaries in Persia, Syria, Chaldea, Egypt, and even among the Jews. The former was distinguished by the simple title of *philosophy*. The latter was honoured with the more pompous appellation of *science* or *knowledge*,\* since those who embraced the latter sect pretended to be the restorers of the knowledge of God, which was lost in the world.† The followers of both these systems, in consequence of vehement disputes and dissensions about several points, subdivided themselves into a variety of sects. It is, however, to be observed, that all the sects of the oriental philosophy deduced their various tenets from one fundamental principle, which they held in common; whereas the Greeks were much divided even about the first principles of science.

As we shall have occasion hereafter to speak of the oriental philosophy, we shall confine ourselves here to the doctrines taught by the Grecian sages, and shall give some account of the various sects into which they were divided.

XXI. Of the Grecian sects, some declared openly against all religion; and others, though they acknowledged a deity, and admitted a religion, yet cast a cloud over the truth, instead of exhibiting it in its genuine beauty and lustre.

Of the former kind were the Epicureans and Academics. The Epicureans maintained, "That the world arose from chance; that the gods (whose existence they did not dare to deny) neither did nor could extend their providential care to human affairs; that the soul

was mortal; that *pleasure*\* was to be regarded as the ultimate end of man; and that *virtue* was neither worthy of esteem nor of choice, but with a view to its attainment." The Academics asserted the impossibility of arriving at truth, and held it uncertain, "whether the gods existed or not; whether the soul was mortal or immortal; whether virtue ought to be preferred to vice, or vice to virtue."† These two sects, though they struck at the foundations of all religion, were the most numerous of all at the birth of Christ, and were particularly encouraged by the liberality of the rich, and the protection of those who were in power.‡

XXII. We observed in the preceding section, that there was another kind of philosophy, in which religion was admitted, but which was, at the same time, deficient by the obscurity it cast upon truth. Under the philosophers of this class, may be reckoned the Platonists, the Stoics, and the followers of Aristotle, whose subtle disputations concerning God, religion, and the social duties, were of little solid use to mankind. The nature of God, as it is explained by Aristotle, resembles the principle that gives motion to a machine; it is a nature happy in the contemplation of itself, and entirely regardless of human affairs; and such a divinity, who differs but little from the god of Epicurus, cannot reasonably be the object either of love or fear. With respect to the doctrine of this philosopher concerning the human soul, it is uncertain, to say no more, whether he believed its immortality or not.‡ What then could be expected from such a philosophy? could any thing solid and satisfactory, in favour of piety and virtue, be hoped for from a system which excluded from the universe a divine Providence, and insinuated the mortality of the human soul?

XXIII. The god of the Stoics has somewhat more majesty than the divinity of Aristotle; nor is he represented by those philosophers as sitting above the starry heavens in a supine indolence, and a perfect inattention to the affairs of the universe. Yet he is described as a corporeal being, united to matter by a necessary connexion, and subject to the determinations of an immutable *fate*, so that neither rewards nor punishments can properly

\* The ambiguity of this word has produced many disputes in the explication of the Epicurean system. If by *pleasure* be understood only sensual gratifications, the tenet here advanced is indisputably monstrous. But if it be taken in a larger sense, and extended to intellectual and moral objects, in what does the scheme of Epicurus, with respect to virtue, differ from the opinions of those Christian philosophers, who maintain that self-love is the only spring of all human affections and actions?

† The Epicurean sect was, however, the more numerous of the two, as appears from the testimony of Cicero de Finibus, &c. lib. i. cap. vii. lib. ii. cap. xiv. Disput. Tusculan. lib. v. cap. x. Hence the complaint which Juvenal makes in his xiii<sup>th</sup> Satire, of the atheism that prevailed at Rome, in those excellent words:

"Sunt in fortune qui casibus omnia ponant,  
Et nullo credant mundum rectore moveri,  
Natura volente vices et lucis et anni;  
— Atque ideo intrepidi quæcunque altaria tangunt."

‡ See the Notes upon Cudworth's Intellectual System of the Universe, which Dr. Mosheim subjoined to his Latin translation of that learned work, vol. i. p. 66, 500; vol. ii. p. 1171. See also, upon the same subject, Mourgue's Plan Théologique du Pythagorisme, tom. i.

\* Γνωσις (*gnosis*) in the Greek signifies *science* or *knowledge*; and hence came the title of Gnostics, which this presumptuous sect claimed as due to their superior light and penetration in divine things.

† St. Paul mentions and condemns both these kinds of philosophy; the Greek, in the Epistle to the Colossians, ch. 2, and the Oriental, or Gnosis, in the First Epistle to Timothy, vi. 20.

proceed from him.\* The learned also know that, in the philosophy of this sect, the existence of the soul was confined to a certain period. Now it is manifest, that these tenets remove, at once, the strongest motives to virtue, and the most powerful restraints upon vice; and, therefore, the Stoical system may be considered as a body of specious and pompous doctrine, but, at the same time, as a body without nerves, or any principles of consistency and vigour.

XXIV. Plato is generally looked upon as superior to all the other philosophers in wisdom; and this eminent rank does not seem to have been undeservedly conferred upon him. He taught that the universe was governed by a Being, glorious in power and wisdom, and possessing perfect liberty and independence. He extended also the views of mortals beyond the grave, and showed them, in fatality, prospects adapted to excite their hopes, and to work upon their fears. His doctrine, however, besides the weakness of the foundations on which it rests, and the obscurity with which it is often expressed, has other considerable defects. It represents the Supreme Creator of the world as destitute of many perfections,† and confined to a certain determinate portion of space. Its decisions, with respect to the soul and demons, seem calculated to beget and nourish superstition. Nor will the moral philosophy of Plato appear worthy of such a high degree of admiration, if we attentively examine and compare its various parts, and reduce them to their principles.‡

XXV. As then, by these different sects, there were many things maintained that were highly unreasonable and absurd, and as a contentious spirit of opposition and dispute prevailed among them all, some men of true discernment, and of moderate characters, were of opinion, that none of these sects ought to be adhered to in all points, but that it was rather wise to choose and extract out of each of them such tenets and doctrines as were good and reasonable, and

\* Thus is the Stoical doctrine of *fate* generally represented, but not more generally than unjustly. Their *fatum*, when carefully and attentively examined, seems to have signified no more in the intention of the wisest of that sect, than the plan of government formed originally in the divine mind, a plan all-wise and perfect, and from which, of consequence, the Supreme Being, morally speaking, can never depart; so that, when Jupiter is said by the Stoics to be subject to immutable *fate*, this means no more than that he is subject to the wisdom of his own counsels, and ever acts in conformity with his supreme perfections. The following remarkable passage of Seneca, drawn from the 5th chapter of his book de Providentia, is sufficient to confirm the explication we have here given of the Stoical *fate*. "Ille ipse omnium conditor et rector scrip-it quidem fata, sed sequitur. Semper parat, semel jussit."

† This accusation seems to be carried too far by Dr. Mosheim. It is not strictly true, that the doctrine of Plato represents the Supreme Being as destitute of many perfections. On the contrary, all the divine perfections are frequently acknowledged by that philosopher. What probably gave occasion to this animadversion of our learned author, was the erroneous notion of Plato, concerning the *invincible malignity* and corruption of *matter*, which the divine power had not been sufficient to reduce entirely to order. Though this notion is, indeed, injurious to the omnipotence of God, it is not sufficient to justify the censure now under consideration.

‡ There is an ample account of the defects of the Platonic philosophy in a work entitled *Défense des Peres accusés de Platonisme*, par Franc. Baltus; but there is more learning than accuracy in that performance.

to abandon and reject the rest. This gave rise to a new form of philosophy in Egypt, and principally at Alexandria, which was called the *Eclectic*, whose founder, according to some, was Potamon, an Alexandrian, though this opinion is not without its difficulties. It manifestly appears from the testimony of Philo, the Jew, who was himself one of this sect, that this philosophy was in a flourishing state at Alexandria, when our Saviour was upon the earth. The Eclectics held Plato in the highest esteem, though they made no scruple to join, with his doctrines, whatever they thought conformable to reason in the tenets and opinions of the other philosophers.\*

XXVI. The attentive reader will easily conclude, from the short view which we have here given of the miserable state of the world at the birth of Christ, that mankind, in this period of darkness and corruption, stood highly in need of some divine teacher to convey to the mind *true and certain principles* of religion and wisdom, and to recall wandering mortals to the sublime paths of piety and virtue. The consideration of this wretched condition of mankind will be also singularly useful to those who are not sufficiently acquainted with the advantages, the comforts, and the support which the sublime doctrines of Christianity are so proper to administer in every state, relation, and circumstance of life. A set of miserable and unthinking creatures treat with negligence, and sometimes with contempt, the religion of Jesus, not considering that they are indebted to it for all the good things which they so ungratefully enjoy.

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the Civil and Religious State of the Jewish Nation at the Birth of Christ.*

I. THE state of the Jews was not much better than that of the other nations at the time of Christ's appearance in the world. They were governed by Herod, who was himself a tributary to the Roman people. This prince was surnamed the Great, surely from no other circumstance than the greatness of his vices; and his government was a yoke of the most vexatious and oppressive kind. By a cruel, suspicious, and overbearing temper, he drew upon himself the aversion of all, not excepting those who lived upon his bounty. By a mad luxury and an affectation of magnificence far above his fortune, together with the most profuse and immoderate largesses, he exhausted the treasures of that miserable nation. Under his administration, and by his means, the Roman luxury was received in Palestine, accompanied with the worst vices of that licentious people.‡ In a word, Judea, governed by Herod, groaned under all that corruption, which might be expected from the authority and the example of

\* See Godof. Olearius de Philosophia Eclectica, Jac. Brucker, and others.

† See, on this subject, Christ. Noldii Historia Idumæa, which is annexed to Havercamp's edition of Josephus, vol. ii. p. 323. See also Basnage, Histoire Des Juifs, tom. i. part. i.—Noris, Cenotaph. Pisan.—Prideaux, History of the Jews.—Cellarius, Historia Herodum, in the first part of his Academical Dissertations, and, above all, Josephus the Jewish historian.

a prince, who, though a Jew in outward profession, was in point of morals and practice, a contemner of all laws, divine and human.

II. After the death of this tyrant, the Romans divided the government of Palestine among his sons. In this division, one half of Judea was given to Archelaus, with the title of exarch; and the other was divided between his brothers, Antipas and Philip. Archelaus was a corrupt and wicked prince, and followed the example of his father's crimes in such a manner, that the Jews, weary of his iniquitous administration, laid their complaints and grievances before Augustus, who delivered them from their oppressor, by banishing him from his dominions, about ten years after the death of Herod the Great. The kingdom of this dethroned prince was reduced to the form of a province, and added to the jurisdiction of the governor of Syria, to the great detriment of the Jews, whose heaviest calamities arose from this change, and whose final destruction was its undoubted effect in the appointment of Providence.

III. However severe was the authority which the Romans exercised over the Jews, it did not extend to the entire suppression of their civil and religious privileges.—The Jews were, in some measure, governed by their own laws; and they were tolerated in the enjoyment of the religion they had received from the glorious founder of their church and state. The administration of religious ceremonies was committed, as before, to the high priest, and to the sanhedrim, to the former of whom the priests and Levites were in the usual subordination; and the form of outward worship, except in a very few points, had suffered no visible change. But, on the other hand, it is impossible to express the inquietude and disgust, the calamities and vexations, which this unhappy nation suffered from the presence of the Romans, whom their religion obliged them to look upon as a polluted and idolatrous people, and in a more particular manner, from the avarice and cruelty of the praetors and the frauds and extortions of the publicans; so that, all things considered, the condition of those who lived under the government of the other sons of Herod, was much more supportable than the state of those who were immediately subject to the Roman jurisdiction.

IV. It was not, however, from the Romans alone, that the calamities of this miserable people proceeded. Their own rulers multiplied their vexations, and hindered them from enjoying any little comforts that were left to them by the Roman magistrates. The leaders of the people, and the chief priests, were, according to the account of Josephus, profligate wretches, who had purchased their places by bribes, or by acts of iniquity, and who maintained their ill acquired authority by the most flagitious and abominable crimes. The subordinate and inferior members were infected with the corruption of the head; the priests, and those who possessed any shadow of authority, were dissolute and abandoned to the highest degree; while the people, seduced by these corrupt examples, ran headlong into every sort of iniquity, and by their endless seditions, robberies, and

extortions, armed against them both the justice of God and the vengeance of men.

V. Two religions flourished at this time in Palestine, viz. the Jewish and the Samaritan, whose respective followers beheld those of the opposite sect with the utmost aversion. The Jewish religion stands exposed to our view in the books of the Old Testament; but, at the time of Christ's appearance, it had lost much of its original nature and of its primitive aspect. Errors of a very pernicious kind had infected the whole body of the people, and the more learned part of the nation were divided upon points of the highest consequence. All looked for a deliverer, but not for such a one as God had promised. Instead of a meek and spiritual Saviour, they expected a formidable and warlike prince, to break off their chains, and set them at liberty from the Roman yoke. All regarded the whole of religion, as consisting in the rites appointed by Moses, and in the performance of some external acts of duty towards the Gentiles. They were all horribly unanimous in excluding from the hopes of eternal life all the other nations of the world; and, as a consequence of this odious system, they treated them with the utmost rigour and inhumanity, when any occasion was offered. And, besides these corrupt and vicious principles, there prevailed among them several absurd and superstitious notions concerning the divine nature, invisible powers, magic, &c. which they had partly brought with them from the Babylonian captivity, and partly derived from the Egyptians, Syrians, and Arabians, who lived in their neighbourhood.

VI. Religion had not a better fate among the learned than among the multitude. The supercilious doctors, who vaunted their profound knowledge of the law, and their deep science in spiritual and divine things, were constantly showing their fallibility and their ignorance by their religious differences, and were divided into a great variety of sects. Of these sects, three in a great measure eclipsed the rest, both by the number of their adherents, and also by the weight and authority which they acquired. These were the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes.\* There is frequent mention made of the two former in the sacred writings; but the knowledge of the rites and doctrines of the last, is to be derived from Josephus, Philo, and other historians. These three illustrious sects agreed in the fundamental principles of the Jewish religion, and, at the same time, were involved in endless disputes upon points of the highest importance, and about matters in which the salvation of mankind was directly concerned; and their controversies could not but be highly detrimental to the rude and illiterate multitude, as every one must easily perceive.

VII. It may not be improper to mention here some of the principal matters that were

\* Besides these more illustrious sects, there were several of inferior note, which prevailed among the Jews at the time of Christ's appearance. The Herodians are mentioned by the sacred writers, the Gaulonites by Josephus, and others by Epiphanius and Hieronymus in Eusebius; and we cannot reasonably look upon all these sects as fictitious.

debated among these famous sects. A main point of controversy was, whether the *written law* alone was of divine authority. The Pharisees added to this law another, which had been received by oral tradition. This the Sadducees and Essenes rejected as of no authority, and adhered to the written law as the only divine rule of obedience. They differed also in their opinions concerning the true sense of the law. For, while the Pharisees attributed to the sacred text a double sense, one of which was obvious, regarding only the *words*, and another mysterious, relating to the intimate nature of the *things* expressed; and while the Sadducees maintained that nothing farther was delivered by the law, than that which was contained in the signification of the words; the Essenes, at least the greatest part of that sect, entertained an opinion different from both of these. They asserted, in their jargon, that the words of the law were absolutely void of all power, and that the things expressed by them, were the images of holy and celestial objects. These litigious subtleties and unintelligible wranglings, about the nature and sense of the divine word, were succeeded by a controversy of the greatest moment, concerning the rewards and punishments of the law, particularly with respect to their extent. The Pharisees were of opinion, that these rewards and punishments extended both to the soul and body, and that their duration was prolonged beyond the limits of this transitory state. The Sadducees assigned to them the same period that concludes this mortal life. The Essenes differed from both, and maintained that future rewards and punishments extended to the soul alone, and not to the body, which they considered as a mass of malignant matter, and as the prison of the immortal spirit.

VIII. These differences, in matters of such high importance, among the three famous sects above mentioned, produced none of those injurious and malignant effects which are too often seen to arise from religious controversies.—But such as have any acquaintance with the history of these times, will not be so far deceived by this specious appearance of moderation, as to attribute it to noble or generous principles. They will look through the fair outside, and see that mutual fears were the latent cause of this apparent charity and reciprocal forbearance. The Sadducees enjoyed the favour and protection of the great: the Pharisees, on the other hand, were exceedingly high in the esteem of the multitude; and hence they were both secured against the attempts of each other, and lived in peace, notwithstanding the diversity of their religious sentiments. The government of the Romans contributed also to the maintenance of this mutual toleration and tranquillity, as they were ever ready to suppress and punish whatever had the appearance of tumult and sedition. We may add to all this, that the Sadducean principles rendered that sect naturally averse to alteration and tumult. Libertinism has for its objects ease and pleasure, and chooses rather to slumber in the arms of a fallacious security, than to expose itself to the painful

activity, which is required both in the search and in the defence of truth.

IX. The Essenes had little occasion to quarrel with the other sects, as they dwelt generally in rural solitude, far removed from the view and commerce of men.—This singular sect, which was spread abroad through Syria, Egypt, and the neighbouring countries, maintained, that religion consisted wholly in contemplation and silence.—By a rigorous abstinence also, and a variety of penitential exercises and mortifications, which they seem to have borrowed from the Egyptians,\* they endeavoured to arrive at still higher degrees of excellence in virtue. There prevailed, however, among the members of this sect, a considerable difference both in point of opinion and discipline.—Some passed their lives in a state of celibacy, and employed their time in educating the children of others. Some embraced the state of matrimony, which they considered as lawful; when contracted with the sole view of propagating the species, and not to satisfy the demands of lust. Those of the Essenes who dwelt in Syria, held the possibility of appeasing the Deity by sacrifices, though in a manner quite different from that of the Jews; by which, however, it appears that they had not utterly rejected the literal sense of the Mosaic law. But those who wandered in the deserts of Egypt were of very different sentiments; they maintained, that no offering was acceptable to God but that of a serene and composed mind, intent on the contemplation of divine things; and hence it is manifest that they looked upon the law of Moses as an allegorical system of spiritual and mysterious truths, and renounced in its explication all regard to the outward letter.†

X. The Therapeutæ, of whom Philo the Jew makes particular mention in his treatise concerning contemplative life, are supposed to have been a branch of this sect. From this notion arose the division of the Essenes into *theoretical* and *practical*. The former of these were wholly devoted to contemplation, and are the same with the Therapeutæ, while the latter employed a part of their time in the performance of the duties of active life. Whether this division be accurate or not, is a point which I will not pretend to determine. But I see nothing in the laws or manners of the Therapeutæ, that should lead us to consider them as a branch of the Essenes; nor, indeed, has Philo asserted any such thing. There may have been, surely, many other fanatical tribes among the Jews, besides that of the Essenes; nor should a resemblance of principles always induce us to make a coalition of sects. It is, however, certain, that the Therapeutæ were neither Christians nor Egyptians, as some have erroneously imagined. They were undoubtedly Jews: they gloried in that title, and styled themselves, with particular affectation,

\* See the Annotations of Holstenius upon Porphyry's Life of Pythagoras, p. 11. of Kuster's edition.

† See Mosheim's observations on a small treatise, written by the learned Cudworth, concerning the true notion of the Lord's Supper.

the true disciples of Moses, though their manner of life was equally repugnant to the institutions of that great lawgiver and to the dictates of right reason, and showed them to be a tribe of melancholy and wrong-headed enthusiasts.\*

XI. None of these sects, indeed, seemed to have the interests of real and true piety at heart; nor were their principles and discipline at all adapted to the advancement of pure and substantial virtue. The Pharisees courted popular applause by a vain ostentation of pretended sanctity, and an austere method of living, while, in reality, they were strangers to true holiness, and were inwardly defiled with the most criminal dispositions, with which our Saviour frequently reproaches them. They also treated with greater veneration the commandments and traditions of men, than the sacred precepts and laws of God.† The Sadducees, by denying a future state of rewards and punishments, removed, at once, the most powerful incentives to virtue, and the most effectual restraints upon vice, and thus gave new vigour to every sinful passion, and a full encouragement to the indulgence of every irregular desire. As to the Essenes, they were a fanatical and superstitious tribe, who placed religion in a certain sort of seraphic indolence, and looking upon piety to God as incompatible with any social attachment to men, dissolved, by this pernicious doctrine, all the great bonds of human society.

XII. While such darkness, such errors and dissensions, prevailed among those who assumed the character and authority of persons distinguished by their superior sanctity and wisdom, it will not be difficult to imagine, how totally corrupt the religion and morals of the multitude must have been. They were, accordingly, sunk in the most deplorable ignorance of God and of divine things, and had no notion of any other way of rendering themselves acceptable to the Supreme Being, than by sacrifices, ablutions, and the other external ceremonies of the Mosiac law. Hence proceeded that laxity of manners, and that profligate wickedness, which prevailed among the Jews during Christ's ministry upon earth; and hence the Divine Saviour compares that people to a flock of sheep which wandered without a shepherd, and their doctors to men who, though deprived of sight, yet pretended to show the way to others.‡

XIII. To all these corruptions, both in point of doctrine and practice, which reigned among the Jews at the time of Christ's coming, we may add the attachment which many of them discovered to the tenets of the oriental philosophy concerning the origin of the world, and to the doctrine of the Cabala, which was undoubtedly derived from that system. That considerable numbers of the Jews had imbibed the errors of this fantastic theory, evidently appears both from the books of the New Tes-

tament, and from the ancient history of the Christian church,\* and it is also certain, that many of the Gnostic sects were founded by Jews. Those among that degenerate people, who adopted this chimerical philosophy, must have widely differed from the rest in their opinions concerning the God of the Old Testament, the origin of the world, the character and doctrine of Moses, and the nature and ministry of the Messiah, since they maintained that the creator of this world was a being different from the Supreme God, and that his dominion over the human race was to be destroyed by the Messiah. Every one must see that this enormous system was fruitful of errors, destructive of the very foundations of Judaism.

XIV. If any part of the Jewish religion was less disguised and corrupted than the rest, it was, certainly, the form of external worship, which was established by the law of Moses. And yet many learned men have observed, that a great variety of rites were introduced into the service of the temple, of which no traces are to be found in the sacred writings. These additional ceremonies manifestly proceeded from those changes and revolutions which rendered the Jews more conversant with the neighbouring nations, than they had formerly been; for, when they saw the sacred rites of the Greeks and Romans, they were pleased with several of the ceremonies that were used in the worship of the heathen deities, and did not hesitate to adopt them in the service of the true God, and add them as ornaments to the rites which they had received by divine appointment.†

XV. But whence arose such enormous degrees of corruption in that very nation which God had, in a peculiar manner, separated from an idolatrous world to be the depository of divine truth? Various causes may be assigned, in order to give a satisfactory account of this matter. In the first place, it is certain, that the ancestors of those Jews, who lived in the time of our Saviour, had brought, from Chaldaea and the neighbouring countries, many extravagant and idle fancies, which were utterly unknown to the original founders of the nation.‡ The conquest of Asia by Alexander the Great, was also an event from which we may date a new accession of errors to the Jewish system, since, in consequence of that revolution, the manners and opinions of the Greeks began to spread themselves among the Persians, Syrians, Arabians, and likewise among the Jews, who before that period, were entirely unacquainted with letters and philosophy. We may, farther, rank among the causes that contributed to corrupt the religion and manners of the Jews, their voyages into the adjacent countries, especially Egypt and

\* See Joh. Chr. Wolf. Biblioth. Ebraica, vol. ii. lib. vii. cap. i. sect. ix.

† See the learned work of Spencer, De Legibus Hebræorum, in the fourth book of which he treats expressly of those Hebrew rites which were borrowed from the Gentile worship.

‡ See Gole's observations on Jamblichus, de Mysteriis Ægyptiorum, p. 206. Josephus acknowledges the same thing in his Jewish Antiquities, book iii. chap. vii. sect. 2.

\* The principal writers, who have given accounts of the Therapeutæ, are mentioned by Jo. Albert Fabricius, in the fourth chapter of his *Lux Salutaris Evangelii toto orbe exoriens*.

† Matt. xxiii. 13—30.

‡ Matt. x. 6; xv. 21. John ix. 39.

Phœnicia, in pursuit of wealth; for, with the treasures of those corrupt and superstitious nations, they brought home also their pernicious errors, and their idle fictions, which were imperceptibly blended with their religious system. Nor ought we to omit, in this enumeration, the pestifential influence of the wicked reigns of Herod and his sons, and the enormous instances of idolatry, error, and licentiousness, which this unhappy people had constantly before their eyes in the religion and manners of the Roman governors and soldiers, which, no doubt, contributed much to the progress of their national superstition and corruption of manners. We might add here many other facts and circumstances, to illustrate more fully the matter under consideration; but these will be readily suggested to such as have the least acquaintance with the Jewish history from the time of the Maccabees.

XVI. It is indeed worthy of observation, that, corrupted as the Jews were with the errors and superstitions of the neighbouring nations, they still preserved a zealous attachment to the law of Moses, and were exceedingly careful that it should not suffer any diminution of its credit, or lose the least degree of the veneration due to its divine authority. Hence synagogues were erected throughout the province of Judea, in which the people assembled for the purposes of divine worship, and to hear their doctors interpret and explain the holy scriptures. There were besides, in the more populous towns, public schools, in which learned men were appointed to instruct the youth in the knowledge of divine things, and also in other branches of science.\* And it is beyond all doubt, that these institutions contributed to maintain the law in its primitive authority, and to stem the torrent of abounding iniquity.

XVII. The Samaritans, who celebrated divine worship in the temple that was built on mount Gerizim, lay under the burthen of the same evils that oppressed the Jews, with whom they lived in the bitterest enmity, and were also, like them, highly instrumental in increasing their own calamities. We learn from the most authentic histories of those times, that the Samaritans suffered as much as the Jews, from troubles and divisions fomented by the intrigues of factious spirits, though their religious sects were yet less numerous than those of the latter. Their religion, also, was much more corrupted than that of the Jews, as Christ himself declares in his conversation with the woman of Samaria, though it appears, at the same time, that their notions concerning the offices and ministry of the Messiah, were much more just and conformable to truth, than those which were entertained at Jerusalem.† Upon the

whole, it is certain that the Samaritans mixed the profane errors of the Gentiles with the sacred doctrines of the Jews, and were excessively corrupted by the idolatrous customs of the pagan nations.\*

XVIII. The Jews multiplied so prodigiously, that the narrow bounds of Palestine were no longer sufficient to contain them. They poured, therefore, their increasing numbers into the neighbouring countries with such rapidity, that, at the time of Christ's birth, there was scarcely a province in the empire, where they were not found carrying on commerce and exercising other lucrative arts. They were maintained, in foreign countries, against injurious treatment and violence, by the special edicts and protection of the magistrates;‡ and this, indeed, was absolutely necessary, since, in most places, the remarkable difference in their religion and manners, from those of the other nations, exposed them to the hatred and indignation of the ignorant and bigoted multitude. All this appears to have been most singularly and wisely directed by the adorable hand of an interposing Providence, to the end that this people, which was the sole depository of the true religion, and of the knowledge of one Supreme God, being spread abroad through the whole earth, might be every where, by the force of example, a reproach to superstition, might contribute in some measure to check it, and thus prepare the way for that yet fuller discovery of divine truth, which was to shine upon the world from the ministry and Gospel of the Son of God.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Life and Actions of JESUS CHRIST.*

I. THE errors and disorders that we have now been considering, required something far above human wisdom and power to dispel and remove them, and to deliver mankind from the miserable state to which they were reduced by them. Therefore, towards the conclusion of the reign of Herod the Great, the Son of God descended upon earth, and, assuming the human nature, appeared to men under the sublime characters of an infallible teacher, an all-sufficient mediator, and a spiritual and immortal king. The place of his birth was Bethlehem, in Palestine. The year in which it happened, has not hitherto been ascertained, notwithstanding the deep and laborious researches of the learned. There is nothing surprising in this, when we consider that the first Christians laboured under the same difficulties, and were divided in their opinions concerning the time

\* See Camp. Vitringa. de Synagoga veteri, lib. iii. cap. v. and lib. i. cap. v. vii.

† Christ insinuates, on the contrary, in the strongest manner, the superiority of the Jewish worship to that of the Samaritans, John iv. 22. See also, on this head, 2 Kings xvii. 29. The passage to which Dr. Mosheim refers, as a proof that the Samaritans had juster notions of the Messiah than the Jews, is the 25th verse of the chapter of St. John already cited, where the woman of Samaria says to Jesus, "I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ; when he is come, he will tell us all things." But this passage seems much too vague to justify the conclusion of our learned historian. Besides the

confession of one person who may possibly have had some singular and extraordinary advantages, is not a proof that the nation in general entertained the same sentiments, especially since we know that the Samaritans had corrupted the service of God by a profane mixture of the grossest idolatries.

\* Those who desire an exact account of the principal authors who have written concerning the Samaritans, will find it in the learned work of Jo. Gottlob Carpovius, entitled, *Critica S. Vet. Testam. part. ii. cap. iv.*

‡ See the account published at Leyden, in 1712, by James Gronovius, of the Roman and Asiatic edicts in favour of the Jews, allowing them the free and secure exercise of their religion in all the cities of Asia Minor

of Christ's birth.\* That which appears most probable, is, that it happened about a year and six months before the death of Herod, in the year of Rome 748 or 749.† The uncertainty, however, of this point, is of no great consequence. We know that the Sun of Righteousness has shined upon the world; and though we cannot fix the precise period in which he arose, this will not preclude us from enjoying the direction and influence of his vital and salutary beams.

II. Four inspired writers, who have transmitted to us an account of the life and actions of Jesus Christ, mention particularly his birth, lineage, family, and parents; but they say very little respecting his infancy and his early youth. Not long after his birth, he was conducted by his parents into Egypt, that he might be out of the reach of Herod's cruelty.‡ At the age of twelve years, he disputed in the temple, with the most learned of the Jewish doctors, concerning the sublime truths of religion; and the rest of his life, until the thirtieth year of his age, was spent in the obscurity of a private condition, and consecrated to the duties of filial obedience.§ This is all that the wisdom of God hath permitted us to know, with certainty, of Christ, before he entered upon his public ministry; nor is the story of his having followed the trade of his adoptive father Joseph built upon any sure foundation. There have been, indeed, several writers, who, either through the levity of a wanton imagination, or with a view of exciting the admiration of the multitude, have invented a series of the most extravagant and ridiculous fables, in order to give an account of this obscure part of the Saviour's life.||

III. Jesus began his public ministry in the thirtieth year of his age; and, to render it more solemn and affecting to the Jews, a man, whose name was John, the son of a Jewish priest, a person of great gravity also, and much respected on account of the austere dignity of his life and manners, was commanded by God to proclaim to the people the coming of the long promised Messiah, of whom this extraordinary man called himself the forerunner. Filled with a holy zeal and a divine fervour, he cried aloud to the Jews, exhorting them to depart from their transgressions, and to purify their hearts, that they might thus partake of the blessings which the Son of God was now come to offer to the world. The exhortations of this respectable messenger were not without effect; and those who, moved by his solemn admonitions, had formed the resolution of correcting their evil dispositions, and amending their lives, were initiated into the kingdom of the Redeemer by the ceremony of immersion, or baptism.¶ Christ himself, before he began his ministry, desired to be solemnly baptized by John in the waters of Jordan, that he might not, in

any point, neglect to answer the demands of the Jewish law.

IV. It is not necessary to enter here into a detail of the life and actions of Jesus Christ. All Christians must be perfectly acquainted with them. They must know, that, during the space of three years, and amidst the deepest trials of affliction and distress, he instructed the Jewish nation in the will and counsels of the Most High, and omitted nothing in the course of his ministry, that could contribute either to gain the multitude or to charm the wise. Every one knows, that his life was a continued scene of perfect sanctity, of the purest and most active virtue; not only without spot, but also beyond the reach of suspicion; and it is also well known, that by miracles of the most stupendous kind, and not more stupendous than salutary and beneficent, he displayed to the universe the truth of that religion which he brought with him from above, and demonstrated in the most illustrious manner the reality of his divine commission.

V. As this system of religion was to be propagated to the extremities of the earth, it was necessary that Christ should choose a certain number of persons to accompany him constantly through the whole course of his ministry; that thus they might be faithful and respectable witnesses of the sanctity of his life, and the grandeur of his miracles, to the remotest nations; and also transmit to the latest posterity a genuine account of his sublime doctrines, and of the nature and end of the Gospel dispensation. Therefore Jesus chose, out of the multitude that attended his discourses, twelve persons whom he separated from the rest by the name of *Apostles*. These men were illiterate, poor, and of mean extraction; and such alone were truly proper to answer his views. He avoided making use of the ministry of persons endowed with the advantages of fortune and birth, or enriched with the treasures of eloquence and learning, lest the fruits of this embassy, and the progress of the Gospel, should be attributed to human and natural causes.\* These apostles were sent but once to preach to the Jews during the life of Christ.† He chose to keep them about his own person, that they might be thoroughly instructed in the affairs of his kingdom. That the multitude, however, might not be destitute of teachers to enlighten them with the knowledge of the truth, Christ appointed seventy disciples to preach the glad tidings of eternal life throughout the whole province of Judea.‡

VI. The researches of the learned have been employed to find out the reason of Christ's fixing the number of the apostles to twelve, and that of the disciples to seventy; and various conjectures have been applied to the solution of this question. But since it is manifest from his own words,§ that he intended the number of the twelve apostles as an allusion to that of the tribes of Israel, it can scarcely be doubted, that he was willing to insinuate by this appointment that he was the supreme lord and high-priest of the twelve tribes into which the

\* The learned John Albert Fabricius has collected all the opinions of the learned, concerning the year of Christ's birth, in his *Bibliograph. Antiquar. cap. vii. sect. x.*

† *Matt. iii. 2. &c. John i. 22, &c.*

‡ *Matt. ii. 13.*

§ *Luke ii. 51, 52.*

¶ See the account which the above mentioned Albert Fabricius has given of these romantic triflers, in his *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, tom. i.*

¶ *Matt. iii. 6. John i. 22.*

\* *1 Cor. i. 21.*

† *Matt. x. 7.*

‡ *Luke x. i.*

§ *Matt. xix. 28. Luke xxii. 30.*

Jewish nation was divided; and, as the number of disciples answers evidently to that of the senators, of whom the council of the people (or the sanhedrim) was composed, there is a high degree of probability in the conjecture of those, who think that Christ, by the choice of the seventy, designed to admonish the Jews that the authority of their sanhedrim was now at an end, and that all power, with respect to religious matters, was vested in him alone.

VII. The ministry of Jesus was confined to the Jews; nor, while he remained upon earth did he permit his apostles or disciples to extend their labours beyond this distinguished nation.\* At the same time, if we consider the illustrious acts of mercy and omnipotence that were performed by Christ, it will be natural to conclude that his fame must have been very soon spread abroad in other countries. We learn from writers of no small note, that Abgarus, king of Edessa, being seized with a severe and dangerous illness, wrote to our blessed Lord to implore his assistance; and that Jesus not only sent him a gracious answer, but also accompanied it with his picture, as a mark of his esteem for that pious prince.† These letters, it is said, are still extant. But they are justly looked upon as fictitious by most writers, who also go yet farther, and treat the whole story of Abgarus as entirely fabulous, and unworthy of credit.‡ I will not pretend to assert the genuineness of these letters; but I see no reason of sufficient weight to destroy the credibility of that story which is supposed to have given occasion to them.§

VIII. A great number of the Jews, influenced by those illustrious marks of a divine authority and power, which shone forth in the ministry and actions of Christ, regarded him as the Son of God, the true Messiah. The rulers of the people, and more especially the chief priests and Pharisees, whose licentiousness and

hypocrisy he censured with a noble and generous freedom, laboured with success, by the help of their passions, to extinguish in their breasts the conviction of his celestial mission; or at least, to suppress the effects it was adapted to produce upon their conduct. Fearing also that his ministry might tend to diminish their credit, and to deprive them of the advantages they derived from the impious abuse of their authority in religious matters, they laid snares for his life, which, for a considerable time, were without effect. They succeeded, at length, by the infernal treason of an apostate disciple, by the treachery of Judas, who discovering the retreat which his divine master had chosen for the purposes of meditation and repose, delivered him into the merciless hands of a brutal soldiery.

IX. In consequence of this, Jesus was produced as a criminal before the Jewish high-priest and sanhedrim, being accused of having violated the law, and blasphemed the majesty of God. Dragged thence to the tribunal of Pilate the Roman prætor, he was charged with seditious enterprises, and with treason against Cæsar. Both these accusations were so evidently false, and destitute even of every appearance of truth, that they must have been rejected by any judge, who acted upon the principles of common equity. But the clamours of an enraged populace, inflamed by the impious instigations of their priests and rulers, intimidated Pilate, and engaged him, though with the utmost reluctance, and in opposition to the dictates of his conscience, to pronounce a capital sentence against Christ. The Redeemer of mankind behaved with inexpressible dignity under this heavy trial. As the end of his mission was to make expiation for the sins of men, so when all things were ready, and when he had finished the work of his glorious ministry, he placidly submitted to the death of the cross, and, with a serene and voluntary resignation, committed his spirit into the hands of the Father.

X. After Jesus had remained three days in the sepulchre, he resumed that life which he had voluntarily laid down; and, rising from the dead, declared to the universe, by that triumphant act, that the divine justice was satisfied, and the paths of salvation and immortality were rendered accessible to the human race. He conversed with his disciples during forty days after his resurrection, and employed that time in instructing them more fully with regard to the nature of his kingdom. Many wise and important reasons prevented his showing himself publicly at Jerusalem, to confound the malignity and unbelief of his enemies. He contented himself with manifesting the certainty of his glorious resurrection to a sufficient number of faithful and credible witnesses, being aware that, if he should appear in public, those malicious unbelievers, who had formerly attributed his miracles to the power of magic, would represent his resurrection as a phantom, or vision, produced by the influence of infernal powers. After having remained upon earth during the space of time above mentioned, and given to his disciples a divine commission to preach the glad tidings of salvation and im-

\* Matt. x. 5, 6; xv. 24.

† Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. i. xiii.—Jo. Albert Fabric. Codex Apocryphus N. T. tom. i. p. 317.

‡ See Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, vol. i. cap. xviii.—also Theoph. Sigef. Bayerus, Historia Edessena et Osroena, lib. iii.—Jos. Simon Assemanus, Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican. tom. i.

§ There is no author who has discussed this question (concerning the authenticity of the letters of Christ and Abgarus, and the truth of the whole story) with such learning and judgment, as the late Mr. Jones, in the second volume of his excellent work, entitled, A New and Full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament. Notwithstanding the opinions of such celebrated names, as Parker, Care, and Grabe, in favour of these letters, and the history to which they relate, Mr. Jones has offered reasons to prove the whole fictitious, which seem unanswerable, independent of the authorities of Rivet, Chemnitz, Walther, Simon, Dupin, Wake, Spanheim, Fabricius, and Le Clerc, which he opposes to the three above mentioned. It is remarkable that the story is not mentioned by any writer before Eusebius; that it is little noticed by succeeding authors; that the whole affair was unknown to Christ's apostles, and to the Christians, their contemporaries, as is manifest from the early disputes about the method of receiving Gentile converts into the church, which this story, had it been true, must have entirely decided. As to the letters, no doubt can be made of their spuriousness, since, if Christ had written a letter to Abgarus, it would have been a part of sacred Scripture, and would have been placed at the head of all the books of the New Testament. See Lardner's Collection of Ancient Jewish and Heathen Testimonies, vol. i. p. 297, &c. It must be observed in behalf of Eusebius, that he relates this story as drawn from the archives of Edessa.



mortality to the human race, he ascended into heaven, in their presence, and resumed the enjoyment of that glory which he had possessed before the worlds were created.

CHAPTER IV.

*Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. JESUS, having ascended into heaven, soon showed the afflicted disciples, that, though invisible to mortal eyes, he was still their omnipotent protector, and their benevolent guide. About fifty days after his departure from them he gave them the first proof of that majesty and power to which he was exalted, by the effusion of the Holy Ghost upon them according to his promise.\* The consequences of this grand event were surprising and glorious, infinitely honourable to the Christian religion, and the divine mission of its triumphant author. For no sooner had the apostles received this precious gift, this celestial guide, than their ignorance was turned into light, their doubts into certainty, their fears into a firm and invincible fortitude, and their former backwardness into an ardent and inextinguishable zeal, which led them to undertake their sacred office with the utmost intrepidity and alacrity of mind. This marvellous event was attended with a variety of gifts; particularly the gift of tongues, so indispensably necessary to qualify the apostles to preach the Gospel to the different nations. These holy apostles were also filled with a perfect persuasion, founded on Christ's express promise, that the Divine presence would perpetually accompany them, and show itself by miraculous interpositions, as often as the state of their ministry should render this necessary.

II. Relying upon these celestial succours, the apostles began their glorious ministry, by preaching the Gospel, according to Christ's positive command, first to the Jews, and by endeavouring to bring that deluded people to the knowledge of the truth.† Nor were their labours unsuccessful, since, in a very short time, many thousands were converted, by the influence of their ministry, to the Christian faith.‡ From the Jews, they passed to the Samaritans, to whom they preached with such efficacy, that great numbers of that nation acknowledged the Messiah.§ And, when they had exercised their ministry, during several years, at Jerusalem, and brought to a sufficient degree of consistence and maturity the Christian churches which were founded in Palestine and the adjacent countries, they extended their views, carried the divine lamp of the Gospel to all the nations of the world, and saw their labours crowned almost every where, with the most abundant fruits.

III. No sooner was Christ exalted in the heavens, than the apostles determined to render their number complete, as it had been fixed by their divine Master, and accordingly to choose in the place of Judas, who had despe-

rately perished by his own hands, a man endowed with such degrees of sanctity and wisdom, as were necessary in a station of such high importance. When therefore they had assembled the Christians who were then at Jerusalem, two men remarkable for their piety and faith, were proposed as the most worthy to stand candidates for this sacred office. These men were Matthias and Barnabas, the former of whom was, either by lot, (which is the most general opinion,) or by a plurality of voices of the assembly there present, chosen to the dignity of an apostle.\*

IV. All these apostles were men without education, and absolutely ignorant of letters and philosophy; and yet in the infancy of the Christian church, it was necessary that there should be at least, some one defender of the Gospel, who, versed in the learned arts, might be able to combat the Jewish doctors and the pagan philosophers with their own arms. For this purpose, Jesus himself, by an extraordinary voice from heaven, called to his service a thirteenth apostle, whose name was Saul (afterwards Paul), and whose acquaintance both with Jewish and Grecian learning was very considerable.† This extraordinary man, who had been one of the most virulent enemies of the Christians, became their most glorious and triumphant defender. Independently of the miraculous gifts with which he was enriched, he possessed an invincible courage, an amazing force of genius, and a spirit of patience, which no fatigue could overcome, and which no sufferings or trials could exhaust. To these the cause of the Gospel, under the divine appointment, owed a considerable part of its rapid progress and surprising success, as the acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul, abundantly testify.

V. The first Christian church, founded by the apostles, was that of Jerusalem, the model of all those which were afterwards erected during the first century. This church was, indeed, governed by the apostles themselves, to whom both the elders, and those who were entrusted with the care of the poor, even the deacons, were subject. The people, though they had not abandoned the Jewish worship, held, however, separate assemblies, in which they were instructed by the apostles and elders, prayed together, celebrated the holy Supper in remembrance of Christ, of his death and sufferings, and the salvation offered to mankind through him; and at the conclusion of these meetings, they testified their mutual love, partly by their liberality to the poor, and partly by sober and friendly repasts,‡ which thence were called *feasts of charity*. Among the virtues which distinguished the rising church in this its infancy, that of charity to the poor and needy shone in the first rank, and with the brightest lustre. The rich supplied the wants of their indigent brethren with such liberality and readiness, that, as St. Luke tells us, among the primitive disciples of Christ, all things were in *common*.§ This expression has, however, been greatly abused, and has been

\* Acts ii. 1, &c.

† Luke xxiv. 47. Acts i. 8; xiii. 46.

‡ Acts ii. 41; iv. 4. § Acts i. 8; viii. 14.

\* Acts i. 26.

† Acts ii. 42.

‡ Acts ix. 1.

§ Acts ii. 44; iv. 32.

made to signify a *community of rights, goods, or possessions*, than which interpretation nothing is more groundless or more false; for, from a multitude of reasons, as well as from the express words of St. Peter,\* it is abundantly manifest that the community, which is implied in mutual *use* and mutual liberality, is the only thing intended in this passage. †

VI. The apostles, having finished their work at Jerusalem, went to diffuse their labours among other nations, visited with that intent a great part of the known world, and in a short time planted a vast number of churches among the Gentiles. Several of these are mentioned in the sacred writings, particularly in the *Acts of the Apostles*; ‡ though these are, undoubtedly, only a small part of the churches which were founded, either by the apostles themselves, or by their disciples under their immediate direction. The distance of time, and the want of records, leave us at a loss with respect to many interesting circumstances of the peregrinations of the apostles; nor have we any certain or precise accounts of the limits of their voyages, of the particular countries where they sojourned, or of the times and places in which they finished their glorious course. The stories that are told concerning their arrival and exploits among the Gauls, Britons, Spaniards, Germans, Americans, Chinese, Indians, and Russians, are too romantic in their nature, and of too recent a date, to be received by an impartial inquirer after truth. The greatest part of these fables were forged after the time of Charlemagne, when most of the Christian churches contended about the antiquity of their origin with as much vehemence as the Arcadians, Egyptians, Greeks, and other nations, disputed formerly about their seniority and precedence.

VII. At the same time, the beauty and excellence of the Christian religion excited the admiration of the reflecting part of mankind, wherever the apostles directed their course. Many, who were not willing to adopt the whole of its doctrines, were, nevertheless, as appears from undoubted records, so struck with the account of Christ's life and actions, and so charmed with the sublime purity of his precepts, that they ranked him in the number of the greatest heroes, or even among the gods themselves. Great numbers kept with the utmost care, in their houses, pictures or images of the divine Redeemer and his apostles, which they treated with the highest marks of veneration and respect. § And so illustrious was the fame of his power after his resurrection, and of the miraculous gifts shed upon

his apostles, that the emperor Tiberius is said to have proposed his being enrolled among the gods of Rome, which the opposition of the senate prevented from taking effect. Many have doubted of the truth of this story: there are, however, several authors of the first note who have declared, that the reasons alleged for its truth are such as have removed their doubts, and appeared to them satisfactory and conclusive.\*

VIII. When we consider the rapid progress of Christianity among the Gentile nations, and the poor and feeble instruments by which this great and amazing event was immediately effected, we must naturally have recourse to an omnipotent and invisible hand, as its true and proper cause. For, unless we suppose here a divine interposition, how was it possible that men, destitute of all human aid, without credit or riches, learning or eloquence, could, in so short a time, persuade a considerable part of mankind to abandon the religion of their ancestors? How was it possible, that a handful of apostles, who, as fishermen and publicans, must have been contemned by their own nation, and as Jews, must have been odious to all others, could engage the learned and the mighty, as well as the simple and those of low degree, to forsake their favourite prejudices, and to embrace a new religion which was an enemy to their corrupt passions? And, indeed, there were undoubted marks of a celestial power perpetually attending their ministry. Their very language possessed an incredible energy, an amazing power of sending light into the understanding and conviction into the heart. To this were added, the commanding influence of stupenduous miracles, the foretelling of future events, the power of discerning the secret thoughts and intentions of the heart, a magnanimity superior to all difficulties, a contempt of riches and honours, a serene tranquillity in the face of death, and an invincible patience under torments still more dreadful than death itself; and all this accompanied with lives free from stain, and adorned with the constant practice of sublime

\* See Theod. Hasæus, de decreto Tiberii, quo Christum referre voluit in numerum Deorum; as also a very learned letter, written in defence of the truth of this fact, by the celebrated Christopher Ielius, and published in the Bibliothéque Germanique, tom. xxxii. [We may add to this note of Dr. Mosheim, that the late learned professor Altman published at Bern, in 1755, an ingenious pamphlet on this subject, entitled, *Disquisitio Historico-critica de Epistola Pontii Pilati ad Tiberium, qua Christi Miracula, Mors, et Resurrectio, recensentur*. This author makes it appear, that though the letter, which some have attributed to Pilate, and which is extant in several authors, be manifestly spurious, yet it is no less certain, that Pilate sent to Tiberius an account of the death and resurrection of Christ. See the Biblioth. des Sciences et des beaux Arts, published at the Hague, tome vi. This matter has been examined with his usual diligence and accuracy by the learned Dr. Lardner, in the third volume of his Collection of Jewish and Heathen Testimonies to the truth of the Christian Religion. He thinks that the testimonies of Justin Martyr and Tertullian, who, in apologies for Christianity, presented or at least addressed to the emperor and senate of Rome, or to magistrates of high authority in the empire, affirm, that Pilate sent to Tiberius an account of the death and resurrection of Christ, deserve some regard; though some writers, and particularly Orosius, have made such alterations and additions in the original narration of Tertullian, as tend to diminish the credibility of the whole.]

\* Acts v. 4.

† This is proved with the strongest evidence by Dr. Mosheim, in a dissertation concerning the true nature of that community of goods, which is said to have taken place in the church of Jerusalem. This learned discourse is to be found in the second volume of our author's incomparable work, entitled, *Dissertationes ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentes*.

‡ The names of the churches planted by the apostles in different countries, are specified in a work of Phil. James Hartman, de rebus gestis Christianorum sub Apostolis, cap. vii. and also in that of F. Albert Fabricius, entitled, *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens*, cap. v.

§ This is particularly mentioned by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. cap. xviii. and by Irenæus lib. i. c. xxv.

virtue. Thus were the messengers of Christ, the heralds of his spiritual and immortal kingdom, furnished for their glorious work, as the unanimous voice of ancient history so loudly testifies. The event sufficiently declares this; for, without these remarkable and extraordinary circumstances no rational account can be given of the rapid propagation of the Gospel throughout the world.

IX. What indeed contributed still further to this glorious event, was the power vested in the apostles of transmitting to their disciples these miraculous gifts; for many of the first Christians were no sooner baptized according to Christ's appointment, and dedicated to the service of God by solemn prayer and the imposition of hands, than they spoke languages which they had never known or learned before, foretold future events, healed the sick by pronouncing the name of Jesus, restored the dead to life, and performed many things above the reach of human power.\* And it is no wonder if men, who had the power of communicating to others these marvellous gifts, appeared great and respectable, wherever they exercised their glorious ministry.

X. Such then were the true causes of that amazing rapidity with which the Christian religion spread itself upon the earth; and those who pretend to assign other reasons of this surprising event, indulge themselves in idle fictions, which must disgust every attentive observer of men and things. In vain, therefore, have some imagined, that the extraordinary liberality of the Christians to their poor, was a temptation to the more indolent and corrupt part of the multitude to embrace the Gospel. Such malignant and superficial reasoners do not consider, that those who embraced this divine religion exposed their lives to great danger; nor have they attention enough to recollect, that neither lazy nor vicious members were suffered to remain in the society of Christians. Equally vain is the fancy of those, who imagine, that the profligate lives of the Heathen priests occasioned the conversion of many to Christianity; for, though this might indeed give them a disgust to the religion of those unworthy ministers, yet it could not, alone, attach them to that of Jesus, which offered them from the world no other prospects than those of poverty, infamy, and death. The person who could embrace the Gospel, solely from the motive now mentioned, must have reasoned in this senseless and extravagant manner: "The ministers of that religion which I have professed from my infancy, lead profligate lives: therefore, I will become a Christian, join myself to that body of men who are condemned by the laws of the state, and thus expose my life and fortune to the most imminent danger."

#### CHAPTER V.

*Concerning the Calamitous Events that happened to the Church.*

I. THE innocence and virtue that distinguished so eminently the lives of Christ's

\* See Flanner's learned treatise, *De Charismatibus sive Donis miraculosis antiquæ Ecclesiæ*, published at Francfort, 1683.

servants, and the spotless purity of the doctrine they taught, were not sufficient to defend them against the virulence and malignity of the Jews. The priests and rulers of that abandoned people, not only loaded with injuries and reproaches the apostles of Jesus, and their disciples, but condemned as many of them as they could to death, and executed in the most irregular and barbarous manner their sanguinary decrees. The murder of Stephen, of James the son of Zebedee, and of James, surnamed the Just, bishop of Jerusalem, furnish dreadful examples of the truth of what we here advance.\* This odious malignity of the Jewish doctors, against the heralds of the Gospel, undoubtedly originated in a secret apprehension that the progress of Christianity would destroy the credit of Judaism, and lead to the abolition of their pompous ceremonies.

II. The Jews who lived out of Palestine, in the Roman provinces, did not yield to those of Jerusalem in point of cruelty to the innocent disciples of Christ. We learn from the history of the Acts of the Apostles, and other records of unquestionable authority, that they spared no labour, but zealously seized every occasion of animating the magistrates against the Christians, and instigating the multitude to demand their destruction. The high priest of the nation, and the Jews who dwelt in Palestine, were instrumental in exciting the rage of these foreign Jews against the infant church, by sending messengers to exhort them, not only to avoid all intercourse with the Christians, but also to persecute them in the most vehement manner.† For this inhuman order, they endeavoured to find out the most plausible pretexes; and, therefore, they gave out, that the Christians were enemies to the Roman emperor, since they acknowledged the authority of a certain person whose name was Jesus, whom Pilate had punished capitally as a malefactor by a most righteous sentence, and on whom, nevertheless, they conferred the royal dignity. These perfidious insinuations had the intended effect, and the rage of the Jews against the Christians was conveyed from father to son, from age to age; so that the church of Christ had, in no period, more bitter and desperate enemies than the very people, to whom the immortal Saviour was more especially sent.

III. The Supreme Judge of the world did not suffer the barbarous conduct of this perfidious nation to go unpunished. The most signal marks of divine justice pursued them; and the cruelties which they had exercised upon Christ and his disciples, were dreadfully avenged. The God, who had for so many ages protected the Jews with an outstretched arm, withdrew his aid. He permitted Jerusalem, with its famous temple, to be destroyed by Vespasian and his son Titus, an innumerable multitude of this devoted people to perish by the

\* The martyrdom of Stephen is recorded in the acts of the Apostles, vii. 55; and that of James the son of Zebedee, Acts xii. 1, 2; that of James the Just is mentioned by Josephus in his Jewish Antiquities, book xx. chap. viii. and by Eusebius, in his Eccles. History, book ii. chap. xxiii.

† See the Dialogue of Justin Martyr, with Trypho the Jew.

sword, and the greatest part of those that remained to groan under the yoke of a severe bondage. Nothing can be more affecting than the account of this terrible event, and the circumstantial description of the tremendous calamities which attended it, as they are given by Josephus, himself a Jew, and also a spectator of this horrid scene. From this period the Jews experienced, in every place, the hatred and contempt of the Gentile nations, still more than they had formerly done; and in these their calamities, the predictions of Christ were amply fulfilled, and his divine mission farther illustrated.

IV. However virulent the Jews were against the Christians, yet, on many occasions, they wanted power to execute their cruel purposes. This was not the case with the heathen nations; and, therefore, from them the Christians suffered the severest calamities. The Romans are said to have pursued the Christians with the utmost violence in ten persecutions;\* but this number is not verified by the ancient history of the church; for if, by these persecutions, such only are meant as were extremely severe and universal throughout the empire, then it is certain, that these amount not to the number above mentioned; and, if we take the provincial and less remarkable persecutions into the account, they far exceed it. In the fifth century, certain Christians were led by some passages of the Scriptures, and by one especially in the Revelations,† to imagine that the church was to suffer ten calamities of a most grievous nature. To this notion, therefore, they endeavoured, though not all in the same way, to accommodate the language of history, even against the testimony of those ancient records, from which alone history can speak with authority.‡

V. Nero was the first emperor who enacted laws against the Christians. In this he was followed by Domitian, Marcus Antoninus the philosopher, Severus, and the other emperors who indulged the prejudices they had imbibed against the disciples of Jesus. All the edicts of these different princes were not, however, equally unjust, nor framed with the same views, or for the same reasons. Were they now extant as they were collected by the celebrated lawyer Domitius, in his book concerning the duty of a proconsul, they would undoubtedly cast a great light upon the history of the church, under the persecuting emperors.§ At present, we must, in many cases, be satisfied with probable conjectures, for want of certain evidence.

VI. Before we proceed in this part of our history, a very natural curiosity calls us to in-

quire, how it happened that the Romans, who were troublesome to no nation on account of its religion, and who suffered even the Jews to live under their own laws, and follow their own method of worship, treated the Christians alone with such severity. This important question seems still more difficult to be solved, when we consider, that the excellent nature of the Christian religion, and its admirable tendency to promote both the public welfare of the state, and the private felicity of the individual, entitled it, in a singular manner, to the favour and protection of the reigning powers. A principal reason of the severity with which the Romans persecuted the Christians, notwithstanding these considerations, seems to have been the abhorrence and contempt felt by the latter for the religion of the empire, which was so intimately connected with the form, and indeed, with the very essence of its political constitution; for, though the Romans gave an unlimited toleration to all religions which had nothing in their tenets dangerous to the commonwealth, yet they would not permit that of their ancestors, which was established by the laws of the state, to be turned into derision, nor the people to be drawn away from their attachment to it. These, however, were the two things which the Christians were charged with, and that justly, though to their honour. They dared to ridicule the absurdities of the pagan superstition, and they were ardent and assiduous in gaining proselytes to the truth. Nor did they only attack the religion of Rome, but also all the different shapes and forms under which superstition appeared in the various countries where they exercised their ministry. Hence the Romans concluded, that the Christian sect was not only insupportably daring and arrogant, but, moreover, an enemy to the public tranquillity, and ever ready to excite civil wars and commotions in the empire. It is probably on this account, that Tacitus reproaches them with the odious character of *haters of mankind*,\* and styles the religion of Jesus a *destructive superstition*; and that Suetonius speaks of the Christians, and their doctrine, in terms of the same kind.†

VII. Another circumstance that irritated the Romans against the Christians, was the simplicity of their worship, which resembled in nothing the sacred rites of any other people. They had no sacrifices, temples, images, oracles, or sacerdotal orders; and this was sufficient to bring upon them the reproaches of an ignorant multitude, who imagined that there could be no religion without these. Thus they were looked upon as a sort of atheists; and, by the Roman laws, those who were chargeable with atheism were declared the pests of human society. But this was not all: the sordid in-

\* The learned J. Albert Fabricius has given us a list of the authors who have written concerning these persecutions, in his *Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens*, cap. vii.

† Rev. xvii. 14.

‡ See Sulpitius Severus, book ii. ch. xxxiii. as also Augustin, de Civitate Dei, book xviii. ch. lii.

§ The collection of the imperial edicts against the Christians, made by Domitius, and now lost, is mentioned by Lactantius, in his *Divine Institutes*, book v. chap. xi. Such of these edicts as have escaped the ruins of time, are learnedly illustrated by Franc. Balduinus, in his *Comment. ad Edicta veterum Principum Romanorum de Christianis*.

\* Annal. lib. xv. cap. xlv.

† In Nerone, cap. xvi. These odious epithets, which Tacitus gives to the Christians and their religion, as likewise the language of Suetonius, who calls Christianity a *poisonous or malignant superstition* (*malefica superstitio*), are founded upon the same reasons. A sect, which could not endure, and even laboured to abolish, the religious practices of the Romans, and also those of all the other nations of the universe, appeared to the short-sighted and superficial observers of religious matters, as the determined enemies of mankind.

terests of a multitude of lazy and selfish priests were immediately connected with the ruin and oppression of the Christian cause. The public worship of such an immense number of deities was a source of subsistence, and even of riches, to the whole rabble of priests and augurs, and also to a multitude of merchants and artists. And, as the progress of the gospel threatened the ruin of that religious traffic, this consideration raised up new enemies to the Christians, and armed the rage of mercenary superstition against their lives and their cause.\*

VIII. To accomplish more speedily the ruin of the Christians, all those persons whose interests were incompatible with the progress of the gospel, loaded them with the most opprobrious calumnies, which were too easily received as truth, by the credulous and unthinking multitude, among whom they were dispersed with the utmost industry. We find a sufficient account of these perfidious and ill-grounded reproaches in the writings of the first defenders of the Christian cause.† And these, indeed, were the only arms the assailants had to oppose the truth, since the excellence of the Gospel, and the virtue of its ministers and followers, left to its enemies no resources but calumny and persecution. Nothing can be imagined, in point of virulence and fury, that they did not employ for the ruin of the Christians. They even went so far as to persuade the multitude, that all the calamities, wars, tempests, and diseases that afflicted mankind, were judgments sent down by the angry gods, because the Christians, who contemned their authority, were suffered in the empire.‡

IX. The various kinds of punishment, both capital and corrective, which were employed against the Christians, are particularly described by learned men who have written professedly on that subject.§ The forms of proceeding, used in their condemnation, may be seen in the *Acts of the Martyrs*, in the letters of Pliny and Trajan, and other ancient monuments.|| These judicial forms were very different at different times, and changed, naturally, according to the mildness or severity of the laws enacted by the different emperors against the Christians. Thus, at one time, we observe appearances of the most diligent search after the followers of Christ; at another, we find all perquisition suspended, and positive accusation and information only allowed. Under one reign we see them, on their being proved Christians, or their confessing themselves such, immediately dragged away to execution, unless

they prevent their punishment by apostacy; under another, we see inhuman magistrates endeavouring to compel them, by all sorts of tortures, to renounce their religious profession.

X. All who, in the perilous times of the church, fell by the hand of bloody persecution, and expired in the cause of the divine Saviour, were called *martyrs*; a term borrowed from the sacred writings, signifying *witnesses*, and thus expressing the glorious testimony which these magnanimous believers bore to the truth. The title of *confessor* was given to such, as, in the face of death, and at the expense of honours, fortune, and all the other advantages of the world, had confessed with fortitude, before the Roman tribunals, their firm attachment to the religion of Jesus. Great was the veneration that was paid both to martyrs and confessors; and there was, no doubt, as much wisdom as justice in treating with profound respect these Christian heroes, since nothing was more adapted to encourage others to suffer with cheerfulness in the cause of Christ. But, as the best and wisest institutions are generally perverted, by the weakness or corruption of men, from their original purposes, so the authority and privileges granted, in the beginning, to martyrs and confessors, became in process of time, a support to superstition, an incentive to enthusiasm, and a source of innumerable evils and abuses.

XI. The first three or four ages of the church were stained with the blood of martyrs, who suffered for the name of Jesus. The greatness of their number is acknowledged by all who have a competent acquaintance with ancient history, and who have examined that matter with any degree of impartiality. It is true, the learned Dodwell has endeavoured to invalidate this unanimous decision of the ancient historians,\* and to diminish considerably the number of those who suffered death for the gospel; and, after him, several writers have maintained his opinion, and asserted, that whatever may have been the calamities which the Christians, in general, suffered for their attachment to the Gospel, very few were put to death on that account. This hypothesis has been warmly opposed, as derogating from that divine power which enabled Christians to be faithful even unto death, and a contrary one embraced, which augments prodigiously the number of these heroic sufferers. It will be wise to avoid both these extremes, and to hold the middle path, which certainly leads nearest to the truth. The martyrs were less in number than several of the ancient modern writers have supposed them to be, but much more numerous than Dodwell and his followers are willing to believe; and this medium will be easily admitted by such as have learned from the ancient writers, that, in the darkest and most calamitous times of the church, all Christians were not equally or promiscuously disturbed, or called before the public tribunals. Those who were of the lowest rank of the people, escaped the best; their obscurity, in some measure, screened them from the fury of per-

\* This observation is verified by the story of Demetrius the silversmith, Acts xix. 25, and by the following passage in the 97th letter of the xth book of Pliny's epistles; "The temples, which were almost deserted, begin to be frequented again; and the sacred rites, which have been long neglected, are again performed. The victims, which have had hitherto few purchasers, begin to come again to the market," &c.

† See the laborious work of Christ. Kortholt, entitled, *Paganus Obtrektor*, seu *de Calumniis Gentilium in Christianos*; to which may be added, *Jo. Jac. Huldricus, de Calumniis Gentilium in Christianos*, published at Zurich in 1744.

‡ See Arnobius contra Gentes.

§ See for this purpose Ant. Gallonius and Gasp. Sagittarius, de Cruciatibus Martyrum.

|| See Bohmer, *Juris Ecclæs. Protestant. tom. iv. lib. v. Decretal. tit. 1. sec. 32.*

\* See Dodwell's Dissertation, de *Faustitate Martyrum*, in his *Dissertationes Upprianæ*.

secution. The learned and eloquent, the doctors and ministers, and chiefly the rich, for the confiscation of whose fortunes the rapacious magistrates were perpetually gaping, were the persons most exposed to the dangers of the times.

XII. The actions and sayings of these holy martyrs, from the moment of their imprisonment to their last gasp, were carefully recorded, in order to be read on certain days, and thus proposed as models to future ages. Few, however, of these ancient acts have reached our times;\* the greatest part of them having been destroyed during that dreadful persecution which Diocletian carried on ten years with such fury against the Christians: for a most diligent search was then made after all their books and papers; and all of them that were found were committed to the flames. From the eighth century downwards, several Greek and Latin writers endeavoured to make up this loss, by compiling, with vast labour, accounts of the lives and actions of the ancient martyrs. But most of them have given us scarcely any thing more than a series of fables, adorned with a profusion of rhetorical flowers and striking images, as the wiser, even among the Romish doctors, frankly acknowledge. Nor are those records, which pass under the name of *martyrology*, worthy of superior credit, since they bear the most evident marks both of ignorance and falsehood; so that, upon the whole, this part of ecclesiastical history, for want of ancient and authentic monuments, is extremely imperfect, and necessarily attended with much obscurity.

XIII. It would have been surprising, if, under such a monster of cruelty as Nero, the Christians had enjoyed the sweets of tranquillity and freedom. This, indeed, was far from being the case; for the perfidious tyrant accused them of having set fire to the city of Rome, that horrid crime which he himself had committed with a barbarous pleasure. In avenging this crime upon the innocent Christians, he ordered matters so, that the punishment should bear some resemblance to the offence. He therefore wrapped up some of them in combustible garments, and ordered fire to be set to them when the darkness came on, that thus, like torches, they might dispel the obscurity of the night: while others were fastened to crosses, or torn to pieces by wild beasts, or put to death in some such dreadful manner. This horrid persecution was set on foot in the month of November, † in the 64th year of Christ: and in it, according to some ancient accounts, St. Paul and St. Peter suffered martyrdom, though the latter assertion is contested by many, as being absolutely irrecon-

cilable with chronology.\* The death of Nero, who perished miserably in the year 68, put an end to the calamities of this first persecution, under which, during the space of four years, the Christians suffered every sort of torment and affliction, which the ingenious cruelty of their enemies could invent.

XIV. Learned men are not entirely agreed with regard to the extent of this persecution under Nero. Some confine it to the city of Rome, while others represent it as having raged through the whole empire. The latter opinion, which is also the more ancient, ‡ is undoubtedly to be preferred, as it is certain, that the laws enacted against the Christians were enacted against the whole body, and not against particular churches, and were consequently in force in the remotest provinces. The authority of Tertullian confirms this, who tells us, that Nero and Domitian had enacted laws against the Christians, of which Trajan had, in part, taken away the force, and rendered them, in some measure, without effect. § We shall not have recourse for a confirmation of this opinion, to that famous Portuguese or Spanish inscription, in which Nero is praised for having purged that province from the new superstition; since that inscription is justly suspected to be a mere forgery, and the best Spanish authors consider it as such. ¶ We may, however, make one observation, which will tend to illustrate the point in question, namely, that since the Christians were condemned by Nero, not so much on account of their religion, as for the falsely-imputed crime of burning the city, || it is scarcely to be imagined, that he would leave unmolested, even beyond the bounds of Rome, a sect whose members were accused of such an abominable deed.

XV. Though, immediately after the death of Nero, the rage of this first persecution against the Christians ceased, yet the flame broke out anew in the year 93 or 94, under Domitian, a prince little inferior to Nero in

\* See Tillemont, *Histoire des Empereurs*, tom. i. p. 504.—Baratier, de *Successione Romanor. Pontif. cap. v.*

† This opinion was first defended by Franc. Baldum, in his *Comm. ad Edicta Imperatorum in Christianos*. After him Launoy maintained the same opinion in his *Dissert. qua Sulpitii Severi locus de prima Martyrum Gallie Epochâ vindicatur*, sect. i. p. 139, 140; tom. ii. part i. oper. This opinion is still more acutely and learnedly defended by Dodwell, in the sixth of his *Dissertationes Cypriacæ*.

‡ Apologet. cap. iv.

§ This celebrated inscription is published by the learned Gruter, in the first volume of his *Inscriptions*. It must, however, be observed, that the best Spanish writers do not venture to defend the genuineness and authority of this inscription, as it was never seen by any of them, and was first produced by Cyriac of Ancona, a person universally known to be utterly unworthy of the least credit. We shall add here the judgment which the excellent historian of Spain, Jo. de Ferreras, has given of this inscription; “Je ne puis m’empêcher (says he) d’observer que Cyriac d’Ancone fut le premier qui publia cette inscription, et que c’est de lui que les autres l’ont tirée; mais comme la foi de cet écrivain est suspecte au jugement de tous les sçavans, que d’ailleurs il n’y a ni vestige ni souvenir de cette inscription dans les places où l’on dit qu’elle s’est trouvée, et qu’on ne sçait on la prendre a présent, chacun peut en porter le jugement qu’il vaudra.”

|| See Theod. Ruinart, *Præf. ad Acta Martyrum sin-cera et selecta*, f. 31, &c.

\* Such of those acts as are worthy of credit have been collected by the learned Ruinart, into one volume in folio, of a moderate size, entitled, *Selecta et sincera Martyrum Acta*, Amstelod. 1713. The hypothesis of Dodwell is amply refuted in the author’s preface.

† See for a farther illustration of this point of chronology, two French Dissertations of the very learned Alphonse de Vignoles, concerning the cause and the commencement of the persecution under Nero, which are printed in Masson’s *Histoire critique de la République des Lettres*, tom. viii. p. 71—117; tom. ix. p. 172—186. See also Toinard *ad Laetantium de Mortibus Persequit* p. 396.

wickedness.\* This persecution was occasioned, if we may give credit to Hegeſippus, by Domitian's fear of loſing the empire;† for he had been informed, that, among the relatives of Chriſt, a man ſhould ariſe, who, poſſeſſing a turbulent and ambitious ſpirit, was to excite commotions in the ſtate, and aim at ſupreme dominion. However that may have been, the perſecution renewed by this unworthy prince was extremely violent, though his untimely death ſoon put a ſtop to it. Flavius Clemens,

a man of conſular dignity, and Flavia Domitilla, his niece, or, as ſome ſay, his wife, were the principal martyrs that ſuffered in this perſecution, in which alſo the apoſtle John was baniſhed to the iſle of Patmos. Tertullian and other writers inform us, that, before his baniſhment, he was thrown into a caldron of boiling oil, from which he came forth, not only living, but even unhurt. This ſtory, however, is not atteſted in ſuch a manner as to preclude all doubt.\*

\* Pref. ad Acta Martyrum, &c. f. 33.—Thom. Ittigii Select. Hiſtor. Eccl. Capit. ſec. i. cap. vi. ſect. II.  
† Euseb. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. xix. xx.

\* See Moſheim's Syntagma Diſcert. ad Hiſtoriam Eccl. pertinentium, p. 497—546.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

*Containing an Account of the State of Learning and Philoſophy.*

I. If we had any certain or ſatisfactory account of the doctrines which were received among the wiſer of the eaſtern nations, when the light of the Goſpel firſt roſe upon the world, this would contribute to illuſtrate many important points in the ancient hiſtory of the church. But the caſe is quite otherwiſe: the fragments of the ancient oriental philoſophy that have come down to us, are, as every one knows, few in number, and, ſuch as they are, they yet require the diligence, erudition, and ſagacity of ſome learned man, to collect them into a body, arrange them with method, and explain them with perſpicuity.\*

II. The doctrine of the *magi*, who believed the univerſe to be governed by *two principles*, the one good, and the other evil, flouriſhed in Perſia. Their followers, however, did not all agree with reſpect to the nature of theſe principles;‡ but this did not prevent the propagation of the main doctrine, which was received throughout a conſiderable part of Aſia and Africa, eſpecially among the Chaldeans, Aſſyrians, Syrians, and Egyptians, though with different modifications, and had even infected the Jews themſelves.† The Arabians at that time, and even afterwards, were more remarkable for ſtrength and courage, than for genius and ſagacity; nor do they ſeem, according to their own confeſſion,§ to have acquired any great reputation for wiſdom and philoſophy before the time of Mohammed.

\* The hiſtory of the oriental philoſophy by Mr. Stanley, though it is not void of all kind of merit, is yet extremely defective. That learned author is ſo far from having exhausted his ſubject, that he has left it, on the contrary, in many places, wholly untouched. The hiſtory of philoſophy, published in Germany by the very learned Mr. Brucker, is vaſtly preferable to Mr. Stanley's work; and the German author, indeed, much ſuperior to the Engliſh one, both in point of genius and of erudition.

† See Hyde's Hiſtory of the Religion of the Ancient Perſians, a work full of erudition, but indigeſted and interſpersed with conjectures of the moſt improbable kind.  
‡ See Wolf's Manichæiſmus ante Manichæos.

§ See Abulpharagus de Moribus Arabum, published by Pococke.

III. From the earlieſt times, the Indians were diſtinguiſhed by their taſte for ſublime knowledge and wiſdom. We might, perhaps, be able to form a judgment of their philoſophical tenets, if that moſt ancient book, which they deemed particularly ſacred, and which they called *veda*, or the law, ſhould be brought to light, and tranſlated into ſome known language. But the accounts which are given of this remarkable book, by thoſe who have been in the Indies, are ſo various and irreconcilable with each other, that we muſt yet wait for ſatisfaction on this head.\* As to the Egyptians, they were divided, as every one knows, into a multitude of ſects and opinions.‡—Fruitleſs, therefore, are the labours of thoſe who endeavour to reduce the philoſophy of this people to one ſystem.

IV. But of all the ſystems of philoſophy that were received in Aſia and Africa about the time of our Saviour, no one was ſo detrimental to the Chriſtian religion, as that which was ſtyled *gnosis*, or ſcience, i. e. the way to the true knowledge of the Deity, and which we have above called the oriental doctrine, in order to diſtinguiſh it from the Grecian philoſophy. It was from the boſom of this pretended oriental wiſdom, that the chiefs of thoſe ſects, which, in the three firſt centuries perplexed and afflicted the Chriſtian church originally iſſued. Theſe ſupercilious doctors, endeavouring to accommodate to the tenets of their fantaſtic philoſophy, the pure, ſimple, and ſublime doctrines of the Son of God, brought forth, as the reſult of this jarring compoſition, a multitude of idle dreams and fictions, and impoſed upon their followers a ſystem of opinion which were partly ludicrous and partly perplexed with intricate ſubtilties, and covered with impenetrable obſcurity. The ancient doctors, both Greek and

Some parts of the *Veda* have been publiſhed; or, it may rather be ſaid that pretended portions of it have appeared; but, whatever may be alleged by oriental entuſiaſts, theſe Brahmical remains do not evince the "ſublime knowledge or wiſdom" which many writers attribute to the ancient inhabitants of India.—*Édit.*

† See Dr. Moſheim's Obſervations on Cudworth's System

Latin, who opposed these sects, considered them as so many branches that derived their origin from the Platonic philosophy. But this was mere illusion. An apparent resemblance between certain opinions of Plato, and some of the tenets of the eastern schools, deceived these good men, who had no knowledge but of the Grecian philosophy, and were absolutely ignorant of the oriental doctrines. Whoever compares the Platonic with the Gnostic philosophy, will easily perceive the wide difference that exists between them.

V. The first principles of the oriental philosophy seem to be perfectly consistent with the dictates of reason; for its founder must undoubtedly have argued in the following manner: "There are many evils in this world, and men seem impelled by a natural instinct to the practice of those things which reason condemns; but that eternal mind, from which all spirits derive their existence, must be inaccessible to all kinds of evil, and also of a most perfect and beneficent nature; therefore the origin of those evils, with which the universe abounds, must be sought somewhere else than in the Deity. It cannot reside in him who is all perfection; and therefore it must be *without* him. Now, there is nothing *without* or *beyond* the Deity, but *matter*; therefore *matter* is the centre and source of all evil, of all vice." Having taken for granted these principles, they proceeded to affirm that matter was eternal, and derived its present form, not from the will of the Supreme God, but from the creating power of some inferior intelligence, to whom the world and its inhabitants owed their existence. As a proof of this assertion they alleged, that it was incredible, that the Supreme Deity, perfectly good, and infinitely removed from all evil, should either create or modify matter, which is essentially malignant and corrupt, or bestow upon it, in any degree, the riches of his wisdom and liberality. They were, however, aware of the insuperable difficulties that lay against their system; for, when they were called to explain in an accurate and satisfactory manner, how this rude and corrupt matter came to be arranged into such a regular and harmonious frame as that of the universe, and, particularly, how celestial spirits were joined to bodies formed out of its malignant mass, they were sadly embarrassed, and found, that the plainest dictates of reason declared their system incapable of defence. In this perplexity they had recourse to wild fictions and romantic fables, in order to give an account of the formation of the world and the origin of mankind.

VI. Those who, by mere dint of fancy and invention, endeavour to cast a light upon obscure points, or to solve great and intricate difficulties, are seldom agreed about the methods of proceeding; and, by a necessary consequence, separate into different sects. Such was the case of the oriental philosophers, when they set themselves to explain the difficulties mentioned above. Some imagined *two eternal principles* from which all things proceeded, one presiding over *light* and the other over *matter*; and, by their perpetual conflict, explained the mixture of good and evil, apparent in the uni-

verse. Others maintained, that the being which presided over matter was not an eternal principle, but a subordinate intelligence, one of those whom the Supreme God produced from himself. They supposed that this being was moved by a sudden impulse to reduce to order the rude mass of matter which lay excluded from the mansions of the Deity, and also to create the human race. A third sort devised a system different from the two preceding, and formed to themselves the notion of a triumvirate of beings, in which the Supreme Deity was distinguished both from the material evil principle, and from the creator of this sublunary world. These, then, were the three leading sects of the oriental philosophy, which were subdivided into various factions, by the disputes that arose when they came to explain more fully their respective opinions, and to pursue them into all their monstrous consequences. These multiplied divisions were the natural and necessary consequences of a system which had no solid foundation, and was no more, indeed, than an airy phantom, blown up by the wanton fancies of self-sufficient men. And that these divisions did really subsist, the history of the Christian sects that embraced this philosophy abundantly testifies.

VII. It is, however, to be observed, that, as all these sects were founded upon one common principle, their divisions did not prevent their holding, in common, certain opinions concerning the Deity, the universe, the human race, and several other subjects. They were all, therefore, unanimous in acknowledging the existence of a high and eternal nature, in whom dwelt the fulness of wisdom, goodness, and all other perfections, and of whom no mortal was able to form a complete idea. This great being was considered by them as a most pure and radiant *light*, diffused through the immensity of space, which they called *pleroma*, a Greek word that signifies fulness; and they taught the following particulars concerning him, and his operations: "The eternal nature, infinitely perfect, and infinitely happy, having dwelt from everlasting in a profound solitude, and in a blessed tranquillity, produced, at length, from itself, two minds of a different sex, which resembled their supreme parent in the most perfect manner. From the prolific union of these two beings others arose, which were also followed by different generations; so that, in process of time, a celestial family was formed in the *pleroma*.\* This divine progeny, being immutable in its nature, and above the power of mortality, was called by the philosophers *æon*,"†

\* It appears highly probable that the apostle Paul had an eye to this fantastic mythology, when, in his First Epistle to Timothy, he exhorts him not to "give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions," &c.

† The word *æon*, or *æon*, is commonly used by the Greek writers, but in different senses. Its signification in the Gnostic system is not very evident, and several learned men have despaired of finding out its true meaning. *Æon*, or *æon*, among the ancients, was used to signify the age of man, or the duration of human life. In after-times, it was employed by philosophers to express the duration of spiritual and invisible beings. These philosophers used the word *ζῶον*, as the measure of corporeal and changing objects; and *αἰών*, as the measure of such as were immutable and eternal; and, as God is the chief of those immutable beings which are spiritual, and,



a term which signifies, in the Greek language, an eternal nature. How many in number these *æons* were, was a point much controverted among the oriental sages.

VIII. "Beyond the mansions of *light*, where dwells the Deity with his celestial offspring, there lies a rude and unwieldy mass of *matter*, agitated by innate, turbulent, and irregular motions. One of the celestial natures descending from the *pleroma*, either by a fortuitous impulse, or in consequence of a divine commission, reduced to order this unseemly mass, adorned it with a rich variety of gifts, created men, and inferior animals of different kinds, to store it with inhabitants, and corrected its malignity by mixing with it a certain portion of *light*, and also of a matter celestial and divine. This creator of the world is distinguished from the Supreme Deity by the name of *demiurge*. His character is a compound of shining qualities and insupportable arrogance; and his excessive lust of empire effaces his talents and his virtues. He claims dominion over the new world which he has formed, as his sovereign right; and, excluding totally the Supreme Deity from all concern in it, he demands from mankind, for himself and his associates, divine honours."

IX. "Man is a compound of a terrestrial and corrupt body, and a soul which is of celestial origin, and, in some measure, an emanation from the divinity. This nobler part is miserably weighed down and encumbered by the body, which is the seat of all irregular lusts and impure desires. It is this body that seduces the soul from the pursuit of truth, and not only turns it from the contemplation and worship of God, so as to confine its homage and veneration to the creator of this world, but also attaches it to terrestrial objects, and to the immoderate pursuit of sensual pleasures, by which its nature is totally polluted. The sovereign mind employs various means to deliver his offspring from this deplorable servitude, especially the ministry of divine messengers, whom he sends to enlighten, to admonish, and to reform the human race. In the meantime, the imperious *demiurge* exerts his power in opposition to the merciful purpose of the

consequently, not to be perceived by our outward senses, his infinite and eternal duration was expressed by the term *æon*; and that is the sense in which this word is now commonly understood. It was, however, afterwards attributed to other spiritual and invisible beings; and the oriental philosophers, who lived about the time of Christ's appearance upon earth, and made use of the Greek language, understood by it the *duration* of eternal and immutable things, or the period of time in which they exist. Nor did the variations, through which this word passed, end here; from expressing only the duration of beings, it was, by a metonymy, employed to signify the beings themselves. Thus God was called *æon*, and the angels were distinguished also by the title of *æons*. All this will lead us to the true meaning of that word among the Gnostics. They had formed to themselves the notion of an invisible and spiritual world, composed of *entities* or *virtues*, proceeding from the Supreme Being, and succeeding each other at certain intervals of time, so as to form an eternal *chain*, of which our world was the terminal link; a notion of eternity very different from that of the Platonists, who represented it as stable, permanent, and void of succession. To the beings that formed this eternal chain, the Gnostics assigned a certain term of duration, and a certain sphere of action. Their *terms of duration* were first called *æons*, and they themselves were afterwards metonymically distinguished by that title.

Supreme Being, resists the influence of those solemn invitations by which he exhorts mankind to return to him, and labours to efface the knowledge of God in the minds of intelligent beings. In this conflict, such souls as, throwing off the yoke of the creators and rulers of this world, rise to their Supreme Parent, and subdue the turbulent and sinful motions which corrupt *matter* excites within them, shall, at the dissolution of their mortal bodies, ascend directly to the *pleroma*. Those, on the contrary, who remain in the bondage of servile superstition and corrupt matter, shall, at the end of this life, pass into new bodies, until they awake from their sinful lethargy. In the end, however, God shall come forth victorious, triumph over all opposition, and, having delivered from their servitude the greatest part of those souls that are imprisoned in mortal bodies, shall dissolve the frame of this visible world, and involve it in a general ruin. After this solemn period, primitive tranquillity shall be restored in the universe, and God shall reign with happy spirits, in undisturbed felicity, through everlasting ages."

X. Such were the principal tenets of the oriental philosophy. The state of letters and of philosophy among the Jews comes next under consideration; and of this we may form some idea from what has been already said concerning that nation. It is chiefly to be observed, that the dark and hidden science which they called the *Kabbala*, was at this time taught and inculcated by many among that superstitious people.\* This science, in many points, bears a strong resemblance to the oriental philosophy; or, to speak more accurately, it is indeed that same philosophy accommodated to the Jewish religion, and tempered with a certain mixture of truth. Nor were the doctrines of the Grecian sages unknown to the Jews at the period now before us; since, from the time of Alexander the Great, some of them had been admitted, even into the Mosaic religion. We shall say nothing concerning the opinions which they adopted from the philosophical and theological systems of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, and Syrians.†

XI. The Greeks, in the opinion of most writers, were yet in possession of the first rank among the nations that cultivated letters and philosophy. In many places, and especially at Athens, there were a considerable number of men distinguished by their learning, acuteness, and eloquence; philosophers of all sects, who taught the doctrines of Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and Epicurus; rhetoricians also, and men of genius, who instructed the youth in the rules of eloquence, and formed their taste for the liberal arts; so that those who had a passion for the study of oratory, resorted in multitudes to the Grecian schools, in order to perfect themselves in that noble science. Alexandria, in Egypt, was also much frequented for the same purpose, as a great number of the Grecian philosophers and rhetoricians dwelt in that city.

\* See Jo. Franc. Buddei *Introductio in Historiam Philos. Hebræorum*; and also the works which B. Wolf mentions, with eunomius, in his *Bibliotheca Hebræica*, tom. iii.

† See the same publications.

XII. The Romans also, at this time, made a shining figure among the polished and learned nations. All the sciences flourished at Rome. The youth of a higher rank were early instructed in the Greek language and eloquence. From those pursuits they proceeded to the study of philosophy, and the laws of their country; and they finished their education by a voyage into Greece, where they not only gave the last degree of perfection to their philosophical studies, but also acquired that refined wit and elegance of taste, which served to set off their more solid attainments in the most advantageous manner.\* None of the philosophical sects were more in vogue among the Romans than the Epicureans and the Academics, which were peculiarly favoured by the great, who, soothed by their doctrines into a false security, indulged their passions without remorse, and continued in their vicious pursuits without terror. During the reign of Augustus, the culture of polite learning, and of the fine arts, was holden in great honour, and those who contributed with zeal and success to this, were eminently distinguished by that prince. But after his death, learning languished without encouragement, and was neglected, because the succeeding emperors were more intent upon the arts of war and rapine, than those more amiable arts and inventions which are the fruits of leisure and peace.

XIII. With respect to the other nations, such as the Germans, Celts, and Britons, it is certain, that they were not destitute of learned and ingenious men. Among the Gauls, the people of Marseilles had long acquired a shining reputation for their progress in the sciences;† and there is no doubt that the neighbouring countries received the benefit of their instructions. Among the Celts, the Druids, who were priests, philosophers, and legislators, were highly remarkable for their wisdom; but their writings, at least such as are yet extant, are not sufficient to inform us of the nature of their philosophy.‡ The Romans, indeed, introduced letters and philosophy into all the provinces which submitted to their victorious arms, in order to soften the rough manners of the savage nations, and form in them, imperceptibly, the sentiments and feelings of humanity.§

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government.*

I. THE great end of Christ's mission was to form an universal church, gathered out of all the nations of the world, and to extend the limits of this great society from age to age. But, in order to this, it was necessary, first, to appoint extraordinary teachers, who, convert-

ing the Jews and Gentiles to the truth, should erect, every where, Christian assemblies; and then, to establish ordinary ministers, and interpreters of the divine will, who should repeat and enforce the doctrines delivered by the former, and maintain the people in their holy profession, and in the practice of the Christian virtues; for the best system of religion must necessarily either dwindle to nothing, or be egregiously corrupted, if it be not perpetually inculcated and explained by a regular and standing ministry.

II. The extraordinary teachers whom Christ employed to lay the foundations of his everlasting kingdom, were the twelve apostles, and the seventy disciples, of whom mention has been made above. To these the Evangelists are to be added, by which title those were distinguished whom the apostles sent to instruct the nations, or who, of their own accord, abandoned every worldly attachment, and consecrated themselves to the sacred office of propagating the Gospel.\* In this rank, also, we must place those to whom, in the infancy of the church, the marvellous power of speaking in foreign languages which they had never learned, was communicated from above; for the person to whom the divine omnipotence and liberality had imparted the gift of tongues, might conclude, with the utmost assurance, from the gift itself, (which a wise being would not bestow in vain,) that he was appointed by God to propagate the truth, and employ his talents in the service of Christianity.†

III. Many have undertaken to write the history of the apostles;‡ a history which we find loaded with fables, doubts, and difficulties, when we pursue it farther than the books of the New Testament, and the most ancient writers in the Christian church. In order to have a just idea of the nature, privileges, and authority of the apostolic function, we must consider an apostle as a person who was honoured with a divine commission, invested with the power of making laws, of restraining the wicked, when that was expedient, and of working miracles, when necessary; and sent to mankind, to unfold to them the divine will, to open to them the paths of salvation and immortality, and to separate from the multitude, and unite in the bonds of one sacred society, those who were attentive and obedient to the voice of God, addressed to men by their ministry.§

IV. The accounts we have of the seventy disciples are still more obscure than those of the apostles, since the former are only once mentioned in the New Testament, Luke, x. 1. The illustrations that we have yet remaining,

\* See St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, iv. 11; and also Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xxxvii.

† 1 Cor. xiv. 22.

‡ The authors who have given accounts of the apostles, are enumerated by Sagittarius in his Introduction to Ecclesiastical History, and by Buddeus in his treatise de Ecclesia Apostolica.

§ See Fred. Spanheim, de Apostolis et Apostolatu, tom. ii. op. p. 289. It is not without weighty reasons, and without having considered the matter attentively, that I have supposed the apostles invested with the power of enacting laws. I am sensible that some very learned men among the moderns have denied this power; but I apprehend they differ from me rather in words than in any material point.

\* See Paganini Gaudentii Liber de Philosophiæ apud Romanos initio et progressu, in tertio fasciculo Novæ Collectionis Variorum Scriptorum. Hæte 1717.

† See the Histoire Littéraire de la France par des Religieux Benedictins. Dissert. Prelim. p. 42, &c.

‡ Martin, Religion des Gaulois.

§ Juvenal, Sat. xv. ver. 110.

¶ Nunc totus Graias nostrasque habet orbis Athenas: Gallia caesidicos docuit facunda Britannos: De conducendo loquitur jam rhetore Thule."

relative to their character and office, were certainly composed by the more modern Greeks, and, therefore, can have little authority or credit.\* Their commission extended no farther than the Jewish nation, as appears from the express words of St. Luke, though it is highly probable, that, after Christ's ascension, they performed the function of Evangelists, and declared the glad tidings of salvation, and the means of obtaining it, through different nations and provinces.

V. Neither Christ himself, nor his holy apostles, have commanded any thing clearly or expressly concerning the external form of the church, or the precise method according to which it should be governed.† Hence we may

\* These accounts are to be seen at the end of three books concerning the life and death of Moses, which were discovered and illustrated by Gibb. Gauthamus, and republished by Fabricius in his Biblioth. Græc.

† Those who imagine, that Christ himself, or the apostles by his direction and authority, appointed a certain fixed form of church government, have not determined what that form was. The principal opinions that have been adopted upon this head may be reduced to the four following: The first is that of the Roman Catholics, who maintain, "That Christ's declared intention was, that his followers should be collected into one sacred empire, subjected to the government of St. Peter and his successors, and divided, like the kingdoms of this world, into several provinces; that, in consequence thereof, Peter fixed the seat of ecclesiastical dominion at Rome, but afterwards, to alleviate the burthen of his office, divided the church into three great provinces, according to the division of the world at that time, and appointed a person to preside in each, who was dignified with the title of *patriarch*; that the European patriarch resided at Rome, the Asiatic at Antioch, and the African at Alexandria; that the bishops of each province, among whom also there were various ranks, were to reverence the authority of their respective patriarchs, and that both bishops and patriarchs were to be passively subject to the supreme dominion of the Roman pontiff." [¶] This romantic account scarcely deserves a serious refutation. The second opinion concerning the government of the church, makes no mention of a supreme head, or of patriarchs, constituted by divine authority, but supposes that the apostles divided the Roman empire into as many ecclesiastical provinces as there were secular or civil ones; that the *metropolitan* bishop, i. e. the prelate who resided in the capital city of each province, presided over the clergy of that province, and that the other bishops were subject to his authority. This opinion has been adopted by some of the most learned of the Romish church, [¶] and has also been favoured by some of the most eminent British divines. [¶] Some Protestant writers of note have endeavoured to prove that it is not supported by sufficient evidence. [¶] The third opinion is that of those who acknowledge, that, when the Christians began to multiply exceedingly, metropolitans, patriarchs, and archbishops, were indeed created, but only by *human* appointment and authority, though they confess, at the same time, that it is consonant to the orders and intentions of Christ and his apostles, that, in every Christian church there should be one person invested with the highest authority, and clothed with certain rights and privileges above the other doctors of that assembly. This opinion has been embraced by many English divines of the first rank in the learned world, and also by many in other countries and communions. The fourth or last opinion is that of the Presbyterians, who affirm, that Christ's intention was, that the Christian doctors and ministers should all enjoy the same rank and authority, without

[\*] See Leo Allatius, de perpetua consens. Eccles. Orient. et Occident. lib. i. cap. ii.—Moriinus, Exercit. Ecclesiast. lib. i. exer. i.

[†] Petrus de Marca, de concord. sacerdot. et imperii, lib. vi. cap. i.—Moriinus, Exerc. Eccl. lib. i. ex. xviii.—Pagi Critica in annal. Baronii ad an. xxxvii.

[‡] Hammond, Diss. de Episcop. — Beveregii Cod. Canon. Vet. Eccles. Vindic. lib. ii. cap. v. tom. ii. Patr. Apost.—Usser. de Origine Episcop. et Metropol.

[§] Basnage, Hist. de l'Eglise, tome i. liv. i. cap. viii.—Bohmer. Annot. ad Petrum de Marca de concordia sacerdot. et imperii.

infer, that the regulation of this was, in some measure, to be accommodated to the time, and left to the wisdom and prudence of the chief rulers, both of the state and of the church. If, however, it be true, that the apostles acted by divine inspiration, and in conformity with the commands of their blessed Master, (and this no Christian can call in question,) it follows, that the form of government which the primitive churches borrowed from that of Jerusalem, the first Christian assembly established by the apostles themselves, must be esteemed as of divine institution. But from this it would be wrong to conclude that such a form is immutable, and ought to be invariably observed; for this a great variety of events may render impossible. In those early times, every Christian church consisted of the people, their leaders, and the ministers or deacons; and these, indeed, belong essentially to every religious society. The people were, undoubtedly, the first in authority; for the apostles showed, by their own example, that nothing of moment was to be carried on or determined without the consent of the assembly;\* and such a method of proceeding was both prudent and necessary in those critical times.

VI. It was, therefore, the assembly of the people, which chose rulers and teachers, or received them by a free and authoritative consent, when recommended by others. The same people rejected or confirmed, by their suffrages, the laws that were proposed by their rulers to the assembly; excommunicated profligate and unworthy members of the church; restored the penitent to their forfeited privileges; passed judgment upon the different subjects of controversy and dissension, that arose in their community; examined and decided the disputes which happened between the elders and deacons; and, in a word, exercised all that authority which belongs to such as are invested with sovereign power. The people, indeed, had in some measure purchased these privileges, by administering to the support of their

any sort of pre-eminence or subordination, any distinction of rights and privileges. The reader will find an ample account of these opinions with respect to church government in Dr. Moshim's Larger History of the first Century. This learned and impartial writer, who condemns with reason the fourth opinion, as it is explained by those bigoted Puritans, who look upon all subordination and variety of rank among the doctors of the church as condemnable and antichristian, observes, however, with equal reason, that this opinion may be explained and modified so as to reconcile the moderate advocates of the episcopal discipline with the less rigid Presbyterians. The opinion, modified by Dr. Mosheim, amounts to this: "That the Christian doctors are *equal* in this sense: that Christ has left no positive and special decree which constitutes a distinction among them, nor any *divine* commandment by which those who, in consequence of the appointments of human wisdom, are in the higher ranks, can demand by divine right the obedience and submission of the inferior doctors or ministers, their abstaining from the exercise of certain functions," &c.

The truth is, that, Christ, by leaving this matter undetermined, has left to Christian societies a discretionary power of modelling the government of the church in such a manner, as the circumstantial reasons of times, places, &c. may require; and, therefore, the wisest government of the church is the best and most divine; and every Christian society has a right to make laws for itself, provided that these laws be consistent with charity and peace, and with the fundamental doctrines and principles of Christianity.

\* Acts i. 15; vi. 3; xv. 4; xxi. 22.

rulers, ministers, and poor, and by offering large and generous contributions, when the safety or interests of the community rendered them necessary. In these supplies, each bore a part proportioned to his circumstances; and the various gifts which were thus brought into the public assemblies, were called *oblations*.

VII. There reigned among the members of the Christian church, however distinguished they were by worldly rank and titles, not only an amiable harmony, but also a perfect equality. This appeared by the feast of charity, in which all were indiscriminately assembled; by the names of *brethren* and *sisters*, with which they saluted each other; and by several circumstances of a like nature. Nor, in this first century, was the distinction made between Christians, of a more or less perfect order, which took place afterwards. Whoever acknowledged Christ as the Saviour of mankind, and made a solemn profession of his confidence in him, was immediately baptized and received into the church. But, when the church began to flourish, and its members to increase, it was thought prudent and necessary to divide Christians into two orders, distinguished by the names of believers and catechumens. The former were those who had been solemnly admitted into the church by baptism, and, in consequence thereof, were instructed in all the mysteries of religion, had access to all the parts of divine worship, and were authorized to vote in the ecclesiastical assemblies. The latter were such as had not yet been dedicated to God and Christ by baptism, and were, therefore, neither admitted to the public prayers nor to the holy communion, nor to the ecclesiastical assemblies.

The rulers of the church were called either *presbyters*,\* or *bishops*,—titles which, in the new Testament, are undoubtedly applied to the same order of men.† These were persons of eminent gravity, and such as had distinguished themselves by their superior sanctity and merit.‡ Their particular functions were not always the same; for, while some of them confined their labours to the instruction of the people, others contributed in different ways to the edification of the church. Hence the distinction between teaching and ruling presbyters has been adopted by certain learned men. But if ever this distinction existed, which I neither affirm nor deny, it certainly did not continue long, since it is manifest that St. Paul requires, that all bishops or presbyters be qualified, and ready to teach and instruct.§

IX. Among the first professors of Christianity, there were few men of learning; few,

who had capacity enough to insinuate, into the minds of a gross and ignorant multitude, the knowledge of divine things. God, therefore, in his infinite wisdom, judged it necessary to raise up, in many churches, extraordinary teachers, who were to discourse in the public assemblies, upon the various points of the Christian doctrine, and to treat with the people, in his name, as guided by his direction, and clothed with his authority. Such were the prophets of the New Testament,\* an order of men, whose commission is too much limited by the writers who confine it to the interpretation of the books of the Old Testament, and especially the prophecies;† for it is certain, that they, who claimed the rank of prophets, were invested with the power of censuring publicly such as had been guilty of any irregularity: but, to prevent the abuses that designing men might make of this institution, by pretending to this extraordinary character, in order to execute unworthy ends, there were always present, in the public auditories, judges divinely appointed, who, by certain and infallible marks, were able to distinguish the false prophets from the true. The order of prophets ceased, when the want of teachers, which gave rise to it was abundantly supplied.

X. The church was, undoubtedly, provided from the beginning with inferior ministers or deacons. No society can be without its servants, and still less such societies as those of the first Christians were. And it appears not only probable but evident, that the *young men*, who carried away the dead bodies of Ananias and Sapphira, were the subordinate ministers, or *deacons*, of the church of Jerusalem, who attended the apostles to execute their orders.‡

\* Rom. xiii. 6. I Cor. xii. 28; xiv. 3, 29. Eph. iv. 11.

† See Mosheim's Dissertation de illis qui Prophetæ vocantur in Novo Fœdere, which is to be found in the second volume of his Syntagma Dissertationum ad Historiam Eccles. pertinentium.

‡ Acts v. 6, 10.

Those who may be surprised at my affirming that the *young men*, mentioned in the passage here referred to, were the *deacons* or ministers of the church of Jerusalem, are desired to consider that the words  $\nu\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\iota$ ,  $\nu\epsilon\omega\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\iota$ , i. e. *young men*, are not always used to determine the ages of the persons to whom they are applied, but are frequently employed to point out their offices, or functions, both by the Greek and Latin writers. The same rule of interpretation, that diversifies the sense of the word *presbyter* (which, as all know, signifies sometimes the age of a person, and, at other times his function,) is manifestly applicable to the words before us. As, therefore, by the title of presbyters, the rulers of a society are pointed out, without any regard to their ages so, by the expression *young men*, we are often to understand *ministers*, or *servants*, because such are generally in the flower of youth. This interpretation may be confirmed by examples taken from the New Testament. Christ himself seems to attribute this sense to the word  $\nu\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\iota$ , Luke xii. 26.  $\delta$   $\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$   $\nu\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\iota$   $\sigma\upsilon$   $\sigma\epsilon$   $\nu\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\iota$ . He explains the term  $\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ , by the word  $\nu\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ , and it therefore signifies a presbyter, or ruler; he also substitutes, a little after,  $\delta$   $\delta\alpha\kappa\tau\omega\upsilon\sigma\alpha\upsilon$  in the place of  $\nu\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\iota$ , which confirms our interpretation in the most unanswerable manner: so that  $\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$  and  $\nu\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\iota$  are not here indications of certain ages, but of certain functions, and the precept of Christ amounts to this: "Let not him who performs the office of a presbyter or elder among you, think himself superior to the ministers or deacons." The passage of I Pet. v. 5. is still more express to our purpose:  $\theta\omicron\mu\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$ ,  $\nu\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\iota$ ,  $\upsilon\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\kappa\eta\tau\epsilon$   $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$   $\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ . It is evident from the preceding verses, that *presbyter* here is the name of an office, and points out a ruler or teacher of the church; and that the

\* The word *Presbyter*, or elder, is taken from the Jewish institution, and signifies rather the venerable prudence and wisdom of old age, than age itself.

† Acts xx. 17, 28. Phil. i. 1. Tit. i. 5, 7. I Tim. iii. 1.

‡ I Tim. iii. 1. Tit. 1. 5.

§ I Tim. iii. 2, &c. See, concerning the word *Presbyter*, the illustrations given by the learned Vitringa, de Synagoga vetere, lib. iii. cap. i. p. 609; and by the venerable Jo. Bened. Carpovius, in his Exere. in Epist. ad Hebræos ex Philone, p. 499. As to the presbyters themselves, and the nature of their office, the reader will receive much satisfaction from the accounts given of that order by Budeus, de Ecclesia Apostolica, cap. vi. p. 719, and by the most learned Paffius de Originibus Juris Eccles. p. 49.

These first deacons, being chosen from among the Jews who were born in Palestine, were suspected by the foreign Jews of partiality in distributing the offerings which were presented for the support of the poor.\* To remedy this disorder, seven other deacons were chosen, by order of the apostles, and employed in the service of that part of the church at Jerusalem, which was composed of the foreign Jews converted into Christianity. Of these new ministers six were foreigners, as appears by their names; the seventh was chosen out of the proselytes, of whom there were a certain number among the first Christians at Jerusalem, and to whom it was reasonable that some regard should be shown, in the election of the deacons, as well as to the foreign Jews. All the other Christian churches followed the example of that of Jerusalem, in whatever related to the choice and office of the deacons. Some, particularly the eastern churches, elected deaconesses, and chose for that purpose matrons or widows of eminent sanctity, who also ministered to the necessities of the poor, and performed several other offices, that tended to the maintenance of order and decency in the church.†

XI. Such was the constitution of the Christian church in its infancy, when its assemblies were neither numerous nor splendid. Three or four presbyters, men of remarkable piety and wisdom, ruled these small congregations in perfect harmony; nor did they stand in need of any president or superior to maintain concord and order where no dissensions were known. But the number of the presbyters and deacons increasing with that of the churches, and the sacred work of the ministry growing more painful and weighty, by a number of additional duties, these new circumstances required new regulations. It was then judged necessary, that one man of distinguished gravity and wisdom should preside in the council of presbyters, in order to distribute among his colleagues their several tasks, and to be a centre of union to the whole society. This person was, at first, styled the *angel*‡ of the church to which he belonged, but was afterwards distinguished by the name of *bishop*, or inspector; a name borrowed from the Greek language, and expressing the principal part of the episcopal function, which was to inspect and superintend

the affairs of the church. It is highly probable that the church of Jerusalem, grown considerably numerous, and deprived of the ministry of the apostles, who were gone to instruct the other nations, was the first which chose a president or bishop; and it is no less probable, that the other churches followed by degrees such a respectable example.

XII. Let none, however, confound the bishops of this primitive and golden period of the church with those of whom we read in the following ages; for, though they were both distinguished by the same name, yet they differed in many respects. A bishop during the first and second century, was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly, which, at that time was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly he acted, not so much with the authority of a master, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful servant. He instructed the people, performed the several parts of divine worship, attended the sick, and inspected the circumstances and supplies of the poor. He charged, indeed, the presbyters with the performance of those duties and services, which the multiplicity of his engagements rendered it impossible for him to fulfil; but he had not the power to decide or enact any thing without the consent of the presbyters and people; and, though the episcopal office was both laborious and singularly dangerous, yet its revenues were extremely small, since the church had no certain income, but depended on the gifts or oblations of the multitude, which were, no doubt, inconsiderable, and were moreover to be divided among the bishops, presbyters, deacons, and poor.

XIII. The power and jurisdiction of the bishops were not long confined to these narrow limits, but were soon extended by the following means. The bishops, who lived in the cities, had, either by their own ministry, or that of their presbyters, erected new churches in the neighbouring towns and villages. These churches, continuing under the inspection and ministry of the bishops, by whose labours and counsels they had been engaged to embrace the Gospel, grew imperceptibly into ecclesiastical provinces, which the Greeks afterwards called *dioceses*. But, as the bishop of the city could not extend his labours and inspection to all these churches in the country and in the villages, he appointed certain sutragans or deputies to govern and to instruct these new societies; and they were distinguished by the title of *chorepiscopi*, i. e. country bishops. This order held the middle rank between bishops and presbyters.

XIV. The churches, in those early times, were entirely independent, none of them being subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each governed by its own rulers and its own laws; for, though the churches founded by the apostles had this particular deference shown to them, that they were consulted in difficult and doubtful cases, yet they had no juridical authority, no sort of supremacy over the others, nor the least right to enact laws for them. Nothing, on the contrary, is more evident than the perfect equality that reigned among the primitive

term *νεωτερος* is also to be interpreted, not a *young man* in point of age, but a *minister* or servant of the church. St. Peter, having solemnly exhorted the presbyters not to abuse the power that was committed to them, addresses his discourse to the ministers: "But likewise, ye younger, i. e. deacons, despise not the orders of the presbyters or elders, but perform cheerfully whatsoever they command you." In the same sense St. Luke employs this term, Acts v. 6, 10, and his *νεωτεροι* and *νεωτεροι* are undoubtedly the deacons of the church of Jerusalem, of whom the Greek Jews complain afterwards to the apostles, (Acts vi. 1, &c.) on account of the partial distribution of the alms. I might confirm this sense of the words *young men*, by numberless citations from Greek and Roman writers, and a variety of authors, sacred and profane; but this is not the proper place for demonstrations of this nature.

\* Acts vi. 1, &c.

† For an ample account of the deacons and deaconesses of the primitive church, see Zeigler, de Diaconis et Diaconissis, cap. xix. p. 347.—Basnage Annal. Polit. Eccles. ad an. xxxv. tom. i. p. 450.—Bingham, Orig. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. xx.

‡ Rev. ii. 3.

churches; nor does there even appear, in this first century, the smallest trace of that association of provincial churches, from which *councils* and *metropolitans* derive their origin. It was only in the second century that the custom of holding councils commenced in Greece, whence it soon spread through the other provinces.\*

XV. The principal place among the Christian Doctors, and among those also, who by their writings were instrumental in the progress of the truth, is due to the apostles and some of their disciples, who were set apart and inspired by God, to record the actions of Christ and his apostles. The writings of these holy men, which are comprehended in the books of the New Testament, are in the hands of all who profess themselves Christians. Those who are desirous of particular information with respect to the history of these sacred books, and the arguments which prove their divine authority, their genuineness, and purity, must consult the learned authors who have written professedly upon that head.†

XVI. The opinions, or rather the conjectures of the learned, concerning the time when the books of the New Testament were collected into one volume, as also about the authors of that collection, are extremely different. This important question is attended with great and almost insuperable difficulties to us in these latter times.‡ It is, however, sufficient for us to know, that, before the middle of the second century, the greatest part of the books of the New Testament were read in every Christian society throughout the world, and received as a divine rule of faith and manners. Hence it appears, that these sacred writings were carefully separated from several human compositions upon the same subject, either by some of the apostles themselves, who lived so long, or by their disciples and successors.§ We are well assured,|| that the four Gospels were formed into a volume during the life of St. John, and that the three first received the approbation of this divine apostle. And why may we not suppose that the other books of the New Testament were collected at the same time?

\* The meeting of the church of Jerusalem, mentioned in the xvth chapter of the Acts, is commonly considered as the first Christian council. But this notion arises from a manifest abuse of the word *council*. That meeting was only of one church; and, if such a meeting be called a *council*, it will follow that there were innumerable councils in the primitive times. But, every one knows, that a *council* is an assembly of deputies, or commissioners, sent from several churches associated by certain bonds in a general body, and therefore the supposition above mentioned falls to the ground.

† For the history of the books of the New Testament, see particularly Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græc. lib. iv. cap. v. p. 122-227*. The same learned author has given an accurate list of the writers, who have defended the divinity of these sacred books, in his *Delectus Argumentorum et Syllabus Scriptorum pro verit. relig. Christianæ*, cap. xxvi. p. 502.

‡ See Jo. Eus. *Bibliotheca S. seu Diatriba de librorum N. T. Canon.* published at Amsterdam in 1710; as also Jo. Mill. *Prolegomen. ad Nov. Test. sect. 1.*

§ See E. Frickius, *de Cura Veteris Ecclesiæ circa Canon. cap. iii.*

|| This is expressly affirmed by Eusebius, in the xxvth chapter of the third book of his *Ecclesiastical History*.

XVII. What renders this highly probable is, that the most urgent necessity required its being done; for, not long after Christ's ascension into heaven, several histories of his life and doctrines, full of pious frauds and fabulous wonders, were composed by persons, whose intentions, perhaps, were not bad, but whose writings discovered the greatest superstition and ignorance. Nor was this all: productions appeared which were imposed upon the world by fraudulent men, as the writings of the holy apostles.\* These apocryphal and spurious writings must have produced a sad confusion, and rendered both the history and the doctrine of Christ uncertain, had not the rulers of the church used all possible care and diligence in separating the books that were truly apostolical and divine from all that spurious trash, and conveying them down to posterity in one volume.

XVIII. The writer, whose fame surpassed that of all others in this century, the apostles excepted, was Clemens, bishop of Rome. The accounts which remain of his life, actions, and death, are for the most part uncertain.‡ Two Epistles to the Corinthians,§ written in Greek, have been attributed to him, of which the second is deemed spurious, and the first genuine, by many learned writers.§ But even this seems to have been corrupted and interpolated by some ignorant and presumptuous author, who appears to have been displeased at observing a defect of learning and genius in the writings of so great a man as Clemens.||

XIX. The learned are now unanimous in regarding the other writings which bear the name of Clemens, viz. the *Apostolic Canons*, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the *Recognitions of Clemens* and *Clementina*,§ as spurious pro-

\* Such of these writings as are yet extant have been carefully collected by Fabricius, in his *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*. Many ingenious and learned observations have been made on these spurious books by the celebrated Beausobre, in his *Histoire Critique des Dogmes de Manichee*.

† After Tillemont, Cotelerius and Grabe have given some accounts of this great man; and all that has been said concerning him by the best and most credible writers, has been collected by Rondinini, in the former of two books published at Rome, in 1706, under the following title, *Libri Duo de S. Clemente, Papa, et Martyre, ejusque Basilica in urbe Roma*.

‡ J. A. Fabricius, in the fourth book of his *Bibliotheca Græca*, mentions the editions that have been given of St. Clement's epistles. To this account we must add the edition published at Cambridge, in 1718, which is preferable to the preceding ones in many respects.

§ See the ample account that is given of these two Greek epistles of Clemens, by Dr. Lardner, in the first volume of the second part of his valuable work, entitled, *The Credibility of the Gospel History*.

|| See J. Bapt. Cotelerii *Patres Apost.* tom. i.; and Bernardi Adnotatiunculæ in Clementem, in the last edition of these fathers of the church, published by Le Clerc. The learned Wotton has endeavoured, though without success, in his observations on the epistles of Clemens, to refute the annotations above mentioned.

¶ Beside these writings attributed to Clemens, we may reckon two epistles which the learned Wetstein found in a Syriac version of the New Testament, which he took the pains to translate from Syriac into Latin. He has subjoined both the original and the translation to his famous edition of the Greek Testament, published in 1752; and the title is as follows: "Duae Epistolæ S. Clementis Romani, Discipuli Petri Apostoli, quas ex Codice Manuscripto Novi Test. Syriaci nunc primum erutas, cum versione Latina adposita, edidit Jo. Jacobus Wetstenius." The manuscript of the Syriac version, whence these epis

ductions ascribed by some impostor to this venerable prelate, in order to procure them a high degree of authority.\* The Apostolical Canons, which consist of eighty-five ecclesiastical laws, contain a view of the church government and discipline received among the Greek and oriental Christians in the second and third centuries. The eight books of Apostolical Constitutions are the work of some austere and melancholy author, who, having taken it into his head to reform the Christian worship, which he looked upon as degenerated from its original purity, made no scruple to prefix to his rules the names of the apostles, that thus they might be more speedily and favourably received.† The Recognitions of Clements, which differ very little from the Clementina, are the witty and agreeable productions of an Alexandrian Jew, well versed in philosophy. They were written in the third century, with a view of answering, in a new manner, the objections of the Jews, philosophers, and Gnostics, against the Christian religion; and the careful perusal of them will be exceedingly useful to such as are desirous of information with respect to the state of the Christian church in the primitive times.‡

XX. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, succeeds Clements in the list of the apostolic fathers, among whom were placed such Christian doctors as had conversed with the apostles themselves, or their disciples. This pious and venerable man, who was the disciple and familiar friend of the apostles, was, by the order of Trajan, exposed to wild beasts in the public theatre at Rome, where he suffered martyrdom with the utmost fortitude.§ There are yet extant several epistles, attributed to him, concerning the authenticity of which there have been, however, tedious and warm disputes among the learned. Of these epistles, seven are said to have been written by this eminent martyr, during his journey from Antioch to Rome; and these the majority of learned men acknowledge to be genuine, as they stand in the edition that was published in the seventeenth century, from a manuscript in the Me-

telles were taken, was procured by the good offices of Sir James Porter, a judicious patron of literature, who, at that time, was British ambassador at Constantinople. Their authenticity is boldly maintained by Weistein, and learnedly opposed by Dr. Lardner. The celebrated professor Vencma, of Francker, also considered them as spurious. See an account of his controversy with Wetstein on that subject, in the *Bibliothèque des Sciences et des Beaux Arts*, tom. ii.

\* For an account of the fate of these writings, and the editions that have been given of them, it will be proper to consult two dissertations of the learned Ittigius; one, de *Patribus Apostolicis*, which he has prefixed to his *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum*; and the other, de *Pseudopigraphis Apostolicis*, which he has subjoined to the Appendix of his book de *Heresiarchis Novi Testamenti*. See also Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, lib. v. cap. i., and lib. vi. cap. i.

† Budeus has collected the various opinions of the learned concerning the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions, in his *Esagoge in Theologiam*.

‡ See, for a full account of this work, Mosheim's Dissertation, de *turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia*, sect. 34. ¶ This Dissertation is in the first volume of that learned work which our author published under the title of *Synagoga Dissertationum ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentium*.

§ See Tillmont's *Memoirs pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. ii.

dicean library. The others are generally rejected as spurious. As to my own sentiments of this matter, though I am willing to adopt this opinion as preferable to any other, I cannot help looking upon the authenticity of the Epistle to Polycarp as extremely dubious, on account of the difference of style; and indeed, the whole question relating to the epistles of St. Ignatius in general, seems to me to labour under much obscurity, and to be embarrassed with many difficulties.\*

XXI. The Epistle to the Philippians, which is ascribed to Polycarp bishop of Smyrna, who, in the middle of the second century, suffered martyrdom in a venerable and advanced age, is considered by some as genuine; by others, as spurious; and it is no easy matter to determine this question.† The Epistle of Barnabas was the production of some Jew, who, most probably, lived in this century, and whose mean abilities and superstitious attachment to Jewish fables, show, notwithstanding the uprightness of his intentions, that he must have been a very different person from the true Barnabas, who was St. Paul's companion.‡ The work which is entitled the *Shepherd of Hermas*, because the angel, who bears the principal part in it, is represented in the form and habit of a shepherd, was composed in the second century by Hermas, who was brother to Pius, bishop of Rome.§ This whimsical and visionary writer has taken the liberty of inventing several dialogues or conversations between God and the angels, in order to insinuate, in a more easy and agreeable manner, the precepts which he thought useful and salutary, into the minds of his readers. But indeed, the discourse, which he puts into the mouths of those celestial beings, is more insipid and senseless, than what we commonly hear among the meanest of the multitude.||

XXII. We may here remark in general, that these apostolic fathers, and the other writers, who, in the infancy of the church, employed their pens in the cause of Christianity, were neither remarkable for their learning nor for their eloquence. On the contrary, they express the most pious and admirable sentiments in the plainest and most illiterate style.¶ This, indeed, is rather a matter of honour than

\* For an account of this controversy, it will be proper to consult the *Bibliotheca Græca* of Fabricius, lib. v. cap. i.

† For an account of this martyr, and of the epistle attributed to him, see Tillmont's *Memoirs*, tom. ii., and Fabricii *Biblioth. Græca*, lib. v.

‡ See Tillmont's *Memoirs*, and Ittigius' *Select. Hist. Eccles. Capita*, sect. i.

§ This now appears with the utmost evidence from a very ancient fragment of a small book, concerning the canon of the Scriptures, which the learned Lud. Anton. Muratori published from an ancient manuscript in the library at Milan, and which is to be found in the *Antiq. Italie. mediæ Ævi*, tom. iii. diss. xliii.

|| We are indebted for the best edition of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, to Fabricius, who has added it to the third volume of his *Codex Apocryphus N. Testamenti*. We find also some account of this writer in the *Biblioth. Græca* of the same learned author, book v. chap. ix., and also in Ittigius' dissertation de *Patribus Apostolicis*, sect. 55.

¶ All the writers mentioned in this chapter are usually called *apostolic fathers*. Of the works of these authors, Jo. Bap. Cotelierus, and after him Le Clerc, have published a collection in two volumes, accompanied with their own annotations, and the remarks of other learned men.

of reproach to the Christian cause, since we see, from the conversion of a great part of mankind by the ministry of weak and illiterate men, that the progress of Christianity is not to be attributed to human means but to a divine power.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church in this Century.*

I. THE whole of the Christian religion is comprehended in two great points, one of which regards what we are to believe, and the other relates to our conduct and actions; or, in a shorter phrase, the Gospel presents to us objects of *faith* and rules of *practice*. The apostles express the former by the term *mystery*, or the *truth*, and the latter by that of *godliness*, or *piety*.<sup>\*</sup> The rule and standard of both are those books which contain the revelation that God made of his will to persons chosen for that purpose, whether before or after the birth of Christ; and these divine books are usually called the *Old and New Testament*.

II. The apostles and their disciples took all possible care, in the earliest times of the church, that these sacred books might be in the hands of all Christians, that they might be read and explained in the assemblies of the faithful, and thus contribute, both in private and in public, to excite and nourish in the minds of Christians a fervent zeal for the truth, and a firm attachment to the ways of piety and virtue. Those who performed the office of interpreters studied above all things plainness and perspicuity. At the same time it must be acknowledged, that, even in this century, several Christians adopted the absurd and corrupt custom, used among the Jews, of darkening the plain words of the Holy Scriptures by insipid and forced allegories, and of drawing them violently from their proper and natural meanings, in order to extort from them mysterious and hidden significations. For a proof of this, we need go no farther than the Epistle of Barnabas, which is yet extant.

III. The method of teaching the sacred doctrines of religion was, at this time, most simple, far removed from all the subtle rules of philosophy, and all the precepts of human art. This appears abundantly, not only in the writings of the apostles, but also in all those of the second century, which have survived the ruins of time. Neither did the apostles, or their disciples, ever think of collecting into a regular system the principal doctrines of the Christian religion, or of demonstrating them in a scientific and geometrical order. The beautiful and candid simplicity of these early ages rendered such philosophical niceties unnecessary; and the great study of those who embraced the Gospel was rather to express its divine influence in their dispositions and actions, than to examine its doctrines with an excessive curiosity, or to explain them by the rules of human wisdom.

IV. There is extant, indeed, a brief summary of the principal doctrines of Christianity

in that form which bears the name of the *Apostles' Creed*, and which, from the fourth century downwards, was almost generally considered as a production of the apostles. All, however, who have the least knowledge of antiquity, look upon this opinion as entirely false, and destitute of all foundation.<sup>\*</sup> There is much more reason in the opinion of those who think, that this creed was not all composed at once, but, from small beginnings, was imperceptibly augmented in proportion to the growth of heresy, and according to the exigencies and circumstances of the church, from which it was designed to banish the errors that daily arose.†

V. In the earliest times of the church, all who professed firmly to believe that Jesus was the only redeemer of the world, and who in consequence of this profession, promised to live in a manner conformable to the purity of his holy religion, were immediately received among the disciples of Christ. This was all the preparation for baptism then required; and a more accurate instruction in the doctrines of Christianity was to be administered to them after their reception of that sacrament. But, when Christianity had acquired more consistence, and churches rose to the true God and his eternal Son, almost in every nation, this custom was changed for the wisest and most solid reasons. Then baptism was administered to none but such as had been previously instructed in the principal points of Christianity, and had also given satisfactory proofs of his pious dispositions and upright intentions. Hence arose the distinction between *catechumens*, who were in a state of probation, and under the instruction of persons appointed for that purpose; and *believers*, who were consecrated by baptism, and thus initiated into all the mysteries of the Christian faith.

VI. The methods of instructing the catechumens differed according to their various capacities. To those, in whom the natural force of reason was small, only the fundamental principles and truths, which are, as it were, the basis of Christianity, were taught. Those, on the contrary, whom their instructors judged capable of comprehending, in some measure, the whole system of divine truth, were furnished with superior degrees of knowledge; and nothing was concealed from them, which could have any tendency to render them firm in their profession, and to assist them in arriving at Christian perfection. The care of instructing such was committed to persons who were distinguished by their gravity and wisdom, and also by their learning and judgment. Hence the ancient doctors generally divide their flock into two classes; the one comprehending such as were solidly and thoroughly

<sup>\*</sup> See Buddei *Isagoge ad Theologium*, lib. i. cap. ii. sect. 2. p. 441, as also Walchii *Introductio in libros Symbolicos*, lib. i. cap. ii. p. 87.

† This opinion is confirmed in the most learned and ingenious manner by Sir Peter King, in his history of the *Apostles' Creed*. Such, however, as read this valuable work with pleasure, and with a certain degree of prepossession, would do well to consider that its author, upon several occasions, has given us conjectures instead of proofs; and also, that his conjectures are not always so happy as justly to command our assent.



instructed; the other, those who were acquainted with little more than the first principles of religion; nor do they deny that the methods of instruction applied to these two sorts of persons were extremely different.

VII. The Christians took all possible care to accustom their children to the study of the Scriptures, and to instruct them in the doctrines of their holy religion; and schools were every where erected for this purpose, even from the very commencement of the Christian church. We must not, however, confound the schools designed only for children, with the *gymnasia* or academies of the ancient Christians, erected in several large cities, in which persons of riper years, especially such as aspired to be public teachers, were instructed in the different branches, both of human learning and of sacred erudition. We may, undoubtedly, attribute to the apostles themselves, and to the injunctions given to their disciples, the excellent establishments, in which the youth destined to the holy ministry received an education suitable to the solemn office they were to undertake.\* St. John erected a school of this kind at Ephesus, and one of the same nature was founded by Polycarp at Smyrna;† but these were not in greater repute than that which was established at Alexandria;‡ commonly called the *catechetical school*, and generally supposed to have been erected by St. Mark.§

VIII. The ancient Christians are supposed by many to have had a *secret doctrine*; and if by this be meant, that they did not teach all in the same manner, or reveal all at once, and to all indiscriminately, the sublime mysteries of religion, there is nothing in this that may not be fully justified. It would have been improper, for example, to propose to those who were yet to be converted to Christianity, the more difficult doctrines of the Gospel, which surpass the comprehension of imperfect mortals. Such were, therefore, first instructed in those points which are more obvious and plain, until they became capable of higher and more difficult attainments in religious knowledge. And even those who were already admitted into the society of Christians, were, in point of instruction, differently dealt with according to their respective capacities. Those who consider the *secret doctrine* of this century in any other light, or give to it a greater extent than what we have here attributed to it, confound the superstitious practices of the following

\* 2 Tim. ii. 2.

† Irenæus, adv. Hæres. lib. ii. cap. xxii. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. v. cap. xx.

‡ The Alexandrian School was renowned for a succession of learned doctors, as we find by the accounts of Eusebius and St. Jerom; for, after St. Mark, Pantaenus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and many others, taught in it the doctrines of the Gospel, and rendered it a famous seminary for Christian philosophy and religious knowledge. There were also at Rome, Antioch, Caesarea, Edessa, and in several other cities, schools of the same nature, though not all of equal reputation.

§ See the dissertation of Schmidius, de Schola Catechetica Alexandrina; as also Aulinius, delle Scuole Sacre, book ii. ch. i. ii. xvi. The curious reader will find a learned account of the more famous Christian schools in the eastern parts, at Edessa, Nisibis, and Seleucia; and, indeed, of the ancient schools in general, in Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vaticana; tom. iii. par. ii.

ages, with the simplicity of that discipline which prevailed at the time of which we write.\*

IX. The lives and manners of the Christians in this century are highly celebrated by most authors, and recommended to succeeding generations as unspotted models of piety and virtue; and, if these encomiums be confined to the greater part of those who embraced Christianity in the infancy of the church, they are certainly distributed with justice: but many run into extremes upon this head, and, estimating the lives and manners of all by the illustrious examples of some eminent saints, or the sublime precepts and exhortations of certain pious doctors, fondly imagine, that every appearance of vice and disorder was banished from the first Christian societies. The greatest part of those authors who have treated of the innocence and sanctity of the primitive Christians, have fallen into this error; and a gross error indeed it is, as the strongest testimonies too evidently prove.

X. One of the circumstances which contributed chiefly to preserve, at least, an external appearance of sanctity in the Christian church, was the right of excluding from it, and from all participation of the sacred rites and ordinances of the Gospel, such as had been guilty of enormous transgressions, and to whom repeated exhortations to repentance and amendment had been administered in vain. This right was vested in the church from the earliest period of its existence, by the apostles themselves, and was exercised by each Christian assembly upon its respective members. The rulers, or doctors, denounced the persons whom they thought unworthy of the privileges of church communion; and the people, freely approving or rejecting their judgment, pronounced the decisive sentence. It was not, however, irrevocable; for such as gave undoubted signs of their sincere repentance, and declared their solemn resolutions of future reformation, were re-admitted into the church, however enormous their crimes had been; but, in case of a relapse, their second exclusion became absolutely irreversible.†

XI. It will easily be imagined, that unity and peace could not reign long in the church, since it was composed of Jews and Gentiles, who regarded each other with the bitterest aversion. Besides, as the converts to Christianity could not extirpate radically the prejudices which had been formed in their minds by education, and confirmed by time, they brought with them into the bosom of the church more or less of the errors of their former religion. Thus the seeds of discord and controversy were early sown, and could not fail to spring up soon into animosities and dissensions, which accordingly broke out, and divided the church. The first of these controversies arose in the church of Antioch. It regarded the necessity of observing the law of

\* Many learned observations upon the *secret discipline* have been collected by the celebrated Christoph. Matt. Pfaffius, in his Dissert. poster. de Præjudiciis Theolog. sect. 13. p. 119, &c. in Primitivis Tubingensibus.

† See Morinus, Comm. de Disciplina Penitentia, lib. ix. cap. xiv. p. 670.

Moses; and its issue is mentioned by St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles.\* This controversy was followed by many others, either with the Jews, who were violently attached to the worship of their ancestors, or with the votaries of a wild and fanatical sort of philosophy, or with such as, mistaking the true genius of the Christian religion, abused it monstrously to the encouragement of their vices, and the indulgence of their appetites and passions.† St. Paul and the other apostles have, in several places of their writings, mentioned these controversies, but with such brevity, that it is difficult, at this distance of time, to discover the true state of the question in these various disputes.

XII. The most weighty and important of all these controversies, was that which some Jewish doctors raised at Rome, and in other Christian churches, concerning the means of justification and acceptance with God, and the method of salvation pointed out in the word of God. The apostles, wherever they exercised their ministry, had constantly declared all hopes of acceptance and salvation delusive, except such as were founded on Jesus the Redeemer, and his all-sufficient merits, while the Jewish doctors maintained the works of the law to be the true efficient cause of the soul's eternal salvation and felicity. The latter sentiment not only led to other errors prejudicial to Christianity, but was particularly injurious to the glory of its divine author; for those who looked upon a course of life conformable to the law, as a meritorious title to eternal happiness, could not consider Christ as the Son of God, and the Saviour of mankind, but only as an eminent prophet, or a divine messenger, sent from above to enlighten and instruct a darkened world. It is not, therefore, surprising, that St. Paul took so much pains in his Epistle to the Romans, and in his other writings, to extirpate such a pernicious and capital error.

XIII. The controversy that had been raised concerning the necessity of observing the ceremonies of the Mosaic law, was determined by the apostles in the wisest and most prudent manner.‡ Their authority, however, respectable as it was, had not its full effect; for the prejudices, which the Jews, especially those who lived in Palestine, entertained in favour of the Mosaic law and their ancient worship, were so deeply rooted in their minds, that they could not be thoroughly removed. The force of these prejudices was indeed, somewhat diminished after the destruction of Jerusalem and the ruin of the temple, but not entirely destroyed. And hence, as we shall see in its place, a part of the judaizing Christians separated themselves from the rest, and formed a particular sect, distinguished by their adherence to the law of Moses.

## CHAPTER IV.

### *Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. THE Christian religion was singularly commendable on account of its beautiful and divine simplicity, which appears from its two great and fundamental principles—faith and charity. This simplicity was not, however, incompatible with external ceremonies and positive institutions, which, indeed, are necessary, in this imperfect state, to keep alive a sense of religion in the minds of men. The rites instituted by Christ himself were only two in number; and these were intended to continue to the end of the church here below, without any variation. These rites were baptism and the holy supper, which are not to be considered as mere ceremonies, nor yet as symbolic representations only, but also as ordinances accompanied with a sanctifying influence upon the heart and the affections of true Christians. And we cannot help observing here, that since the divine Saviour thought fit to appoint no more than two plain institutions in his church, this shows us that a great number of ceremonies are not essential to his religion, and that he left it to the free and prudent choice of Christians to establish such rites as the circumstances of the times, or the exigencies of the church, might require.

II. There are several circumstances, however, which incline us to think, that the friends and apostles of our blessed Lord either tolerated through necessity, or appointed for wise reasons, many other external rites in various places. At the same time, we are not to imagine that they ever conferred upon any person a perpetual, indelible, pontifical authority, or that they enjoined the same rites in all churches. We learn on the contrary, from authentic records, that the Christian worship was, from the beginning, celebrated in a different manner in different places, undoubtedly by the orders, or at least with the approbation of the apostles and their disciples. In those early times it was both wise and necessary to show, in the establishment of outward forms of worship, some indulgence to the ancient opinions, manners, and laws of the respective nations to which the Gospel was preached.

III. Hence it follows that the opinion of those who maintain that the Jewish rites were adopted every where, in the Christian churches, by order of the apostles, or their disciples, is destitute of all foundation. In those Christian societies, which were totally or principally composed of Jewish converts, it was natural to retain as much of the Jewish ritual as the genius of Christianity would suffer; and a multitude of examples testify that this was actually done. But that the same translation of Jewish rites should take place in Christian churches, where there were no Jews, or a very small and inconsiderable number, is utterly incredible, because such an event was morally impossible. In a word, the external forms of worship used in ancient times, must necessarily have been re-

\* Chap. xv.

† See, for an illustration of these points, Witsius' *Miscellanea Sacra*, tom. ii. *Evercit.* xx. xxi. xxii. p. 668., and also *Camp. Vitringa, Observ. Sacræ*, lib. iv., cap. ix. x. xi., p. 952.

‡ Acts xv.

gulated and modified according to the character, genius, and manners of the different nations on which the light of the Gospel arose.

IV. Since then there was such a variety in the ritual and discipline of the primitive churches, it must be very difficult to give such an account of the worship, manners, and institutions, of the ancient Christians, as will agree with what was practised in all those countries where the Gospel flourished. There are, notwithstanding, certain laws, whose authority and obligation were universal and indispensable among Christians; and of these we shall here give a brief account. All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the first day of the week, on which the triumphant Saviour arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the express appointment of the apostles, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout the Christian churches, as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers.\* The seventh day of the week was also observed as a festival,† not by the Christians in general, but by such churches only as were principally composed of Jewish converts; nor did the other Christians censure this custom as criminal or unlawful. It appears, moreover, that all the Christian churches observed two great anniversary festivals; one in memory of Christ's glorious resurrection, and the other to commemorate the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles.‡ To these we may add the days on which the blessed martyrs laid down their lives for the truth, which days were probably dignified with particular solemnities and marks of veneration from the earliest times.

V. The places in which the first Christians assembled to celebrate divine worship, were, no doubt, the houses of private persons. But, in process of time, it became necessary, that these sacred assemblies should be confined to one fixed place in which the books, tables, and desks, required in divine service, might be constantly kept, and the dangers avoided, which

in those perilous times, attended their transportation from one place to another. And then, probably, the places of meeting, that had formerly belonged to private persons, became the property of the whole Christian community. These few remarks are, in my opinion, sufficient to determine that question, which has been so long, and so tediously debated,—whether the first Christians had churches or not;‡ since if any are pleased to give the name of church to a house, or the part of a house, which, though appointed as the place of religious worship, was neither separated from common use, nor considered as holy in the opinion of the people, it will be readily granted, that the most ancient Christians had churches.

VI. In these assemblies the holy scriptures were publicly read, and for that purpose were divided into certain portions or lessons. This part of divine service was followed by a brief exhortation to the people, in which eloquence and art gave place to the natural and fervent expression of zeal and charity. If any declared themselves extraordinarily animated by the Spirit, they were permitted to explain successively the divine will, while the other prophets who were present decided how much weight and authority were to be attributed to what they said.‡ The prayers, which formed a considerable part of the public worship, were introduced at the conclusion of these discourses, and were repeated by the people after the bishop or presbyter, who presided in the service.§ To these were added certain hymns, which were sung, not by the whole assembly, but by persons appointed for that purpose, during the celebration of the Lord's supper, and the feasts of charity. Such were the essential parts of divine worship which were observed in all Christian churches, though, perhaps the method and order in which they were performed were not the same in all.||

VII. The prayers of the first Christians were followed by oblations of bread, wine, and other things; and hence both the ministers of the church and the poor, derived their subsistence. Every Christian, who was in an opulent condition, and indeed every one, according to his circumstances, brought gifts and offered them, as it were, to the Lord.¶ Of the bread and wine presented in these offerings, such a quantity was separated from the rest as was required in the administration of the Lord's supper; this was consecrated by certain prayers pronounced by the bishop alone, to which the

\* Phil. Jac. Hartmannus, de rebus gestis Christianorum sub Apostolis, cap. xv. p. 367. Just. Hen. Bohmer, Dissert. I. Juris Eccles. Antiqui de stato die Christianor. p. 20, &c.

† Steph. Curedæus, Diatriba de Eisu Sanguinis, Opus Theolog. p. 958. Gab. Albaspinæus, Observat. Eccles. lib. i. Observ. xiii. It is in vain that many learned men have laboured to prove, that, in all the primitive churches, both the first and last day of the week were observed as festivals. The churches of Bithynia, of which Pliny speaks in his letter to Trajan, had only one stated day for the celebration of public worship; and that was, undoubtedly, the first day of the week, or what we call the Lord's day.

‡ There are, it is true, learned men, who look upon it as a doubtful matter whether the day of Pentecost was celebrated as a festival so early as the first century. See Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, book xx. chap. vi. But, notwithstanding this, there are some weighty reasons for believing that this festival was as ancient as that of Easter, which was celebrated, as all agree, from the very first rise of the church. It is also probable that Friday, the day of Christ's crucifixion, was early distinguished by particular honours from the other days of the week. See Jac. Godofred, in Codicem Theodosii, tom. i. Asseman. Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. i. Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdol. tom. v.

\* See Camp. Vitringa, de Synagoga veteri, lib. i. par. iii. cap. i. p. 432.

† See Blondi, de Episcopis et Presbyteris, sect. iii. p. 216, 213, 216. Just. Hen. Bohmer, Dissert. II. Juris Eccles. Antiqui, de Antelucenis Christianorum Cotibus, sect. 4. Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, book viii. chap. 1.

‡ 1 Cor. xiv. 6.

§ See Justin Martyr's second Apology, p. 98, &c.

|| This must be understood of churches well established, and regulated by fixed laws; for, in the first Christian assemblies, which were yet in an imperfect and fluctuating state, one or other of these circumstances of divine worship may possibly have been omitted.

¶ See the dissertations of the venerated and learned Pfaff, de Oblatione et Consecratione Eucharistica, which are contained in his Syntagma Dissertation. Theologicæ, published at Stutgard in 1720.

people assented, by saying Amen.\* The holy supper was distributed by the deacons; and this sacred institution was followed by sober repasts, denominated (from the excellent purpose to which they were directed,) *agape*, or feasts of charity.† Many attempts have been made to fix precisely the nature of these social feasts. But here it must be again considered, that the rites and customs of the primitive Christians were very different in different countries, and that consequently these feasts, like other institutions, were not every where celebrated in the same manner. This is the true and only way of explaining all the difficulties that can arise upon this subject.

VIII. The sacrament of *baptism* was administered in this century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font.‡ At first it was usual for all who laboured in the propagation of the Gospel, to be present at that solemn ceremony; and it was also customary, that the converts should be baptized and received into the church by those under whose ministry they had embraced the Christian doctrine. But this custom was soon changed. When the churches were well established, and governed by a system of fixed laws, then the right of baptizing the converts was vested in the bishop alone. This right, indeed, he conferred upon the *presbyters* and the *chorepiscopi* (country bishops,) when the bounds of the church were still farther enlarged; reserving, however, to himself the confirmation of that baptism which was administered by a presbyter.§ There were, doubtless, several circumstantial ceremonies observed in the administration of this sacrament for the sake of order and decency. Of these, however, it is not easy, nor perhaps is it possible to give a certain or satisfactory account, since, on this subject we are too much exposed to the illusion which arises from confounding the customs of the primitive times with those of succeeding ages.

IX. Persons who were visited with violent or dangerous disorders, sent, according to the apostle's direction,|| for the rulers of the church, and, after confessing their sins, were recommended by them to the divine mercy, in prayers full of piety and fervour, and were also anointed with oil. This rite has occasioned many debates, and, indeed, they must be endless,

\* Justin Martyr, *Apologia secunda*. The several authors who have investigated the manner of celebrating the Lord's supper, are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his *Bibliograph. Antiquar.* cap. xi.

† The authors who have described the *agape* are mentioned by Ittigius, in his *Selecta Historiæ Eccles. Capita*, Sæc. ii. cap. iii.; and also by Pfaff, de *Originibus Juris Eccles.* p. 68.

‡ See the learned dissertation of Jo. Gerard Vossius concerning baptism, *Disp. i. Thes. vi. p. 31, &c.* The reader will also find, in the xith chapter and xxvth section of the *Bibliogr. Antiquar.* of Fabricius, an account of the authors who have written upon this subject.

§ These observations will illustrate, and, perhaps, decide the question concerning the right of administering baptism, which has been so long debated among the learned, and with such ardour and vehemence. See Bohmer, *Dissert. xi. Juris Eccles.* p. 500; and also Le Cleve, *Biblioth. Universelle et Historique*, tom. iv. p. 93. || James v. 14.

since the silence of the ancient writers upon that head renders it impossible to decide the matter with certainty. The anointing of the sick is very rarely mentioned in the ancient records of the church, though there is no reason to doubt that it was an universal custom among Christians.\*

X. Neither Christ nor his apostles enacted any law concerning *fasting*. A custom, however, prevailed among many Christians, of joining abstinence with their prayers, especially when they were engaged in affairs of extraordinary importance.† As this custom was authorized by no public law, the time that was to be employed in these acts of abstinence was left to every one's private judgment; nor were those looked upon as criminal, who contented themselves with observing the rules of strict temperance, without going farther.‡ In the most ancient times we find no mention of any public and solemn fasts, except on the anniversary of Christ's crucifixion. But, in process of time, days of fasting were gradually introduced, first by custom, and afterwards by positive appointment, though it is not certain what those days were, or whether they were observed in the first century. Those, however, who affirm, that in the time of the apostles, or soon after, the fourth and sixth days of the week were observed as fasts, are not, it must be acknowledged, destitute of specious arguments in favour of their opinion.§

## CHAPTER V.

*Concerning the Divisions and Heresies which troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. THE Christian church was scarcely formed, when, in different places, there started up certain pretended reformers, who, not satisfied with the simplicity of that religion which was taught by the apostles, meditated changes of doctrine and worship, and set up a new religion, drawn from their own licentious imaginations. This we learn from the writings of the apostles, and particularly from the epistles of St. Paul, where we find, that some were inclined to force the doctrines of Christianity into a conformity with the philosophical systems they had adopted,|| while others were as studious to blend with these doctrines the opinions, customs, and traditions of the Jews. Several of these are mentioned by the apostles, such as Hymenæus, Alexander, Philetus, Hermogenes, Demas, and Diotrophes; though the four last are rather to be considered as apostates from the truth, than as corrupters of it.¶

\* The accounts which the ancient authors have given of this custom are the most of them collected in a treatise published by Launoy, de *Sacramentis Uctionis infirmorum*, cap. i. p. 444. in the first volume of his works. Among these accounts there are very few drawn from the writers of the first ages, and some passages applicable to this subject have been omitted by that learned author.

† 1 Cor. vii. 5.

‡ See the *Shepherd of Hermas*, book iii. *Similitud. v.*

§ See Beverege's *Vindication of the Canon*, in the second volume of his edition of the *Apostolic Fathers*.

|| 1 Tim. vi. 20. 1 Tim. i. 3, 4. Tit. iii. 9. Col. ii. 8.

¶ 2 Tim. ii. 18; and in other places. See also the accurate accounts given of these men by Vitringa, *Observ. Sacr. lib. iv. cap. ix.* p. 952. Ittigius, de *Hæresiarchis Ævi Apostol.* sect. i. cap. viii. Eudæus, de *Ecclesia Apostolica*, cap. v.

II. The influence of these new teachers was at first inconsiderable. During the lives of the apostles, their attempts toward the perversion of Christianity were attended with little success, and they had a very small number of followers. They, however, acquired credit and strength by degrees; and, even from the first dawn of the Gospel, imperceptibly laid the foundations of those sects, whose animosities and disputes produced afterwards such trouble and perplexity in the Christian church. The true state of these divisions is more involved in darkness than any other part of ecclesiastical history; and this obscurity proceeds, partly from the want of ancient records, partly from the abstruse and unintelligible nature of the doctrines that distinguished these various sects; and, finally, from the ignorance and prejudices of those, who have transmitted to us the accounts of them, which are yet extant. Of one thing, indeed, we are certain, and that is, that the greater part of these doctrines were chimerical and extravagant in the highest degree; and, far from containing any thing that could recommend them to a lover of truth, they rather deserve to occupy a place in the history of human delusion and folly.\*

III. Among the various sects that troubled the tranquillity of the Christian church, the leading one was that of the Gnostics. These enthusiastic and self-sufficient philosophers boasted of their being able to restore mankind to the *knowledge (gnosis)* of the true and Supreme Being, which had been lost in the world. They also foretold the approaching defeat of the *evil principle*, to whom they attributed the creation of this globe, and declared, in the most pompous terms, the destruction of his associates, and the ruin of his empire. An opinion has prevailed, derived from the authority of Clemens the Alexandrian, that the first appearance of the Gnostic sect is to be dated after the death of the apostles, and placed in the reign of the emperor Adrian; and it is also alleged, that, before this time, the church enjoyed a perfect tranquillity, undisturbed by dissensions, or sects of any kind. But the smallest degree of attention to the language of the Scriptures, not to mention the authority of other ancient records, will prevent us from adopting this groundless notion. For, from several passages of the sacred writings,† it evidently appears, that, even in the first century, the general Christian meeting was deserted, and separate assemblies were formed in several

\* Certain authors have written professedly of the sects that divided the church in this, and the following century, such as Iltigius, in his treatise de Hæresiarum Tivi Apostolice et Apostolice proximi, and also in the Appendix to the same work; Renatus Massuet, in his Dissertations prefixed to Irenæus, and Tillemont, in his Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise. But these authors, and others whom we shall not mention, have rather collected the materials from which a history of the ancient sects may be composed, than written their history. Hinckelmann, Thomasius, Dodwell, Horbius, and Basnage, have some of them promised, others of them attempted such a history; but none of them finished this useful design. It is therefore to be wished that some eminent writer, who, with a competent knowledge of ancient philosophy and literature, also possesses a penetrating and unbiassed judgment, would undertake this difficult but interesting work.

† 1 John ii. 18. 1 Tim. vi. 20. Col. ii. 8.

places, by persons infected with the Gnostic heresy; though, at the same time, it must be acknowledged, that this pernicious sect was not conspicuous, either for its number, or its reputation, before the time of Adrian. It is proper to observe here, that, under the general appellation of Gnostics, are comprehended all those who, in the first ages of Christianity, corrupted the doctrine of the Gospel by a profane mixture of the tenets of the oriental philosophy (concerning the origin of evil and the creation of the world,) with its divine truths.

IV. It was from this oriental philosophy, of which the leading principles have been already mentioned, that the Christian Gnostics derived their origin. If it was one of the chief tenets of this philosophy, that rational souls were imprisoned in corrupt matter, contrary to the will of the Supreme Deity, there were, however, in this same system, other doctrines which promised a deliverance from this deplorable state of servitude and darkness. The oriental sages expected the arrival of an extraordinary messenger of the Most High upon earth; a messenger invested with a divine authority, endowed with the most eminent sanctity and wisdom, and peculiarly commissioned to enlighten, with the knowledge of the Supreme Being, the darkened minds of miserable mortals, and to deliver them from the chains of the tyrants, and usurpers of this world. When, therefore, some of these philosophers perceived that Christ and his followers wrought miracles of the most amazing kind, and also of the most salutary nature to mankind, they were easily induced to believe that he was the great Messenger expected from above, to deliver men from the power of the malignant *genii*, or spirits, to which, according to their doctrine, the world was subjected, and to free their souls from the dominion of corrupt matter.—This supposition once admitted, they interpreted, or rather corrupted, all the precepts and doctrines of Christ and his apostles, in such a manner as to reconcile them with their own pernicious tenets.

V. From the false principle above mentioned, arose, as it was natural to expect, a multitude of sentiments and notions, most remote from the tenor of the gospel doctrines, and the nature of its precepts. The Gnostic doctrine, concerning the creation of the world by one or more inferior beings, of an evil, or, at least, of an imperfect nature, led that sect to deny the divine authority of the books of the Old Testament, whose accounts of the origin of things so palpably contradicted this idle fiction.—Through a frantic aversion to these sacred books, they lavished their encomiums upon the *serpent*, the first author of sin, and held in veneration some of the most impious and profligate persons of whom mention is made in sacred history. The pernicious influence of their fundamental principle carried them to all sorts of extravagance, filled them with an abhorrence of Moses and the religion he taught, and induced them to assert, that in imposing such a system of disagreeable and severe laws upon the Jews, he was only actuated by the malignant author of this world, who consulted his own glory and authority, and not the real

advantage of men. Their persuasion that *evil* resided in *matter*, as its centre and source, prevented their treating the body with the regard that is due to it, rendered them uniformly unfavourable to wedlock, as the means by which corporeal beings are multiplied, and led them to reject the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and its future re-union with the immortal spirit. Their notion that malevolent *genii* presided in nature, and that from them proceeded all diseases and calamities, wars and desolations, induced them to apply themselves to the study of magic, to weaken the powers or suspend the influences of these malignant agents. I omit the mention of several other extravagances in their system, the enumeration of which would be incompatible with the character of a compendious history.

VI. The notions of this sect concerning Jesus Christ were impious and extravagant. For, though they considered him as the Son of the Supreme God, sent from the *plenoma*, or habitation of the Everlasting Father, for the happiness of miserable mortals, yet they entertained unworthy ideas, both of his person and offices. They denied his deity, looking upon him as the mere Son of God, and consequently inferior to the Father; and they rejected his humanity, upon the supposition that every thing concrete and corporeal is, in itself, essentially and intrinsically evil. Hence the greatest part of the Gnostics denied that Christ was clothed with a *real* body, or that he suffered *really*, for the sake of mankind, the pains and sorrows which he is said to have sustained in the sacred history. They maintained that he came to mortals with no other view, than to deprive the tyrants of this world of their influence upon virtuous and heaven-born souls, and, destroying the empire of these wicked spirits, to teach mankind how they might separate the divine mind from the impure body, and render the former worthy of being united to the Father of spirits.

VII. Their doctrine, relating to morals and practice, was of two kinds, which were extremely different from each other. The greatest part of this sect adopted rules of life that were full of austerity, recommended a strict and rigorous abstinence, and prescribed the most severe bodily mortifications, from a notion that these observances had a happy influence in purifying and enlarging the mind, and in disposing it for the contemplation of celestial things. As they looked upon it to be the unhappiness of the soul to have been associated, at all, to a malignant, terrestrial body, so they imagined that the more the body was extenuated, the less it would corrupt and degrade the mind, or divert it from pursuits of a spiritual and divine nature: all the Gnostics, however, were not so severe in their moral discipline. Some maintained that there was no moral difference in human actions; and thus confounding right and wrong, they gave a loose rein to all the passions, and asserted the innocence of following blindly all their motions, and of living by their tumultuous dictates.\* There

is nothing surprising or unaccountable in this difference between the Gnostic moralists; for, when we examine the matter with attention, we shall find, that the same doctrine may very naturally have given rise to these opposite sentiments. As they all deemed the body the centre and source of evil, those of that sect, who were of a morose and austere disposition, would be hence naturally led to mortify and combat the body as the enemy of the soul; and those who were of a voluptuous turn, might also consider the actions of the body as having no relation, either of congruity or incongruity, to the state of a soul in communion with God.

VIII. Such extraordinary doctrines had certainly need of an undoubted authority to support them; and, as this authority was not to be found in the writings of the evangelists or apostles, recourse was had to fables and stratagems. When the Gnostics were challenged to produce the sources whence they had drawn such strange tenets, and an authority proper to justify the confidence with which they taught them, some referred to fictitious writings of Abraham, Zoroaster, Christ, and his apostles; others boasted of their having drawn these opinions from certain secret doctrines of Christ, which were not exposed to vulgar eyes; others affirmed, that they had arrived at these sublime degrees of wisdom by an innate force and vigour of mind; and some asserted, that they were instructed in these mysterious parts of theological science by Theudas, a disciple of St. Paul, and by Matthias, one of the friends of our Lord. As to those among the Gnostics who did not utterly reject the books of the New Testament, it is proper to observe, that they not only interpreted those sacred books most absurdly, by neglecting the true spirit of the words and the intention of the writers, but also corrupted them, in the most perfidious manner, by curtailing and adding, in order to remove what was unfavourable, or to produce something conformable to their pernicious and extravagant system.

IX. It has been already observed, that the Gnostics were divided in their opinions before they embraced Christianity. This appears from the account which has been given above of the oriental philosophy; and hence we may see the reason why they were formed into so many different sects after their receiving the Christian faith. For, as all of them endeavoured to force the doctrines of the Gospel into a conformity with their particular sentiments and tenets, so Christianity must have appeared in various forms, among the different members of a sect, which passed, however, under one general name. Another circumstance, which contributed to this diversity of sects, was, that some, being Jews by birth (as Cerinthus and others,) could not so easily assume that contempt of Moses, and that aversion to his history, which were so virulently indulged by those who had no attachment to the Jewish nation or to its religious institutions. We may also observe, that the whole Gnostic system was destitute of any sure or solid foundation, and depended both for its existence and support, upon the airy suggestions of genius and fancy. This consideration alone

\* See the Stromata of Clemens Alexandrinus, lib. iii. cap. v.

is a sufficient key to explain the divisions that reigned in this sect, since *uniformity* can never subsist, with assurance, but upon the basis of evident and substantial truth; and *variety* must naturally introduce itself into those systems and institutions which are formed and conducted by the sole powers of invention and fancy.

X. As then the Christian religion was, in its rise, corrupted by the mixture of an impious and chimerical philosophy with its pure and sublime doctrines, it will be proper to mention here the heads of those sects, who, in the first century, cast a cloud upon the lustre of the rising church. Among these, many have given the first place to Dositheus, a Samaritan. It is certain, that, about the time of our Saviour, a man so named, lived among the Samaritans, and abandoned that sect; but all the accounts we have of him tend to show, that he is improperly placed among mere heretics, and should rather be ranked among the enemies of Christianity: for this delirious man set himself up for the Messiah, whom God had promised to the Jews, and disowning, in consequence, the divine mission of Christ, could not be said to corrupt his doctrine.\*

XI. The same observation is applicable to Simon Magus. This impious man is not to be ranked among those who corrupted with their errors the purity and simplicity of the Christian doctrine; nor is he to be considered as the parent and chief of the heretical tribe, in which point of light he has been injudiciously viewed by almost all ancient and modern writers. He is rather to be placed in the number of those who were enemies to the progress and advancement of Christianity; for it is manifest, from all the records we have concerning him, that after his defection from the Christians, he retained not the least attachment to Christ, but opposed himself openly to that divine personage, and assumed to himself blasphemously the title of the *supreme power of God*.†

XII. The accounts which ancient writers give us of Simon the magician, and of his opinions, seem so different and indeed so inconsistent with each other, that several learned men have considered them as regarding two different persons, bearing the name of Simon; the one a magician, and an apostate from Christianity; the other a Gnostic philosopher. This opinion, which supposes a fact, without any other proof than a seeming difference in the narration of the ancient historians, ought not to be too lightly adopted. To depart from the authority of ancient writers in this matter is by no means prudent: nor is it necessary to reconcile the different accounts already mentioned, whose inconsistency is not real, but apparent only. Simon was by birth a Samaritan, or a Jew; when he had studied philosophy at Alexandria,‡ he made a public profession of magic (which was not a very uncommon circumstance at that time,) and persuaded the Samaritans, by fictitious miracles, that he had

received from God the power of commanding and restraining those evil beings by which mankind were tormented.\* Having seen the miracles which Philip wrought by a divine power, he joined himself to this apostle, and embraced the doctrine of Christ, but with no other design than to receive the power of working miracles, in order to promote a low interest, and to preserve and increase his impious authority over the minds of men. Then St. Peter pointed out to him solemnly the impiety of his intentions and the vanity of his hopes, in that severe discourse recorded in the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles: then the vile impostor not only returned to his former ways by an entire defection from the Christians, but also opposed, wherever he came, the progress of the Gospel, and even visited different countries with that odious intent. Many things are recorded of this impostor, of his tragical end, and of the statue erected to him at Rome, which the greatest part of the learned reject as fabulous. They are at least uncertain, and destitute of all probability.†

XIII. It is beyond all doubt, that Simon was in the class of those philosophers, who not only maintained the eternity of *matter*, but also the existence of an *evil being* who presided, and thus shared the empire of the universe with the supreme and beneficent *Mind*; and, as there was a considerable variety in the sentiments of the different members of this sect, it is more than probable, that Simon embraced the opinion of those who held that matter moved from eternity by an intrinsic and necessary activity, had, by its innate force, produced at a certain period, from its own substance, the evil principle which now exercises dominion over it, with all his numerous train of attendants. From this pernicious doctrine, the other errors attributed to him concerning fate, the indifference of human actions, the impurity of the human body, the power of magic, and the like extravagances, flow naturally, as from their true and genuine source.‡ But this odious magician still proceeded to more shocking degrees of enormity in his mon-

\* Acts viii. 9, 10.

† See Beauvoisine, Histoire de Manich. p. 203, 395.—Van Dale's Dissertation, de Statua Simonis, subjoined to his discourse concerning the ancient oracles.—Dellingius, Observat. Sacr. lib. I. observ. xxxvi. Tillamont, Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. I. p. 340.

‡ The circumstances of Simon's tragical end; his having pretended to fly by a miraculous power, in order to please the emperor Nero, who was fond of magic; his falling to the ground, and breaking his limbs, in consequence of the prayers of St. Peter and St. Paul; and his putting himself to death, through shame and despair, at having been thus defeated by the superior power of the apostles; all these romantic fictions have derived their credit from a set of ecclesiastical writers, who, on many occasions, prefer the marvellous to the truth, as favourable to a system of religion, or rather superstition, which truth and reason loudly disown.

§ The dissertation of Horbuis, concerning Simon, the magician, which was published not long ago in the Biblioth. Heresiologica of Voigtius, tom. I. part iii. seems preferable to any thing else upon that subject, though it be a juvenile performance, and not sufficiently finished. He follows the steps of his master, Thomasius, who, with admirable penetration, discovered the true source of that multitude of errors with which the Gnostics, and particularly Simon, were so dismally polluted. Voigtius gives a list of the other authors who have made mention of this impostor.

\* See Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, lib. ii. cap. xiii. and Rich. Simon, Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques de M. Du Pin, tom. iii. cap. xiii.

† Origen adv. Celsus, lib. v.

‡ Clementina Homil. ii. p. 633, tom. ii. PP. Apost.

strous fictions; for he pretended, that in his person resided the greatest and most powerful of the divine æons; that another æon of the female sex, the mother of all human souls, dwelt in the person of his mistress Helena,\* and that he came, by the command of God upon earth, to abolish the empire of those who had formed this material world, and to deliver Helena from their power and dominion.

XIV. Another wrong-headed teacher, named Menander, a Samaritan also by birth, appeared in this century. He is said to have been instructed by Simon; but this opinion has no other foundation than the groundless notion, that all the Gnostic sects derived their origin from that magician. He ought rather to be ranked with the Lunatics, than with the heretics of antiquity, since he also took it into his head to exhibit himself to the world as the promised Saviour; for it appears, by the testimonies of Irenæus, Justin, and Tertullian, that he pretended to be one of the æons sent from the pleroma or celestial regions, to succour the souls that lay groaning under bodily oppression and servitude, and to maintain them against the violence and stratagems of the dæmons who held the reins of empire in this sublunary world. As this doctrine was built upon the same foundation with that of Simon Magus, the ancient writers looked upon him as the instructor of Menander.

XV. If then we separate these three persons now successively mentioned, from the heretics of the first century, we may rank among the chief of the Christian sectaries, and particularly those who bear the general name of Gnostics, the Nicolaitans, whom Christ himself mentions with abhorrence by the mouth of his apostle.† It is true, indeed, that the divine Saviour does not reproach them with erroneous opinions concerning the deity, but with the licentiousness of their practice, and the contempt of that solemn law which the apostles had enacted (Acts, xv. 29.) against fornication, and the use of meats offered to idols. It is, however, certain, that the writers of the second and the following centuries, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens, and others, affirm, that the Nicolaitans adopted the sentiments of the Gnostics concerning the two principles of all things, the æons, and the origin of this terrestrial globe. The authority of these writers would be entirely satisfactory in this matter, were there not some reason to imagine that they confounded, in their narrations, two sects very different from each other; that of the Nicolaitans, mentioned in the Revelations; and another, founded by a certain Nicolaus, in the second century, upon the principles of the Gnostics. But this is a matter of too doubtful a nature to justify a positive decision on either side.

XVI. There is no sort of doubt, that Cerenthus may be placed with propriety among

the Gnostics, though the learned are not entirely agreed whether he belongs to the heretics of the first or the second century.\* This man was by birth a Jew, and, having applied himself to letters and philosophy at Alexandria,† attempted at length, to form a new and singular system of doctrine and discipline, by a monstrous combination of the doctrines of Christ with the opinions and errors of the Jews and Gnostics. From the latter he borrowed the pleroma, their æons, their demiurge, &c. and so modified and tempered these fictions, as to give them an air of judaism, which must have considerably favoured the progress of his heresy. He taught "that the Creator of this world, whom he considered also as the sovereign and lawgiver of the Jewish people, was a being endowed with the greatest virtues, and derived his birth from the Supreme God; that he fell by degrees, from his native virtue and his primitive dignity; that God in consequence of this determined to destroy his empire, and sent upon earth, for this purpose, one of the ever-happy and glorious æons, whose name was Christ; that this Christ chose for his habitation the person of Jesus, a man of the most illustrious sanctity and justice, the son of Joseph and Mary, and, descending in the form of a dove, entered into him while he was receiving baptism from John in the waters of Jordan: that Jesus, after his union with Christ, opposed himself with vigour to the God of the Jews, and was by his instigation, seized and crucified by the Hebrew chiefs; and that, when Jesus became a prisoner, Christ ascended into heaven, so that the man Jesus alone was subjected to the pains of an ignominious death." Cerenthus required of his followers, that they should worship the Father of Christ, even the Supreme God, in conjunction with the Son; that they should abandon the lawgiver of the Jews, whom he looked upon as the Creator of the world; that they should retain a part of the law given by Moses, but should, nevertheless, employ their principal attention and care to regulate their lives by the precepts of Christ. To encourage them to this, he promised them the resurrection of this mortal body, after which was to commence a scene of the most exquisite delights, during Christ's earthly reign of a thousand years, which would be succeeded by a happy and never-ending life in the celestial world; for he held, that Christ will one day return upon earth, and, renewing his former union with the man Jesus, will reign with his people in the land of Palestine during a thousand years.

XVII. It has been already observed, that the church was troubled with early disputes concerning the law of Moses and the Jewish rites. Those, however, who considered the observance of the Mosaic rites as necessary to salvation, had not, in this first century, proceeded so far as to break off all communion with

\* Some very learned men have given an allegorical explanation of what the ancient writers say concerning Helena, the mistress of this magician, and imagine, that by the name Helena is signified either *matter* or *spirit*. But nothing is more easy than to show upon what slight foundations this opinion is built.

† Rev. ii. 6, 14, 15.

\* See San. Bausage, *Annal. Polit. Eccles.* tom. ii.; and Faydit, *Eclaircissement sur l'Histoire Eccles. des deux premiers Siècles*, cap. v. The opinion of these two learned men is opposed by Buddeus, *de Eccles. Apostolica*, cap. v.

† Theodoret. *Fabul. Hæret. lib. ii. cap. iii.*



such as differed from them in this matter; therefore they were still regarded as brethren, though of the weaker sort. But when, after the second destruction of Jerusalem, under the emperor Adrian, these zealots for the Jewish rites deserted the ordinary assemblies of Christians, and established separate meetings among themselves, they were numbered with those sects who had departed from the pure doctrine of Christ. Hence arose the names of Naza-

renes and Ebionites, by which the judaizing Christians were distinguished from those who looked upon the Mosaic worship and ceremonies as entirely abolished by the appearance of Christ upon earth. We shall only observe farther under this head, that though the Nazarenes and Ebionites are generally placed among the sects of the apostolic age, they really belong to the second century, which was the earliest period of their existence as a sect.

## THE SECOND CENTURY.

### PART I.

#### THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

##### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. IN this century, the Roman sceptre was, for the most part, swayed by princes of a mild and moderate turn. Trajan, though too eagerly bent upon the pursuit of glory, and not always sufficiently attentive to his conduct, or prudent in his measures, was nevertheless endowed with many virtues; and the predominant lines of his character were clemency and benevolence. Adrian was of a more harsh and intractable temper, yet far from deserving the odious appellation of a wicked or unjust prince. He was of a mixed character, chargeable with several vices, and estimable on account of some excellent qualities. The Antonines were illustrious models of humanity, goodness, and sublime virtue. Severus himself, in whose character and disposition such an unexpected and disadvantageous change was effected, was, in the beginning of his reign, unjust toward none; and even the Christians were treated by him with equity and mildness.

II. This lenity of the emperors proved advantageous to those Christians who lived under the Roman sceptre; it sometimes suspended their suffering, and alleviated the burthen of their distresses; for, though edicts of a severe nature were issued out against them, and the magistrates, animated by the priests and by the multitude, shed their blood with a cruelty which frequently exceeded even the dictates of the most barbarous laws, yet there was always some remedy that accompanied these evils, and softened their severity. Trajan, however condemnable in other respects, on account of his conduct toward the Christians, was yet engaged, by the representation that Pliny the younger gave of them, to forbid all search to be made after them. He also prohibited all anonymous libels and accusations, by which they had so

often been perfidiously exposed to the greatest sufferings.\* Antoninus Pius went so far as to enact penal laws against their accusers;† and others, by various acts of beneficence and compassion, defended them from the injurious treatment of the priests and people. Hence it came to pass, that, in this century, the limits of the church were considerably enlarged, and the number of converts to Christianity prodigiously augmented. Of the truth of this, we have the most respectable and authentic testimonies in the writings of the ancients; testimonies, whose evidence and authority are every way superior to the vain attempts which some have made to obscure and weaken them.‡

III. It is not easy to point out particularly the different countries on which the light of celestial truth first rose in this age. The ancient records that yet remain, do not give us information sufficient to determine that point with certainty; nor is it, indeed, a matter of high importance. We are, however, assured, by the most unexceptionable testimonies, that Christ was worshipped as God almost throughout the whole East, as also among the Germans, Spaniards, Celts, Britons, and many other nations;§ but which of them received the Gospel in the first century and which in the second, is a question unanswerable at this distance of time. Pantaenus, the head of the Alexandrian school, is said to have conveyed to the Indians the knowledge of Christ.|| But,

\* See Pliny's epistles, book x. let. xviii.

† Eusebius, *Ecl. Hist.* lib. iv. cap. xiii.

‡ See Moyle's letters concerning the thundering legion. with the remarks which Dr. Mosheim has annexed to his Latin translation of them, published at the end of a work entitled, *Syntagma Dissert. ad Sanctiores Discipulas pertinentium*. See also the Dialogue between Justin Martyr and Trypho the Jew.

§ Irenæus contra Hæres. lib. i. cap. x. Tertullian adv. Judæos, cap. vii.

|| Eusebius, *Hist. Ecl.* b. v. c. x. Jerome, *Catol. Script. Ecl.* c. xxxvi.

after an attentive examination of the account which Eusebius gives of this point, it will appear that these supposed Indians were Jews, inhabitants of the happy Arabia, whom Bartholomew the apostle had before instructed in the doctrines of Christianity; for, according to the account of St. Jerome, Pantænus found among this people the Gospel of St. Matthew which they had received from Bartholomew, their first teacher.

IV. The Christian religion, having penetrated into the province of Gaul, seems to have passed thence into that part of Germany which was subject to the Romans, and afterwards into Britain.\* Certain German churches, indeed, are fondly ambitious of deriving their origin from St. Peter, and from the companions of the other apostles. The Britons also are willing to believe, upon the authority of Bede, that in this century, and under the reign of Marcus Antoninus, their king Lucius addressed himself to Eleutherus, the Roman pontiff, for doctors to instruct him in the Christian religion, and, having obtained his request, embraced the Gospel.† But, after all, these traditions are extremely doubtful, and are, indeed, rejected by such as have learning sufficient to weigh the credibility of ancient narrations.

V. It is very possible that the light of Christianity may have reached Trans-Alpine Gaul, now called France, before the conclusion of the apostolic age, either by the ministry of the apostles themselves, or their immediate successors. But we have no records that mention, with certainty, the establishment of Christian churches in this part of Europe before the second century. Pothinus, a man of exemplary piety and zeal, set out from Asia in company with Irenæus and others, and laboured in the Christian cause with such success among the Gauls, that churches were established at Lyons and Vienne, of which Pothinus himself became the first bishop.‡

VI. The writers of this century attribute this rapid progress of Christianity to the power of God, to the energy of divine truth, to the extraordinary gifts which were imparted to the first Christians, and the miracles and prodigies that were wrought in their behalf, and at their command; and they scarcely ascribe any part of the amazing success that attended the preaching of the Gospel, to the intervening succours of human means, or second causes.

\* Ursinus, Ebelius and others, have written learnedly concerning the origin of the German churches, which Tertallian and Irenæus mention as erected in this century. Add to these the ample illustrations of this subject, which are to be found in Liron's *Singularités Histor. et Liter.* tom. iv. The celebrated Dom. Calmet has judiciously refuted the common and popular accounts of the first Christian doctors in Germany, in his *Hist. de la Lorraine*, tom. i. *Diss. sur les Evêques de Treves*, par. iii. iv. See also Bollandus, *Act. Sæcutorum*, and Hontheim, *Diss. de Æra Episcop. Trevir.* tom. i.

† See Usher's *Antiq. Ecclæs. Britann.* cap. i.; also Godwin, *de Conversione Britan.* cap. i.; and Rapin's *History of England*.

‡ See the epistle of Peter de Marca, concerning the rise of Christianity in France, published among the dissertations of that author, and also by Valesius, in his edition of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*. See also *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. i., and Liron's *Singularités Histor. et Littéraires*, vol. iv.

But this is carrying the matter too far. The wisdom of human counsels, and the useful efforts of learning and prudence, are too inconsiderately excluded from this account of things; for it is beyond all doubt, that the pious diligence and zeal, with which many learned and worthy men recommended the sacred writings, and spread them abroad in translations, so as to render them useful to those who were ignorant of the language in which they were written, contributed much to the success and propagation of the Christian doctrine. Latin versions of these sacred books were multiplied by the pious labours of the learned, with particular diligence, because that language was now more general than any other.\* Among these versions, that which was distinguished by the name of the Italic obtained universally the preference, and was followed by the Syriac, Egyptian, and Æthiopic versions, whose dates it is impossible to fix with certainty.†

VII. Among the obstacles that retarded the progress of Christianity, the impious calumnies of its enemies were the most considerable. The persons, the characters, and religious sentiments of the first Christians, were most unjustly treated, and most perfidiously misrepresented to the credulous multitude,‡ who were restrained by this only from embracing the Gospel. Those, therefore, who, by their apologetic writings for the Christians, destroyed the poisonous influence of detraction, rendered, no doubt, signal service to the doctrine of Christ, by removing the chief impediment to its progress. Nor were the writings of such as combated with success the ancient heretics without their use, especially in the early periods of the church; for the insipid and extravagant doctrines of these sectaries, and the gross immoralities with which they were chargeable, were extremely prejudicial to the Christian religion, by disgusting many at whatever bore the Christian name; but, when it was known by the writings of those who defended Christianity, that these corrupt heretics were held in aversion, instead of being patronized by the true followers of Christ, the clouds that were cast over the religion of Jesus were dispersed, and the prejudices that had been raised against it were fully removed.

VIII. It is easier to conceive than to express, how much the *miraculous powers* and *extraordinary gifts*, which were displayed in the ministry of the first heralds of the Gospel, contributed to enlarge the bounds of the church. These gifts, however, which were bestowed for wise and important reasons, began gradually to diminish in proportion as the reasons ceased for which they were conferred. And, accord-

\* See Augustin. *de doctrina Christiana*, lib. ii. cap. xi.

† See Jo. Guttlob Carpov. *Critica sacra Vet Test.* p. 663.

‡ Nothing more injurious can be conceived than the terms of contempt, indignation, and reproach, which the Heathens employed in expressing their hatred against the Christians, who were called by them *atheists*, because they denied the heathen Polytheism; *magicians*, because they wrought miracles; *self-murderers*, because they suffered martyrdom cheerfully for the truth; *haters of the light*, because, to avoid the fury of the persecutions raised against them, they were obliged, at first, to hold their religious assemblies in the night. See Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, book i. cap. ii.

ingly, when almost all nations were enlightened with the truth, and the number of Christian churches daily increased, the miraculous gift of tongues began gradually to decrease. It appears at the same time, from unexceptionable testimonies, that the other extraordinary gifts with which the omnipotence and wisdom of the Most High had so richly endowed the rising church, were in several places continued during this century.\*

IX. We cannot indeed place, with certainty, among the effects of a miraculous power yet remaining in the church, the story of the Christian legion, who, by their prayers, drew from heaven a refreshing shower upon the army of Marcus Antoninus, ready to perish with thirst, when that emperor was at war with the Marcomanni. This remarkable event (which gave to the Christians, to whom it was attributed, the name of the *thundering legion*, on account of the thunder and lightning that destroyed the enemy, while the shower revived the fainting Romans) has been mentioned by many writers. But whether it was really miraculous or not, has been much disputed among learned men. Some think that the Christians, by a pious sort of mistake, attributed this unexpected and seasonable shower, which saved the Roman army, to a miraculous interposition; and this opinion is, indeed, supported by the weightiest reasons, as well as by the most respectable authorities.†

X. Let us distinguish what is doubtful in this story, from that which is certain. It is undoubted, that the Roman troops, enclosed by the enemy, and reduced to the most deplorable and even desperate condition, by the thirst under which they languished in a parched desert, were revived by a sudden and unexpected rain. It is also certain, that both the Heathens and the Christians considered this event as extraordinary and miraculous; the former attributing it to Jupiter, Mercury, or the power of magic; the latter to Christ, interposing thus unexpectedly, in consequence of their prayers. It is equally indisputable, that

\* Pfanner, de donis miraculosis; Spencer, Not. ad Orig. contra Celsum; Manuachius, Origines et Antiquitat. Christiana. tom. i.

† Such readers as are desirous to know what learned men have alleged on both sides of this curious question, may consult Witsius's *Dissertat. de Legione Fulminatrice*, which is subjoined to his *Ægyptiaca*, in defence of this miracle; as also what is alleged against it by Dan. La Roque, in a discourse upon that subject subjoined to the *Adversaria Sacra* of Math. La Roque, his father. But, above all, the controversy between Sir Peter King [?] and Mr. Walter Moyle, upon this subject, is worthy of the attention of the curious; and like wise the dissertation of the learned Jablonski, inserted in the eighth volume of the *Miscellanea Lipsien-sia*, p. 417, under the title of *Spiritibus de Legione Fulminatrice*. The last mentioned author investigates, with great acuteness, the reasons and motives which induced the Christians to place so inconsiderately this shower in the list of miracles.

[?] It is by mistake that Dr. Mosheim confounds Sir Peter King, lord Chancellor of England, with the person who carried on the controversy with Moyle, concerning the thundering legion. Moyle's adversary was Mr. King, rector of Topsham, near Exeter, which was the place of his nativity, and also that of the famous chancellor who bore his name. See the letters addressed to the Rev. Mr. King, in the posthumous collection of Locke's Letters, published by Collins. See also Lardner's Collection of Heathen and Jewish Testimonies, &c., vol. ii.

a considerable number of Christians served at this time in the Roman army; and it is exceedingly probable, that, in such trying circumstances of calamity and distress, they implored the merciful interposition and succour of their God and Saviour; and, as the Christians of those times looked upon all extraordinary events as miracles, and ascribed to their prayers all the uncommon occurrences of an advantageous nature that happened to the Roman empire, it will not appear surprising, that, on the present occasion, they attributed the deliverance of Antoninus and his army to a miraculous interposition which they had obtained from above. But, on the other hand, it must be carefully observed, that it is an invariable maxim, universally adopted by the wise and judicious, that no events are to be esteemed miraculous, which may be rationally attributed to natural causes, and accounted for by a recourse to the ordinary dispensations of Providence; and, as the unexpected shower, which restored the expiring force of the Romans, may be easily explained without rising beyond the usual and ordinary course of nature, the conclusion is manifest; nor can it be doubtful in what light we are to consider that remarkable event.

XI. The Jews were visited with new calamities, first under Trajan, and then under Adrian, when, under the standard of Barcochebas, who gave himself out for the Messiah, they rose in rebellion against the Romans. In consequence of this sedition, prodigious numbers of that miserable people were put to the sword; and a new city, called *Ælia Capitolina*, was raised upon the ruins of Jerusalem, into which no Jew was permitted to enter.‡ This defeat of the Jews tended to confirm, in some measure, the external tranquility of the Christian Church; for that turbulent and perfidious nation had hitherto vexed and oppressed the Christians, not only by presenting everywhere to the Roman magistrates complaints and accusations against them, but also by treating them in the most injurious manner in Palestine and the neighbouring countries, because they refused to succeed them against the Romans. But this new calamity, which fell upon that seditious nation, put it out of their power to exercise their malignity against the disciples of Jesus, as they had formerly done.

XII. Among other accessions to the splendour and force of the growing church, we may reckon the learned and ingenious labours of those philosophers and literati, who were converted to Christianity in this century. I am sensible that the advantages hence arising to the cause of true religion will be disputed by many; and, indeed, when the question is thus proposed, whether, upon the whole, the interests of Christianity have gained or lost by the writings of the learned, and the speculations of philosophers who have been employed in its defence, I confess myself incapable of solving it in a satisfactory manner; for nothing is more manifest than this truth, that the noble simplicity and dignity of religion were sadly corrupted in many places, when the philoso-

\* Justin Mart. Dial. cum Tryphone, p. 49, 378.

phers blended their opinions with its pure doctrines, and were so audacious as to submit that divine system of faith and piety to be scrutinized and modified by the fallible rules of imperfect reason.

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. In the beginning of this century, there were no laws in force against the Christians; for the senate had annulled the cruel edicts of Nero, and Nerva had abrogated the sanguinary laws of his predecessor, Domitian. But notwithstanding this, a horrid custom prevailed, of persecuting the Christians, and even of putting them to death, as often as sanguinary priests, or an outrageous populace instigated by those ecclesiastics, demanded their destruction. Hence it happened, that, even under the reign of the good Trajan, popular clamours\* were raised against the Christians, many of whom fell victims to the rage of a merciless multitude. Such were the riotous proceedings that happened in Bithynia, under the administration of Pliny the younger, who, on that occasion, wrote to the emperor, to know in what manner he was to conduct himself toward the Christians. The answer which he received from Trajan amounted to this, "That the Christians were not to be officiously sought after,† but that such as were accused and convicted of an adherence to Christianity were to be put to death as wicked citizens, if they did not return to the religion of their ancestors."

II. This edict of Trajan, being registered among the public and solemn laws of the Roman empire, set bounds, indeed, to the fury of those who persecuted the Christians, but was the occasion of martyrdom to many, even under the best emperors. For, as often as an accuser appeared, and the person accused of an adherence to Christianity confessed the truth of the charge, the alternative was apostasy or death, since a magnanimous perseverance in the Christian faith was, according to the edict of Trajan, a capital crime. And, accordingly, the venerable and aged Simeon, son of Cleophas, and bishop of Jerusalem, was, by this very law, crucified in consequence of an accusation formed against him by the Jews.‡ By the same law, also, was the great and pious Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, ordered by Trajan himself to expire in the Roman theatre, exposed to the rapacity of furious beasts;§ for, as the law simply denounced death to such as were convicted of an attachment to Christ, the kind of punishment was left by the legislator to the choice of the judge.

III. Such of the Christians as could conceal their profession were indeed sheltered under the law of Trajan, which was, therefore, a disagreeable restraint upon the heathen priests,

\* Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xxxii.

† See Pliny's Letters, book x. let. xvii. and xviii., which have been illustrated by many learned men, such as Vossius, Bohner, Baldwin, Heuman, and others.

‡ Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xxvii. p. 103.

§ See the Acta Martyrii Ignatiani, published by Ru-  
mart, and also in the Collection of the Apostolic Fathers.

who breathed nothing but fury against the disciples of Jesus. The office of an accuser was also become dangerous, and very few were disposed to undertake it, so that the sacerdotal craft was now inventing new methods to oppress the Christians. The law of Trajan was therefore artfully evaded under the reign of his successor Adrian. The populace, set in motion by the priests, demanded of the magistrates, with one voice, during the public games, the destruction of the Christians; and the magistrates, fearing that a sedition might be the consequence of despising or opposing these popular clamours, were too much disposed to indulge them in their request. During these commotions, Serenus Gramianus, proconsul of Asia, represented to the emperor how barbarous and unjust it was to sacrifice, to the fury of a lawless multitude, persons who had been convicted of no crime. Nor were his wise and equitable remonstrances fruitless; for Adrian, by an edict issued out to these magistrates, prohibited the putting the Christians to death, unless they were regularly accused and convicted of crimes committed against the laws; and this edict appears to have been a solemn renewal of the law of Trajan.\* The moderation of the emperor, in this edict, may, perhaps, have been produced by the admirable apologies of Quadratus and Aristides, in favour of the Christians, which were every way proper to dispel the angry prejudices of a mind that had any sense of equity and humanity left. But it was not from the Romans alone, that the disciples of Christ were to feel oppression; Barcochebas, the pretended king of the Jews, whom Adrian afterwards defeated, vented against them all his fury, because they refused to join his standard, and second his rebellion.†

IV. The law of Adrian, according to its natural sense, seemed to cover the Christians from the fury of their enemies, since it rendered them punishable on no other account than the commission of crimes, and since the magistrates refused to interpret their religion as the crime mentioned in the imperial edict. Therefore their enemies invented a new method of attacking them under the reign of Antoninus Pius, even by accusing them of impiety and atheism. This calumny was refuted in an apology for the Christians, presented to the emperor by Justin Martyr; in consequence of which, this equitable prince ordered that all proceedings against them should be regulated by the law of Adrian.‡ This, however, was not sufficient to suppress the rage of bloodthirsty persecution; for some time after this, on occasion of some earthquakes which happened in Asia, the people renewed their violence against the Christians, whom they considered as the authors of those calamities, and treated consequently in the most cruel and injurious manner. The emperor, informed of these unjust and barbarous proceedings, addressed an edict to the whole province of Asia, in which he denounced capital punishment

\* Compare Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. iv. with Balduinus ad Edicta Princip. in Christianos, p. 73.

† Justin Mart. Apologia secunda, p. 72, edit. Colon.

‡ Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xxvi. p. 148.

against such as should, for the future, accuse the Christians, without being able to prove them guilty of any crime.\*

V. This worthy prince was succeeded by Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, the philosopher, whom most writers have celebrated beyond measure on account of his extraordinary wisdom and virtue. It is not, however, in his conduct toward the Christians that we must look for the reasons of these pompous encomiums; for, here the clemency and justice of that emperor suffer a strange eclipse. He did not, indeed, revoke the edict of Antoninus Pius, or abrogate the laws which the preceding emperors had enacted in favour of the Christians; but he did what was equally pernicious to them. Without examining impartially their cause, he lent an easy and attentive ear to the most virulent insinuations of their enemies, especially to the malignant calumnies of the philosophers, who accused them of the most horrid crimes and the most monstrous impiety, and charged them with renewing the shocking feasts of Thyestes, and the incestuous amours of the Theban prince; so that, if we except that of Nero, there was no reign under which the Christians were more injuriously and cruelly treated, than under that of the wise and virtuous Marcus Aurelius; and yet there was no reign under which such numerous and victorious *Apologies* were published in their behalf. Those which Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and Tatian, wrote upon this occasion, are still extant.

VI. This emperor issued against the Christians, whom he regarded as a vain, obstinate, and vicious set of men, edicts,† which, upon the whole, were very unjust; though we do not know, at this distance of time, their particular contents. In consequence of these imperial edicts, the judges and magistrates received the accusations, which even slaves, and the vilest of the perjured rabble, brought against the followers of Jesus; and the Christians were put to the most cruel tortures and were condemned to meet death in the most barbarous forms, notwithstanding their perfect innocence, and their persevering and solemn denial of the horrid crimes laid to their charge. The imperial edicts were so positive and express against inflicting punishment upon such of the Christians as were guilty of no crime, that the corrupt judges, who, through motives of interest or popularity, desired their destruction, were obliged to suborn false accusers to charge them with actions that might bring them within the reach of the laws. Hence

many fell victims to cruel superstition and popular fury, seconded by the corruption of a wicked magistracy, and the connivance of a prince, who, with respect to one set of men, forgot those principles of justice and clemency which directed his conduct toward all others. Among these victims, there were many men of illustrious piety, and some of eminent learning and abilities, such as the holy and venerable Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and Justin Martyr, so deservedly renowned for his erudition and philosophy.‡ Many churches, particularly those of Lyons and Vienna, were almost entirely destroyed, during this violent persecution, which raged in the year 177, and will be an indelible stain upon the memory of the prince by whose order it was carried on.†

VII. During the reign of Commodus, the Christians suffered very little; no general persecution raged against them; and any cruelties which they endured were confined to a small number, who had newly abandoned the Pagan superstitions.† But the scene changed toward the latter end of this century, when Severus was declared emperor. Then Egypt and other provinces were dyed with the blood of martyrs, as appears from the testimonies of Tertullian, Clemens of Alexandria, and other writers. Those, therefore, are not to be followed, who affirm, that the Christians suffered nothing under Severus, before the beginning of the third century, which was distinguished by the cruel edicts of this emperor against their lives and fortunes; for, as the imperial laws against the Christians were not abrogated, and the iniquitous edicts of Trajan and Marcus Antoninus were still in force, there was a door, in consequence, open to the fury and injustice of corrupt magistrates, as often as they were pleased to exercise them upon the church. It was this series of calamities, under which it groaned toward the conclusion of the second century, which engaged Tertullian to write his *Apology*, and several other books, in defence of the Christians.

VIII. It is very easy to account for the sufferings and calamities with which the disciples of Jesus were loaded, when we consider how they were blackened and rendered odious by the railings, the calumnies, and libels of the Heathen priests, and the other defenders of a corrupt and most abominable system of superstition. The injurious imputations, the horrid charges, of which we took notice above, are mentioned by all those who have written in defence of the Christians, and ought indeed, to stand always upon record, as proofs both of the weakness and wickedness of their adversaries. Nothing can be more frivolous and insignificant than the objections with which the most famous defenders of Paganism assailed Christianity at this time; and such as desire a convincing proof of this assertion, have only

\* Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xiii. p. 126. † It is proper to be observed, that the word *crime*, in several former edicts, had not been sufficiently determined in its signification; so that we find the enemies of the Christians, and even the Roman magistrates, applying this term to the profession of Christianity. But the equitable edict of this good emperor decided that point on the side of humanity and justice, as appears from the letter he addressed to the province of Asia, in favour of the persecuted Christians, and which concludes with the following words: "If any one, for the future, shall molest the Christians, and accuse them merely on account of their religion, let the person thus accused be discharged, though he is found to be a Christian, and the accuser be punished according to the rigour of the law." ‡ See Melito ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xxvi.

\* A full account of their martyrdom is to be found in the valuable work of Ruart, entitled, *Acta Sancta Martyrum*.

† See the letter of the Christians at Lyons concerning this persecution, which is to be found in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, book v. chap. ii. and also in Fox's Martyrology, vol. i.

‡ Eusebius, lib. v.

to read the arguments of Celsus on that subject. This philosopher wrote against the Christians during the reign of Adrian, and was admirably refuted, in the following century, by Origen, who represents him as an Epicurean, (a mistake which has been almost generally followed;) whereas it appears with the utmost probability, that he was a Platonic philosopher of the sect of Ammonius.\* Be that as it will,

\* The learned Dr. Lardner does not think it possible that Celsus could have been of the sect of Ammonius, since the former lived and wrote in the second century, whereas the latter did not flourish before the third. And indeed we learn from Origen himself, that he knew of two only of the name of Celsus, one who lived in the time of Nero, and the other in the reign of Adrian, and afterwards. The latter was the philosopher who wrote against Christianity,

Celsus was a trifling caviller, as is manifest from the answer of Origen; nor do his writings against Christianity serve any other purpose, than to show his malignant and illiberal turn of mind.

Fronto, the rhetorician, and Crescens, the Cynic philosopher, made also some wretched attempts against Christianity. The efforts of the former are only known by the mention that is made of them by Minutius Felix;\* and the enterprises of the latter were confined to a vehement zeal for the ruin of the Christians, and a virulent persecution of Justin Martyr, which ended in the cruel death of that eminent saint.†

\* Octavius, p. 266, edit. Heraldi.

† Justin Mart. *Apologia secunda*, p. 21.—Tatian, *Orat. contra Græcos*.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the state of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.*

I. UNDER the reign of Trajan, letters and philosophy came forth from the retreat where they had languished during the savage tyranny of his predecessors, and, by the auspicious protection of that excellent prince, were in some measure restored to their former lustre.\* This happy revolution in the republic of letters, was indeed of a short duration, as it was not supported by the following emperors, who were, for the most part, averse to literary pursuits. Even Marcus Antoninus, who surpassed them all in learning, gave protection and encouragement to the Stoics alone, and, after the example of that supercilious sect, treated the arts and sciences with indifferencence and contempt.† And here we see the true reason why the writers of this century are, in general, so much inferior to those of the former in point of elegance and purity, eloquence and taste.

II. It must be observed, at the same time, that this degeneracy of erudition and taste did not amount to an utter extinction of the one and the other; for, even in this century, there were, both among the Greeks and Romans, men of eminent genius and abilities, who set off, in the most advantageous manner, the learning of the times in which they lived. Among the learned Grecians, the first place is due to Plutarch, a man of vast erudition, whose knowledge was various, but indigested, and whose philosophical taste was corrupted by the sceptical tenets of the academics. There were, likewise, in all the more considerable cities of the Roman empire, rhetoricians, sophists, and grammarians, who, by a variety of learned exercises, seemed zealous in forming the youth to their arts of eloquence and declamation, and

in rendering them fit, by their talents and their acquisitions, to be useful to their country. But the instruction acquired in these schools was more specious than solid; and the youth who received their education in them, distinguished themselves, at their entrance upon the active stage of life, more by empty declamation, than by true eloquence; more by pompous erudition, than by wisdom and dexterity in the management of public affairs. The consequence of this was, that the rhetoricians and sophists, though agreeable to the corrupt taste of the time, which was incapable, generally speaking, of perceiving the native charms of truth, yet fell into contempt among the prudent and the wise, who held in derision the knowledge and education acquired in their auditories. Beside the schools now mentioned, there were two public academies in the empire; one at Rome, founded by Adrian, in which all the sciences were taught; and the other at Berytus in Phœnicia, which was principally destined for the education of youth in the science of law.\*

III. Many philosophers of all the different sects flourished at this time, whose names we do not think it necessary to mention.† Two, however, there were, of such remarkable and shining merit, as rendered them real ornaments to the Stoic philosophy; which the meditations of Marcus Antoninus and the manual of Epictetus abundantly testify. These two great men had more admirers than disciples and followers; for, in this century, the Stoical sect was not in the highest esteem, as the rigour and austerity of its doctrine were by no means suited to the dissolute manners of the times. The Platonic schools were more frequented for several reasons, and particularly for these two,

\* See the *Meditations of Marcus Antoninus*, book i. sect. 7, 10.

† Justin Mart. *Dialog. cum Tryphone*, op. p. 218, &c. We find also many of these philosophers mentioned in the *meditations of Marcus Antoninus*.

\* Plin. *epist. lib. iii. ep. 18.*

† In the first book of his *Meditations*, sect. 7, 17.

that their moral precepts were less rigorous and severe than those of the Stoics, and their doctrines more conformable to, or rather less incompatible with, the common opinions concerning the gods. But, of all the philosophers, the Epicureans enjoyed the greatest reputation, and had undoubtedly the greatest number of followers, because their opinions tended to encourage the indolent security of a voluptuous and effeminate life, and to banish the remorse and terrors that haunt vice, and naturally incommode the wicked in their sensual pursuits.\*

IV. Toward the conclusion of this century, a new sect of philosophers suddenly arose, spread with amazing rapidity through the greatest part of the Roman empire, swallowed up almost all other sects, and proved extremely detrimental to the cause of Christianity. Alexandria in Egypt, which had been, for a long time, the seat of learning, and, as it were, the centre of all the liberal arts and sciences, gave birth to this new philosophy. Its votaries chose to be called Platonists, though, far from adhering to all the tenets of Plato, they collected from the different sects such doctrines as they thought conformable to truth, and formed thereof one general system. The reason, then, why they distinguished themselves by the title of Platonists, was, that they thought the sentiments of Plato, concerning that most noble part of philosophy, which has the Deity and things invisible for its objects, much more rational and sublime than those of the other philosophers.

V. What gave to this new philosophy a superior air of reason and dignity, was, the unprejudiced spirit of candour and impartiality on which it seemed to be founded. This recommended it particularly to those real sages, whose inquiries were accompanied with wisdom and moderation, and who were sick of those arrogant and contentious sects, which required an invariable attachment to their particular systems. And, indeed, nothing could have a more engaging aspect than a set of men, who, abandoning all cavil, and all prejudices in favour of any party, professed searching after the truth alone, and were ready to adopt, from all the different systems and sects, such tenets as they thought agreeable to it. Hence also they were called Eclectics. It is, however, to be observed, as we hinted in the former section, that though these philosophers were attached to no particular sect, yet they preferred, as appears from a variety of testimonies, the sublime Plato to all other sages, and approved most of his opinions concerning the Deity, the universe, and the human soul.

VI. This new species of Platonism was embraced by such of the Alexandrian Christians as were desirous of retaining, with the profession of the Gospel, the title, the dignity, and the habit of philosophers. It is also said to have had the particular approbation of Athenagoras, Pantæus, Clemens the Alexandrian, and of all those who, in this century, were charged with the care of the public school

which the Christians had at Alexandria. These sages were of opinion, that true philosophy, the greatest and most salutary gift of God to mortals, was scattered in various portions through all the different sects; and that it was, consequently, the duty of every wise man, and more especially of every Christian doctor, to gather it from the several corners where it lay dispersed, and to employ it, thus re-united, in the defence of religion, and in destroying the dominion of impiety and vice. The Christian Eclectics had this also in common with the others, that they preferred Plato to the other philosophers, and looked upon his opinions concerning God, the human soul, and things invisible, as conformable to the spirit and genius of the Christian doctrine.

VII. This philosophical system underwent some changes, when Ammonius Saccæus, who taught, with the highest applause, in the Alexandrian school about the conclusion of this century, laid the foundations of that sect which was distinguished by the name of the New Platonists. This learned man was born of Christian parents, and never, perhaps, gave up entirely the outward profession of that divine religion in which he had been educated.\* As his genius was vast and comprehensive, so were his projects bold and singular. For he

in the church to the rank of presbyters, they would not abandon the philosophers' cloak. See Origen, *Epist. ad. Eusebium*, tom. i. op. edit. de la Rue.

\* Porphyry, in his third book against the Christians, maintains, that Ammonius deserted the Christian religion and went over to Paganism as soon as he came to that time of life when the mind is capable of making a wise and judicious choice. Eusebius, on the other hand, denies this assertion; maintaining, that Ammonius persevered constantly in the profession of Christianity; and he is followed in this opinion by Valesius, Bayle, Basnage, and others. The learned Fabricius is of opinion, that Eusebius confounded two persons who bore the name of Ammonius, one of whom was a Christian writer, and the other a heathen philosopher. See *Fabric. Biblioth. Græca*, lib. iv. cap. xxvi. The truth of the matter seems to have been, that Ammonius Saccæus was a Christian, who adopted with such dexterity the doctrines of the pagan philosophy, as to appear a Christian to the Christians, and a Pagan to the Pagans. See Brucker's *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*, vol. ii. and iii. Since the first edition of this work appeared, the learned Dr. Lardner has maintained, not without a certain degree of asperity, which is unusual in his valuable writings, the opinion of Fabricius, against Eusebius, and particularly against Dr. Mosheim. See his *Collection of Heathen and Jewish Testimonies*, vol. iii. Dr. Mosheim was once of the same opinion with Fabricius, and he maintained it in a *Dissertation, de ecclesiâ turbata per recentiores Platonicos*; but he afterwards saw reason to change his mind. His reasons may be seen in his book, *de rebus Christianorum*, ante *Const. Mag.* p. 281, &c. They indeed weigh little with Dr. Lardner, who, however, opposes nothing to them but mere assertions, unsupported by the smallest glimpse of evidence. For the letter of Origen, which he quotes from Eusebius, is so far from proving that Ammonius was *verily* a Heathen philosopher, and not a Christian, that it would not be sufficient to demonstrate that there was ever such a person as Ammonius in the world, since he is not so much as named in that letter. But allowing with Valesius that it is Ammonius whom Origen has in view, when he talks of the philosophical master from whom he and Hercules received instruction, it seems very whimsical to conclude from this circumstance, that Ammonius was no Christian. The coalition between Platonism and Christianity, in the second and third centuries, is a fact too fully proved to be rendered dubious by mere affirmations. The notion, therefore, of two persons bearing the name of Ammonius, the one a Heathen philosopher, and the other a Christian writer, of which Dr. Lardner seems so fond, rests upon little more than an hypothesis formed to remove an imaginary difficulty.

\* Lucian's Pseudomant. p. 763. tom. i. op.

† The title and dignity of philosophers delighted so much these honest men, that though they were advanced

attempted a general reconciliation or coalition of all sects, whether philosophical or religious, and taught a doctrine which he looked upon as proper, to unite them all, the Christians not excepted, in the most perfect harmony. And herein lies the difference between this new sect and the Eclectics, who had, before this time, flourished in Egypt. The Eclectics held, that, in every sect, there was a mixture of good and bad, of truth and falsehood; and, accordingly, they chose and adopted, out of each of them, such tenets as seemed to them conformable to reason and truth, and rejected such as they thought repugnant to both. Ammonius, on the contrary, maintained, that the great principles of all philosophical and religious truth were to be found equally in all sects; that they differed from each other only in their method of expressing them, and in some opinions of little or no importance; and that, by a proper interpretation of their respective sentiments, they might easily be united into one body. It is farther to be observed, that the propensity of Ammonius to singularity and paradox, led him to maintain, that all the Gentile religions, and even the Christian, were to be illustrated and explained by the principles of this universal philosophy; but that, in order to this, the fables of the priests were to be removed from Paganism, and the comments and interpretations of the disciples of Jesus from Christianity.

VIII. This arduous design, which Ammonius had formed, of bringing about a coalition of all the philosophical sects, and all the systems of religion that prevailed in the world, required many difficult and disagreeable things in order to its execution. Every particular sect or religion must have several of its doctrines curtailed or distorted, before it could enter into the general mass. The tenets of the philosophers, the superstitions of the Heathen priests, the solemn doctrines of Christianity, were all to suffer in this cause, and forced allegories were to be employed with subtilty in removing the difficulties with which it was attended. How this vast project was effected by Ammonius, the writings of his disciples and followers, that yet remain, abundantly testify. In order to the accomplishment of his purpose, he supposed, that true philosophy derived its origin and its consistence from the eastern nations; that it was taught to the Egyptians by Hermes; that it was brought from them to the Greeks, by whose vain subtilties, and litigious disputes, it was rendered somewhat obscure and deformed; but was however, preserved in its original purity by Plato, who was the best interpreter of Hermes, and of the other oriental sages. He maintained, that all the different religions which prevailed in the world, were, in their original integrity, conformable to the genius of this ancient philosophy; but that it unfortunately happened, that the symbols and fictions, under which, according to the eastern manner, the ancients delivered their precepts and their doctrines, were, in process of time, erroneously understood both by priests and people in a literal sense; that, in consequence of this, the invisible beings and demons, whom the Supreme Deity had placed

in the different parts of the universe as the ministers of his providence, were, by the suggestions of superstition, converted into gods, and worshipped with a multiplicity of vain ceremonies. He therefore insisted, that the religions of all nations should be restored to their original purity, and reduced to their primitive standard, viz. "The ancient philosophy of the east;" and he affirmed, that this his project was agreeable to the intentions of Jesus Christ, whose sole view, in descending upon earth, was, to set bounds to the reigning superstition, and to remove the errors that had crept into all religions, but not to abolish the ancient theology from which they were derived.

IX. Taking these principles for granted, Ammonius adopted the doctrines which were received in Egypt, the place of his birth and education, concerning the universe and the Deity, considered as constituting one great whole; as also concerning the eternity of the world, the nature of souls, the empire of Providence, and the government of this world by demons. For it seems evident, that the Egyptian philosophy, which was said to be derived from Hermes, was the basis of that of Ammonius; or, as it is otherwise called, of modern Platonism; and the book of Jamblichus, concerning the mysteries of the Egyptians, puts the matter beyond dispute. Ammonius, therefore, associated the sentiments of the Egyptians with the doctrines of Plato, which was easily done by adulterating some of the opinions of the latter, and forcing his expressions from their obvious and natural sense; and, to finish this conciliatory scheme, he so interpreted the doctrines of the other philosophical and religious sects, by the violent succours of art, invention, and allegory, that they seemed, at length, to bear some resemblance to the Egyptian and Platonic systems.

X. To this monstrous coalition of heterogeneous doctrines, its fanatical author added a rule of life and manners, which carried an aspect of high sanctity and uncommon austerity. He, indeed, permitted the people to live according to the laws of their country, and the dictates of nature; but a more sublime rule was laid down for the wise. They were to raise, above all terrestrial things, by the towering efforts of holy contemplation, those souls whose origin was celestial and divine. They were ordered to extenuate, by hunger, thirst, and other mortifications, the sluggish body, which confines the activity, and restrains the liberty of the immortal spirit; that thus, in this life, they might enjoy communion with the Supreme Being, and ascend after death, active and unencumbered, to the universal Parent, to live in his presence for ever. As Ammonius was born and educated among the Christians, he embellished these injunctions, and even gave them an air of authority, by expressing them partly in terms borrowed from the sacred scriptures, of which we find a vast number of citations also in the writings of his disciples. To this austere discipline, he added the pretended art of so purging and refining that faculty of the mind which receives the images of things, as to render it capable of perceiving the demons, and of performing many marvellous



things, by their assistance. This art, which the disciples of Ammonius called *theurgy*, was not, however, communicated to all the schools of this fanatical philosopher, but only to those of the first rank.

XI. The extravagant attempts of Ammonius did not cease here. To reconcile the popular religions of different countries, and particularly the Christian, with this new system, he fell upon the following inventions; 1st, He turned into a mere allegory the whole history of the gods, and maintained, that those beings whom the priests and people dignified with this title, were no more than celestial ministers, to whom a certain kind of worship was due, but a worship inferior to that which was to be reserved for the Supreme Deity. 2dly, He acknowledged Christ to be a most excellent man, the friend of God, the admirable *theurge*; he denied, however, that Jesus intended to abolish entirely the worship of demons, and of the other ministers of divine Providence; and affirmed, on the contrary, that his only intention was to purify the ancient religion, and that his followers had manifestly corrupted the doctrine of their divine master.\*

XII. This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by Origen and many other Christians, was extremely prejudicial to the cause of the Gospel, and to the beautiful simplicity of its celestial doctrines. For hence it was, that the Christian doctors began to introduce their perplexed and obscure erudition into the religion of Jesus; to involve, in the darkness of a vain philosophy, some of the principal truths of Christianity, that had been revealed with the utmost plainness, and were indeed obvious to the meanest capacity; and to add, to the divine precepts of our Lord, many of their own, which had no sort of foundation in any part of the sacred writings. From the same source arose that melancholy set of men, who have been distinguished by the name of Mystics, whose system, when separated from the Platonic doctrine concerning the nature and origin of the soul, is but a lifeless mass, without any vigour, form, or consistence. Nor did the evils, which sprang from this Ammonian philosophy, end here. For, under the specious pretext of the necessity of contemplation, it gave occasion to that slothful and indolent course of life, which continues to be led by myriads of monks retired in cells, and sequestered from society, to which they are neither useful by their instructions, nor by their examples. To this philosophy we may trace, as to their source, a multitude of vain and foolish ceremonies, calculated only to cast a veil over truth, and to nourish superstition; and which are, for the most part, religiously observed by many, even in the times in which

\* What we have here mentioned concerning the doctrines and opinions of Ammonius, is gathered from the writings and disputations of his disciples, who are known by the name of the Modern Platonists. This philosopher has left nothing in writing behind him. He even imposed a law upon his disciples not to divulge his doctrines among the multitude; which law, however, they made no scruple to neglect and violate. See Porphyry. Vit. Plotini, cap. iii. At the same time, there is no sort of doubt, that all these inventions belong properly to Ammonius, whom all the later Platonists acknowledge as the founder of this sect, and the author of their philosophy.

we live. It would be endless to enumerate all the pernicious consequences that may be justly attributed to this new philosophy, or rather to this monstrous attempt to reconcile falsehood with truth, and light with darkness. Some of its most fatal effects were, its alienating the minds of many, in the following ages, from the Christian religion; and its substituting, in the place of the pure and sublime simplicity of the Gospel, an unseemly mixture of Platonism and Christianity.

XIII. The number of learned men among the Christians, which was very small in the preceding century, increased considerably in this. Among these there were few rhetoricians, sophists, or orators. The majority were philosophers attached to the Eclectic system, though they were not all of the same sentiments concerning the utility of letters and philosophy. Those who were themselves initiated into the depths of philosophy, were desirous that others, particularly such as aspired to the offices of bishops or doctors, should apply themselves to the study of human wisdom, in order to their being the better qualified for defending the truth with vigour, and instructing the ignorant with success. Others were of a quite different way of thinking upon this subject, and were for banishing all argumentation and philosophy from the limits of the church, from a notion that erudition might prove detrimental to the true spirit of religion. Hence the early beginnings of that unhappy contest between *faith* and *reason*, *religion* and *philosophy*, *piety* and *genius*, which increased in the succeeding ages, and is prolonged, even to our times, with a violence that renders it extremely difficult to be brought to a conclusion. Those who maintained that learning and philosophy were rather advantageous than detrimental to the cause of religion, gained, by degrees, the ascendant; and, in consequence thereof, laws were enacted, which excluded the ignorant and illiterate from the office of public teachers. The opposite side of the question was not, however, without defenders; and the defects and vices of learned men and philosophers contributed much to increase their number, as will appear in the progress of this history.

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and the Form of its Government.*

I. THE form of ecclesiastical government, whose commencement we have seen in the last century, was brought in this to a greater degree of stability and consistence. One inspector, or *bishop*, presided over each Christian assembly, to which office he was elected by the voices of the whole people. In this post he was to be watchful and provident, attentive to the wants of the church, and careful to supply them. To assist him in this laborious province, he formed a council of *presbyters*, which was not confined to any fixed number; and to each of these he distributed his task, and appointed a station, in which he was to promote the interests of the church. To the bishops and presbyters, the ministers or *deacons* were

subject; and the latter were divided into a variety of classes, as the state of the church required.

II. During a great part of this century, the Christian churches were independent with respect to each other; nor were they joined by association, confederacy, or any other bonds than those of charity. Each Christian assembly was a little state, governed by its own laws, which were either enacted, or at least, approved by the society. But, in process of time, all the Christian churches of a province were formed into one large ecclesiastical body, which, like confederate states, assembled at certain times in order to deliberate about the common interests of the whole. This institution had its origin among the Greeks, with whom nothing was more common than this confederacy of independent states, and the regular assemblies which met, in consequence thereof, at fixed times, and were composed of the deputies of each respective state. But these ecclesiastical associations were not long confined to the Greeks; their great utility was no sooner perceived, than they became universal, and were formed in all places where the gospel had been planted.\* To these assemblies, in which the deputies or commissioners of several churches consulted together, the names of *synods* was appropriated by the Greeks, and that of *councils* by the Latins; and the laws that were enacted in these general meetings, were called *canons*, i. e. *rules*.

III. These *councils* of which we find not the smallest trace before the middle of this century, changed the whole face of the church, and gave it a new form: for by them the ancient privileges of the people were considerably diminished, and the power and authority of the bishops greatly augmented. The humility, indeed, and prudence of these pious prelates, prevented their assuming all at once the power with which they were afterward invested. At their first appearance in these general councils, they acknowledged that they were no more than the delegates of their respective churches, and that they acted in the name, and by the appointment of their people. But they soon changed this humble tone, imperceptibly extended the limits of their authority, turned their influence into dominion, and their counsels into laws; and openly asserted, at length, that Christ had empowered them to prescribe to his people *authoritative rules of faith and manners*. Another effect of these councils was, the gradual abolition of that perfect equality which reigned among all bishops in the primitive times. For the order and decency of these assemblies required, that some one of the provincial bishops, meeting in council, should be invested with a superior degree of power and authority; and hence the rights of Metropolitans derive their origin. In the mean time the bounds of the church were enlarged; the custom of holding councils was followed wherever the sound of the Gospel had reached; and the universal church had now the appearance of one vast republic, formed by a combination of a great num-

ber of little states. This occasioned the creation of a new order of ecclesiastics, who were appointed, in different parts of the world, as heads of the church, and whose office it was to preserve the consistence and union of that immense body, whose members were so widely dispersed throughout the nations. Such were the nature and office of the *patriarchs*, among whom, at length, ambition, having reached its most insolent period, formed a new dignity, investing the bishop of Rome, and his successors, with the title and authority of prince of the patriarchs.

IV. The Christian doctors had the good fortune to persuade the people, that the ministers of the Christian church succeeded to the character, rights, and privileges, of the Jewish priesthood; and this persuasion was a new source both of honours and profit to the sacred order. This notion was propagated with industry some time after the reign of Adrian, when the second destruction of Jerusalem had extinguished among the Jews all hopes of seeing their government restored to its former lustre, and their country arising out of ruins. And accordingly, the bishops considered themselves as invested with a rank and character similar to those of the high priest among the Jews, while the presbyters represented the priests, and the deacons the Levites. It is, indeed, highly probable, that they who first introduced this absurd comparison of offices, so entirely distinct, did it rather through ignorance and error, than through artifice or design. The notion, however, once entertained, produced its natural effects; and these effects were pernicious. The errors to which it gave rise were many; and we may justly consider, as one of its immediate consequences, the establishment of a greater difference between the Christian pastors and their flock, than the genius of the Gospel seems to admit.

V. From the government of the church, let us turn our eyes to those who maintained its cause by their learned and judicious writings. Among these we may mention Justin, a man of great piety and considerable learning, who, from a pagan philosopher, became a Christian martyr. He had frequented all the different sects of philosophy in an ardent and impartial pursuit of truth; and finding, neither among Stoics nor Peripatetics, neither in the Pythagorean nor Platonic schools, any satisfactory account of the perfections of the Supreme Being, and the nature and destination of the human soul, he embraced Christianity on account of the light which it cast upon these interesting subjects.—We have yet remaining his two Apologies in behalf of the Christians, which are highly esteemed, as they deserve to be, although, in some passages of them, he shows himself an incautious disputant, and betrays a want of acquaintance with ancient history.

Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, a Greek by birth, and probably born of Christian parents, a disciple also of Polycarp, by whom he was sent to preach the Gospel among the Gauls, is another of the writers of this century, whose labours were remarkably useful to the church. He turned his pen against its internal and domestic enemies, by attacking the monstrous

\* Tertullian, Lib. de Jéjuis, cap. xiii. p. 711.

errors which had been adopted by many of the primitive Christians, as appears by his five Books against Heresies, which are yet preserved in a Latin translation,\* and are considered as one of the most precious monuments of ancient erudition.

Athenagoras also deserves a place among the estimable writers of this age. He was a philosopher of no mean reputation; and his apology for the Christians, and his treatise upon the Resurrection, afford striking proofs of his learning and genius.

The works of Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, are more remarkable for their erudition, than for their order and method; this, at least, is true of his three Books in Defence of Christianity, addressed to Autolycus.† But the most illustrious writer of this century, and the most justly renowned for his various erudition, and his perfect acquaintance with the ancient sages, was Clemens, the disciple of Pantænus, and the head of the Alexandrian school, destined for the instruction of the catechumens. His *Stromata*, *Pedagogue*, and *Exhortation*, addressed to the Greeks, which are yet extant, abundantly show the extent of his learning and the force of his genius, though he is neither to be admired for the precision of his ideas, nor for the perspicuity of his style. It is also to be lamented, that his excessive attachment to the reigning philosophy led him into a variety of pernicious errors.

Hitherto we have made no mention of the Latin writers, who employed their pens in the Christian cause. And, indeed, the only one of any note we find in this century, is Tertullian, by birth a Carthagenian, who, having first embraced the profession of the law, became afterwards a presbyter, and concluded by adopting the heretical visions of Montanus. He was a man of extensive learning, of a fine genius, and highly admired for his elocution in the Latin tongue. We have several works of his yet remaining, which were designed to explain and defend the truth, and to nourish pious affections in the hearts of Christians. There was, indeed, such a mixture in the qualities of this man, that it is difficult to fix his real character, and to determine which of the two predominated—his virtues or his defects. He was endowed with a great genius, but seemed deficient in point of judgment. His piety was warm and vigorous, but, at the same time, melancholy and austere. His learning was extensive and profound; and yet his credulity and superstition were such as could only have been expected from the darkest ignorance. And with respect to his reasonings, they had more of the subtlety that dazzles the imagination,

than of that solidity which brings light and conviction to the mind.\*

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church in this Century.*

I. THE Christian system, as it was hitherto taught, preserved its native and beautiful simplicity, and was comprehended in a small number of articles. The public teachers inculcated no other doctrines, than those which are contained in what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed; and in the method of illustrating them, all vain subtleties, all mysterious researches, every thing that was beyond the reach of common capacities, were carefully avoided. This will not appear surprising to those who consider that, at this time, there was not the least controversy about those capital doctrines of Christianity, which were afterwards so keenly debated in the church; and who reflect, that the bishops of these primitive times were, for the most part, plain and illiterate men, remarkable rather for their piety and zeal, than for their learning and eloquence.

II. This venerable simplicity was not, indeed, of a long duration; its beauty was gradually effaced by the laborious efforts of human learning, and the dark subtleties of imaginary science. Acute researches were employed upon several religious subjects, concerning which ingenious decisions were pronounced; and, what was worst of all, several tenets of a chimerical philosophy were imprudently incorporated into the Christian system. This disadvantageous change, this unhappy alteration of the primitive simplicity of the Christian religion, arose partly from pride, and partly from a sort of necessity. The former cause was the eagerness of certain learned men to bring about a union between the doctrines of Christianity and the opinions of the philosophers; for they thought it a very fine accomplishment, to be able to express the precepts of Christ in the language of *philosophes, civilians, and rabbis*. The other reason that contributed to alter the simplicity of the Christian religion, was, the necessity of having recourse to logical definitions and nice distinctions, in order to confound the sophistical arguments which the infidel and the heretic employed, one to overturn the Christian system, and the other to corrupt it. ¶ These philosophical arms, in the hands of the judicious and wise, were both honourable and useful to religion; but, when they were handled by every ignorant and self-sufficient meddler, as was afterwards the case, they produced nothing but perplexity and confusion, under which genuine Christianity almost disappeared.

III. Many examples might be alleged, which verify the observations we have now been

¶ \* The first book is yet extant in the original Greek; of the rest, we have only a Latin version, through the barbarity of which, though excessive, it is easy to discern the eloquence and erudition that reign throughout the original. See *Hist. Litteraire de la France*.

¶ † Theophilus was the author of several works, beside those mentioned by Dr. Mosheim, particularly of a commentary upon the Proverbs, another upon the Four Evangelists, and of some short and pathetic discourses, which he published from time to time for the use of his flock. He also wrote against Marcion and Hermogenes, and, in refuting the errors of these heretics, he quotes several passages of the Revelations.

\* It is proper to point out, to such as are desirous of a more particular account of the works, as also of the excellencies and defects of these ancient writers, the authors who have professedly written of them; and the principal are those who follow: Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in *Biblioth. Græc. et Latine*.—Cave, *Hist. Liter. Scriptor. Eccl.*—Du Pin et Cellier, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*.

making; and, if the reader is desirous of a striking one, he has only to take a view of the doctrines which began to be taught in this century, concerning the state of the soul after the dissolution of the body. Jesus and his disciples had simply declared, that the souls of good men were, at their departure from their bodies, to be received into heaven, while those of the wicked were to be sent to hell; and this was sufficient for the first disciples of Christ to know, as they had more piety than curiosity, and were satisfied with the knowledge of this solemn fact, without any inclination to penetrate its manner, or to pry into its secret reasons. But this plain doctrine was soon disguised, when Platonism began to infect Christianity. Plato had taught that the souls of heroes, of illustrious men, and eminent philosophers alone, ascended after death into the mansions of light and felicity, while those of the generality, weighed down by their lusts and passions, sunk into the infernal regions, whence they were not permitted to emerge before they were purified from their turpitude and corruption.\* This doctrine was seized with avidity by the Platonic Christians, and applied as a commentary upon that of Jesus. Hence a notion prevailed, that only the martyrs entered upon a state of happiness immediately after death, and that, for the rest, a certain obscure region was assigned, in which they were to be imprisoned until the second coming of Christ, or, at least, until they were purified from their various pollutions. This doctrine, enlarged by the irregular fancies of injudicious men, became a source of innumerable errors, vain ceremonies, and monstrous superstitions.

IV. But, however the doctrines of the Gospel may have been abused by the commentaries and interpretations of different sects, all were unanimous in regarding the Scriptures with veneration, as the great rule of faith and manners; and hence arose the laudable and pious zeal of adapting them to general use. We have mentioned already the translations that were made of them into different languages, and it will not be improper to say something here concerning those who employed their useful labours in explaining and interpreting them. Pantenus, the head of the Alexandrian school, was probably the first who enriched the church with a version of the sacred writings, which has been lost among the ruins of time. The same fate attended the *commentary* of Clemens the Alexandrian, upon the *canonical epistles*; and also another celebrated work of the same author, in which he is said to have explained, in a compendious manner, almost all the sacred writings. The *Harmony of the Evangelists*, composed by Tatian, is yet extant. But the *Exposition of the Revelations*, by Justin Martyr, and of the *four Gospels* by Theophilus bishop of Antioch, together with several illustrations of the Mosaic

history of the creation, by other ancient writers, are lost.

V. The loss of these ancient productions is the less to be regretted as we know, with certainty, their vast inferiority to the expositions of the holy Scriptures that appeared in succeeding times. Among the persons already mentioned, none deserved the name of an able and judicious interpreter of the sacred text. They all attributed a *double sense* to the words of Scripture; the one *obvious* and literal, the other *hidden* and mysterious, which lay concealed, as it were under the veil of the outward letter. The former they treated with the utmost neglect, and turned the whole force of their genius and application to unfold the latter; or, in other words, they were more studious to darken the Scriptures with their idle fictions, than to investigate their true and natural sense. Some of them also forced the expressions of sacred writ out of their obvious meaning, in order to apply them to the support of their philosophical systems; of which dangerous and pernicious attempts, Clemens of Alexandria is said to have given the first example. With respect to the expositors of the Old Testament in this century, we shall only make this general remark, that their excessive veneration for the Alexandrian version, commonly called the Septuagint, which they regarded almost as of divine authority, confined their views, fettered their critical spirit, and hindered them from producing any thing excellent in the way of sacred criticism or interpretation.

VI. If this age was not very fertile in sacred critics, it was still less so in expositors of the doctrinal parts of religion; for hitherto there was no attempt made, at least that has come to our knowledge, to compose a *system* or complete view of the Christian doctrine. Some treatises of Arabians, relative to this subject, are indeed mentioned; but, as they are lost, and seem not to have been much known by any of the writers whose works have survived them, we can form no conclusions concerning them. The books of Papias, concerning the sayings of Christ and his apostles, were according to the account which Eusebius gives of them, rather an historical commentary, than a theological system. Melito, bishop of Sardis, is said to have written several treatises; one concerning faith, another on the creation, a third respecting the church, and a fourth for the illustration of truth; but it does not appear from the titles of these writings, whether they were of a doctrinal or controversial nature.\* Several of the polemic writers, indeed, have been naturally led, in the course of controversy, to explain amply certain points of religion. But those doctrines which have not been disputed, are very rarely defined with

\* Melito, beside his Apology for the Christians, and the treatises mentioned by Dr. Mosheim, wrote a discourse upon Esther and several other dissertations, of which we have only some scattered fragments remaining; but what is worthy of remark here, is, that he is the first Christian writer who has given us a catalogue of the books of the Old Testament. His catalogue, also, is perfectly conformable to that of the Jews, except in this point only, that he has omitted it in the book of Esther.

\* See an ample account of the opinions of the Platonists and other ancient philosophers on this subject, in the notes which Dr. Mosheim has added to his Latin translation of Cudworth's Intellectual System, vol. ii.

† Viz. Clementis *Hypotyposes*.

such accuracy, by the ancient writers, as to point out to us clearly what their opinions concerning them were. Hence it ought not to appear surprising, that all the different sects of Christians pretend to find, in the writings of the fathers, decisions favourable to their respective tenets.

VII. The controversial writers, who shone in this century, had three different sorts of adversaries to combat; the Jews, the Pagans, and those who, in the bosom of Christianity, corrupted its doctrines, and produced various sects and divisions in the church. Justin Martyr, and Tertullian, embarked in a controversy with the Jews, which it was not possible for them to manage with the highest success and dexterity, as they were very little acquainted with the language, the history, and the learning of the Hebrews, and wrote with more levity and inaccuracy, than such a subject would justify. Of those who managed the cause of Christianity against the Pagans, some performed this important task by composing apologies for the Christians, and others by addressing pathetic exhortations to the Gentiles. Among the former were Athenagoras, Melito, Quadratus, Niliades, Aristides, Tatian, and Justin Martyr; and among the latter, Tertullian, Clemens, Justin, and Theophilus bishop of Antioch. All these writers attacked, with judgment, dexterity, and success, the pagan superstition, and also defended the Christians, in a victorious manner, against all the calumnies and aspersions of their enemies. But they did not succeed so well in unfolding the true nature and genius of Christianity, nor were the arguments adduced by them to demonstrate its truth and divinity so full of energy, so striking and irresistible, as those by which they overturned the pagan system. In a word, both their explication and defence of many of the doctrines of Christianity are defective and unsatisfactory in several respects. As to those who directed their polemic efforts against the heretics, their number was prodigious, though few of their writings have come down to our times. Irenæus refuted the whole tribe in a work destined solely for that purpose. Clemens,\* Tertullian,† and Justin Martyr, wrote also against all the sectaries; but the work of the last, upon that subject, is not extant. It would be endless to mention those who combated particular errors; of whose writings also, many have disappeared amidst the decays of time, and the revolutions that have happened in the republic of letters.

VIII. If the primitive defenders of Christianity were not always happy in the choice of their arguments, yet they discovered more candour and probity than those of the following ages. The artifice of sophistry, and the habit of employing pious frauds in support of the truth, had not, as yet, infected the Christians. And this, indeed, is all that can be said in their behalf; for they are worthy of little admiration on account of the accuracy or depth of their reasonings. The most of them appear to have been destitute of penetration, learning, order,

application and force. They frequently make use of arguments void of all solidity, and much more proper to dazzle the fancy, than to enlighten and convince the mind. One, laying aside the sacred writings, from which all the weapons of religious controversy ought to be drawn, refers to the decisions of those bishops who ruled the apostolic churches. Another thinks, that the antiquity of a doctrine is a mark of its truth, and pleads prescription against his adversaries, as if he was maintaining his property before a civil magistrate; than which method of disputing nothing can be more pernicious to the cause of truth. A third imitates those wrong-headed disputants among the Jews, who, infatuated with their cabalistic jargon, offered, as arguments, the imaginary powers of certain mystic words and chosen numbers.‡ Nor do they seem to err, who are of opinion, that, in this century, that vicious method of disputing, which afterwards obtained the name of *aconomical*, was first introduced.†

IX. The principal points of morality were treated by Justin Martyr, or, at least, by the writer of the Epistle to Zena and Serenus, which is to be found among the works of that celebrated author. Many other writers confined themselves to particular branches of the moral system, which they handled with much attention and zeal. Thus Clemens of Alexandria wrote several treatises concerning calumny, patience, continence, and other virtues, which discourses have not reached our times. Those of Tertullian upon chastity, upon flight in the time of persecution, as also upon fasting, shows, female ornaments, and prayer, have survived the waste of time, and might be read with much fruit, were the style in which they are written less laboured and difficult, and the spirit they breathe less melancholy and morose.

X. Learned men are not unanimous with regard to the degree of esteem that is due to the authors now mentioned, and the other ancient moralists. Some represent them as the most excellent guides in the paths of piety and virtue; while others place them in the lowest rank of moral writers, consider them as the worst of all instructors, and treat their precepts and decisions as perfectly insipid, and, in many respects, pernicious. We leave the determination of this point to such as are more capable of pronouncing decisively upon it, than we pretend to be. § It, however, appears

\* Several examples of this senseless method of reasoning are to be found in different writers. See particularly Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. iii. p. 660, 691.

‡ The *aconomical* method of disputing was that in which the disputants accommodated themselves, as far as was possible, to the taste and prejudices of the truth whom they were endeavouring to gain over to the truth. Some of the first Christians carried this concession too far, and abused St. Paul's example, (1 Cor. ix. 20, 21, 22.) to a degree inconsistent with the purity and simplicity of the Christian doctrine.

† Rich. Simon, *Histoire Critique des principaux Commentaires du N. T.* cap. ii. p. 21.

§ This question was warmly and learnedly debated between the deservedly celebrated Barbeyrac and Cellier, a Benedictine monk. Buddus has given us a history of this controversy, with his own judgment of it, in his *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. iv. p. 620, &c. Barbeyrac, however, published after this a particular treatise

\* In his work entitled, *Stromata*.

† In his *Præscriptiones adversus Hæreticos*

to us incontestable, that in the writings of the primitive fathers, there are several sublime sentiments, judicious thoughts, and many things that are naturally adapted to form a religious temper, and to excite pious and virtuous affections; while it must be confessed on the other hand, that they abound still more with precepts of an excessive and unreasonable austerity, with stoical and academical dictates, vague and indeterminate notions, and what is yet worse, with decisions that are absolutely false, and in evident opposition to the precepts of Christ. Before the question mentioned above concerning the merit of the ancient fathers, as moralists, be decided, a previous question must be determined, namely, What is meant by a bad director in point of morals? and, if by such a person be meant, one who has no determinate notion of the nature and limits of the duties incumbent upon Christians, no clear and distinct ideas of virtue and vice; who has not penetrated the spirit and genius of those sacred books, to which alone we must appeal in every dispute about Christian virtue, and who, in consequence thereof, fluctuates often in uncertainty, or falls into error in explaining the divine laws, though he may frequently administer sublime and pathetic instructions; if, by a bad guide in morals, such a person, as we have now delineated, be meant, then it must be confessed, that this title belongs indisputably to many of the fathers.

XI. The cause of morality, and indeed, of Christianity in general, suffered deeply by a capital error which was received in this century; an error admitted without any sinister views, but yet with great imprudence, and, which, through every period of the church, even until the present time, has produced other errors without number, and multiplied the evils under which the Gospel has so often groaned. Jesus Christ prescribed to all his disciples one and the same rule of life and manners. But certain Christian doctors, either through a desire of imitating the nations among whom they lived, or in consequence of a natural propensity to a life of austerity (which is a disease not uncommon in Syria, Egypt, and other Eastern provinces,) were induced to maintain, that Christ had established a double rule of sanctity and virtue, for two different orders of Christians. Of these rules one was ordinary, the other extraordinary; one of a lower dignity, the other more sublime; one for persons in the active scenes of life, the other for those who, in a sacred retreat, aspired to the glory of a celestial state. In consequence of this wild system, they divided into two parts all those moral doctrines and instructions which they had received, either by writing or tradition. One of these divisions they called *precepts* and the other *counsels*. They gave the name of precepts to those laws which were obligatory upon

all orders of men; and that of counsels to such as related to Christians of a more sublime rank, who proposed to themselves great and glorious ends, and aspired to an intimate communion with the Supreme Being.

XII. This double doctrine suddenly produced a new set of men, who made profession of uncommon degrees of sanctity and virtue, and declared their resolution of obeying all the counsels of Christ, that they might enjoy communion with God here; and also, that, after the dissolution of their mortal bodies, they might ascend to him with greater facility, and find nothing to retard their approach to the supreme centre of happiness and perfection. They looked upon themselves as prohibited from the use of things which it was lawful for other Christians to enjoy, such as wine, flesh, matrimony, and trade.\* They thought it their indispensable duty, to extenuate the body by watchings, abstinence, labour and hunger.— They looked for felicity in solitary retreats, in desert places, where, by severe and assiduous efforts of sublime meditation, they raised the soul above all external objects and all sensual pleasures. Both men and women imposed upon themselves the most severe tasks, the most austere discipline; all which however the fruit of pious intention, was, in the issue, extremely detrimental to Christianity. These persons were called Ascetics, *Σησδαισι*, *Ἐκλεκτοί*, and philosophers; nor were they only distinguished by their title from other Christians, but also by their garb.† In this century, indeed, such as embraced this austere kind of life, submitted themselves to all these mortifications in private, without breaking asunder their social bonds, or withdrawing themselves from the concourse of men. But, in process of time, they retired into deserts; and after the example of the Essenes and Therapeutæ, they formed themselves into certain companies.

XIII. Nothing is more obvious than the reasons that gave rise to this austere sect. One of the principal was, the ill judged ambition of the Christians to resemble the Greeks and Romans, many of whose sages and philosophers distinguished themselves from the generality by their maxims, by their habits, and, indeed, by the whole plan of life and manners which they had formed to themselves, and by which they acquired a high degree of esteem and authority. It is also well known, that, of all these philosophers, there were none whose sentiments and discipline were so well received by the ancient Christians as those of the Platonists and Pythagoreans, who prescribed in their lessons two rules of conduct; one for the sages, who aspired to the sublimest heights of virtue; and another for the people, involved in the cares and hurry of an active life.‡ The law of moral conduct, which the Platonists prescribed to the philosophers, was as follows:—

in defence of the severe sentence he had pronounced against the *fathers*. This ingenious performance was printed at Amsterdam in 1720, under the title of *Traite sur la Morale des Peres*; and is highly worthy of the perusal of those who have a taste for this interesting branch of literature, though they will find in it some imputations cast upon the fathers, against which they may be easily defended.

\* Athenagoras, *Apologia pro Christianis*. cap. xxviii.

† See Salmas. *Comm. in Tertullianum de Pallio*.

‡ These famous sects made an important distinction between *living according to nature*, *Ζην κατὰ φύσιν*, and *living above nature*, *Ζην ὑπὲρ φύσιν*. The former was the rule prescribed to the vulgar; the latter, that which was to direct the conduct of the philosophers, who aimed at superior degrees of virtue. See *Æneas Gæzaus* in Theophrast.

"The soul of the wise man ought to be removed to the greatest possible distance from the contagious influence of the body; and, as the depressing weight of the body, the force of its appetites, and its connexions with a corrupt world, are in direct opposition to this sacred obligation, all sensual pleasures are to be carefully avoided; the body is to be supported, or rather extenuated, by a slender diet; *solitude* is to be sought as the true mansion of virtue, and *contemplation* to be employed as the means of raising the soul, as far as is possible, to a sublime freedom from all corporeal ties, and to a noble elevation above all terrestrial things.\* The person who lives in this manner, shall enjoy, even in the present state, a certain degree of communion with the Deity; and, when the corporeal mass is dissolved, shall immediately ascend to the sublime regions of felicity and perfection, without passing through that state of purification and trial, which awaits the generality of mankind." It is easy to perceive, that this rigorous discipline was a natural consequence of the peculiar opinions which these philosophers, and some others who resembled them, entertained concerning the nature of the soul, the influence of matter, the operations of invisible beings, or demons, and the formation of the world; and, as these opinions were adopted by the more learned among the Christians, it was natural that they should embrace also the moral discipline which flowed from them.

XIV. There is a particular consideration that will enable us to render a natural account of the origin of those religious severities of which we have been now speaking, and that is drawn from the genius and temper of the people by whom they were first practised. It was in Egypt that this morose discipline had its rise. That country, we may observe, has in all times, as it were by an immutable law, or disposition of nature, abounded with persons of a melancholy complexion, and produced, in proportion to its extent, more gloomy spirits than any other part of the world.† It was here that the Essenes and Therapeutæ, those dismal and gloomy sects, dwelt principally, long before the coming of Christ; as also many others of the Ascetic tribe, who, led by a melancholy turn of mind, and a delusive notion of rendering themselves more acceptable to the Deity by their austerities, withdrew themselves from human society, and from all the innocent pleasures and comforts of life.‡ From Egypt, this sour and insocial discipline passed into Syria, and the neighbouring countries, which also abounded with persons of the same dismal constitution with that of the Egyptians;§ and thence, in process of time, its infection reached the European nations. Hence arose that train of austere and superstitious vows and

rites, that still, in many places, throw a veil over the beauty and simplicity of the Christian religion. Hence the celibacy of the priestly order, the rigour of unprofitable penances and mortifications, the innumerable swarms of monks, who, in the senseless pursuit of a visionary sort of perfection, refused their talents and labours to society. Hence also that distinction between the *theoretical* and *mystical* life, and many other fancies of a like nature, which we shall have occasion to mention in the course of this history.

XV. It is generally true, that delusions travel in a train, and that one mistake produces many. The Christians who adopted this austere system had certainly made a very false step, and done much injury to their excellent and most reasonable religion. But they did not stop here; another erroneous practice was adopted by them, which, though it was not so general as the other, was yet extremely pernicious, and proved a source of numberless evils to the Christian church. The Platonists and Pythagoreans held it as a maxim, that it was not only lawful, but even praiseworthy, to deceive, and even to use the expedient of a lie, in order to advance the cause of truth and piety. The Jews, who lived in Egypt, had learned and received this maxim from them, before the coming of Christ, as appears incontestably from a multitude of ancient records; and the Christians were infected from both these sources with the same pernicious error, as appears from the number of books attributed falsely to great and venerable names, from the Sibylline verses, and several supposititious productions which were spread abroad in this and the following century. It does not indeed seem probable, that all these *pious frauds* were chargeable upon the professors of *real* Christianity, upon those who entertained just and rational sentiments of the religion of Jesus. The greatest part of these fictitious writings undoubtedly flowed from the fertile invention of the Gnostic sects, though it cannot be affirmed that even true Christians were entirely innocent and irrepachable in this respect.

XVI. As the boundaries of the church were enlarged, the number of vicious and irregular persons who entered into it, received a proportional increase, as appears from the many complaints and censures that we find in the writers of this century. Several methods were practised to stem the torrent of iniquity. Excommunication was peculiarly employed to prevent or punish the most heinous and enormous crimes, and the crimes deemed such, were murder, idolatry, and adultery, which terms, however, we must here understand in their more full and extensive sense. In some places, the commission of any of these sins irrevocably cut off the criminals from all hopes of restoration to the privileges of church communion; in others, after a long, laborious, and painful course of probation and discipline, they were re-admitted into the bosom of the church.\*

\* The reader will find the principles of this fanatical discipline, in Porphyry's book *περί ἀσκητικῆς, ἢ ἑ. ἑ. concerning abstinence*. That celebrated Platonist has explained at large the respective duties that belong to *active* and *contemplative* life, book i. sect. 27, and 41.

† See Maillet, Description de l'Égypte, tom. ii.  
‡ Herodot. Histor. lib. ii.—Epiphanius, Exposit. Fidei, sect. 11.—Tertullian, de Exhortatione Castitat. cap. xiii.—Athan. Vita Antonii.

§ Voyages en Perse, par Jean Chardin, tom. iv.

\* By this distinction, we may easily reconcile the different opinions of the learned concerning the effects of excommunication. See Morinus, de Disciplina Penitent. lib. ix. cap. xix. p. 67.—Sirmund, Historia Penitentiae publicæ, cap. i.—Joseph. Augustin. Orsi, Dissert. de

XVII. It is here to be attentively observed, that the form, used in the exclusion of heinous offenders from the society of Christians, was, at first, extremely simple. A small number of plain, yet judicious rules, made up the whole of this solemn institution, which, however was imperceptibly altered, enlarged by an addition of a vast multitude of rites, and new-modelled according to the discipline used in the Heathen mysteries.\* Those who have any acquaintance with the singular reasons that obliged the Christians of those ancient times to be careful in restraining the progress of vice, will readily grant, that it was incumbent upon the rulers of the church to perfect their discipline, and to render the restraints upon iniquity more severe. They will justify the rulers of the primitive church in their refusing to restore excommunicated members to their forfeited privileges, before they had given incontestable marks of the sincerity of their repentance. Yet it remains to be examined, whether it was expedient to borrow from the enemies of the truth the rules of this salutary discipline, and thus to sanctify in some measure, a part of the Heathen superstition. But, however delicate such a question may be, when determined with a view to all the indirect or immediate consequences of the matter in debate, the equitable and candid judge will consider principally the good intentions of those from whom these ceremonies and institutions proceeded, and will overlook the rest from a charitable condensation and indulgence to human weakness.

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### *Of the Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. THERE is no institution so pure and excellent which the corruption and folly of man will not in time alter for the worse, and load with additions foreign to its nature and original design. Such, in a particular manner, was the fate of Christianity. In this century many unnecessary rites and ceremonies were added to the Christian worship, the introduction of which was extremely offensive to wise and good men.† These changes, while they destroyed the beautiful simplicity of the Gospel, were naturally pleasing to the gross multitude, who are more delighted with the pomp and splendour of external institutions, than with the native charms of rational and solid piety, and who generally give little attention to any objects but those which strike their outward senses.‡ But other reasons may be

*Criminum capitalium per tria priora Sæcula Absolutione,* published at Milan in 1730.

\* See Fabricius, *Bibliograph. Antiquar.* p. 397, and Morinus, de *Pœnitentia*, lib. i. cap. xv, &c.

† Tertullian, *Lib. de Creatione*, p. 792, op.

‡ It is not improper to remark here, that this attachment of the vulgar to the pomp of ceremonies, is a circumstance that has always been favourable to the ambitious views of the Romish clergy, since the pomp of religion naturally casts a part of its glory and magnificence upon its ministers, and thereby gives them, imperceptibly, a vast ascendancy over the minds of the people. The late lord Bolingbroke, being present at the elevation of the host in the cathedral at Paris, expressed to a nobleman who stood near him, his surprise that the king of France should commit the performance of such an august and striking ceremony to any subject. How far ambi-

added to this, which, though they suppose no bad intention, yet manifest a considerable degree of precipitation and imprudence.

II. And here we may observe, in the first place, that there is a high degree of probability in the notion of those who think that the bishops augmented the number of religious rites in the Christian worship, by way of accommodation to the infirmities and prejudices, both of Jews and heathens, in order to facilitate their conversion to Christianity. Both Jews and heathens were accustomed to a great variety of pompous and magnificent ceremonies in their religious service. And as they deemed these rites an essential part of religion, it was natural that they should behold with indifference, and even with contempt, the simplicity of the Christian worship, which was destitute of those idle ceremonies that rendered their service so specious and striking. To remove then, in some measure, this prejudice against Christianity, the bishops thought it necessary to increase the number of ceremonies, and thus to render the public worship more striking to the outward senses.\*

III. This addition of external rites was also designed to remove the opprobrious calumnies which the Jewish and pagan priests cast upon the Christians on account of the simplicity of their worship, considering them as little better than atheists, because they had no temples, altars, victims, priests, nor any mark of that external pomp in which the vulgar are so prone to place the essence of religion. The rulers of the church adopted, therefore, certain external ceremonies, that thus they might captivate the senses of the vulgar, and be able to refute the reproaches of their adversaries. † This, it must be confessed, was a very awkward, and indeed, a very pernicious stratagem; it was obscuring the native lustre of the Gospel, in order to extend its influence, and making it lose, in point of real excellence, what it gained in point of popular esteem. Some accommodations to the infirmities of mankind, some prudent instances of condensation to their invincible prejudices, are necessary in ecclesiastical, as well as in civil institutions; but they must be of such a nature

tion may, in this and the succeeding ages, have contributed to the accumulation of gaudy ceremonies, is a question not easily determined.

\* A remarkable passage in the life of Gregory, surnamed *Thaumaturgus*, i. e. the wonder worker, will illustrate this point in the clearest manner. The passage is as follows: "Cum animadvertisset (Gregorius) quod ob corporales delectationes et voluptates simplex et imperitum vulgus in simulacrorum cultus errore permaneret—permisit eis, ut in memoriam et recordationem sanctorum martyrum sese oblectarent, et in lætiam effunderentur, quod successu temporis aliquando futurum esset, ut sua sponte ad honestiorum et accuriorem vitæ rationem transirent." † c. "When Gregory perceived that the ignorant multitude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the pleasures and sensual gratifications which they enjoyed at the pagan festivals, he granted them a permission to indulge themselves in the like pleasures, in celebrating the memory of the holy martyrs, hoping that, in process of time, they would return of their own accord, to a more virtuous and regular course of life." ‡ There is no sort of doubt, that, by this permission, Gregory allowed the Christians to dance, sport, and feast at the tombs of the martyrs, upon their respective festivals, and to do every thing which the pagans were accustomed to do in their temples, during the feasts celebrated in honour of their gods.‡



as not to inspire ideas, or encourage prejudices, incompatible with just sentiments of the great object of religious worship, and of the fundamental truths which God has imparted by reason and revelation to the human race. How far this rule has been disregarded and violated, will appear too plainly in the progress of this history.

IV. A third cause of the multiplication of ceremonies in the Christian church, may be deduced from the abuse of certain titles that distinguished the sacerdotal orders among the Jews. Every one knows, that many terms used in the New Testament to express the different parts of the Christian doctrine and worship, are borrowed from the Jewish law, or bear a certain analogy to the forms and ceremonies instituted by Moses. The Christian doctors not only imitated this analogical manner of speaking, but even extended it farther than the apostles had done; and though in this there was nothing that deserved reproach, yet the consequences of this method of speaking became, through abuse, detrimental to the purity of the Gospel; for, in process of time, many asserted, (whether through ignorance or artifice is not easy to determine,) that these forms of speech were not figurative, but highly proper, and exactly suitable to the nature of the things they were designed to express. The bishops, by an innocent allusion to the Jewish manner of speaking, had been called chief priests; the elders, or presbyters, had received the title of priests, and the deacons that of Levites. But, in a little time, these titles were abused by an aspiring clergy, who thought proper to claim the same rank and station, the same rights and privileges, that were conferred with those titles upon the ministers of religion under the Mosaic dispensation. Hence the rise of *tithes, first-fruits, splendid garments*, and many other circumstances of external grandeur, by which ecclesiastics were eminently distinguished. In like manner the comparison of the Christian oblations with the Jewish victims and sacrifices, produced a multitude of unnecessary rites, and was the occasion of introducing that erroneous notion of the eucharist, which represents it as a real sacrifice, and not merely as a commemoration of the great offering that was once made upon the cross for the sins of mortals.

V. The profound respect that was paid to the Greek and Roman mysteries, and the extraordinary sanctity that was attributed to them, were additional circumstances that induced the Christians to give their religion a mystic air, in order to put it upon an equal footing, in point of dignity, with that of the Pagans. For this purpose, they gave the name of *mysteries* to the institutions of the Gospel, and decorated particularly the holy sacrament with that solemn title. They used in that sacred institution, as also in that of baptism, several of the terms employed in the Heathen mysteries, and proceeded so far, at length, as even to adopt some of the ceremonies of which those renowned mysteries consisted.\* This

imitation began in the eastern provinces; but, after the time of Adrian, who first introduced the mysteries among the Latins,<sup>†</sup> it was followed by the Christians who dwelt in the western parts of the empire. A great part, therefore, of the service of the Church, in this century, had a certain air of the Heathen mysteries, and resembled them considerably in many particulars.

VI. It may be farther observed, that the custom of teaching their religious doctrines by images, actions, signs, and other sensible representations, which prevailed among the Egyptians, and, indeed, in almost all the eastern nations, was another cause of the increase of external rites in the church. As there were many persons of narrow capacities, whose comprehension scarcely extended beyond sensible objects, the Christian doctors thought it advisable to instruct such in the essential truths of the Gospel, by placing these truths as it were, before their eyes, under sensible images. Thus they administered milk and honey, the ordinary food of infants, to such as were newly received into the church, showing by this sign, that by their baptism they were born again, and were bound to manifest the simplicity and innocence of infants in their lives and conversation.—Certain military forms were borrowed to express the new and solemn engagements, by which Christians attached themselves to Christ as their leader and their chief; and the ancient ceremony of manumission was used to signify the liberty of which they were made partakers, in consequence of their redemption from the guilt and dominion of sin, and their deliverance from the power of the prince of darkness.‡

VII. If it be considered, in the first place, that the Christians who composed the church, were Jews and Heathens, accustomed from their birth, to various insignificant ceremonies and superstitious rites,—and if it be also considered, that such a long course of custom and of education forms prejudices that are extremely obstinate and dillicult to be conquered—it will then appear, that nothing less than a continued miracle could have totally prevented the entrance of all superstitious mixtures into the Christian worship. A single example will tend to the illustrations of this matter. Before the coming of Christ, all the eastern nations performed divine worship with their faces turned to that part of the heavens where the sun displays his rising beams. This custom was founded upon a general opinion, that God, whose *essence* they looked upon to be light, and whom they considered as being circumscribed within certain limits, dwelt in that part of the firmament, from which he sends forth the sun, the bright image of his benignity and glory. The Christian converts, indeed, rejected this gross error; but they retained the ancient and universal custom of worshipping toward the east, which sprang from it. Nor is that custom abolished even in our times, but still pre-

Genev. 1654. Tollius, *Insign. itineris Italicæ*, not. p. 151, 163.—Spanheim's notes to his French translation of Julian's *Cæsars*, p. 123.—Clarkson on *Liturgies*.

\* Spartian, Vit. Hadrianæ, c. xvii.

† See Edm. Merrill's *Observat.* lib. iii. cap. iii.

\* See, for many examples of this, Isaac Casaubon, *Exercitat.* xvi. in *Annal. Cardin. Baronii*, p. 388, edit.

vails in a great number of Christian churches. From the same source arose various rites among the Jews, which many Christians, especially those who live in the eastern countries, observe religiously at this very day.\*

VIII. We shall take no more than a brief view of these rites and ceremonies, since a particular consideration of them would lead us into endless discussions, and open a field too vast to be comprehended in such a compendious history as we here give of the Christian church. The first Christians assembled for the purposes of divine worship, in private houses, in caves, and in vaults, where the dead were buried. Their meetings were on the first day of the week; and, in some places, they assembled also on the seventh, which was celebrated by the Jews. Many also observed the fourth day of the week, on which Christ was betrayed; and the sixth, which was the day of his crucifixion. The hour of the day appointed for holding these religious assemblies varied according to the different times and circumstances of the church; but it was generally in the evening after sun-set, or in the morning before the dawn. During these sacred meetings, prayers were repeated;† the holy scriptures were publicly read; short discourses, upon the duties of Christians, were addressed to the people; hymns were sung; and a portion of the oblations, presented by the faithful was employed in the celebration of the Lord's Supper and the feast of charity.

IX. The Christians of this century celebrated anniversary festivals in commemoration of the death and resurrection of Christ, and of the effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles. The day which was observed as the anniversary of Christ's death was called the *paschal* day, or passover, because it was looked upon to be the same with that on which the Jews celebrated the feast of that name. In the manner, however, of observing this solemn day, the Christians of Asia Minor differed much from the rest, and in a more especial manner from those of Rome. They both indeed, fasted during the *great week* (so that was called in which Christ died,) and afterwards celebrated, like the Jews, a sacred feast, at which they distributed a paschal lamb in memory of the holy supper. But the Asiatic Christians kept this feast on the fourteenth day of the first Jewish month, when the Jews celebrated their passover, and, three days after, commemorated the resurrection of the triumphant Redeemer.—They affirmed, that they had derived this custom from the apostles John and Philip; and pleaded, moreover, in its behalf, the example of Christ himself, who held his paschal feast on the day of the Jewish passover. The western churches observed a different method; they celebrated their paschal feast on the night that preceded the anniversary of Christ's resurrection, and thus connected the commemoration of his crucifixion with that of his victory over

death and the grave. Nor did they differ thus from the Asiatics, without pleading also apostolic authority for what they did; for they alleged that of St. Peter and St. Paul, as a justification of their conduct in this matter.

X. The Asiatic rule for keeping the paschal feast, was attended with two great inconveniences, to which the Christians at Alexandria and Rome, and all the western churches, refused to submit; for, in the first place, as the Asiatics celebrated their festival on the same day that Christ is said to have eaten the paschal lamb with his disciples, this occasioned an inevitable interruption in the fast of the *great week*, which the other churches looked upon as almost criminal, at least as highly indecent. Nor was this the only inconvenience arising from this rule: for, as they celebrated the memory of Christ's resurrection, precisely on the third day after their paschal supper, it happened for the most part, that this great festival (which afterwards was called by the Latins *pascha*, and to which we give the name of *Easter*) was holden on other days of the week than the first. This circumstance was extremely displeasing to the greatest part of the Christians, who thought it unlawful to celebrate the resurrection of our Lord on any day but Sunday, as that was the day on which this glorious event happened. Hence arose sharp and vehement contentions between the Asiatic and western Christians. About the middle of this century, during the reign of Antoninus Pius, the venerable Polycarp went to Rome to confer with Anicet, bishop of that see, upon this matter, with a view to terminate the warm disputes which it had occasioned. But this conference, though conducted with great decency and moderation, was without effect. Polycarp and Anicet only agreed in this, that the bonds of charity were not to be broken on account of this controversy; but they respectively continued, at the same time, in their former sentiments; nor could the Asiatics be engaged by any arguments to alter the rule which they pretended to have received by tradition from St. John.\*

XI. Toward the conclusion of this century, Victor, bishop of Rome, endeavoured to force the Asiatic Christians by the pretended authority of his laws and decrees, to follow the rule which was observed by the western churches in this point. Accordingly, after having taken the advice of some foreign bishops, he wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic prelates commanding them to imitate the example of the western Christians with respect to the time of celebrating the festival of Easter. The Asiatics answered this lordly requisition by the pen of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who declared in their name, with great spirit and resolution, that they would by no means depart, in this manner from the custom handed down to them by their ancestors. Upon this the thunder of excommunication began to roar. Victor, exasperated by this resolute answer of the Asiatic bishops, broke communion with them pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellow-

\* See Spencer *de Legibus ritualibus Hebræorum, Prolegom.*

† There is an excellent account given of these prayers, and of the Christian worship in general, in Tertullian's Apology, chap. xxxix. which is one of the most noble productions of ancient times.

\* Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. v.*

ship with the church of Rome. This excommunication, indeed, extended no farther: nor could it cut off the Asiatic bishops from communion with the other churches, whose bishops were far from approving the conduct of Victor.\* The progress of this violent dissection was stopped by the wise and moderate remonstrances, which Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, addressed to the Roman prelate on this occasion, in which he showed him the imprudence and injustice of the step he had taken, and also by the long letter which the Asiatic Christians wrote in their own justification. In consequence therefore of this cessation of arms, the combatants retained each their own customs, until the fourth century, when the council of Nice abolished that of the Asiatics, and rendered the time of the celebration of Easter the same through all the Christian churches.†

XII. In these times, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was celebrated, for the most part, on Sundays, and the ceremonies observed upon that occasion were such as follow. Of the bread and wine, which were presented among the other oblations of the faithful, a part was separated from the rest, and consecrated by the prayers of the bishop. The wine was mixed with water, and the bread was divided into several portions. A part of the consecrated bread and wine was carried to the sick or absent members of the church, as a testimony of fraternal love, sent to them by the whole society.‡ It appears by many and undoubted testimonies, that this holy rite was looked upon as essential to salvation; and, when this is duly considered, we shall be less disposed to censure, as erroneous, the opinion of those who have affirmed, that the Lord's Supper was administered to infants during this century.§ The feasts of charity, that followed the celebration of the Lord's Supper, have been already mentioned.

XIII. The sacrament of baptism was administered publicly twice every year, at the festivals of Easter and Pentecost or Whitsuntide,|| either by the bishop, or, in consequence of his authorization and appointment, by the presbyters. The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the Creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and his pompous allurements, were immersed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation of

Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the express command of our Blessed Lord. After baptism, they received the sign of the cross, were anointed, and by prayers and imposition of hands, were solemnly recommended to the mercy of God, and dedicated to his service; in consequence of which they received milk and honey, which concluded the ceremony.\* The reasons of this particular ritual coincide with what we have said in general concerning the origin and causes of the multiplied ceremonies that crept from time to time into the church.

Adult persons were prepared for baptism by abstinence, prayer, and other pious exercises. It was to answer for them that sponsors, or godfathers, were first instituted, though they were afterwards admitted also in the baptism of infants.†

## CHAPTER V.

*Concerning the Heresies and Divisions that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. AMONG the many sects which divided the Christian church during this century, it is natural to mention, in the first place, that which an attachment to the Mosaic law separated from the rest of their Christian brethren. The first rise of this sect is placed under the reign of Adrian; for, when this emperor had, at length, razed Jerusalem, entirely destroyed even its very foundations, and enacted laws of the severest kind against the whole body of the Jewish people, the greatest part of the Christians, who lived in Palestine, to prevent their being confounded with the Jews, abandoned entirely the Mosaic rites, and chose a bishop named Mark, a foreigner by nation, and consequently an alien from the commonwealth of Israel. This step was highly shocking to those, whose attachment to the Mosaic rites was violent and invincible; and such was the case of many. These, therefore, separated themselves from the brethren, and founded in Peræa, a country of Palestine, and in the neighbouring parts, particular assemblies, in which the law of Moses maintained its primitive dignity, authority, and lustre.‡

II. This body of judaizing Christians, which set Christ and Moses upon an equal footing, in point of authority, afterwards divided itself into two sects, extremely different both in their rites and in their opinions, and distinguished by the names of Nazarenes and Ebionites. The former are not placed by the ancient Christians in the heretical register;§ but the latter were considered as a sect, whose tenets were destructive of the fundamental principles of the

\* This whole affair furnishes a striking argument, among the multitude that may be drawn from ecclesiastical history, against the supremacy and universal authority of the bishop of Rome.

† Dr. Mosheim, in a note, refers us for a more copious account of this controversy to his *Commentar. de rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum M.* He had said in that work, that Faydit had perceived the error of the common opinion, concerning the disputes which arose in the church about the time of keeping Easter. But here he retracts this encomium, and, after a second reading of Faydit's book, finds himself obliged to declare, that this writer has entirely missed the true state of the question. See the account of this controversy, given by the learned Heuman, in one of the treatises of his *Sylloge*, or collection of small pieces.

‡ Henricus Rixnerus, de *Ritibus veterum Christianorum circa Eucharistiam.*

§ See Jo. Frid. Mayer, *Diss. de Eucharistia Infantum*; as also Zornius, *Histor. Eucharist. Infantum.*

|| See Wall's *History of Infant Baptism*, and *Viccomes de Ritibus Baptismi.*

\* See Tertullian on Baptism.

† See Ger. a Maestricht, de *Suscceptoribus Infantum ex Baptismo*; though he is of a different opinion in this matter, and thinks that sponsors were not used in the baptism of adult persons. See also Wall's *History of Infant Baptism.* ¶ See moreover, upon this subject, Isaac Jundt, *Arg. de Susceptorum Baptismatum Origine Commentatio*, published in 1755, of which an account may be seen in the *Biblioth. des Sciences et des Beaux Arts*, tom. vi.

‡ See Sulpitius Severus, *Hist. Sacr. lib. ii. cap. xxxi.*

§ Epiphanius was the first writer who placed the Nazarenes in the list of heretics. He wrote in the fourth century, but is very far from being remarkable, either for his fidelity or judgment.

Christian religion. These sects made use of a *gospel*, or history of Christ, different from that which is received among us, and concerning which there have been many disputes among the learned.\* The term Nazarine was not originally the name of a sect, in that which distinguished the disciples of Jesus but general; and, as those whom the Greeks called Christians, received the name of Nazarenes among the Jews, the latter name was not considered as a mark of ignominy or contempt. Those, indeed, who, after their separation from their brethren, retained the title of Nazarenes, differed much from the true disciples of Christ, to whom that name had been originally given: "they held, that Christ was born of a virgin, and was also in a *certain manner* united to the divine nature; they refused to abandon the ceremonies prescribed by the law of Moses, but were far from attempting to impose the observance of these ceremonies upon the Gentile Christians; and they rejected all those additions which had been made to the Mosaic institutions, by the Pharisees and the doctors of the law;† and hence we may easily see the reason why the greatest part of the Christians treated the Nazarenes with a more than ordinary degree of gentleness and forbearance.

III. It is doubtful whether the Ebionites derived their name from one of their principal doctors, or from their poverty.‡ One thing, however, is certain, that their sentiments and doctrines were much more pernicious than those of the Nazarenes;§ for, though they believed the celestial mission of Christ, and his participation of a divine nature, yet they regarded him as a man born of Joseph and Mary, according to the ordinary course of nature. They also asserted, that the ceremonial law, instituted by Moses, was not only obligatory upon the Jews, but upon all others, and that the observance of it was essential to salvation; and as St. Paul had very different sentiments from them, concerning the obligation of the ceremonial law, and had opposed the observance of it in the warmest manner, so, in consequence, they held this apostle in abhorrence, and treated his writings with the utmost disrespect. Nor were they only attached to the rites instituted by Moses: they went still far-

ther, and received, with an equal degree of veneration, the superstitions of their ancestors, and the ceremonies and traditions which the Pharisees presumptuously added to the law.\*

IV. These obscure and unfrequented heretical assemblies were very little detrimental to the Christian cause, which suffered much more from those sects, whose leaders explained the doctrines of Christianity in a manner conformable to the dictates of the oriental philosophy concerning the origin of evil. The oriental doctors, who, before this century, had lived in the greatest obscurity, came forth from their retreat under the reign of Adrian,† exposed themselves to public view, and collected, in various provinces, assemblies, whose numbers were very considerable. The ancient records mention a great number of these demi-Christian sects, many of which are no farther known than by their distinguishing names: which perhaps, is the only circumstance in which they differ from each other. One division, however, of these oriental Christians, may be mentioned as real and important, since the two branches it produced were considerably superior to the rest in reputation, and made more noise in the world than the other multiplied subdivisions of this pernicious sect. Of this famous division, one branch which arose in Asia, preserved the oriental doctrine concerning the origin of the world, unmixed with other sentiments and opinions; while the other, which was formed in Egypt, made a motley mixture of this philosophy with the tenets and prodigies adopted in the religious system of that superstitious country. The doctrine of the former surpassed in simplicity and perspicuity that of the latter, which consisted of a vast variety of parts, so artfully combined, that the explication of them became exceedingly difficult.

V. Among the doctors of the Asiatic branch, the first place is due to Elxai, who, during the reign of Trajan, is said to have formed the sect of the Eleesaites. This heretic, though a Jew, attached to the worship of one God, and full of veneration for Moses, corrupted the religion of his ancestors, by blending with it a multitude of fictions drawn from the oriental philosophy. Pretending also, after the example of the Essenes, to give a rational explication of the law of Moses, he reduced it to a mere allegory. It is, at the same time, proper to observe, that some have doubted whether the Eleesaites are to be reckoned among the Christian or the Jewish sects; and Epiphanius who was acquainted with a certain production of Elxai, expresses his uncertainty in this matter. Elxai, indeed, in that book, mentions Christ with the highest encomiums, without, however, adding any circumstance from which it might be concluded with certainty, that Je-

\* This gospel, which was called indiscriminately the gospel of the Nazarenes, or Hebrews, is certainly the same with the gospel of the Ebionites, and that of the twelve apostles, and is probably that which St. Paul refers to, Galatians, ch. i. ver. 6. Dr. Musclem refers his readers, for an account of this gospel, to Fabricius, in his Codex, Apocryphi, Nov. Test. tom. i. p. 355, and to a work of his own, entitled *Vindiciæ contra Tolandii Nazarenum*. The reader will, however, find a still more accurate and satisfactory account of this gospel, in the first volume of the learned and judicious Mr. Jones' incomparable Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament.

† See Mich. le Quien, Adnot. ad Damascenum, tom. i. as also a dissertation of the same author, de Nazarenis et eorum Fide, which is the seventh of those that he has subjoined to his edition of the works of Damascenus.

‡ See Fabric. ad Philostr. de Hæresibus; and Itigius, de Hæresibus Ævi Apostolici.

§ The learned Mr. Jones looked upon these two sects as differing very little from one another. He attributes to them both much the same doctrines, and alleges, that the Ebionites had only made some small additions to the old Nazarene system.

\* Irenæus, lib. i. contra Hæres. cap. xxvi. p. 105, edit. Massueti. Epiphanius gives a large account of the Ebionites, Hæres. xxx. But he deserves little credit, since he confesses, (sect. 3. p. 127, and sect. 4. p. 141.) that he had confounded the Sampseans and Eleesaites with the Ebionites, and also acknowledges that the first Ebionites were strangers to the errors with which he charges them.

† Stromata of Clemens Alex. lib. viii. cap. xvii. p. 698. Cyprianus epist. lxxx.

sus of Nazareth was the Christ of whom he spoke.\*

VI. If, then, Elxai be improperly placed among the leaders of the sect now under consideration, we may place at its head Saturninus of Antioch, who is one of the first Gnostic chiefs mentioned in history. He held the doctrine of two principles, from which proceeded all things; one a wise and benevolent deity; and the other, a principle essentially evil, which he supposed to be under the superintendence of a certain intelligence of a malignant nature. "The world and its first inhabitants were (according to the system of this raving philosopher) created by seven angels, who presided over the seven planets. This work was carried on without the knowledge of the benevolent deity, and in opposition to the will of the material principle. The former, however, beheld it with approbation, and honoured it with several marks of his beneficence. He endowed with rational souls the beings who inhabited this new system, to whom their creators had imparted nothing more than the mere animal life; and, having divided the world into seven parts, he distributed them among the seven angelic architects, one of whom was the god of the Jews, and reserved to himself the supreme empire over all. To these creatures, whom the benevolent principle had endowed with reasonable souls, and with dispositions that led to goodness and virtue, the evil being, to maintain his empire, added another kind, whom he formed of a wicked and malignant character; and hence arose the difference observable among men. When the creators of the world fell from their allegiance to the Supreme Deity, God sent from heaven, into our globe, a restorer of order, whose name was Christ. This divine conqueror came clothed with a corporeal appearance, but not with a real body; he came to destroy the empire of the material principle, and to point out to virtuous souls the way by which they must return to God. This way is beset with difficulties and sufferings, since those souls, who propose returning to the Supreme Being after the dissolution of this mortal body, must abstain from wine, flesh, wedlock, and, in short, from every thing that tends to sensual gratification, or even bodily refreshment." Saturninus taught these extravagant doctrines in Syria, but principally at Antioch, and drew after him many disciples by the pompous appearance of an extraordinary virtue.†

VII. Cerdo the Syrian, and Marcion, son to the bishop of Pontus, belong to the Asiatic sect, though they began to establish their doctrine at Rome, and, having given a turn somewhat different to the oriental superstition, may themselves be considered as the heads of a new sect, which bears their names. Amidst the obscurity and doubts that render so uncertain the history of these two men, the following fact is incontestable, viz. That Cerdo had been

spreading his doctrine at Rome before the arrival of Marcion there; and that the latter having, through his own misconduct, forfeited a place to which he aspired in the church of Rome, attached himself through resentment to the impostor Cerdo, and propagated his impious doctrines with an astonishing success throughout the world. "After the example of the oriental doctors, they held the existence of two principles, the one perfectly good, and the other perfectly evil. Between these, they imagined an intermediate kind of deity, neither perfectly good nor perfectly evil, but of a mixed nature (so Marcion expresses it,) and so far just and powerful, as to administer rewards and inflict punishments. This middle deity is the creator of this inferior world, and the god and legislator of the Jewish nation; he wages perpetual war with the evil principle, and one and the other aspire to the place of the Supreme Being, and ambitiously attempt to reduce under their authority all the inhabitants of the world. The Jews are the subjects of that powerful genius, who formed this globe; the other nations, who worship a variety of gods, are under the empire of the evil principle. Both these conflicting powers exercise oppressions upon rational and immortal souls, and keep them in a tedious and miserable captivity.—Therefore the Supreme God, in order to terminate this war, and to deliver from their bondage those souls whose origin is celestial and divine, sent to the Jews a being most like to himself, even his son Jesus Christ, clothed with a certain shadowy resemblance of a body, that thus he might be visible to mortal eyes. The commission of this celestial messenger was to destroy the empire both of the evil principle, and of the author of this world, and to bring back wandering souls to God. On this account, he was attacked with inexpressible violence and fury by the prince of darkness, and by the god of the Jews, but without effect, since, having a body only in appearance, he was thereby rendered incapable of suffering. Those who follow the sacred directions of this celestial conductor, mortify the body by fastings and austerities, call off their minds from the allurements of sense, and, renouncing the precepts of the god of the Jews, and of the prince of darkness, turn their eyes toward the Supreme Being, shall, after death ascend to the mansions of felicity and perfection." In consequence of all this, the rule of manners which Marcion prescribed to his followers, was excessively austere, containing an express prohibition of wedlock, of the use of wine, flesh, and of all the external comforts of life. Notwithstanding the rigor of this discipline, great numbers embraced the doctrines of Marcion, of whom Lucan (called also Lucian,) Severus, Blastus, and principally Apelles, are said to have varied, in some things, from the opinions of their master, and to have formed new sects.\*

VIII. Bardesanes and Tatian are commonly

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. xxxviii.—Epiphanius, Hæres. xix. sect. iii. Theodoretus, Fabul. Hæret. lib. ii. cap. vii.

† Irenæus, lib. i. c. xxiv.—Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. vii.—Theodoret. Fabul. Hæret. lib. i. cap. ii.—Epiphanius, Hæres. xxxiii.

\* See Irenæus, Epiphanius, and particularly Tertullian's Five Books against the Marcionites, with his Poem against Marcion, and the Dialogue against the Marcionites, which is generally ascribed to Origen. See also Tillamont's Memo. and Brauseobre's Hist. du Manichéisme, tom. ii.

supposed to have been of the school of Valentinus, the Egyptian. But this notion is entirely without foundation, since their doctrine differs in many things from that of the Valentinians, approaching nearer to that of the oriental philosophy concerning the two principles. Bardesanes, a native of Edessa, was a man of a very acute genius, and acquired a shining reputation by his writings, which were in great number, and valuable for the profound erudition they contained. Seduced by the fantastic charms of the oriental philosophy, he adopted it with zeal, but, at the same time, with certain modifications, that rendered his system less extravagant than that of the Marcionites, against whom he wrote a very learned treatise. The sum of his doctrine is as follows: There is a Supreme God, pure and benevolent, absolutely free from all evil and imperfection; and there is also a prince of darkness, the fountain of all evil, disorder and misery. God created the world without any mixture of evil in its composition; he gave existence also to its inhabitants, who came out of his forming hand, pure and incorrupt, endued with subtle ethereal bodies, and spirits of a celestial nature. But when, in process of time, the prince of darkness had enticed men to sin, God, permitted them to fall into sluggish and gross bodies, formed of corrupt matter by the evil principle; he permitted also the depravation and disorder which this malignant being introduced, both into the natural and the moral world, designing, by this permission, to punish the degeneracy and rebellion of an apostate race; and hence proceeds the perpetual conflict between reason and passion in the mind of man. It was on this account, that Jesus descended from the upper regions, clothed, not with a real, but with a celestial and aerial body, and taught mankind to subdue that body of corruption which they carry about with them in this mortal life, and, by abstinence, fasting and contemplation, to disengage themselves from the servitude and dominion of that malignant matter which chained down the soul to low and ignoble pursuits. Those, who hear the voice of this divine instructor, and submit themselves to his discipline, shall, after the dissolution of this terrestrial body, mount up to the mansions of felicity, clothed with ethereal vehicles, or celestial bodies.\* Such was the doctrine of Bardesanes, who afterwards abandoned the chimerical part of this system, and returned to a better mind; though his sect subsisted a long time in Syria.\*

IX. Tatian, by birth an Assyrian, and a disciple of Justin Martyr, is more distinguished, by the ancient writers, on account of his genius and learning, and the excessive and incredible austerity of his life and manners, than by any remarkable errors or opinions which he taught his followers. It appears, however, from the testimony of credible writers, that Tatian looked upon *matter* as the fountain of all evil, and therefore recommended, in a particu-

lar manner, the mortification of the body; that he distinguished the creator of the world from the Supreme Being; denied the reality of Christ's body; and corrupted the Christian religion with several other tenets of the oriental philosophy. He had a great number of followers, who were, after him, called Tatianists,\* but were, nevertheless, more frequently distinguished from other sects by names relative to the austerity of their manners; for, as they rejected, with a sort of horror, all the comforts and conveniences of life, and abstained from wine with such a rigorous obstinacy, as to use nothing but water even at the celebration of the Lord's Supper; as they macerated their bodies by continual fastings, and lived a severe life of eulicacy and abstinence, so they were called Eneratites, [\*] Hydroparastates, [†] and Apotactites. [‡]

X. Hitherto, we have only considered the doctrine of the Asiatic Gnostics. Those of the Egyptian branch differ from them in general in this, that they blended into one mass the oriental philosophy and the Egyptian theology; the former of which the Asiatics preserved unmixed in its original simplicity. The Egyptians were, moreover, particularly distinguished from the Asiatic Gnostics by the following difference in their religious system, viz. 1. That though, beside the existence of a deity, they maintained that also of an eternal matter, endued with life and motion, yet they did not acknowledge an eternal principle of darkness, or the evil principle of the Persians. 2. They supposed that our blessed Saviour was a compound of two persons, of the man Jesus, and of Christ, the Son of God; that the divine nature entered into the man Jesus, when he was baptized by John in the river Jordan, and departed from him when he was seized by the Jews. 3. They attributed to Christ a real not an imaginary body; though it must be confessed, that they were much divided in their sentiments on this head. 4. Their discipline, with respect to life and manners, was much less severe than that of the Asiatic sect, and seems, in some points, to have been favourable to the corruption and passions of men.

XI. Basilides has generally obtained the first place among the Egyptian Gnostics. "He acknowledged the existence of one Supreme God, perfect in goodness and wisdom, who produced from his own substance seven beings, or æons, of a most excellent nature. Two of these æons called Dynamis and Sophia (power and wisdom,) engendered the angels of the highest order. These angels formed a heaven for their habitation, and brought forth other angelic beings, of a nature somewhat inferior to their own. Many other generations of angels followed these and new heavens were also created, until the number of angelic orders, and of their respective heavens amounted to three hundred and sixty-five, and thus equalled

\* See the writers who have given accounts of the ancient heresies, as also Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xxx.—Origen, Dial. contra Marcionitas, sect. iii.—F. Strunzius, Hist. Bardesanis.—Beaupoire, Hist. du Manich. vol. ii.

\* We have yet remaining of the writings of Tatian, an Oration addressed to the Greeks. As to his opinions they may be gathered from Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromat. lib. ii. p. 460.—Epiphanius, Hæres. xvii. cap. i. p. 391. Origen de Oratione, cap. xiii. None, however, of the ancients wrote professedly concerning the doctrine of Tatian.

[\*] Temperate. [†] Drinkers of water. [‡] Renouncers.

the days of the year. All these are under the empire of an omnipotent Lord, whom Basilides called Abraxas.\* This word (which was certainly in use among the Egyptians before his time) contains numeral letters to the amount of 365, and thereby expresses the number of heavens and angelic orders above-mentioned. "The inhabitants of the lowest heavens, which touched upon the borders of the eternal, malignant, and self-animated matter, conceived the design of forming a world from that confused mass, and of creating an order of beings to people it. This design was carried into execution, and was approved by the Supreme God, who, to the animal life with which only the inhabitants of this new world were at first endowed, added a reasonable soul, giving, at the same time, to the angels, the empire over them."

XII. "These angelic beings, advanced to the government of the world which they had created, fell, by degrees, from their original purity, and manifested the fatal marks of their depravity and corruption. They not only endeavoured to efface from the minds of men the knowledge of the Supreme Being, that they might be worshipped in his stead, but also began to war against one another, with an ambitious view to enlarge, every one, the bounds of his respective dominion. The most arrogant and turbulent of all these angelic spirits, was that which presided over the Jewish nation. Hence God, beholding with compassion the miserable state of rational creatures, who groaned under the contests of these jarring powers, sent from heaven his son Nus, or Christ, the chief of the æons, that, joined in a substantial union with the man Jesus, he might restore the knowledge of the Supreme Being, and destroy the empire of those angelic na-

tures which presided over the world, and particularly that of the arrogant leader of the Jewish people. The god of the Jews, alarmed at this, sent forth his ministers to seize the man Jesus, and put him to death. They executed his commands; but their cruelty could not extend to Christ, against whom their efforts were vain.† Those souls, who obey the precepts of the Son of God, shall, after the dissolution of their mortal frame, ascend to the Father, while their bodies return to the corrupt mass of matter from which they were formed. Disobedient spirits, on the contrary, shall pass successively into other bodies."

XIII. The doctrine of Basilides, in point of morals, if we may credit the account of most ancient writers, was favourable to the lusts and passions of mankind, and permitted the practice of all sorts of wickedness. But those whose testimonies are the most worthy of regard, give a quite different account of this teacher, and represent him as recommending the practice of virtue and piety in the strongest manner, and as having condemned not only the actual commission of iniquity, but even every inward propensity of the mind to a vicious conduct. It is true there were, in his precepts relating to the conduct of life, some points which gave great offence to all real Christians; for he affirmed it to be lawful for them to conceal their religion, to deny Christ, when their lives were in danger, and to partake of the feasts of the Gentiles that were instituted in consequence of the sacrifices offered to idols. He endeavoured also to diminish the glory of those who suffered martyrdom for the cause of Christ impiously maintaining, that they were more heinous sinners than others, and that their sufferings were to be looked upon as a punishment inflicted upon them by the divine justice. He was led into this enormous error, by an absurd notion that all the calamities of this life were of a penal nature, and that men never suffered but in consequence of their iniquities. This rendered his principles greatly suspected; and the irregular lives of some of his disciples seemed to justify the unfavourable opinion that was entertained of their master.‡

XIV. But whatever may be said of Basilides, it is certain, that he was far surpassed in impiety by Carpocrates, who was also of Alexandria, and who carried the Gnostic blasphemies to a more enormous degree of extravagance than they had ever been brought by any of that sect. His philosophical tenets agree, in general, with those of the Egyptian Gnostics. He acknowledged the existence of a Supreme God, and of the æons derived from

\* We have remaining a great number of gems, and receive more from Egypt from time to time, on which, beside other figures of Egyptian taste, we find the word Abraxas engraven. See, for this purpose, a work entitled, *Macarii Abraxas, seu de Gemmis Basilidianis Disquisitio*, which was published at Antwerp with several improvements, by M. Chifflet, in 1657. See also *Montfaucon, Palæograph Græc. lib. ii. cap. viii.* All these gems are supposed to come from Basilides, and therefore bear his name. Most of them, however, contain the marks of a superstition too gross to be attributed even to a half-Christian, and bear also emblematic characters of the Egyptian theology. It is not, therefore, just to attribute them all to Basilides (who, though erroneous in many of his opinions, was yet a follower of Christ,) but such of them only as exhibit some mark of the Christian doctrine and discipline.—There is no doubt that the old Egyptian word Abraxas was appropriated to the governor or lord of the heavens, and that Basilides, having learned it from the philosophy of his nation, retained it in his religious system. See *Beaupoire, Hist. du Manichéisme. vol. ii. p. 51.*, and also *Jo. Bapt. Passerius, in his Dissert. de Gemmis Basilidianis*, which makes a part of the splendid work that he published at Florence, 1750, de *Gemmis stelliferis*, tom. ii. p. 221. See also the sentiments of the learned Jablonski, concerning the signification of the word Abraxas, as they are delivered in a dissertation inserted in the seventh volume of the *Miscell. Lipsiæ. Nova.* Passerius affirms, that none of these gems can properly be said to relate to Basilides, but that they concern only magicians, i. e. sorcerers, fortune-tellers, and the like adventurers. Here, however, this learned man seems to go too far, since he himself acknowledges (p. 225,) that he had sometimes found, on these gems, vestiges of the errors of Basilides. These famous monuments stand yet in need of an interpreter; but it must be one who can join circumspection to diligence and erudition.

† Many of the ancients have, upon the authority of Irenæus, accused Basilides of denying the reality of Christ's body, and of maintaining that Simon the Cyrenian was crucified in his stead. But this accusation is entirely groundless, as may be seen by consulting the *Commentar. de rebus Christianis. ante Constant.* where it is demonstrated, that Basilides considered the divine Saviour as compounded of the man Jesus, and Christ the Son of God. It may be true, indeed, that some of the disciples of Basilides entertained the opinion which is here unjustly attributed to their master.

‡ For a further account of Basilides, the reader may consult *Ren. Massuet, Dissert. in Irenæum, and Beaupoire Hist. du Manichéisme, t. i. li.*

him by successive generations. He maintained the eternity of a corrupt matter, and the creation of the world from it by angelic powers, as also the divine origin of souls unhappily imprisoned in mortal bodies, &c. But, beside these, he propagated sentiments and maxims of a horrid kind. He asserted, that Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, according to the ordinary course of nature, and was distinguished from the rest of mankind by nothing but his superior fortitude and greatness of soul. His doctrine, also, with respect to practice, was licentious in the highest degree; for he not only allowed his disciples a full liberty to sin, but recommended to them a vicious course of life, as a matter both of obligation and necessity; asserting, that eternal salvation was only attainable by those who had committed all sorts of crimes, and had daringly filled up the measure of iniquity. It is almost incredible, that one who maintained the existence of a Supreme Being, who acknowledged Christ as the Saviour of mankind, could entertain such monstrous opinions. One might infer, indeed, from certain tenets of Carpocrates that he adopted the common doctrine of the Gnostics concerning Christ, and acknowledged also the laws which this divine Saviour imposed upon his disciples. Notwithstanding this, it is beyond all doubt, that the precepts and opinions of this Gnostic are full of impiety, since he held, that lusts and passions being implanted in our nature by God himself, were consequently void of guilt, and had nothing criminal in them; that all actions were indifferent in their own nature, and were rendered good or evil only by the opinions of men, or by the laws of the state; that it was the will of God that all things should be possessed in common, the female sex not excepted; but that human laws, by an arbitrary tyranny, branded those as robbers and adulterers, who only used their natural rights. It is easy to perceive, that, by these tenets, all the principles of virtue were destroyed, and a door opened to the most horrid licentiousness, and to the most profligate and enormous wickedness.\*

XV. Valentine, who was likewise an Egyptian by birth, was eminently distinguished from all his brethren by the extent of his fame, and the multitude of his followers. His sect, which took rise at Rome, grew up to a state of consistency and vigour in the isle of Cyprus, and spread itself through Asia, Africa, and Europe, with an amazing rapidity. The principles of Valentine were, generally speaking, the same with those of the Gnostics, whose name he assumed; yet, in many points, he entertained opinions that were peculiar to himself. "He placed, for instance, in the *pleroma* (so the Gnostics called the habitation of the Deity) thirty æons, of which the one half were male, and the other female. To these he added four others, which were of neither sex, viz. Horus, who guarded the borders of the *pleroma*, Christ, the Holy Ghost, and Jesus. The youngest of the æons, called *Sophia* (i. e. wisdom,) conceiving an ardent desire of comprehending the

nature of the Supreme Being, and by force of this propensity, brought forth a daughter, named Achamoth, who, being exiled from the *pleroma*, fell down into the rude and undigested mass of matter, to which she gave a certain arrangement, and, by the assistance of Jesus, produced the *demiurge*, the lord and creator of all things. This demiurge separated the subtle or animal matter from that of the grosser or more terrestrial kind; out of the former he created the superior world, or the visible heavens; and out of the latter he formed the inferior world, or this terraqueous globe. He also made man, in whose composition the subtle, and also the grosser matter, were both united in equal portions; but Achamoth, the mother of the demiurge, added to these two substances, of which the human race was formed, a spiritual and celestial substance." This is the sum of that intricate and tedious fable, which the extravagant brain of Valentine imposed upon the world for a system of religious philosophy; and from this it appears that, though, he explained the origin of the world and of the human race, in a more subtle manner than the Gnostics, he did not differ from them in reality. His imagination was more wild and inventive than that of his brethren; and this is manifest in the whole of his doctrine, which is no more than Gnosticisism, set out with some supernumerary fringes, as will farther appear from what follows.

XVI. "The Creator of this world, according to Valentine, arrived, by degrees, at such a pitch of arrogance, that he either imagined himself to be God alone, or, at least, was desirous that mankind should consider him as such. For this purpose he sent forth prophets to the Jewish nation, to declare his claim to the honour that is due to the Supreme Being; and in this point the other angels who preside over the different parts of the universe immediately began to imitate his ambition. To chastise this lawless arrogance, and to illuminate the minds of rational beings with the knowledge of the true and Supreme Deity, Christ appeared upon earth, composed of an animal and spiritual substance, and clothed moreover, with an aerial body. This Redeemer, in descending upon earth, passed through the womb of Mary, as the pure water flows through the untainted conduit. Jesus, one of the supreme æons, was substantially united to him, when he was baptized by John in the waters of Jordan. The creator of this world, when he perceived that the foundations of his empire were shaken by this divine man, caused him to be apprehended and nailed to the cross. But before Christ submitted to this punishment, not only Jesus the Son of God, but also the rational soul of Christ ascended on high, so that only the animal soul and the ethereal body suffered crucifixion. Those who abandoning the service of false deities, and the worship of the God of the Jews, live according to the precepts of Christ, and submit the animal and sensual soul to the discipline of reason, shall be truly happy; their rational and also their sensual souls shall ascend to those glorious seats of bliss which border on the *pleroma*; and when all the parts of the divine nature, or all

\* See *Iren. contra Hæres. cap. xxv. Clementis Alex. Stromata, lib. iii. p. 511.*



souls are purified thoroughly, and separated from matter, then a raging fire, let loose from its prison, shall spread its flames throughout the universe, and dissolve the frame of this corporeal world." Such is the doctrine of Valentinus and the Gnostics; such also are the tenets of the oriental philosophy, and they may be summed up in the following propositions: "This world is a compound of good and evil. Whatever is good in it, comes down from the Supreme God, the Father of light, and to him it shall return; and then the world shall be entirely destroyed."\*

XVII. We learn from ancient writers, that the Valentinian sect was divided into many branches. One was the sect of the Ptolemites, so called from their chief Ptolemy, who differed in opinion from his master Valentinus, with respect both to the number and nature of the æons, another was the sect of the Secundians, whose chief Secundus, one of the principal followers of Valentinus, maintained the doctrine of two eternal principles, viz. *light* and *darkness*, whence arose the good and evil that are observable in the universe. From the same source arose the sect of Heracleon, from whose writings Clemens and Origen have made many extracts; as also that of the Marcosians, whose leaders, Marc and Colarbasus, added many absurd fictions to those of Valentinus; though it is certain, at the same time, that many errors were attributed to them, which they did not maintain.† I omit the mention of some other sects, to which the Valentinian heresy is said to have given rise. Whether, in reality, they all sprang from this source, is a question of a very doubtful kind, especially if we consider the errors into which the ancients have fallen, in tracing out the origin of the various sects that divided the church.‡

XVIII. It is not necessary to take any particular notice of the more obscure and less considerable of the Gnostic sects, of which the ancient writers scarcely mention any thing but

\* It is proper to observe, for the information of those who desire a more copious account of the Valentinian heresy, that many ancient writers have written upon this subject, especially Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens Alex. &c. Among the moderns, see the dissertation of J. F. Buddeus de hæresi Valentiniana, which gave occasion to many disputes concerning the origin of this heresy. Some of the moderns have endeavoured to reconcile, with reason, this obscure and absurd doctrine of the Valentinians. See, for this purpose, the following authors: Souverain, Platonisme dévoilé, ch. viii. Camp-Vitringa, Observ. Saer. lib. i. cap. ii. Beausobre, Histoire du Manichéisme, p. 548. Jac. Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, tom. iii. p. 729. Pierre Faydit, Eclaircissemens sur l'Hist. Ecclesiast. des deux premiers Siècles. How vain all such endeavours are, might easily be shown: and Valentinus himself has determined the matter, by acknowledging that his doctrine is absolutely and entirely different from that of other Christians.

† Marc did not certainly entertain all the opinions that are attributed to him. Those, however, which we are certain that he adopted, are sufficient to convince us that he was out of his senses. He maintained, among other crude fancies, that the plenitude and perfection of truth resided in the Greek Alphabet, and alleges that as the reason why Jesus Christ was called the Alpha and the Omega.

‡ Concerning these sects, the reader will find something fuller in Irenæus and the other ancient writers, and a yet more learned and satisfactory account in Græbe's Spicilegium Patr. et Hæreticor. sc. 2. There is an ample account of the Marcosians in Irenæus, contra Hæc. lib. i.

the name, and one or two of their distinguishing tenets. Such were the Adamites, who are said to have professed an exact imitation of the primitive state of innocence; the Cainites, who treated as saints, with the utmost marks of admiration and respect, Cain, Cora, Dathan, the inhabitants of Sodom, and even the traitor Judas. Such also were the Abelites, who entered into the bonds of matrimony, but neglected to fulfil its principal end, even the procreation of offspring; the Sethites, who honoured Seth in a particular manner, and looked upon him as the same person with Christ; the Florinians, who had Florinus and Blastus for their chiefs,\* and several others. It is highly probable that the ancient doctors, deceived by the variety of names that distinguished the heretics, may with too much precipitation have divided one sect into many; and it may be farther questioned, whether they have, at all times, represented accurately the nature and true meaning of several opinions concerning which they have written.

XIX. The Ophites, or Serpentinians, a ridiculous sort of heretics, who had for their leader a man called Euphrates, deserve not the lowest place among the Egyptian Gnostics. This sect, which had its origin among the Jews, was of a more ancient date than the Christian religion. A part of its followers embraced the Gospel, while the rest retained their primitive superstition; and hence arose the division of the Ophites into Christian and anti-Christian. The Christian Ophites entertained almost the same fantastic opinions that were held by the other Egyptian Gnostics, concerning the æons, the eternal matter, the creation of the world in opposition to the will of God, the rulers of the seven planets that presided over this world, the tyranny of the demiurge, and also respecting Christ united to the man Jesus, in order to destroy the empire of this usurper. But, beside these, they maintained the following particular tenet (whence they received the name of Ophites); "That the *serpent*, by which our first parents were deceived, was either Christ himself, or *Sophia*, concealed under the form of that animal;" and, in consequence of this opinion, they are said to have nourished a certain number of serpents, which they looked upon as sacred, and to which they offered a sort of worship, a subordinate kind of divine honours. It was no difficult matter for those, who made a distinction between the Supreme Being and the Creator of the world, and who looked upon every thing as divine, which was in opposition to the demiurge, to fall into these extravagant notions.

XX. The schisms and commotions that arose in the church, from a mixture of the oriental and Egyptian philosophy with the Christian religion, were, in the second century, increased by those Grecian philosophers who embraced the doctrine of Christ. The Christian doctrines concerning the Father, Son, and Holy

\* Here Dr. Mosheim has fallen into a slight inaccuracy in confounding the opinions of these two heretics, since it is certain, that Blastus was for restoring the Jewish religion, and celebrating the pass-over on the fourteenth day; whereas Florinus was a Valentinian, and maintained the doctrine of the two principles, with other Gnostic errors.

Ghost, and the two natures united in our blessed Saviour, were by no means reconcilable with the tenets of the sages and doctors of Greece, who therefore endeavoured to explain them in such a manner as to render them comprehensible. Praxeas, a man of genius and learning, began to propagate these explications at Rome, and was severely persecuted for the errors they contained. He denied any real distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and maintained that the Father, sole creator of all things, had united to himself the human nature of Christ. Hence his followers were called Monarchians, because of their denying a plurality of persons in the Deity; and also Patripassians, because, according to Tertullian's account, they believed that the Father was so intimately united with the man Christ, his son, that he suffered with him the anguish of an afflicted life, and the torments of an ignominious death. However ready many may have been to embrace this erroneous doctrine, it does not appear, that this sect formed to itself a separate place of worship, or removed from the ordinary assemblies of Christians.\*

XXI. An opinion highly resembling that now mentioned, was, about the same time, professed at Rome by Theodotus, who, though a tanner, was a man of profound learning, and also by Artemas, or Artemon, from whom the sect of the Artonites derived their origin. The accounts given of these two persons, by the ancient writers, are not only few in number, but are also extremely ambiguous and obscure. Their sentiments, however, as far as they can be collected from the best records, amount to this; "That, at the birth of the man Christ, a certain *divine energy*, or portion of the divine nature (and not the *person* of the Father, as Praxeas imagined,) united itself to him."

It is impossible to decide with certainty which of the two was the more ancient, Theodotus, or Artemon; as also whether they both taught the same doctrine, or differed in their opinions. One thing, indeed, is certain, that the disciples of both applied the dictates of philosophy, and even the science of geometry, to the explication of the Christian doctrine.

XXII. A like attachment to the dictates of a presumptuous philosophy, induced Hermogenes, a painter by profession, to abandon the doctrine of Christianity concerning the origin of the world, and the nature of the soul, and thus to raise new troubles in the church. Regarding *matter* as the fountain of all evil, he could not persuade himself that God had created it from nothing, by an almighty act of his will; and therefore he maintained, that the world, with whatever it contains, as also the souls of men, and other spirits, were formed by the Deity from an uncreated and eternal mass of corrupt matter. In this doctrine there were many intricate things, and it manifestly jarred with the opinions commonly received among Christians relative to that difficult and almost unsearchable subject. How Hermogenes explained those doctrines of Christianity which

opposed his system, neither Tertullian, who refuted it, nor any of the ancient writers, inform us.\*

XXIII. These sects, which we have now been slightly surveying, may be justly regarded as the offspring of philosophy. But they were succeeded by one in which ignorance reigned, and which was the mortal enemy of philosophy and letters. It was formed by Montanus, an obscure man, without any capacity or strength of judgment, and who lived in a Phrygian village called Pepuza. This weak man was so foolish and extravagant as to imagine and pretend, that he was the *paraclete*, or comforter,† whom the divine Saviour, at his departure from the earth, promised to send to his disciples to lead them to all truth. He made no attempts upon the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, but only declared, that he was sent with a divine commission, to give, to the moral precepts delivered by Christ and his apostles, the finishing touch that was to bring them to perfection. He was of opinion, that Christ and his apostles made, in their precepts, many allowances to the infirmities of those among whom they lived, and that this condescending indulgence rendered their system of moral laws imperfect and incomplete. He therefore added to the laws of the Gospel many austere decisions; inculcated the necessity of multiplying fasts; prohibited second marriages as unlawful; maintained that the church should refuse absolute to those who had fallen into the commission of enormous sins; and condemned all care of the body, especially all nicety in dress, and all female ornaments. The excessive austerity of this ignorant fanatic did not stop here; he showed the same aversion to the no-

\* There is yet extant a book written by Tertullian against Hermogenes, in which the opinions of the latter concerning matter, and the origin of the world, are warmly opposed. We have lost another work of the same author, in which he refuted the notion of Hermogenes concerning the soul.

† Those are undoubtedly in an error, who have asserted that Montanus gave himself out for the Holy Ghost. However weak he may have been in point of capacity, he was not fool enough to push his pretensions so far. Neither have they, who inform us that Montanus pretended to have received from above the same spirit or paraclete which formerly animated the apostles, interpreted with accuracy the meaning of this heretic. It is, therefore, necessary to observe here, that Montanus made a distinction between the paraclete promised by Christ to his apostles, and the Holy Spirit that was shed upon them on the day of Pentecost; and understood, by the former, a divine teacher pointed out by Christ, as a comforter, who was to perfect the Gospel by the addition of some doctrines omitted by our Saviour, and to cast a full light upon others which were expressed in an obscure and imperfect manner, though for wise reasons which subsisted during the ministry of Christ; and, indeed, Montanus was not the only person who made this distinction. Other Christian doctors were of opinion, that the paraclete promised by Jesus to his disciples, was a divine ambassador, entirely distinct from the Holy Ghost which was shed upon the apostles. In the third century, Manes interpreted the promise of Christ in this manner. He pretended, moreover, that he himself was the paraclete, and that, in his person, the prediction was fulfilled. Every one knows, that Mohammed entertained the same notion, and applied to himself the prediction of Christ. It was, therefore, this divine messenger that Montanus pretended to be, and not the Holy Ghost. This will appear with the utmost evidence, to those who read with attention the account given of this matter by Tertullian, who was the most famous of all the disciples of Montanus, and the most perfectly acquainted with every point of his doctrine.

\* Tertulliani lib. contra Praxeam; as also Petri Weselingii Probabilia, cap. xxvi.

blest employments of the mind, that he did to the innocent enjoyments of life; and gave it as his opinion, that philosophy, arts, and whatever savoured of polite literature, should be mercilessly banished from the Christian church. He looked upon those Christians as guilty of a most heinous transgression, who saved their lives by flight, from the persecuting sword, or who ransomed them by money, from the hands of their cruel and mercenary judges. I might mention many other precepts of the same teacher, equal to these in severity and rigour.

XXIV. It was impossible to suffer, within the bounds of the church, an enthusiast, who gave himself out for a communicator of precepts superior in sanctity to those of Christ himself, and who imposed his austere discipline upon Christians, as enjoined by a divine authority, and dictated by the oracle of celestial wisdom, which spoke to the world through him. Besides, his dismal predictions concerning the disasters that were to happen in the empire, and the approaching destruction of the Roman republic, might be expected to render him obnoxious to the governing powers, and also to excite their resentment against the church, which nourished such an inauspicious prophet in its bosom. Montanus, therefore, first by a decree of certain assemblies, and afterwards by the unanimous voice of the whole church, was solemnly separated from the body of the faithful.

It is, however, certain, that the very severity

of his doctrines gained him the esteem and confidence of many, who were far from being of the lowest order. The most eminent among these were Priscilla and Maximilla, ladies more remarkable for their opulence than for their virtue, and who fell with a high degree of warmth and zeal into the visions of their fanatical chief, prophesied like him, and imitated the pretended paraclete in all the variety of his extravagance and folly. Hence it became an easy matter for Montanus to erect a new church, which was first established at Pepuza, and afterwards spread abroad through Asia, Africa, and a part of Europe. The most eminent and learned of all the followers of this rigid enthusiast was Tertullian, a man of great learning and genius, but of an austere and melancholy temper. This great man, by adopting the sentiments of Montanus, and maintaining his cause with fortitude, and even vehemence, in a multitude of books written upon that occasion, has exhibited a mortifying spectacle of the deviations of which human nature is capable, even in those in whom it seems to have approached the nearest to perfection.\*

\* For an account of the Montanists, see Euseb. Eccles. History, book v. ch. xvi., and all the writers ancient and modern (especially Tertullian) who have professedly written of the sects of the earlier ages. The learned Theophilus Wernsdorff published, in 1751, a most ingenious exposition of whatever regards the sect of the Montanists, under the following title: *Commentatio de Montanists Seculi secundi, vulgo creditis Hæreticis.*

## THE THIRD CENTURY.

### PART I.

#### THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

##### CHAPTER I.

*Which contains the Prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THAT the Christians suffered, in this century, calamities and injuries of the most dreadful kind, is a matter that admits no debate; nor was there, indeed, any period in which they were secure or free from danger. For, not to mention the fury of the people, set in motion so often by the craft and zeal of their licentious priests, the evil came from a higher source; the prætors and magistrates, notwithstanding the ancient laws of the emperors in favor of the Christians, had it in their power to pursue them with all sorts of vexations, as often as avarice, cruelty, or superstition roused up the infernal spirit of persecution in their breasts. At the same time, it is certain that the rights and

privileges of the Christians were multiplied, in this century, much more than some are apt to imagine. In the army, at court, and, indeed, in all the orders of the nation, there were many Christians who lived entirely unmolested; and, what is still more, the profession of Christianity was no obstacle to the public preferment under most of the emperors that reigned in this century. It is also certain, that the Christians had, in many places, houses where they assembled for the purposes of divine worship with the knowledge and connivance of the emperors and magistrates. And though it be more than probable, that this liberty was, upon various occasions, and even for the most part, purchased at a high rate, yet it is manifest, that some of the emperors were very favourably inclined toward the Christians, and were far from having any aversion to their religion.

II. Caracalla, the son of Severus, was proclaimed emperor in the year 211, and, during the six years of his government, he neither oppressed the Christians himself, nor permitted any others to treat them with cruelty or injustice. Heliogabalus also, though in other respects the most infamous of all princes,\* and, perhaps, the most odious of all mortals, showed no marks of bitterness or aversion to the disciples of Jesus. His successor, Alexander Severus, who was a prince distinguished by a noble assemblage of the most excellent and illustrious virtues, did not, indeed, abrogate the laws that had been enacted against the Christians; and this is the reason why we have some examples of martyrdom under his administration. It is nevertheless certain, that he showed them, in many ways, and upon every occasion that was offered to him, the most undoubted marks of benignity: he is even said to have gone so far as to pay a certain sort of worship to the divine author of our religion.† The friendly inclination of this prince toward the Christians probably arose, at first, from the instructions and counsels of his mother, Julia Mammæa, for whom he had a high degree of love and veneration. Julia had very favourable sentiments of the Christian religion: and, being once at Antioch, sent for the famous Origen from Alexandria, in order to enjoy the pleasure and advantage of his conversation and instructions. Those who assert, that Julia, and her son Alexander, embraced the Christian religion, are by no means furnished with unexceptionable testimonies to confirm this fact, though we may affirm, with confidence, that this virtuous prince looked upon Christianity as meriting, beyond all other religions, toleration and favour from the state, and considered its author as worthy of a place among those who had been distinguished by their sublime virtues, and honoured with a commission from above.‡

III. Under Gordian, the Christians lived in tranquillity. His successors the Philips, father and son, proved so favourable, and even friendly to them, that these two emperors passed, in the opinion of many, for Christians; and, indeed, the arguments alleged to prove that they embraced, though in a secret and clandestine manner, the religion of Jesus, seem to render this point highly probable. But, as these arguments are opposed by others equally specious, the famous question, relating to the religion of Philip the Arabian and his son, must be left undecided.§ Neither side offers reasons so

\* Lampridius, Vita Elagabali.

† Lamprid. di Vita Severi, cap. xxix. Vide Carol Henr. Zeibichii Dis. de Christo ab Alexandro in larario culto, in Miscellan. Lips. nov. tom. iii.

‡ Vide F. Spanhemii Dis. de Lucii, Britonum Regis, Julæ Mammææ et Philipporum, conversionibus, tom. ii. op. p. 400. Item, Paul Jablonski, Dis de Alexandro Severo sacris Christianis per Gnosticos initiato, in Miscellan. Lips. nov. tom. iv.

§ The authors of the Universal History have determined the question which Dr. Mosheim leaves here undecided; and they think it may be affirmed, that Philip and his son embraced the Gospel, since that opinion is built upon such respectable authority as that of Jerom, Chrysostom, Dionysius of Alexandria, Zonaras, Nicephorus, Cedrenus, Rufinus, Syncellus, Orosius, Jordanus, Amnianus Marcellinus, the learned cardinal Bona, Vincentius Lirinensis, Huetius, and others. Dr.

victorious and unanswerable, as to produce a full and complete conviction; and this is therefore one of those many cases, where a suspension of judgment is both allowable and wise. With respect to Gallienus, and some other emperors, of this century, if they did not professedly favour the progress of Christianity, they did not oppress its followers, or retard its advancement.

IV. This clemency and benevolence, which the followers of Jesus, experienced from great men, and especially from those of imperial dignity, must be placed, without doubt, among the human means that contributed to multiply the number of Christians, and to enlarge the bounds of the church. Other causes, however, both divine and human, must be added here, to afford a complete and satisfactory account of this matter. Among the causes which belong to the first of these classes, we do not only reckon the intrinsic force of celestial truth, and the piety and fortitude of those who declared it to the world, but also that *especial and interposing providence*, which, by such dreams and visions as were presented to the minds of many, who were either inattentive to the Christian doctrine, or its professed enemies, touched their hearts with a conviction of its truth and a sense of its importance, and engaged them, without delay, to profess themselves the disciples of Christ.\* To this may also be added, the healing of diseases, and other miracles, which many Christians were yet enabled to perform by invoking the name of the divine Saviour.† The number of miracles, however, we find to have been much less in this than in the preceding century; nor must this alteration be attributed only to the divine wisdom, which rendered miraculous interpositions less frequent in proportion as they became less necessary, but also to that justice which was provoked to diminish the frequency of gifts, because some did not scruple to pervert them to mercenary purposes.‡

V. If we turn our view to the human means that contributed, at this time, to multiply the number of Christians, and extend the limits of the church, we shall find a great variety of causes uniting their influence, and contributing jointly to this happy purpose. Among these must be reckoned the translations of the sacred writings into various languages, the zeal and labours of Origen in spreading abroad copies of them, and the different works that were published, by learned and pious men, in defence of the Gospel. We may add to this, that the acts of beneficence and liberality, performed by the Christians, even toward persons whose religious principles they abhorred, had a

Mosheim refers his readers, for an account of this matter, to the following writers: Spanheim, de Christianismo Philipp. tom. ii. op. p. 400.—Entretiens Historiques sur le Christianisme de l'Empereur Philippe, par P. De L. F.—Mammæchii Origines et Antiqu. Christianæ, tom. ii. p. 252.—Fabric. de Lucæ Evang. &c. p. 252.

\* See, for an account of this matter, the following authors: Origen, lib. i. adv. Celsum, p. 35. Homil. in Lucæ vii. p. 216, tom. ii. op. edit. Basil.—as also Tertullian, de Anima, cap. xiv. and Eusebius, lib. vi. cap. v.

† Origen, contra celsum, lib. i. Euseb. lib. v. cap. vii. Cypriani Ep. i. ad Donat. and the notes of Baluze upon that passage.

‡ Spencer, not in Origen. contra Celsum.

great influence in attracting the esteem, and removing the prejudices of many, who were thus prepared for examining with candour the Christian doctrine, and, consequently, for receiving its divine light. The adorers of the pagan deities must have been destitute of every generous affection, of every humane feeling, if the view of that boundless charity, which the Christians exercised toward the poor, the love they expressed even to their enemies, the tender care they took of the sick and infirm, the humanity they discovered in the redemption of captives, and the other illustrious virtues, which rendered them so worthy of universal esteem, had not touched their hearts, dispelled their prepossessions, and rendered them more favourable to the disciples of Jesus. If, among the causes of the propagation of Christianity, there is any place due to *pious frauds*, it is certain that they merit a very small part of the honour of having contributed to this glorious purpose, since they were practised by few, and that very rarely.

VI. That the limits of the church were extended in this century, is a matter beyond all controversy. It is not, however, equally certain in what manner, by what persons, or in what parts of the world, this was effected. Origen, invited from Alexandria by an Arabian prince, converted, by his assiduous labours, a certain tribe of wandering Arabs to the Christian faith.\* The Goths, a fierce and warlike people, who inhabited the countries of Mœsia and Thrace, and who, accustomed to rapine, harassed the neighbouring provinces by perpetual incursions, received the knowledge of the Gospel by the means of certain Christian doctors sent thither from Asia. The holy lives of these venerable teachers, and the miraculous powers with which they were endowed, attracted the esteem, even of a people educated to nothing but plunder and devastation, and absolutely uncivilized by letters or science; and their authority and influence became so great, and produced, in process of time, such remarkable effects, that a great part of this barbarous people professed themselves the disciples of Christ, and put off, in a manner, that ferocity which had been so natural to them.†

VII. The Christian assemblies, founded in Gaul by the Asiatic doctors in the preceding century, were few in number, and of very small extent; but both their number and their extent were considerably increased from the time of the emperor Decius. Under his sway, Dionysius, Gatian, Trophimus, Paul, Saturninus, Martial, Stremonius, men of exemplary piety, passed into this province, and, amidst dangers and trials of various kinds, erected churches at Paris, Tours, Arles, and several other places. This was followed by a rapid progress of the Gospel among the Gauls, as the disciples of these pious teachers spread, in a short time, the knowledge of Christianity through the whole country.‡ We must also place in this century

the origin of several German churches, such as those of Cologne, Treves, Mentz, and others, of which Eucharius, Valerius, Maternus, and Clemens, were the principal founders.\* The historians of Scotland inform us, that the light of Christianity arose upon that country during this century; but, though there be nothing improbable in this assertion, yet it is not built upon incontestable authority.†

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the Calamitous Events which happened to the Church in this Century.*

I. In the beginning of this century, the Christian church suffered calamities of various kinds throughout the provinces of the Roman empire. These sufferings increased in a terrible manner, in consequence of a law made, in the year 203, by the emperor Severus (who, in other respects, was certainly no enemy to the Christians,) by which every subject of the empire was prohibited from changing the religion of his ancestors for the Christian or Jewish faith.‡ This law was, in its effects, most prejudicial to the Christians; for, though it did not formally condemn them, and seemed only adapted to put a stop to the progress of the Gospel, yet it induced rapacious and unjust magistrates to persecute even unto death the poorer sort among the Christians, that thus the richer might be led, through fear of the like treatment, to purchase their tranquillity and safety at an expensive rate. Hence many of the disciples of Christ, in several parts of Asia, also in Egypt and other parts of Africa, were put to death in consequence of this law.— Among these Leonidas, the father of Origen, Perpetua and Felicitas (those two famous African ladies, whose *acts* § are come down to our times,) Potamiana Marcella, and other martyrs of both sexes, acquired an illustrious name by the magnanimity and tranquillity with which they endured the most cruel sufferings.

II. From the death of Severus to the reign of Maximin, the condition of the Christians was, in some places, prosperous, and, in all, supportable. But with Maximin the face of affairs changed. This unworthy emperor, having animated the Roman soldiers to assassinate Alexander Severus, dreaded the resentment of the Christians, whom that excellent prince had favoured and protected in a distinguished manner; and, for this reason, he ordered the bishops, whom he knew that Alexander had always treated as his intimate friends, to be seized and put to death.¶ During his reign, the Christians suffered in the most barbarous manner; for, though the edict of this tyrant extended only to the bishops and leaders of the Christian church, yet its shocking effects reached much farther, as it animated the heathen

\* See Aug. Calmet, Hist. de Lorraine, tom. i. dissert. i. p. 7. Jo. Nicol. ab Hontheim, Historia Trevirensis, tom. i. ubi. Diss. de æra fundati Episcopatus Trevirensis.

† See Usher and Stillingfleet, Antiquit. et Origin. Ecclesiar. Brit. See also Sir George Mackenzie, de Regali Secutorum prosapia, cap. viii. p. 119.

‡ Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. i. Spartianus in Severo, cap. xvi. xvii.

§ Theod. Ruinart, Acta Martyr. p. 90.

¶ Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. xviii. p. 225. Orosius, Hist. lib. vii. cap. xix. p. 509.

\* Eusebius; Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xix. p. 221.

† Sozomenus, Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. vi. Paulus Diaconus, Hist. Miscel. lib. ii. cap. xiv. Philostorgius, Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. v. p. 470.

‡ See the history of the Franks by Gregory of Tours, book i. ch. xviii. Theodor. Ruanart, Acta Martyr. sucera, p. 109.

priests, the magistrates, and the multitude, against Christians of every rank and order.\*

III. This storm was succeeded by a calm, in which the Christians enjoyed a happy tranquillity for many years. The accession of Decius Trajan to the imperial throne, in the year 249, raised a new tempest, in which the fury of persecution fell in a dreadful manner upon the church of Christ; for this emperor, either from an illgrounded fear of the Christians, or from a violent zeal for the superstition of his ancestors, published most terrible and cruel edicts; by which the prætors were ordered, on pain of death, either to extirpate the whole body of Christians without exception, or to force them, by torments of various kinds, to return to the pagan worship. Hence, in all the provinces of the empire, multitudes of Christians were, in the course of two years, put to death by the most horrid punishments; which an ingenious barbarity could invent. Of all these cruelties the most unhappy circumstance was, their fatal influence upon the faith and constancy of many of the sufferers; for as this persecution was much more terrible than all those which preceded it, so a great number of Christians, dismayed, not at the approach of death, but at the aspect of those dreadful and lingering torments, which a barbarous magistracy had prepared to combat their constancy, fell from the profession of their faith, and secured themselves from punishment, either by offering sacrifices, or by burning incense, before the images of the gods, or by purchasing certificates from the pagan priests. Hence arose the opprobrious names of *Sacrificati*, given to those who sacrificed; *Thurificati*, to those who burned incense; and *Libellatici*, to those who produced certificates.†

IV. This defection of such a prodigious number of Christians under Decius, was the occasion of great commotions in the church, and produced debates of a very difficult and delicate nature; for the lapsed, or those who had fallen from their Christian profession, were desirous of being restored to the church-communication, without submitting to that painful course of penitential discipline, which the ecclesiastical laws indispensably required. The bishops were divided upon this matter: some were for showing the desired indulgence, while others opposed it with all their might.‡ In

Africa, many, in order to obtain more speedily the pardon of their apostacy, interested the martyrs in their behalf, and received from them letters of reconciliation and peace, i. e. a formal act, by which they (the martyrs) declared in their last moments, that they looked upon them as worthy of their communion, and desired, of consequence, that they should be restored to their place among the brethren. Some bishops and presbyters re-admitted into the church, with too much facility, apostates and transgressors, who produced such testimonies as these. But Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, a man of severe wisdom and great dignity of character, acted in quite another way. Though he had no intention of derogating from the authority of the venerable martyrs, yet he opposed with vigour this unreasonable lenity, and set limits to the efficacy of these letters of reconciliation and peace. Hence arose a keen dispute between him and the martyrs, confessors, presbyters, and lapsed, seconded by the people: and yet, notwithstanding this formidable multitude of adversaries, the venerable bishop came off victorious.\*

V. Gallus, the successor of Decius, and Volusianus, son of the former, re-animating the flame of persecution, which was beginning to burn with less fury; and, beside the sufferings which the Christians had to undergo in consequence of their cruel edicts, they were also involved in the public calamities that prevailed at this time, and suffered grievously from a terrible pestilence, which spread desolation through many provinces of the empire.† This pestilence also was an occasion which the pagan priests used with dexterity to renew the rage of persecution against them, by persuading the people that it was on account of the lenity used towards the Christians, that the gods sent down their judgments upon the nations. In the year 254, Valerian, being declared emperor, made the fury of persecution cease, and restored the church to a state of tranquillity.

VI. The clemency and benevolence which Valerian showed to the Christians, continued until the fifth year of his reign. Then the scene began to change, and the change indeed was sudden. Maerianus, a superstitious and cruel bigot to paganism, had gained an entire ascendancy over Valerian, and was chief counsellor in every thing that related to the affairs of government. By the persuasion of this imperious minister, the Christians were prohibited from assembling, and their bishops and doctors were sent into banishment. This edict was published in the year 257, and was followed, the year after, by one still more severe; in consequence of which, a considerable number of Christians, in the different provinces of the empire, were put to death; and many of these were subjected to such cruel modes of execution, as were more terrible than death itself. Of those who suffered in this persecution, the

\* Origen, tom. xxviii. in Math. op. tom. i. p. 137. See also Firmilianus in Cypriani Epistolis, p. 140.

† Eusebius, lib. vi. cap. xxxix. xli. Gregorius Nyss. in vita Thaumaturgi. Cyprianus, de Lapsis.

‡ These certificates were not all equally criminal; nor did all of them indicate a degree of apostacy equally enormous. It is therefore necessary to inform the reader of the following distinctions omitted by Dr. Mosheim: these certificates were sometimes no more than a permission to abstain from sacrificing, obtained by a fee given to the judges, and were not looked upon as an act of apostacy, unless the Christians who demanded them had declared to the judges that they had conformed themselves to the emperor's edicts. But, at other times, they contained a profession of paganism, and were either offered voluntarily by the apostate, or were subscribed by him, when they were presented to him by the persecuting magistrates. Many used certificates, as letters of security obtained from the priests, at a high rate, and which dispensed them from either professing or denying their sentiments. See Spanheim's Historia Christiana, p. 732. See also Prud. Maranus in vita Cypriani, sect. 6.

§ Eusebius, lib. vi. cap. xlv. Cyr. Epistolæ.

\* The whole history of this controversy may be gathered from the epistles of Cyprian. See also Gabr. Albanus, Observat. Eccles. lib. i. observ. xx. and Dallæus, de Pœnis et Satisfactionibus humanis, lib. vii. cap. xvi.

† Euseb. lib. vii. cap. i. Cypriani. Epist. lviii. lviiii.

‡ Vid. Cypriani Lib. ad Demetrianum.

most eminent were Cyprian, bishop of Carthage; Sixtus, bishop of Rome; and Laurentius, a Roman deacon, who was barbarously consumed by a slow and lingering fire. An unexpected event suspended, for awhile, the sufferings of the Christians. Valerian was made prisoner in the war against the Persians; and his son Gallienus, in the year 260, restored peace to the church.\*

VII. The condition of the Christians was rather supportable than happy, under the reign of Gallienus, which lasted eight years; as also under the short administration of his successor Claudius. Nor did they suffer much during the first four years of the reign of Aurelian, who was raised to the empire in the year 270. But the fifth year of this emperor's administration would have proved fatal to them, had not his violent death prevented the execution of his cruel purposes; for while, instigated by the unjust suggestions of his own superstition, or by the barbarous counsels of a bigoted priesthood, he was preparing a formidable attack upon the Christians, he was obliged to march into Gaul, where he was murdered, in the year 275, before his edicts were published throughout the empire.† Few, therefore, suffered martyrdom under his reign; and indeed, during the remainder of this century, the Christians enjoyed a considerable measure of ease and tranquillity. They were, at least, free from any violent attacks of oppression and injustice, except in a small number of cases, where the avarice and superstition of the Roman magistrates interrupted their tranquillity.‡

VIII. While the emperor, and proconsuls employed against the Christians the terror of unrighteous edicts, and the edge of the destroying sword, the Platonic philosophers, who have been described above, exhausted against Christianity all the force of their learning and cloquence, and all the resources of their art and dexterity, in rhetorical declamations, subtle writings, and ingenious stratagems. These artful adversaries were so much the more dangerous and formidable, as they had adopted several of the doctrines and institutions of the Gospel, and, with a specious air of moderation and impartiality, were attempting, after the example of their master Anthonius, to reconcile paganism with Christianity, and form a sort of coalition of the ancient and the new religion. These philosophers had at their head, in this century, Porphyry (a Syrian, or, as some allege, a Tyrian, by birth,) who wrote against the Christians a long and laborious work, which was destroyed afterwards by an imperial edict.§ He was, undoubtedly, a writer of great dexterity, genius, and erudition, as those of his works which yet remain suffi-

ciently testify. But those very works, and the history of his life, show us, at the same time, that he was a much more virulent, than formidable enemy to the Christians; for by them it appears, that he was much more attentive to the suggestions of a superstitious spirit, and the visions of a lively fancy, than to the sober dictates of right reason and a sound judgment; and it may be more especially observed of the remaining fragments of his work against the Christians, that they are equally destitute of judgment and equity, and are utterly unworthy of a wise and a good man.\*

IX. Many were the deceitful and perfidious stratagems by which this sect endeavoured to obscure the lustre, and diminish the authority of the Christian doctrine. None of these seemed to be more dangerous than the seducing artifice with which they formed a comparison between the life, actions, and miracles of Christ, and the history of the ancient philosophers, and placed the contending parties in such fallacious points of view, as to make the pretended sages of antiquity appear in nothing inferior to the divine Saviour. With this view, Archytas of Tarentum, Pythagoras, of whom Porphyry wrote the life, Apollonius Tyanæus, a Pythagorean philosopher, whose miracles and peregrinations were highly celebrated by the vulgar, were brought upon the scene, and exhibited as divine teachers, and rivals of the glory of the Son of God. Philostratus, one of the most eminent rhetoricians of this age, composed a pompous history of the life of Apollonius, who was little better than a cunning knave, and did nothing but ape the austerity and sanctity of Pythagoras. This history appears manifestly designed to draw a parallel between Christ and the philosopher of Tyanæ; but the impudent fictions and ridiculous fables, with which this work is filled, must, one would think, have rendered it incapable of deceiving any who possessed a sound mind; any, but such as, through the corruption of vicious prejudices, were willing to be deceived.‡

X. But as there are no opinions, however absurd, and no stories, however idle and improbable, that a weak and ignorant multitude, more attentive to the pomp of words than to the truth of things, will not easily swallow; so it happened, that many were ensnared by the absurd attempts of these insidious philosophers. Some were induced by these perfidious stratagems to abandon the Christian religion, which

\* This work of Porphyry against the Christians was burned, by an edict of Constantine the Great. It was divided into fifteen books, as we find in Eusebius, and contained the blackest calumnies against the Christians. The first book treated of the contradictions which he pretended to have found in the sacred writings. The greatest part of the twelfth is employed in fixing the time when the prophecies of Daniel were written; for Porphyry himself found these predictions so clearly and evidently fulfilled, that, to avoid the force of the argument, thence deducible in favor of Christianity, he was forced to have recourse to the absurd supposition, that these prophecies had been published under the name of Daniel by one who lived in the time of Antiochus, and wrote after the arrival of the events foretold. Methodus, Eusebius, and Apollinaris, wrote against Porphyry; but their refutations have been long since lost.

‡ See Olerius' preface to the Life of Apollonius by Philostratus; as also Moshem's notes to his Latin translation of Cudworth's Intellectual System, p. 304, &c.

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. x. xi. p. 255. Acta Cypriani, as they are to be found in Ruinart's Act. Martyrum, p. 216. Cyprian Epist. lxxvii. lxxxii.

† Eusebius, lib. vii. Lactantius, de mortibus Persecutorum.

‡ Among these vexations may be reckoned the cruelty of Galerius Maximian, who, toward the conclusion of this century, persecuted the ministers of his court, and the soldiers of his army, who had professed Christianity. See Eusebius, lib. viii.

§ See Holstenius de vita Porphyry. cap. xi. Fabric. Lux Evang. p. 154. Budeus, Isagoge in Theologium, tom. ii.

they had embraced. Others, when they were taught to believe that true Christianity (as it was inculcated by Jesus, and not as it was afterwards corrupted by his disciples) differed in few points from the pagan system, properly explained and restored to its primitive purity, determined to remain in the religion of their ancestors, and in the worship of their gods. A third sort were led, by these comparisons between Christ and the ancient philosophers, to form to themselves a motley system of religion composed of the tenets of both parties, whom they treated with the same veneration and respect. Such was, particularly, the method of Alexander Severus, who paid indiscriminately divine honours to Christ and to Orpheus, to Apollonius, and the other philosophers and heroes whose names were famous in ancient times.

XI. The credit and power of the Jews were now too much diminished to render them as capable of injuring the Christians, by their influence over the magistrates, as they had formerly been. This did not, however, discour-

age their malicious efforts, as the books which Tertullian and Cyprian have written against them abundantly show, with several other writings of the Christian doctors, who complained of the malignity of the Jews, and of their sinister machinations.\* During the persecution under Severus, a certain person called Dominus, who had embraced Christianity, deserted to the Jews, doubtless to avoid the punishments that were decreed against the Christians; and it was to recall this apostate to his duty and his profession, that Serapion, bishop of Antioch, wrote a particular treatise against the Jews.† We may easily conclude, from this instance, that, when the Christians were persecuted, the Jews were treated with less severity and contempt, on account of their enmity against the disciples of Jesus. From the same fact we may also learn, that, though they were in a state of great subjection and abasement, they were not entirely deprived of all power of oppressing the Christians.

\* Hippolytus, *Serm. in Susann. et Daniël.* tom. i. cap.

† Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. cap. xii. p. 213.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.*

I. THE arts and sciences, which, in the preceding century, were in a declining state, seemed, in this, ready to expire, and had lost all their vigour and lustre. The celebrated rhetorician Longinus, and the eminent historian Dio Cassius, with a few others, were the last among the Greeks, who stood in the breach against the prevailing ignorance and barbarism of the times. Men of learning and genius were still less numerous in the western provinces of the empire, though there were in several places flourishing schools, appropriated to the advancement of the sciences and the culture of taste and genius. Different reasons contributed to this decay of learning. Few of the emperors patronised the sciences, or encouraged, by the prospect of their favour and protection, that emulation which is the soul of literary excellence. Besides, the civil wars that almost always distracted the empire, were extremely unfavourable to the pursuit of science; and the perpetual incursions of the barbarous nations interrupted that leisure and tranquillity which are so essential to the progress of learning and knowledge, and extinguished, among a people accustomed to the din of arms, all desire of literary acquisitions.\*

II. If we turn our eyes toward the state of philosophy, the prospect will appear somewhat less desolate and comfortless. There were, as

yet, in several of the Grecian sects, men of considerable knowledge and reputation, of whom Longinus has mentioned the greatest part.\* But all these sects were gradually eclipsed by the school of Ammonius, whose origin and doctrines have been considered above. This victorious sect, which was formed in Egypt, issued thence with such a rapid progress, that, in a short time, it extended itself almost throughout the Roman empire, and drew into its vortex the greatest part of those who applied themselves, through inclination, to the study of philosophy. This amazing progress was due to Plotinus, the most eminent disciple of Ammonius, a man of a most subtle invention, endowed by nature with a genius capable of the most profound researches, and equal to the investigation of the most abstruse and difficult subjects. This penetrating and sublime philosopher taught publicly, first in Persia, and afterwards at Rome, and in Campania; in all which parts the youth flocked in crowds to receive his instructions. He comprehended the precepts of his philosophy in several books, most of which are yet extant.†

III. The number of disciples, formed in the school of Plotinus, is almost beyond credibility. The most famous was Porphyry,‡ who spread

\* In his life of Plotinus, epitomised by Porphyry, ch. xx.

† See Porphyrii vita Plotini, of which Fabricius has given an edition in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, tom. iv.—Bayle's *Diction.* tom. iii.—and Brucker's *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*.

‡ Porphyry was first the disciple of Longinus, author of the justly celebrated *Treatise on the Sublime*;

\* See the *Literary History of France*, by the Benedictine monks, vol. i. part ii.



abroad through Sicily, and many other countries, the doctrine of his master, revived with great accuracy, adorned with the graces of a flowing and elegant style, and enriched with new inventions and curious improvements.' From the time of Ammonius, until the sixth century this was almost the only system of philosophy that was publicly taught at Alexandria. A certain philosopher, whose name was Plutarch, having learned it there, brought it into Greece, and renewed, at Athens, the celebrated Academy, from which issued a set of illustrious philosophers, whom we shall have occasion to mention in the progress of this work.†

IV. We have unfolded, above, the nature and doctrines of this philosophy, as far as was compatible with the brevity of our present design. It is, however, proper to add here, that its votaries were not all of the same sentiments, but thought very differently upon a variety of subjects. This difference of opinion was the natural consequence of that fundamental law, which the whole sect was obliged to keep constantly in view, viz. That truth was to be pursued with the utmost liberty, and to be collected from all the different systems in which it lay dispersed. Hence it happened, that the Athenians rejected certain opinions that were entertained by the philosophers of Alexandria: yet none of those who were ambitious to be ranked among these new Platonists, called in question the main doctrines which formed the groundwork of their singular system; those, for example, which regarded the existence of one God, the fountain of all things; the eternity of the world; the dependence of matter upon the Supreme Being; the nature of souls; the plurality of gods; the method of interpreting the popular superstitions, &c.

V. The famous question concerning the excellence and utility of human learning, was now debated with great warmth among the Christians; and the contending parties, in this controversy, seemed hitherto of equal force in point of number, or nearly so. Many recommended the study of philosophy, and an acquaintance with the Greek and Roman literature; while others maintained, that these were pernicious to the interests of genuine Christianity, and the progress of true piety. The cause of letters and philosophy triumphed, however, by degrees; and those who wished well to them, continued to gain ground, till at length the superiority was manifestly decided in their favour. This victory was principally due to the influence and authority of Origen, who, having been early instructed in the new kind of Platonism already mentioned, blended it, though unhappily, with the purer and more sublime tenets of a celestial doctrine, and recommended it, in the warmest manner, to the youth who attended his public lessons. The fame of this philosopher increased daily

among the Christians; and, in proportion to his rising credit, his method of proposing and explaining the doctrines of Christianity gained authority, till it became almost universal. Besides, some of the disciples of Plotinus having embraced Christianity, on condition that they should be allowed to retain such of the opinions of their master as they thought of superior excellence and merit,\* this must also have contributed, in some measure, to turn the balance in favour of the sciences. These Christian philosophers, preserving still a fervent zeal for the doctrines of their Heathen chief, would naturally embrace every opportunity of spreading them abroad, and instilling them into the minds of the ignorant and the unwary.

## CHAPTER II.

*Respecting the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government, during this Century.*

I. THE form of ecclesiastical government that had been adopted by Christians in general, had now acquired greater degrees of stability and force, both in particular churches, and in the general society of Christians. It appears incontestable, from the most authentic records and the best histories of this century, that, in the larger cities, there was, at the head of each church, a person to whom was given the title of *bishop*, who ruled this sacred community with a certain sort of authority, in concert, however, with the body of presbyters, and consulting, in matters of moment, the opinions and the voices of the whole assembly.† It is also equally evident, that, in every province, *one* bishop was invested with a certain superiority over the rest, in point of rank and authority. This was necessary to the maintenance of that association of churches which had been introduced in the preceding century; and it contributed to facilitate the holding of general councils, and to give a certain degree of order and consistency to their proceedings. It must, at the same time, be carefully observed, that the rights and privileges of these primitive bishops were not every where accurately fixed, nor determined in such a manner as to prevent encroachments and disputes; nor does it appear, that the chief authority in the province was always conferred upon that bishop who presided over the church established in the metropolis. It may also be noticed, as a matter beyond all dispute, that the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, considered as rules of primitive and apostolic churches, had a kind of pre-eminence over all others, and were not only consulted frequently in affairs of a difficult and momentous nature, but were also distinguished by peculiar rights and privileges.

II. With respect, particularly, to the bishop of Rome, he is supposed by Cyprian to have had, at this time, a certain pre-eminence in

but, having passed from Greece to Rome, where he heard Plotinus, he was so charmed with the genius and penetration of this philosopher, that he attached himself entirely to him. See Plotin. vit. p. 3. Eunap. e. ii. p. 17.

\* Holstenius, vit. Porphyrit, republished by Fabricius. † Marini vita Proci, cap. vi. xii.

\* Augustinus, Epistola lvi. ad Dioscor. p. 260, tom. ii. op.

† A satisfactory account of this matter may be seen in Blonde-lli Apologia pro Sententia Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris, p. 136, as that author has collected all the testimonies of the ancients relative to that subject.

the church;\* nor does he stand alone in this opinion. But it ought to be observed, that even those, who, with Cyprian, attributed this pre-eminence to the Roman prelate, insisted, at the same time, with the utmost warmth, upon the *equality*, in point of *dignity* and *authority*, that subsisted among all the members of the episcopal order. In consequence of this opinion of an equality among all Christian bishops, they rejected, with contempt, the judgment of the bishop of Rome, when they thought it ill-founded or unjust, and followed their own sense of things with a perfect independence. Of this Cyprian himself gave an eminent example, in his famous controversy with Stephen bishop of Rome, concerning the baptism of heretics, in which he treated the arrogance of that imperious prelate with a noble indignation, and also with a perfect contempt. Whoever, therefore, compares these particulars, will easily perceive, that the only dignity which the bishop of Rome could justly claim was a pre-eminence of *order* and *association*,† not of *power* and *authority*. Or to explain the matter yet more clearly, the pre-eminence of the bishop of Rome, in the universal church, was such as that of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, was in the African churches; and every one knows, that the precedency of this latter prelate diminished in nothing the equality that subsisted among the African bishops, and invalidated in no instance their rights and liberties, but gave only to Cyprian, as the president of their general assemblies, a power of calling councils, of presiding in them, of admonishing his brethren in a mild and fraternal manner, and of executing, in short, such offices as the order and purposes of these ecclesiastical meetings necessarily required.‡

III. The face of things began now to change in the Christian church. The ancient method of ecclesiastical government seemed, in general, still to subsist, while, at the same time, by imperceptible steps, it varied from the primitive rule, and degenerated toward the form of a religious monarchy; for the bishops aspired to higher degrees of power and authority than they had formerly possessed, and not only violated the rights of the people, but also made gradual encroachments upon the privileges of the presbyters; and that they might cover these usurpations with an air of justice, and an appearance of reason, they published new doctrines concerning the nature of the church, and of the episcopal dignity, which, however, were in general so obscure, that they themselves seemed to have understood them as little as those to whom they were delivered. One of the principal authors of this change, in the go-

vernment of the church, was Cyprian, who pleaded for the power of the bishops with more zeal and vehemence than had ever been hitherto employed in that cause, though not with an unshaken constancy and perseverance; for, in difficult and perilous times, necessity sometimes obliged him to yield, and to submit several things to the judgment and authority of the church.

IV. This change in the form of ecclesiastical government, was soon followed by a train of vices, which dishonoured the character and authority of those to whom the administration of the church was committed; for, though several yet continued to exhibit to the world illustrious examples of primitive piety and Christian virtue, yet many were sunk in luxury and voluptuousness, puffed up with vanity, arrogance, and ambition, possessed with a spirit of contention and discord, and addicted to many other vices that cast an undeserved reproach upon the holy religion, of which they were the unworthy professors and ministers. This is testified in such an ample manner, by the repeated complaints of many of the most respectable writers of this age,\* that truth will not permit us to spread the veil, which we should otherwise be desirous to cast over such enormities among an order so sacred. The bishops assumed, in many places, a princely authority, particularly those who had the greatest number of churches under their inspection, and who presided over the most opulent assemblies. They appropriated to their evangelical function the splendid ensigns of temporal majesty; a throne, surrounded with ministers, exalted above his equals the servant of the meek and humble Jesus; and sumptuous garments dazzled the eyes and the minds of the multitude into an ignorant veneration for this usurped authority. An example which ought not to have been followed, was ambitiously imitated by the presbyters, who, neglecting the sacred duties of their station, abandoned themselves to the indolence and delicacy of an effeminate and luxurious life. The deacons, beholding the presbyters thus deserting their functions, boldly invaded their rights and privileges; and the effects of a corrupt ambition were spread through every rank of the sacred order.

V. From what has been now observed, we may come, perhaps, at the true origin of minor or inferior orders, which were, in this century, added every where to those of the bishops, presbyters, and deacons; for, certainly, the titles and offices of *subdeacon*, *acolythi*, *ostiarii*, or door-keepers, *readers*, *exorcists*, and *copiata*, would never have been heard of in the church, if its rulers had been assiduously and zealously employed in promoting the interests of truth and piety, by their labours and their example. But, when the honors and privileges of the bishops and presbyters were augmented, the deacons also began to extend their ambitious views, and to despise those lower functions and employments which they had hitherto exercised with such humility and zeal. The additional orders that were now created to di-

\* Cyprian, Ep. lv. et lxxiii. etiam de Unitate Ecclesie, p. 195, edit. Baluzii.

† So I have translated *Principatus ordinis et consociationis*, which could not be otherwise rendered without a long circumlocution. The pre-eminence here mentioned, signifies the right of convening councils, of presiding in them, of collecting voices, and such other things as were essential to the order of these assemblies.

‡ See Steph. Baluzii adno. ad Cypriani Epistolam, p. 387, 389, 400. Consult particularly the seventy-first and seventy-third epistles of Cyprian, and the fifty-fifth, addressed to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, in which letters the Carthaginian prelate pleads with warmth and vehemence for the equality of all Christian bishops.

\* Origen. Comm. in Matthæum, par. i. op. p. 420, 441. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. viii. cap. i.

minish the labours of the present rulers of the church, had functions allotted to them, which their names partly explain.\* The institution of *exorcists* was a consequence of the doctrine of the New Platonists, which the Christians adopted, and which taught, that the evil *genii*, or spirits, were continually hovering over human bodies, toward which they were carried by a natural and vehement desire; and that vicious men were not so much impelled to sin by an innate depravity, or by the seduction of example, as by the internal suggestions of some evil demon. The *copiatae* were employed in providing for the decent interment of the dead.

VI. Marriage was permitted to all the various ranks and orders of the clergy. Those, however, who continued in a state of celibacy, obtained by this abstinence a higher reputation of sanctity and virtue than others. This was owing to an almost general persuasion, that they, who took wives, were of all others the most subject to the influence of malignant *dæmons*.† And as it was of infinite importance to the interests of the church, that no impure or malevolent spirit should enter into the bodies of such as were appointed to govern, or to instruct others, so the people were desirous that the clergy should use their utmost efforts to abstain from the pleasures of the conjugal life. Many of the sacred order, especially in Africa, consented to satisfy the desires of the people, and endeavoured to do this in such a manner as not to offer an entire violence to their own inclinations. For this purpose, they formed connexions with those women who had made vows of perpetual chastity; and it was an ordinary thing for an ecclesiastic to admit one of these fair saints to the participation of his bed; but still under the most solemn

declarations, that nothing passed in this commerce that was contrary to the rules of chastity and virtue.‡ These holy concubines were called, by the Greeks, *Συνεπίθετοι*; and by the Latins, *Mulieres subintroductæ*. This indecent custom alarmed the zeal of the more pious among the bishops, who employed the utmost efforts of their severity and vigilance to abolish it, though it was a long time before they entirely effected this laudable purpose.

VII. Thus we have given a short, though not a very pleasing view of the rulers of the church during this century; and we ought now to mention the principal writers who distinguished themselves in it by their learned and pious productions. The most eminent of these, whether we consider the extent of his fame, or the multiplicity of his labours, was Origen, a presbyter and catechist of Alexandria, a man of vast and uncommon abilities, and the greatest luminary of the Christian world that this age exhibited to view. Had the soundness of his judgment been equal to the immensity of his genius, the fervour of his piety, his indefatigable patience, his extensive erudition, and his other eminent and superior talents, all encomiums must have fallen short of his merit. Yet such as he was, his virtues and his labours deserve the admiration of all ages; and his name will be transmitted with honour through the annals of time, as long as learning and genius shall be esteemed among men.†

The second in renown, among the writers of this century, was Julius Africanus, a native of Palestine, a man of the most profound erudition, but the greatest part of whose learned labours are unhappily lost.

Hippolytus, whose history is much involved in darkness,‡ is also esteemed among the most celebrated authors and martyrs of this age; but those writings which at present bear his name, are justly looked upon by many as either extremely corrupted, or entirely spurious.

Gregory, bishop of New-Cæsarea, acquired, at this time, the title of *Thaumaturgus*, i. e. wonder-worker, on account of the variety of great and signal miracles, which he is said to have wrought during the course of his ministry. Few of his works have come down to our times, and his miracles are called in question by many, as unsupported by sufficient evidence.§

It is to be wished that we had more of the writings of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, than those which have survived the ruins of time, since the few remaining fragments of his works display the most consummate wisdom and prudence, and the most amiable spirit of moderation and candor, and thus abundantly

\* The sub-deacons were designed to ease the deacons of the meanest part of their work. Their office, consequently, was to prepare the sacred vessels of the altar, and to deliver them to the deacons in time of divine service; to attend the doors of the church during the communion service; to go on the bishop's embassies, with his letters or messages to foreign churches. In a word, they were so subordinate to the superior rulers of the church, that by a canon of the council of Laodicea, they were forbidden to sit in the presence of a deacon without his leave. The order of *acolythi* was peculiar to the Latin church; for there was no such order in the Greek church, during the four first centuries. Their name signifies *attendants*; and their principal office was to light the candles of the church, and to attend the ministers with wine for the eucharist. The *ostiarii*, or door-keepers, were appointed to open and shut the doors, as officers and servants under the deacons and sub-deacons; to give notice of the times of prayer and church assemblies, which, in time of persecution, required a private signal for fear of discovery; and that, probably, was the first reason for instituting this order in the church of Rome, whose example, by degrees, was soon followed by other churches.—The *readers* were those who were directed to read the scripture in that part of divine service to which the catechumens were admitted.—The *exorcists* were appointed to drive out evil spirits from the bodies of persons possessed; they had been long known in the church, but were not erected into an ecclesiastical order before the latter end of the third century.—The *copiatae*, or *fossarii*, were an order of the inferior clergy, whose business it was to take care of funerals, and to provide for the decent interment of the dead. In vain have Baronius and other Romish writers asserted, that these inferior orders were of apostolical institution. The contrary is evidently proved, since these offices are not mentioned by authentic writers as having taken place before the third century, and the origin can be traced no higher than the fourth.

† Porphyrius, *τὰ ἐκτετακτα*, lib. iv. p. 417.

\* *Credat Judæus Apella*. See however Dodwell, Diss. tertiam Cyprianicam, and Lud. An. Muratorius, Diss. de Syniætiis et Agapetis, in his Anecdot. Græc. p. 218: as also Baluzius ad Cypriani Epistol.

† See a very learned and useful work of the famous Huet, bishop of Avranches, entitled, *Origeniana*. See also, Doucin, *Histoire d'Origene et des Mouvemens arrivés dans l'Eglise au sujet de sa Doctrine*; and Bayle's Dictionary.

‡ The benedictine monks have, with great labour and erudition, endeavoured to dispel this darkness in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. i. p. 261.

§ See Van-Dale's preface to his Latin treatise concerning Oracles.

vindicate from all suspicion of flattery, the ancients who mentioned him under the title of Dionysius the Great.\*

Methodius appears to have been a man of great piety, and highly respectable on account of his eminent virtue; but those of his works which are yet extant, evince no great degree of penetration and acuteness in handling controversy and weighing opinions.

VIII. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, a man of the most eminent abilities and flowing eloquence, stands foremost in the list of Latin writers. His letters, and indeed the greater part of his works breathe such a noble and pathetic spirit of piety, that it is impossible to read them without the warmest feelings of enthusiasm. We must however observe, that he would have been a better writer, had he been less attentive to the ornaments of rhetoric; and a better bishop, had he been able to restrain the vehemence of his temper and to distinguish with greater acuteness, between truth and falsehood.

The dialogue of Minucius, Felix, which bears the title of *Octavius*, effaces with such judgment, spirit and force, the calumnies and reproaches that were cast upon the Christians by their adversaries, that it deserves an attentive perusal from those who are desirous of knowing the state of the church during this century.

The seven books of Arnobius, the African, written against the Gentiles, form a still more copious and ample defence of the Christians, and, though obscure in several places, may yet be read with pleasure and with profit. It is true, that this rhetorician, too little instructed in the Christian religion, when he wrote this work, has mingled great errors with solemn and important truths, and has exhibited Christianity under a certain philosophical form, very different from that in which it is commonly received.

We refer our readers, for an account of the authors of inferior note, who lived in this century, to those who have professedly given histories or enumerations of the Christian writers.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church in this Century.*

I. THE principal doctrines of Christianity were now explained to the people in their native purity and simplicity, without any mixture of abstract reasonings or subtle inventions; nor were the feeble minds of the multitude loaded with a great variety of precepts.† But the Christian doctors who had applied themselves to the study of letters and philosophy, soon abandoned the frequented paths, and wandered in the devious wilds of fancy. The Egyptians distinguished themselves in this new method of explaining the truth. They looked upon it as a noble and a glorious task to bring the doctrines of celestial wisdom into a certain subjec-

tion to the precepts of their philosophy, and to make deep and profound researches into the intimate and hidden nature of those truths which the divine Saviour had delivered to his disciples. Origen was at the head of this speculative tribe. This great man, enchanted by the charms of the Platonic philosophy, set it up as the test of all religion, and imagined that the reasons of each doctrine were to be found in that favorite philosophy, and their nature and extent to be determined by it.\* It must be confessed that he handled this matter with modesty and caution; but he still gave an example to his disciples, the abuse of which could not fail to be pernicious, and under the authority of which, they would naturally indulge themselves without restraint in every wanton fancy. And so, indeed, the case was; for the disciples of Origen, breaking forth from the limits fixed by their master, interpreted, in the most licentious manner, the divine truths of religion according to the tenor of the Platonic philosophy. From these teachers the philosophical, or *scholastic theology*, as it is called, derived its origin; and, proceeding hence, passed through various forms and modifications according to the genius, turn, and erudition of those who embraced it.

II. The same principles gave rise to another species of theology, which was called *mystic*. And what must seem at first sight surprising here, is, that this mystic theology, though formed at the same time, and derived from the same source with the scholastic, had a natural tendency to overturn and destroy it. The authors of this mystic science are not known; but the principles from which it sprang are manifest. Its first promoters argued from that known doctrine of the Platonic school, which also was adopted by Origen and his disciples that the divine nature was diffused through all human souls; or in other words that the faculty of reason, from which the health and vigour of the mind proceed, was an emanation from God into the human soul, and comprehended in it the principles and elements of all truth, human and divine. They denied that men could, by labour or study, excite this celestial flame in their breasts; and, therefore, they highly disapproved the attempts of those who, by definitions, abstract theorems, and profound speculations, endeavoured to form distinct notions of truth, and to discover its hidden nature. On the contrary, they maintained, that silence, tranquillity, repose, and solitude, accompanied with such acts of mortification as might tend to extenuate and exhaust the body, were the means by which the internal word was excited to produce its latent virtues, and to instruct men in the knowledge of divine things. For thus they reasoned: "They who behold with a noble contempt all human affairs, they who turn away their eyes from terrestrial vanities, and shut all the avenues of the outward senses against the contagious influences of a material world, must necessarily return to God, when the spirit is thus disengaged from the impediments that prevented that happy union; and

\* The history of Dionysius is particularly illustrated by Jaques Basnage, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i.

† See Origen, in *Præf. Libro. de Principiis*, tom. i. op. p. 49, and lib. i. de *Principiis*, cap. ii. See also the *Expositio Fidei* by Gregorius Neocesariensis.

\* This is manifest from what remains of his *Stromata*; as also from his books de *Principiis*, which are still preserved in a Latin translation of them by Rufinus.

in this blessed frame, they not only enjoy inexpressible raptures from their communion with the Supreme Being, but are also invested with the inestimable privilege of contemplating truth, undisturbed and uncorrupted, in its native purity, while others behold it in a vitiated and delusive form.\*

III. This method of reasoning produced strange effects, and drove many into caves and deserts, where they macerated their bodies with hunger and thirst, and submitted to all the miseries of the severest discipline that a gloomy imagination could prescribe; and it is not improbable, that Paul, the first hermit, was rather engaged by this fanatical system, than by the persecution under Decius, to fly into the most solitary deserts of Thebais, where he led, during the space of ninety years, a life more worthy of a savage animal than of a rational being.† It is, however, to be observed, that though Paul is placed at the head of the order of Hermits, yet that insocial manner of life was very common in Egypt, Syria, India, and Mesopotamia, not only long before his time, but even before the coming of Christ; and it is still practised among the Mohammedans, as well as the Christians, in those arid and burning climates;‡ for the glowing atmosphere, that surrounds these countries, is a natural cause of that love of solitude and repose, of that indolent and melancholy disposition, which are remarkably common among their languid inhabitants.

IV. But let us turn away our eyes from these scenes of fanaticism, which are so opprobrious to human nature, and consider some other circumstances that belong more or less to the history of the Christian doctrine during this century. And here it is proper to mention the useful labours of those who manifested their zeal for the holy scriptures by the care they took to have accurate copies of them multiplied every where, and offered at such moderate prices, as rendered them of easy purchase; as also to have them translated into various languages, and published in correct editions. Many of the more opulent among the Christians generously contributed a great part of their substance to the prosecution of these pious and excellent undertakings. Pierius and Hesychius in Egypt, and Lucian at Antioch, employed much pains in correcting the copies of the Septuagint; and Pamphilus of Cæsarea laboured with great diligence and success in works of the same nature, until a glorious martyrdom finished his course. But Origen surpassed all others in diligence and assiduity; and his famous Hexapla, though almost entirely destroyed by the waste of time, will, even in its fragments, remain an eternal monument of the incredible application with which that great man laboured to remove those obstacles which retarded the progress of the Gospel.‡

V. After the encomiums we have given to Origen, who has an undoubted right to the first

place among the interpreters of the Scriptures in this century, it is not without a deep concern that we are obliged to add, that he also, by an unhappy method, opened a secure retreat for all sorts of errors that a wild and irregular imagination could bring forth. Having entertained a notion that it was extremely difficult, if not impossible, to defend every thing contained in the sacred writings from the cavils of heretics and infidels, so long as they were explained *literally*, according to the real import of the terms, he had recourse to the fecundity of a lively imagination, and maintained, that they were to be interpreted in the same *allegorical* manner in which the Platonists explained the history of the gods. In consequence of this pernicious rule of interpretation, he alleged, that the words of Scripture were, in many places, absolutely void of sense; and that though in others there were, indeed, certain notions conveyed under the outward terms according to their literal force and import, yet it was not in these that the true meanings of the sacred writers were to be sought, but in a mysterious and hidden sense, arising from the nature of the things themselves.‡ This hidden sense he endeavours to investigate throughout his commentaries, neglecting and despising, for the most part, the outward letter; and in this devious path he displays the most ingenious strokes of fancy, though generally at the expense of truth, whose divine simplicity is rarely discernible through the cobweb veil of allegory.† Nor did the inventions of Origen end here. He divided this hidden sense, which he pursued with such eagerness into *moral* and *mystical*, or *spiritual*. The moral sense of Scripture displays those doctrines that relate to the inward state of the soul and the conduct of life. The mystical or spiritual sense represents the nature, the laws, and the history of the spiritual or mystical world. We are not yet at the end of the labyrinth; for he subdivided this mystical world of his own creation into two distinct regions, one of which he call-

\* For a farther illustration of this matter, the reader may consult the excellent preface of M. de la Rue, to the second volume of the works of Origen, published at Paris in 1733. An accurate and full account of Origen's method of interpreting the Scripture may be found in the work entitled *Commentar. de rebus Christian. ante Constantinum* M. p. 629; where the philosophy and theology of that great man, and his controversy with Demetrius bishop of Alexandria, are treated of professedly, and at large.

† Origen, in his *Stromata*, book x., expresses himself in the following manner: "The source of many evils lies in adhering to the carnal or external part of Scripture. Those who do so, shall not attain to the kingdom of God. Let us, therefore, seek after the spirit and the substantial fruit of the word, which are hidden and mysterious." And again, "The Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written." One would think it impossible that such expressions should drop from the pen of a wise man. But the philosophy, which this great man embraced with such zeal, was one of the sources of his delusion. He could not find in the bible, the opinions he had adopted, as long as he interpreted that sacred book according to its literal sense. But Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and, indeed, the whole philosophical tribe, could not fail to obtain, for their sentiments, a place in the Gospel, when it was interpreted by the wanton inventions of fancy, and upon the supposition of a hidden sense, to which it was possible to give all sorts of forms. Hence all who desired to model Christianity according to their fancy, or their favourite system of philosophy, embraced Origen's method of interpretation.

\* The life of this hermit was written by Jerome.

† See the travels of Lucas, in 1714, vol. ii.

‡ The fragments that yet remain of Origen's Hexapla, were collected and published, by the learned Montfaucou, in folio, at Paris, in 1713. See also upon this head Buddei *Isagoge in Theolog.* tom. ii. and Carpentieri *Critic. Sacr. Veter. Testam.* p. 574.

ed the superior, *i. e.* heaven, and the other the inferior, by which he meant the church. This led to another division of the mystical sense into an earthly or allegorical sense, adapted to the inferior world, and a celestial or analogical one, adapted to the superior region. This chimerical method of explaining the Scripture was, before Origen, received by many Christians, who were deluded into it by the example of the Jews. But, as this learned man reduced it into a system, and founded it upon fixed and determined rules, he is, on that account, commonly considered as its principal author.

VI. A prodigious number of interpreters, both in this and the succeeding ages, followed the method of Origen, though with some variations; nor could the few, who explained the sacred writings with judgment and a true spirit of criticism, oppose with success the torrent of allegory that was overflowing the church. The commentaries of Hippolytus, which are yet extant, show manifestly, that this good man was entirely addicted to the system of Origen, and the same judgment may be hazarded concerning Victorinus' explications of certain books of the Old and New Testament, though these explications are, long since, lost. The translation of the Ecclesiastes by Gregory Thaumaturgus, which is yet remaining, is not chargeable with this reproach, notwithstanding the tender and warm attachment of its author to Origen. The book of Genesis and the Song of Solomon were explained by Methodius, whose work is lost; and Ammonius composed a Harmony of the Gospels.

VII. The doctrinal part of theology employed the pens of many learned men in this century. In his *Stromata*, and his four books of *Elements*, Origen illustrated the greatest part of the doctrines of Christianity, or, to speak more properly, rather disguised them under the lines of a vain philosophy. These books of elements, or principles, were the first sketch that appeared of the scholastic or philosophical theology. Something of the same nature was attempted by Theognostus, in his seven books of *Hypotyposes*, which are only known at present by the extracts of them in Photius, who represents them as the work of one who was infected with the notions of Origen.—Gregory Thaumaturgus drew up a brief summary of the Christian religion, in his *Exposition of the Faith*; and many treated, in a more ample manner, particular points of doctrine in opposition to the enemies and corruptors of Christianity. Thus Hippolytus wrote of the Deity, the resurrection, Anti-Christ, and the end of the world; Methodius, of free-will; and Lucian, of faith. It is doubtful in what class these productions are to be placed, as most of them have perished among the ruins of time.

VIII. Among the moral writers, the first place, after Tertullian, of whom we have already spoken, is due to Cyprian, a prelate of eminent merit, who published several treatises concerning patience, mortality, works, alms, as also an exhortation to martyrdom. In these dissertations there are many excellent things; but they are destitute of order, precision, and method; nor do we always find solid proofs in

favour of the decisions they contain.\* Origen has written many treatises of this kind, and, among others, an *exhortation* to suffer martyrdom for the truth; a subject handled by many authors in this century, but with unequal eloquence and penetration. Methodius treated of chastity, in a work entitled, *Symposium Virginum*, or, the Feast of Virgins: but this treatise is full of confusion and disorder.—Dionysius handled the doctrine of penance and temptations. The other moral writers of this period are too obscure and trivial to render the mention of them necessary.

IX. The controversial writers were exceedingly numerous in this century. The Pagans were attacked, in a victorious manner, by Minucius Felix, in his dialogue called *Octavius*; by Origen; in his writings against Celsus; by Arnobius in his seven books against the Gentiles; and by Cyprian, in his treatise concerning the vanity of idols. The chronicle of Hippolytus in opposition to the Gentiles, and the work of Methodius against Porphyry, that bitter adversary of the Christians, are both lost.

We may also reckon, in the number of the polemic writers, those who wrote against the philosophers, or who treated any subjects that were disputed between different sects. Such was Hippolytus, who wrote against Plato, and who also treated the nicest, the most difficult, and the most controverted subjects, such as fate, free-will, and the origin of evil, which exercised, likewise, the pens of Methodius and other acute writers. What Hippolytus wrote against the Jews, has not reached our times; but the work of Cyprian, upon that subject, yet remains.† Origen, Victorinus, and Hippolytus, attacked, in general, the various sects and heresies that divided the church; but their labours in that immense field have entirely disappeared; and as to those who only turned their controversial arms against some few sects and particular doctrines, we think it not necessary to enumerate them here.

X. It is, however, proper to observe, that the methods now used of defending Christianity, and attacking Judaism and idolatry, degenerated much from the primitive simplicity, and the true rules of controversy. The Christian doctors, who had been educated in the schools of the rhetoricians and sophists, rashly employed the arts and evasions of their subtle masters in the service of Christianity; and, intent only upon defeating the enemy, they were too little attentive to the means of victory, indifferent whether they acquired it by artifice or plain dealing. This method of disputing, which the ancients called *æconomical*,‡ and which had victory for its object, rather than truth, was in consequence of the prevailing taste for rhetoric and sophistry, almost universally approved. The Platonists contributed to the support and encouragement of this ungenerous method of

\* See Barbeyrac, de la Morale des Peres, chap. viii.

† This work is entitled *Testimonia contra Judæos*.  
‡ *Souverain, Platonisme dévoilé*, p. 244. Daille, de vet. usu Patrum, lib. i. p. 160. Jo. Christ. Wolfii Casaubon. p. 100. With regard to the famous rule, *to do a thing, κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, or *economically*, see particularly the ample illustrations of Gataker, ad Marc. Antoninum. lib. xi.

disputing, by that maxim which asserted the innocence of defending the truth by artifice and falsehood. This will appear manifest to those who have read, with any manner of penetration and judgment, the arguments of Origen against Celsus, and those of the other Christian disputants against the idolatrous Gentiles. The method of Tertullian, who used to plead prescription against erroneous doctrines, was not, perhaps, unfair in this century; but they must be unacquainted both with the times, and, indeed, with the nature of things, who imagine that it is always allowable to employ this method.\*

XI. This disingenuous and vicious method of surprising their adversaries by artifice, and striking them down, as it were, by lies and fictions, produced among other disagreeable effects, a great number of books, which were falsely attributed to certain great men, in order to give these spurious productions more credit and weight; for, as the greatest part of mankind are less governed by reason than by authority, and prefer, in many cases, the decisions of fallible mortals to the unerring dictates of the divine word, the disputants, of whom we are now speaking, thought they could not serve the truth more effectually than by opposing illustrious names and respectable authorities to the attacks of its adversaries. Hence arose the book of *canons*, which certain artful men ascribed falsely to the apostles; hence, the *apostolical constitutions*, of which Clement, bishop of Rome, is said to have formed a collection; hence the *recognitions* and the *Clementina*, which are also attributed to Clement,† and many other productions of that nature, which, for a long time, were too much esteemed by credulous men.

Nor were the managers of controversy the only persons who employed these stratagems; the Mystics had recourse to the same pious frauds to support their sect. And accordingly, when they were asked from what chief their establishment took its rise, to get clear of this perplexing question, they feigned a chief, and chose, for that purpose, Dionysius the Areopagite, a man of almost apostolical weight and authority, who was converted to Christianity, in the first century, by the preaching of St. Paul at Athens. To render this fiction more specious, they attributed to this great man various treatises concerning the monastic life, the mystic theology, and other subjects of that nature, which were the productions of some senseless and insipid writers of after-times. Thus it happened, through the pernicious influence

of human passions, which too often mingle themselves with the execution of the best purposes and the most upright intentions, that they, who were desirous of surpassing all others in piety, looked upon it as lawful, and even laudable, to advance the cause of piety by artifice and fraud.

XII. The most famous controversies that divided the Christians during this century, were those concerning the *Millennium*, or reign of a thousand years; the baptism of heretics, and the doctrine of Origen.

Long before this period, an opinion had prevailed, that Christ was to come and reign a thousand years among men, before the entire and final dissolution of this world. This opinion, which had hitherto met with no opposition, was variously interpreted by different persons: nor did all promise themselves the same kind of enjoyments in that future and glorious kingdom.‡ But, in this century, its credit began to decline, principally through the influence and authority of Origen, who opposed it with the greatest warmth, because it was incompatible with some of his favourite sentiments.† Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, endeavoured to restore this opinion to its former credit, in a book written against the *Allegorists*, for so he called, by way of contempt, the adversaries of the Millenniumian system. This work, and the hypothesis it defended, were exceedingly well received by great numbers in the canton of Arsinoë; and among others by Coracion, a presbyter of no mean influence and reputation. But Dionysius of Alexandria, a disciple of Origen, stopped the growing progress of this doctrine by his private discourse, and also by two learned and judicious dissertations concerning the divine promises.‡

XIII. The disputes concerning the baptism of heretics were not carried on with that amiable spirit of candour, moderation, and impartiality, with which Dionysius opposed the doctrine of the Millennium. The warmth and violence that were exerted in this controversy, were far from being edifying to such as were acquainted with the true genius of Christianity, and with that meekness and forbearance that should particularly distinguish its doctors.

As there was no express law which determined the manner and form, according to which those who abandoned the heretical sects were to be received into the communion of the church, the rules practised in this matter were not the same in all Christian churches. Many of the Oriental and African Christians placed recanting heretics in the rank of catechumens, and admitted them, by baptism, into the communion of the faithful; while the greatest part of the European churches, considering the baptism of heretics as valid, used no other

\* We scarcely know any case in which the plea of prescription can be admitted as a satisfactory argument, in favour of religious tenets, or articles of faith, unless by prescription be meant, a doctrine's being established in the time, and by the authority of the apostles. In all other cases, prescription is no argument at all: it cannot recommend error, and truth has no need of its support.

† It is not with the utmost accuracy that Dr. Mosheim places the recognitions among the spurious works of antiquity, since they are quoted by Origen, Epiphanius, and Rufinus, as the work of Clement. It is true, indeed, that these writers own them to have been altered in several places, and falsified by the heretics; and Epiphanius particularly, tells us, that the Ebionites scarcely left any thing sound in them. As to the Clementina, they were undoubtedly spurious.

‡ See the learned *Treatise concerning the true Millennium*, which Dr. Whitty has subjected to the second volume of his commentary upon the New Testament. See also, for an account of the doctrine of the ancient Millennarians, the fourth, fifth, seventh, and ninth volumes of Lardner's *Credibility*, &c.

† See Origen, de Principiis, lib. ii. cap. xi. p. 104. tom. i. op.

‡ See Eusebius. Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. xviii. p. 271, as also Genadius, de dogmatibus Ecclesiasticis, cap. lv. p. 32. edit. Elmenhorst.

form in their reception than the imposition of hands, accompanied with solemn prayer. This diversity prevailed for a long time without exciting contentions or animosities. But, at length, charity waxed cold, and the fire of ecclesiastical discord broke out. In this century, the Asiatic Christians came to a determination in a point that was hitherto, in some measure undecided; and in more than one council established it as a law, that all heretics were to be re-baptised before their admission to the communion of the true church.\* When Stephen bishop of Rome, was informed of this determination, he behaved with the most unchristian violence and arrogance toward the Asiatic Christians, broke communion with them, and excluded them from the communion of the church of Rome. These haughty proceedings made no impression upon Cyprian bishop of Carthage, who, notwithstanding the menaces of the Roman pontiff, assembled a council on this occasion, adopted with the rest of the African bishops, the opinion of the Asiatics, and gave notice thereof to the imperious Stephen. The fury of the latter was redoubled at this notification, and produced many threatenings and invectives against Cyprian, who replied with great force and resolution, and in a second council holden at Carthage, declared the baptism, administered by heretics, void of all efficacy and validity. Upon this the wrath of Stephen was inflamed beyond measure; and, by a decree full of invectives, which was received with contempt, he excommunicated the African bishops, whose moderation on the one hand, and the death of their imperious antagonist on the other, put an end to the violent contest.†

XIV. The controversy concerning Origen was set in motion by Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, animated as some say, by a principle of envy and hatred against that learned man, with whom he had formerly lived in an intimate friendship. The assertion, however of those who attribute the opposition of Demetrius to this odious principle, appears more than doubtful; for, in the whole of his conduct toward Origen, there are no visible marks of envy, though many indeed of passion and arrogance, of violence and injustice. The occasion of all this was as follows. In the year 228, Origen having set out for Achaia, was in his journey thither, received with singular marks of affection and esteem by the bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem, who ordained him presbyter by imposition of hands. This proceeding gave high offence to Demetrius, who declared Origen unworthy of the priesthood, because he had castrated himself, and maintained, at the same time, that it was not lawful to advance, to a higher dignity, the principal of the Alexandrian school, which was under his episcopal inspection, without his knowledge and approbation. A conclusion, however was put to these warm debates, and

Origen returned to Alexandria. This calm was indeed, but of short duration, being soon succeeded by a new breach between him and Demetrius, the occasion of which is not known, but which grew to such a height as obliged Origen, in the year 231, to abandon his charge at Alexandria and retire to Cæsarea. His absence, however, did not appease the resentment of Demetrius, who continued to persecute him with the utmost violence. To satisfy fully his vengeance against Origen, he assembled two councils, in the first of which he condemned him unheard, and deprived him of his office, and, in the second, procured his degradation from the sacerdotal dignity. It is probable, that in one of these councils, especially the latter, Demetrius accused him of erroneous sentiments in matters of religion; for it was about this time that Origen published his *Book of Principles*, containing several opinions of a dangerous tendency.\* The greatest part of the Christian bishops approved the proceedings of the Alexandrian council, against which the bishops of the churches of Achaia, Palestine, Phœnicia, and Arabia, declared at the same time the highest displeasure.†

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### *Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. ALL the records of this century mention the multiplication of rites and ceremonies in the Christian church. Several of the causes that contributed to this, have been already pointed out; to which we may add, as a principal one, the passion which now reigned for the Platonic philosophy, or, rather, for the popular Oriental superstition concerning demons, adopted by the Platonists, and borrowed from them, unhappily, by the Christian doctors. For there is not the least doubt, that many of the rites, now introduced into the church, derived their origin from the reigning opinions concerning the nature of demons, and the powers and operations of invisible beings.—Hence arose the use of exorcisms and spells, the frequency of fasts, and the aversion to wedlock; hence the custom of avoiding all connexion with those who were not as yet baptized, or who lay under the penalty of excommunication, as persons supposed to be under the

† \* This work, which was a sort of introduction to theology, has only come down to us in the translation of Rufinus, who corrected and maimed it, in order to render it more conformable to the orthodox doctrine of the church than Origen had left it. It contains, however, even in its present form, several bold and singular opinions, such as the pre-existence of souls, and their fall into mortal bodies, in consequence of their deviation from the laws of order in their first state, and the final restoration of all intelligent beings to order and happiness. Rufinus, in his apology for Origen, alleges, that his writings were maliciously falsified by the heretics; and that, in consequence thereof, many errors were attributed to him which he did not adopt; as also, that the opinions, in which he differed from the doctrines of the church, were only proposed by him as curious conjectures.

† The accounts here given of the persecution of Origen, are drawn from the most early and authentic sources,—from Eusebius' History, the Bibliotheca of Photius, Jerome's Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Authors, and Origen himself; and they differ in some respects from those which common writers, such as Doucin, Huet, and others, give of this matter.

\* Euseb. lib. vii. cap. v. vii. Firmilianus, *Epistol. ad Cyprianum*, printed among Cyprian's Letters.

† Cyprian, *Epist. lxx. lxxiii.*—Augustin, *de Baptismo contra Donatistas*, lib. v. vii. tom. ix. op. where are to be found the acts of the council of Carthage, A. D. 256.—Frud. Marani *vita Cypriani*, p. 107.



dominion of some malignant spirit; and hence the rigour and severity of the penance imposed upon those who had incurred by their immoralities, the censures of the church.\*

II. In most of the provinces there were, at this time, some fixed places set apart for public worship among the Christians as will appear evident to every impartial inquirer into these matters. Nor is it absolutely improbable, that these churches were, in several places, embellished with images and other ornaments.

With respect to the form of divine worship, and the times appointed for its celebration, there were few innovations made in this century. Two things, however, deserve to be noticed here: the first is, that the discourses, or sermons, addressed to the people, were very different from those of the earlier times of the church, and degenerated much from the ancient simplicity; for, not to say any thing of Origen, who introduced long sermons, and was the first who explained the Scriptures in his discourses, several bishops, who had received their education in the schools of the rhetoricians, were exactly scrupulous in adapting their public exhortations and discourses to the rules of Grecian eloquence; and this method gained such credit, as to be soon almost universally followed. The second thing that we proposed to mention as worthy of notice, is, that about this time, the use of incense was introduced, at least into many churches. This has been denied by some men of eminent learning: the fact, however, is rendered evident by the most unexceptionable testimonies.†

III. Several alterations were now introduced in the celebration of the Lord's supper, by those who had the direction of divine worship. The prayers, used upon this occasion, were lengthened; and the solemnity and pomp, with which this important institution was celebrated, were considerably increased; no doubt, with a pious intention to render it still more respectable. Those who were in a penitential state and those also who had not received the sacrament of baptism, were not admitted to this holy supper; and it is not difficult to perceive, that these exclusions were an imitation of what was practised in the heathen mysteries. We find, by the accounts of Prudentius and others, that gold and silver vessels were now used in the administration of the Lord's supper; nor is there any reason why we should not adopt this opinion, since it is very natural to imagine, that those churches, which were composed of the most opulent members, would readily indulge themselves in this piece of religious pomp. As to the time of celebrating this solemn ordinance, it must be carefully observed, that there was a considerable variation in different churches, arising from their different circumstances, and founded upon reasons

of prudence and necessity. In some, it was celebrated in the morning; in others, at noon; and in others, in the evening. It was also more frequently repeated in some churches, than in others; but was considered in all as of the highest importance, and as essential to salvation; for which reason it was even thought proper to administer it to infants. The sacred feasts, which accompanied this venerable institution, preceded its celebration in some churches, and followed it in others.

IV. There were, twice a year, stated times when baptism was administered to such as, after a long course of trial and preparation, offered themselves as candidates for the profession of Christianity. This ceremony was performed only in the presence of such as were already initiated into the Christian mysteries. The remission of sin was thought to be its immediate and happy fruit; while the bishop, by prayer and the imposition of hands, was supposed to confer those sanctifying gifts of the Holy Ghost, which are necessary to a life of righteousness and virtue.\* We have already mentioned the principal rites that were used in the administration of baptism; and we have only to add, that no persons were admitted to this solemn ordinance, until, by the menacing and formidable shouts and declamation of the exorcist, they had been delivered from the dominion of the prince of darkness, and consecrated to the service of God. The origin of this superstitious ceremony may be easily traced, when we consider the prevailing opinions of the times. The Christians, in general, were persuaded, that rational souls, deriving their existence from God, must consequently be in themselves pure, holy, and endowed with the noble principles of liberty and virtue. But, upon this supposition, it was difficult to account for the corrupt propensities and actions of men in any other way, than by attributing them either to the malignant nature of *matter*, or the influence and impulse of some *evil spirit*, who was perpetually compelling them to sin. The former opinion was embraced by the Gnostics, but was rejected by true Christians, who denied the eternity of matter, considered it as a creature of God, and therefore adopted the latter notion, that in all vicious persons there was a certain evil being, the author and source of their corrupt dispositions and their unrighteous deeds.† The ex-

\* That such was the notion prevalent at this time, is evident from testimonies of sufficient weight. And as this point is of great consequence, in order to our understanding the theology of the ancients, which differs from ours in many respects, we shall mention one of these testimonies, even that of Cyprian, who, in his 73d letter, expresses himself thus: "It is manifest where, and by whom the remission of sin, conferred in baptism, is administered.—They who are presented to the rulers of the church, obtain, by our prayers and imposition of hands, the Holy Ghost." See also Euseb. lib. vi. cap. viii.

† It is demonstrably evident, that *exorcism* was added to the other baptismal rites in the third century, after the introduction of the Platonic philosophy into the church; for, before this time, we hear no mention made of it. Justin Martyr, in his second apology, and Tertullian, in his book concerning the military crown, give us an account of the ceremonies used in baptism during the second century, without any mention of exorcism. This is a very strong argument of its being posterior to these two great men; and is every way proper to persuade

\* For a more ample account of this matter, the reader may consult Porphyry's treatise concerning abstinence, and compare what that writer has said on the subject, with the customs received among the Christians. Several curious things are also to be found in Theodoret and Eusebius upon this head.

† See Bishop Beverege ad Canon. iii. Apostol. p. 461; as also another work of the same author, entitled, Codex Canon. vindicatus, p. 78.

† Hæc. c. 27. Hymn ii. n. 60, edit. Heinii.

pulsion of this demon was now considered as an essential preparation for baptism, after the administration of which, the candidates returned home, adorned with crowns, and arrayed in white garments, as sacred emblems; the former, of their victory over sin and the world; the latter, of their inward purity and innocence.

V. Fasting began now to be held in more esteem than it had formerly been; a high degree of sanctity was attributed to this practice, and it was even looked upon as of indispensable necessity, from a notion that the demons directed their stratagems principally against those who pampered themselves with delicious fare, and were less troublesome to the lean and hungry, who lived under the severities of a rigorous abstinence.\* The Latins, contrary to the general custom, fasted on the seventh day of the week; and, as the Greeks and Orientals refused to follow their example in this respect, a new subject of contention arose between them.

The Christians offered up their ordinary prayers at three stated times of the day, viz. at the *third*, the *sixth*, and the *ninth hour*, according to the custom observed among the Jews. But, beside these stated devotions, true believers were assiduous in their addresses to the Supreme Being, and poured forth frequently their vows and supplications before his throne, because they considered prayer as the most essential duty, as well as the noblest employment, of a sanctified nature. At those festivals, which recalled the memory of some joyful event, and were to be celebrated with expressions of thanksgiving and praise, they prayed standing, as they thought that posture the fittest to express their joy and their confidence. On days of contrition and fasting, they presented themselves upon their knees before the throne of the Most High, to express their profound humiliation and self-abasement. Certain forms of prayer were, undoubtedly, used in many places both in public and in private; but many also expressed their pious feeling in the natural effusions of an unpremeditated eloquence.

The sign of the cross was supposed to administer a victorious power over all sorts of trials and calamities, and was more especially considered as the surest defence against the snares and stratagems of malignant spirits; and, hence it was, that no Christian undertook any thing of moment, without arming himself with the influence of this triumphant sign.

## CHAPTER V.

*Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. THE same sects that, in the former ages, had produced such disorder and perplexity in the Christian church, continued, in this, to create new troubles, and to foment new divisions. The Montanists, Valentinians, Marcionites, and the other Gnostics, continued

still to draw out their forces, notwithstanding the repeated defeats they had met with; and their obstinacy remained even when their strength was gone, as it often happens in religious controversy. Adelpius and Aquilinus, who were of the Gnostic tribe, endeavoured to insinuate themselves and their doctrine into the esteem of the public, at Rome, and in other parts of Italy.\* They were, however, checked, not only by the Christians, but also by Plotinus, the greatest Platonic philosopher of this age, who, followed by a numerous train of disciples, opposed these two chimerical teachers, and others of the same kind, with as much vigour and success as the most enlightened Christians could have done. The philosophical opinions which this faction entertained concerning the Supreme Being, the origin of the world, the nature of evil, and several other subjects, were entirely opposite to the doctrines of Plato. Hence the disciples of Jesus, and the followers of Plotinus, united their efforts against the progress of Gnosticism: and there is no doubt that their conjoint force soon destroyed the credit and authority of this fantastic sect, and rendered it contemptible in the estimation of the wise.†

II. While the Christians were struggling with these corrupters of the truth, and upon the point of obtaining a complete and decisive victory, a new enemy, more vehement and odious than the rest, started up suddenly, and engaged in the contest. This was Manes (or Manichæus, as he sometimes is called by his disciples,) by birth a Persian; educated among the Magi, and himself one of that number, before he embraced the profession of Christianity. Instructed in all those arts and sciences, which the Persians, and the neighbouring nations, held in the highest esteem, he had penetrated into the depths of astronomy in the midst of a rural life; studied the art of healing, and applied himself to painting and philosophy. His genius was vigorous and sublime, but redundant and ungoverned; and his mind, destitute of a proper temperature, seemed to border on fanaticism and madness. He was so adventurous as to attempt an amalgamation of the doctrine of the Magi with the Christian system, or rather the explication of one by the other; and, in order to succeed in this audacious enterprise, he affirmed that Christ had left the doctrine of salvation unfinished and imperfect, and that he was the *comforter* whom the departing Saviour had promised to his disciples to lead them into all truth. Many were deceived by the eloquence of this enthusiast, by the gravity of his countenance, and the innocence and simplicity of his manners; so that, in a short time, he formed a sect not utterly inconsiderable in point of number. He was put to death by Varanes I. king of the Persians; though historians are not agreed with respect to the cause, time, and manner, of his execution.‡

\* Porphyr. vita Plotini, cap. xvi. p. 118.

† Plotinus' book against the Gnostics is extant in his work, Ennead. ii. lib. iv.

‡ Some allege, that Manes, having undertaken to cure the son of the Persian monarch of a dangerous disease, by his medicinal art or his miraculous power, failed

us, that it made its entrance into the Christian church in the third century, and probably first in Egypt.

\* Clementin. Homil. ix. sect. 9. Porphyr. de abstinencia, lib. iv.

III. The doctrine of Manes was a motley mixture of the tenets of Christianity with the ancient philosophy of the Persians, in which he had been instructed during his youth. He combined these two systems, and applied and accommodated to Jesus Christ the characters and actions which the Persians attributed to the god Mithras. The principal doctrines of Manes are comprehended in the following summary:

“There are two principles from which all things proceed; the one is a most pure and subtle matter, called *Light*; and the other a gross and corrupt substance, called *Darkness*. Both are subject to the dominion of a superintending being, whose existence is from all eternity. The being who presides over the light, is called God; he that rules the land of darkness, bears the title of Hyle or Demon. The ruler of the light is supremely happy; and, in consequence thereof, benevolent and good; the prince of darkness is unhappy in himself; and, desiring to render others partakers of his misery, is evil and malignant. These two beings have produced an immense multitude of creatures, resembling themselves, and distributed them through their respective provinces.

IV. “The prince of darkness knew not, for a long series of ages, that light existed in the universe; and he no sooner perceived it, by the means of a war that was kindled in his dominions, than he bent his endeavours toward the subjection of it to his empire. The ruler of the light opposed to his efforts an army commanded by the first man, but not with the highest success; for the generals of the prince of darkness seized a considerable portion of the celestial elements, and of the light itself, and mingled them in the mass of corrupt matter. The second general of the ruler of the light, whose name was the *living spirit*, made war with greater success against the prince of darkness, but could not entirely disengage the pure particles of the celestial matter, from the corrupt mass through which they had been dispersed. The prince of darkness, after his defeat, produced the first parents of the human race. The beings engendered from this original stock, consists of a body formed out of the corrupt matter of the kingdom of darkness, and of two souls; one of which is sensitive and lustful, and owes its existence to the evil principle; the other rational and immortal, a par-

ticle of that divine light, which was carried away by the army of darkness, and immersed into the mass of malignant matter.

V. “Mankind being thus formed by the prince of darkness, and those minds which were the productions of the eternal light, being united to their mortal bodies, God created the earth out of the corrupt mass of matter, by that living spirit, who had vanquished the prince of darkness. The design of this creation was to furnish a dwelling for the human race, to deliver, by degrees, the captive souls from their corporeal prisons, and to extract the celestial elements from the gross substance in which they were involved. In order to carry this design into execution, God produced two beings of eminent dignity from his own substance, who were to lend their auspicious succour to imprisoned souls; of these sublime entities one was Christ; and the other, the Holy Ghost. Christ is that glorious intelligence which the Persians called *Mithras*: he is a most splendid substance, consisting of the brightness of the eternal light; subsisting in and by himself, endowed with life, and enriched with infinite wisdom; and his residence is in the sun. The Holy Ghost is also a luminous and animated body, diffused throughout every part of the atmosphere which surrounds this terrestrial globe. This genial principle warms and illuminates the minds of men, renders also the earth fruitful, and draws forth gradually from its bosom the latent particles of celestial fire, which it waits up on high to their primitive station.

VI. “When the Supreme Being had, for a long time, admonished and exhorted the captive souls, by the ministry of the angels, and of the holy men, appointed for that purpose, he ordered Christ to leave the solar regions, and to descend upon earth, in order to accelerate the return of those imprisoned spirits to their celestial country. In obedience to this divine command, Christ appeared among the Jews, clothed with the shadowy form of a human body, and not with the real substance. During his ministry, he taught mortals how to disengage the rational soul from the corrupt body, and to conquer the violence of malignant matter; and he demonstrated his divine mission by stupendous miracles. On the other hand, the prince of darkness used every method to inflame the Jews against this divine messenger, and incited them at length to put him to death with ignominy upon a cross; which punishment, however he suffered not in reality, but only in appearance, and in the opinion of men. When Christ had fulfilled the purposes of his mission he returned to his throne in the sun, and appointed a certain number of chosen apostles to propagate through the world the religion he had taught during the course of his ministry. But before his departure, he promised, that, at a certain time, he would send an apostle superior to all others in eminence and dignity, whom he called the *paraclete* or comforter, who should add many things to the precepts he had delivered, and dispel all the errors under which his servants laboured concerning divine things. This comforter, thus expressly promised by Christ, is Manes, the

in the attempt, precipitated the death of the prince, and thus incurring the indignation of the king his father, was put to a cruel death. This account is scarcely probable, as it is mentioned by none of the Oriental writers cited by M. d'Herbelot, and as Bar Hebraeus speaks of it in terms which show that it was only an uncertain rumour. The death of Manes is generally attributed to another cause by the Oriental writers. They tell us, that (after having been protected in a singular manner by Hormizdas, who succeeded Sapor on the Persian throne, but who was not able to defend him, at length, against the united hatred of the Christians, the Magi, the Jews, and the Pagans) he was shut up in a strong castle, which Hormizdas had erected between Bagdad and Susa, to serve him as a refuge against those who persecuted him on account of his doctrine. They add, that after the death of Hormizdas, Varanes I., his successor, first protected Manes, but afterwards gave him up to the fury of the Magi, whose resentment against him arose from his having adopted the Sadducean principles, as some say, while others attributed it to his having mingled the tenets of the Magi with the doctrines of Christianity.

Persian, who, by the order of the Most High, declared to mortals the whole doctrine of salvation, without exception, and without concealing any of its truths under the veil of metaphor or any other covering.

VII. "Those souls, who believe Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, who renounce the worship of the God of the Jews (the prince of darkness,) obey the laws delivered by Christ as they are enlarged and illustrated by the *comforter*, Manes, and combat, with persevering fortitude, the lusts and appetites of a corrupt nature, derive from this faith and obedience the inestimable advantage of being gradually purified from the contagion of matter. The total purification of souls cannot, indeed be accomplished during this mortal life. Hence it is, that the souls of men, after death, must pass through two states more of probation and trial, by water and fire, before they can ascend to the regions of light. They mount, therefore, first into the moon, which consists of benign and salutary water; whence, after a lustration of fifteen days, they proceed to the sun, whose purifying fire entirely removes their corruption, and effaces all their stains. The bodies, composed of malignant matter, which they have left behind them, return to their first state, and enter into their original mass.

VIII. "On the other hand, those souls who have neglected the salutary work of their purification, pass, after death, into the bodies of animals, or other natures, where they remain until they have expiated their guilt, and accomplished their probation. Some, on account of their peculiar obstinacy and perverseness, pass through a severer course of trial, being delivered over, for a certain time, to the power of ærial spirits, who torment them in various ways. When the greatest part of the captive souls are restored to liberty, and to the regions of light, then a devouring fire shall break forth at the divine command, from the caverns in which it is at present confined, and, shall destroy and consume the frame of the world. After this tremendous event, the prince and powers of darkness shall be forced to return to their primitive seats of anguish and misery, in which they shall dwell for ever; for, to prevent their ever renewing this war in the regions of light, God shall surround the mansions of darkness with an invincible guard, composed of those souls who have fallen irrecoverably from the hopes of salvation, and who, set in array, like a military band, shall surround those gloomy seats of wo, and hinder any of their wretched inhabitants from coming forth again to the light."

IX. In order to remove the strongest obstacles that lay against the belief of this monstrous system, Manes rejected almost all the sacred books into which Christians look for the sublime truths of their holy religion. He affirmed, in the first place, that the Old Testament was not the word of God, but of the prince of darkness, who was substituted by the Jews in the place of the true God. He maintained farther that the Four Gospels, which contain the history of Christ, were not written by the apostles, or, at least, that they were corrupted and interpolated by designing and

artful men, and were augmented with Jewish fables and fictions. He therefore supplied their place by a gospel which he said was dictated to him by God himself, and which he distinguished by the title of *Erteng*. He rejected also the Acts of the Apostles; and though he acknowledged the *epistles*, that are attributed to St. Paul, to be the productions of that divine apostle, yet he looked upon them as grossly corrupted and falsified in a variety of passages. We have not any certain account of the judgment which he formed concerning the other books of the New Testament.

X. The rules of life and manners that Manes prescribed to his disciples were extravagantly rigorous and austere. He commanded them to mortify and macerate the body, which he looked upon as intrinsically evil, and essentially corrupt; to deprive it of all those objects which could contribute either to its convenience or delight; to extirpate all those desires that lead to the pursuit of external objects; and to divest themselves of all the passions and instincts of nature. Such were the unnatural rules of practice which this absurd fanatic prescribed to his followers; but foreseeing, at the same time, that his sect could not become numerous, if this severe manner of living should be imposed without distinction upon all his adherents, he divided his disciples into two classes; one of which comprehended the perfect Christians, under the name of the *elect*; and the other, the imperfect and feeble, under the title of *hearers*. The *elect* were bound to a rigorous and entire abstinence from flesh, eggs, milk, fish, wine, all intoxicating drink, wedlock, and all amorous gratifications, and were required to live in a state of the sharpest penury, nourishing their shrivelled and emaciated bodies with bread, herbs, pulse, and melons, and depriving themselves of all the comforts that arise from the moderate indulgence of natural passions, and also from a variety of innocent and agreeable pursuits. The discipline, appointed for the *hearers*, was of a milder nature. They were allowed to possess houses, lands, and wealth, to feed upon flesh, and to enter into the bonds of conjugal tenderness; but this liberty was granted to them with many limitations, and under the strictest conditions of moderation and temperance.

The general Manichean assembly was headed by a president, who represented Jesus Christ. There were joined to him twelve rulers, or masters, who were designed to represent the twelve apostles; and these were followed by seventy-two bishops, the images of the seventy-two disciples of our Lord. These bishops had presbyters and deacons under them, and all the members of these religious orders were chosen out of the class of the *elect*.\*

XI. The sect of the Hieracites was formed in Egypt, toward the conclusion of this century, by Hierax of Leontium, a bookseller by profession, distinguished eminently by his extensive learning, and a venerable air of sanctity and virtue. Some have considered this as a

\* See all this amply proved in the work entitled *Commentarii de rebus Christianorum ante Constantinam Magnum*.

branch of the Manichean sect, but without foundation; since, notwithstanding the agreement of Manes and Hierax in some points of doctrine, it is certain that they differed in many respects. Hierax maintained, that the principal object of Christ's office and ministry was the promulgation of a new law, more severe and perfect than that of Moses; and hence he concluded, that the use of flesh and wine, well-look, and other things agreeable to the outward senses, which had been permitted under the Mosaic dispensation, were absolutely prohibited and abrogated by Christ. If, indeed, we look attentively into his doctrine, we shall find, that, like Manes, he did not think that these austere acts of self-denial were imposed by Christ indiscriminately upon all, but on such only as were ambitious of aspiring to the highest summit of virtue. To this leading error he added some others, which were partly the consequences of this illusion, and were, in part, derived from other sources. He excluded, for example, from the kingdom of heaven, children who died before they had arrived at the use of reason, upon the supposition that God was bound to administer the rewards of futurity to those only who had fairly finished their victorious conflict with the body of its lusts. He maintained also, that Melchizedec, king of Salem, who blessed Abraham, was the Holy Ghost; denied the resurrection of the body; and cast a cloud of obscurity over the sacred scriptures by his allegorical fictions.\*

XII. The controversies relating to the divine Trinity, which took their rise in the former century, from the introduction of the Grecian philosophy into the Christian church, were now spreading with considerable vigor, and produced various methods of explaining that inexplicable doctrine. One of the first who engaged in this idle and perilous attempt of explaining what every mortal must acknowledge to be incomprehensible, was Noetus of Smyrna, an obscure man, and of mean abilities. He affirmed, that the Supreme God, whom he called the Father, and considered as absolutely indivisible, united himself to the man Christ, whom he called the Son, and was born, and crucified with him. From this opinion, Noetus and his followers were distinguished by the title of *Patripassians*, i. e. persons who believe that the Supreme Father of the universe, and not any other divine person, had expiated the guilt of the human race; and, indeed, this appellation belongs to them justly, if the accounts which ancient writers give us of their opinions be accurate and impartial.†

XIII. About the middle of this century arose Sabellius, an African bishop or presbyter, who in Pentapolis, a province of Cyrenaica, and in Ptolemais or Barce, its principal city, explained, in a manner very little different from that of Noetus, the doctrine of Scripture concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This dogmatist had a considerable number of followers, who adhered to him, notwithstanding

that his opinions were refuted by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria. His sentiments were, in some respects, different from those of Noetus; for the latter was of opinion, that the person of the Father had assumed the human nature of Christ; whereas Sabellius maintained, that a certain *energy* only, proceeding from the Supreme Parent, or a certain portion of the divine nature, was united to the Son of God, the man Jesus; and he considered, in the same manner, the Holy Ghost, as a portion of the everlasting Father.‡ Hence it appears, that the Sabellians, though they might with justice be called *Patripassians*, were yet called so by the ancients in a different sense from that in which this name was given to the Noetians.

XIV. At this same period, Beryllus an Arabian, bishop of Bozrah, and a man of eminent piety and learning, taught that Christ, before his birth, had no proper subsistence, nor any other divinity, than that of the Father; which opinion, when considered with attention, amounts to this: that Christ did not exist before Mary, but that a *spirit* issuing from God himself, and therefore superior to all human souls, as being a portion of the divine nature, was united to him, at the time of his birth. Beryllus, however, was refuted by Origen, with such a victorious power of argument and zeal, that he yielded up the cause, and returned into the bosom of the church.†

XV. Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, and also a magistrate, or civil judge, was very different from the pious and candid Beryllus, both in point of morals and doctrine. He was a vain and arrogant man, whom riches had rendered insolent and self-sufficient.‡ He introduced great confusion and trouble into the eastern churches, by his new explication of the doctrine of the Gospel concerning the nature of God and Christ, and left behind him a sect, that assumed the title of *Paulians*, or *Paulianists*. As far as we can judge of his doctrine, by the accounts of it that have been transmitted to us, it seems to have amounted to this:—“That the Son and the Holy Ghost exist in God, in the same manner as the faculties of reason and activity do in man; that Christ was born a mere man; but that the reason or wisdom of the Father descended into him, and by him wrought miracles upon earth, and instructed the nations; and finally, that, on account of this union of the divine word with the man Jesus, Christ might, though improperly, be called God.”

Such were the real sentiments of Paul. He involved them, however, in such deep obscurity, by the ambiguous forms of speech with which he affected to explain and defend them, that, in several councils convoked for an inqui-

\* Almost all the historians, who give accounts of the ancient heresies, have made particular mention of Sabellius. Among others, see Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* lib. vi. cap. vi. p. 252. Athanas. *Lib. de sententia Dionysii*. All the passages of the ancient authors, relating to Sabellius, are carefully collected by the learned Christopher Wormius, in his *Historia Sabelliana*.

† Euseb. *lib. vi. cap. xx. xxxii.* Hieronym. *Catalog. Scriptor. Eccles.* cap. lx. Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. iii. cap. vii.; and, among the moderns, le Clerc, *Art. Critica*, vol. i. part ii. sect. i. cap. xiv. Chauffepied, *Nouveau Diction. Hist. et Crit. tom. i.*

‡ Euseb. *lib. vi. cap. xxx.*

\* Epiphani. *Heres. lxxvii.* Hieracitarum, p. 710. &c.  
† See the discourse of Hippolytus against the Heresy of Noetus, in the second volume of his works, published by Fabricius, as also Epiphani. *Heres. lxxvii. tom. i.*; and Theodoret. *Heres. Fabul.* lib. iii. cap. iii.

ry into his errors, he could not be convicted of heresy. At length, however, a council was assembled in the year 269, in which Malchion, the rhetorician, drew him forth from his obscurity, detected his evasions, and exposed him in his true colours; in consequence of which he was degraded from the episcopal order.\*

XVI. It was not only in the point now mentioned, that the doctrine of the Gospel suffered, at this time, from the erroneous fancies of wrong-headed doctors; for there sprang up now, in Arabia, a certain sort of minute philosophers, the disciples of a master, whose obscurity has concealed him from the knowledge of after-ages, who denied the immortality of the soul, and believed that it perished with the body; but maintained, at the same time, that it was to be recalled to life with the body, by the power of God. The philosophers, who held this opinion, were denominated Arabians from their country. Origen was called from Egypt, to make head against this rising sect, and disputed against them, in a full council, with such remarkable success, that they abandoned their erroneous sentiments, and returned to the received doctrine of the church.

XVII. Among the sects that arose in this century, we place that of the Novatians the last. This sect cannot be charged with having corrupted the doctrine of Christianity by their opinions; their crime was, that, by the unreasonable severity of their discipline, they gave occasion to the most deplorable divisions, and made an unhappy schism in the church. Novatian, a presbyter of the church of Rome, a man of uncommon learning and eloquence, but of an austere and rigid character, entertained the most unfavourable sentiments of those who had been separated from the communion of the church. He indulged his inclination to severity so far, as to deny that such as had fallen into the commission of grievous transgressions, especially those who had apostatised from the faith, under the persecution set on foot by Decius, were to be again received into the bosom of the church. The greatest part of the presbyters were of a different opinion in this matter, especially Cornelius, whose credit and influence were raised to the highest pitch by the esteem and admiration which his eminent virtues so naturally excited. Hence it happened, that when a bishop was to be chosen, in the year 250, to succeed Fabianus in the see of Rome, Novatian opposed the election of Cornelius, with the greatest activity and bitterness. His opposition, however, was in vain; for Cornelius was chosen to that emi-

nent office of which his distinguished merit rendered him so highly worthy. Novatian, upon this, separated himself from the jurisdiction of Cornelius, who, in his turn, called a council at Rome, in the year 251, and cut off Novatian and his partisans from the communion of the church. This turbulent man, being thus excommunicated, erected a new society, of which he was the first bishop; and, which, on account of the severity of its discipline, was followed by many, and flourished, until the fifth century, in the greatest part of those provinces which had received the Gospel. The chief person who assisted him in this enterprise was Novatus, a Carthaginian presbyter, a man of no sound principles, who, during the heat of this controversy, had come from Carthage to Rome, to escape the resentment and excommunication of Cyprian, his bishop, with whom he was highly at variance.

XVIII. There was no difference, in point of doctrine, between the Novatians and other Christians. What peculiarly distinguished them, was their refusing to re-admit, to the communion of the church, those who, after baptism, had fallen into the commission of heinous crimes, though they did not pretend, that even such were excluded from all possibility or hopes of salvation. They considered the Christian church as a society where virtue and innocence reigned universally, and none of whose members, from their entrance into it, had defiled themselves with any enormous crime; and, in consequence, they looked upon every society, which re-admitted heinous offenders to its communion, as unworthy of the title of a true Christian Church. For that reason, also, they assumed the title of *Cathari*, i. e. the *pure*; and what showed a still more extravagant degree of vanity and arrogance, they obliged such as came over to them from the general body of Christians, to submit to be baptised a second time, as a necessary preparation for entering into their society; for such deep root had their favourite opinion concerning the irrevocable rejection of heinous offenders taken in their minds, and so great was its influence upon the sentiments they entertained of other Christian societies, that they considered the baptism administered in those churches, which received the lapsed to their communion, even after the most sincere and undoubted repentance, as absolutely divested of the power of imparting the remission of sins.\*

\* Epistol. Concil. Antioch. ad Paulum in Bibliotheca Patrum, tom. xi. p. 302. Dionysii Alex. Ep. ad Paulum. Decem Pauli Samosatenui Questiones.

\* Eusebius, lib. vi. cap. xliii. Cyprianus, in variis Epistolis, xlix. &c. Albaspinæus, Observat. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. xx. xxi. Jos. Aug. Orsi, de Criminum capital. inter veteres Christianos Absolutione, p. 254. Kenckel, de Hæresi Novatiana.

AN

# ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY;

BOOK THE SECOND,

CONTAINING THE STATE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

FROM THE TIME OF

CONSTANTINE THE GREAT TO CHARLEMAGNE.

---

## THE FOURTH CENTURY.

---

### PART I.

THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the prosperous and calamitous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THAT I may not separate facts, which are intimately connected with each other, I have judged it expedient to combine, in the same chapter, the prosperous and calamitous events that happened to the church during this century, instead of treating them separately, as I have hitherto done. This combination, which presents things in their natural relations, as causes or effects, is undoubtedly the principal circumstance that renders history truly interesting. In following, however, this plan, the order of time shall also be observed with as much accuracy as the combination of events will allow.

In the beginning of the century, the Roman empire was under the dominion of four chiefs, of whom two, Diocletian and Maximian Herkulius, were of superior dignity, and were severally distinguished by the title of Augustus; while the other two, Constantius Chlorus and Maximian Galerius, were in a certain degree of subordination to the former, and were honoured with the appellation of Cæsars. Under these four emperors, the church enjoyed an agreeable calm.\* Diocletian, though much addicted to superstition, did not entertain any aversion to the Christians; and Constantius Chlorus, who, following the dictates of reason alone in the worship of the Deity, had abandoned the absurdities of polytheism, treated them

with condescension and benevolence. This alarmed the pagan priests, whose interests were so closely connected with the continuance of the ancient superstitions, and who apprehended, not without cause, that to their great detriment the Christian religion would become daily more general and triumphant throughout the empire. Under these anxious fears of the downfall of their authority, they addressed themselves to Diocletian, whom they knew to be of a timorous and credulous disposition, and by fictitious oracles, and other perfidious stratagems, endeavoured to engage him to persecute the Christians.\*

II. Diocletian, however, stood for some time unmoved by the treacherous arts of these selfish and superstitious priests, who, when they perceived the ill success of their cruel efforts, addressed themselves to Maximian Galerius, one of the Cæsars, and also son-in-law to Diocletian, in order to accomplish their unrighteous purposes. This prince, whose gross ignorance of every thing but military affairs was accompanied with a fierce and savage temper, was a proper instrument for executing their designs. Set on, therefore, by the malicious insinuations of the heathen priests, the suggestions of a superstitious mother, and the ferocity of his own natural disposition, he solicited Diocletian, with such urgent and indefatigable importunity, for an edict against the Christians, that he, at length, obtained his horrid purpose; for in the year 303, when this emperor was at Nicomedia, an order was ob-

\* Eusebius, hb. viii. cap. 1. p. 291, &c.

\* Eusebius, de vita Constantini, hb. ii. cap. i. p. 467. Lactantii Institut. divin. hb. ix. cap. xxvii. et de Mortibus Persecutorum, cap. x.

tained from him to pull down the churches of the Christians, to burn all their books and writings, and to take from them all their civil rights and privileges, and render them incapable of any honours or civil promotion.\* This first edict, though rigorous and severe, extended not to the lives of the Christians, for Diocletian was extremely averse to slaughter and bloodshed; it was, however, destructive to many of them, particularly to those who refused to deliver the sacred books into the hands of the magistrates.† Many Christians, therefore, and among them several bishops and presbyters, seeing the consequences of this refusal, delivered up all the religious books, and other sacred things that were in their possession, in order to save their lives. This conduct was highly condemned by the most steady and resolute Christians, who looked upon this compliance as sacrilegious, and branded those who were guilty of it with the ignominious appellation of *traitors*.‡

III. Not long after the publication of this first edict against the Christians, a fire broke out twice in the palace of Nicomedia, where Galerius lodged with Diocletian. The Christians were accused, by their enemies, as the authors of this conflagration;§ and the credulous Diocletian, too easily persuaded of the truth of this charge, caused vast numbers of them to suffer, at Nicomedia, the punishment of incendiaries, and to be tormented in the most inhuman and infamous manner.|| About the same time, there arose tumults and seditions in Armenia and in Syria, which were also attributed to the Christians by their irreconcilable enemies, who took advantage of those disturbances to inflame the emperor's fury. And, accordingly, Diocletian, by a new edict, ordered all the bishops and ministers of the Christian church to be thrown into prison. Nor did his inhuman violence end here; for a third edict was soon issued, by which it was ordered, that all sorts of torments should be employed, and the most insupportable punishments invented, to force these venerable captives to renounce their profession, by sacrificing to the heathen gods;¶ for it was hoped, that, if the bishops and doctors of the church could be brought to yield, their respective flocks would be easily induced to follow their example. An immense number of persons, illustriously distinguished by their piety and learning, became the victims of this cruel stratagem through the whole Roman empire, Gaul excepted, which was under the mild and equitable dominion of

Constantius Chlorus.\* Some were punished in such a shameful manner, as the rules of decency oblige us to pass in silence; some were put to death after having had their constancy tried by tedious and inexpressible tortures; and some were sent to the mines to draw out the remains of a miserable life in poverty and bondage.

IV. In the second year of this horrible persecution, the 304th of the Christian æra, a fourth edict was published by Diocletian, at the instigation of Galerius, and the other inveterate enemies of the Christian name. By it the magistrates were ordered and commissioned to force all Christians, without distinction of rank or sex, to sacrifice to the gods, and were authorised to employ all sorts of torments, in order to drive them to this act of apostasy.|- The diligence and zeal of the Roman magistrates, in the execution of this inhuman edict, nearly proved fatal to the Christian cause.‡

Galerius now made no longer a mystery of the ambitious project which he had been revolving in his mind. Finding his scheme ripe for execution, he obliged Diocletian and Maximian Herculius to resign the imperial dignity, and declared himself emperor of the east; leaving in the west Constantius Chlorus, with the ill state of whose health he was well acquainted. He chose colleagues according to his own fancy; and rejecting the proposal of Diocletian, who recommended Maxentius and Constantine (the son of Constantius) to that dignity, he made choice of Severus and Daza, his sister's son, to whom he had a little before given the name of Maximin.§ This revolution restored peace to those Christians who lived in the western provinces, under the administration of Constantius;|| while those of the east, under the tyranny of Galerius, had their sufferings and calamities dreadfully augmented.¶

V. The divine providence, however, was preparing more serene and happy days for the church. In order to this, it confounded the schemes of Galerius, and brought his counsels to nothing. In the year 306, Constantius Chlorus dying in Britain, the army saluted, with the title of Augustus, his son Constantine, surnamed afterwards the Great on account of his illustrious exploits, and forced him to accept the purple. This proceeding, which must have stung the tyrant Galerius to the heart, he was, nevertheless, obliged to bear with patience, and even to confirm with the outward marks of his approbation. Soon after, a civil war broke out, the occasion of which was as follows: Maximian Galerius, inwardly enraged at the election of Constantine by the soldiers, sent him, indeed, the purple, but gave him only the title of Cæsar, and created Severus emperor. Maxentius, the son of Maximian Herculius, and son-in-law to Galerius, provoked at the preference given to Severus,

\* Lactantius, de Mortibus Persequutorum, c. xi. Euseb. lib. viii. cap. ii.

† Augustinus, Brev. collat. cum Donatistis, cap. xv. xvii. Baluzii Miscellan. tom. ii.

‡ Optatus Milevit. de Schismate Donatistarum, lib. i. sect. xiii.

§ Euseb. Hist. Eccles. assures us, that Galerius caused fire to be privately set to the palace, that he might lay the blame of it upon the Christians, and thus incense Diocletian still more against them; in which horrid stratagem he succeeded; for never was any persecution so bloody and inhuman, as that which this credulous emperor now set on foot against them.

|| Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. viii. cap. vi. Lactant. de Mortibus Persequut. cap. xii. Constant. Mag. Oratio ad sanctor. Cætum, cap. xxv.

¶ Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. viii. cap. vii. et de Martyribus Palæstinz.

\* Lactantius, cap. xv.—Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. viii. cap. xiii. xviii.

† Euseb. de Martyribus Palæstinz, cap. iii.

‡ Lactantius, Institut. divin. lib. v. cap. xi.

§ Lactant. de Mortibus Persequut. cap. xvii. xx.

|| Euseb. de Martyribus Palæstinz, cap. xiii.

¶ Lactant. cap. xxi.



assumed the imperial dignity, and found the less difficulty in making good this usurpation, as the Roman people hoped, by his means, to deliver themselves from the insupportable tyranny of Galerius. Having caused himself to be proclaimed emperor, he chose his father Maximian for his colleague, who, receiving the purple from the hands of his son, was universally acknowledged in that character by the senate and the people. Amidst all these troubles and commotions, Constantine, beyond all human expectation, made his way to the imperial throne.

The western Christians, those of Italy and Africa excepted,\* enjoyed some degree of tranquillity and liberty during these civil tumults. Those of the east seldom continued for any considerable time in the same situation. They were subject to various changes and revolutions; their condition was sometimes adverse and sometimes tolerably easy, according to the different scenes that were presented by the fluctuating state of public affairs. At length, however, Maximian Galerius, who had been the author of their heaviest calamities, being brought to the brink of the grave by a most dreadful and lingering disease,† whose complicated horrors no language can express, published, in the year 311, a solemn edict, ordering the persecution to cease, and restoring freedom and repose to the Christians, against whom he had exercised such horrible cruelties.‡

VI. After the death of Galerius, his dominions fell into the hands of Maximin and Licinius, who divided between them the provinces he had possessed. At the same time, Maxentius, who had usurped the government of Africa and Italy, determined to make war upon Constantine (who was now master of Spain and Gaul,) with the ambitious view of reducing, under his dominion, the whole western empire. Constantine, apprised of this design, marched with a part of his army into Italy, gave battle to Maxentius at a small distance from Rome, and totally defeated that abominable tyrant, who, in his precipitate flight, fell into the Tiber, and was drowned. After this victory, which happened in the year 312, Constantine, and his colleague Licinius, immediately granted to the Christians a full power of living according to their own laws and institutions; which power was specified still more clearly in another edict, drawn up at Milan, in the following year.§ Maximin, indeed, who ruled in the east, was preparing new calamities for the Christians, and threatening also with destruction the western emperors. But his projects were disconcerted by the victory which Licinius gained over his army, and, through distraction and despair, he ended his life by poison, in the year 313.

VII. About the same time, Constantine the Great, who had hitherto manifested no religious principles of any kind, embraced Chris-

\* The reason of this exception is, that the provinces of Italy and Africa, though nominally under the government of Severus, were yet in fact ruled by Galerius with an iron sceptre.

† See a lively description of the disease of Galerius in the Universal History.

‡ Euseb. lib. viii. cap. xvi. Lactantius, cap. xxxiii.

§ Euseb. lib. x. cap. v.—Lactant. cap. xlviii.

tianity, in consequence, as it is said, of a miraculous cross, which appeared to him in the air, as he was marching toward Rome to attack Maxentius. But that this extraordinary event was the reason of his conversion, is a matter that has never yet been placed in such a light, as to dispel all doubts and difficulties. For the first edict of Constantine in favour of the Christians, and many other circumstances that might be here alleged, show, indeed, that he was well-disposed to them and to their worship, but are no proof that he looked upon Christianity as the only true religion; which, however, would have been the natural effect of a miraculous conversion. It appears evident, on the contrary, that this emperor considered the other religions, and particularly that which was handed down from the ancient Romans, as also true and useful to mankind; and declared it to be his intention and desire, that they should all be exercised and professed in the empire, leaving to each individual the liberty of adhering to that which he thought the best. It is true that he did not remain always in this state of indifference. In process of time, he acquired more extensive views of the excellence and importance of the Christian religion, and gradually arrived at an entire persuasion of its bearing alone the sacred marks of celestial truth and a divine origin. He was convinced of the falsehood and impiety of all other religious institutions; and, acting in consequence of this conviction, he exhorted earnestly all his subjects to embrace the Gospel, and at length employed all the force of his authority in the abolition of the ancient superstition. It is not, indeed, easy, nor perhaps is it possible, to fix precisely the time when the religious sentiments of Constantine were so far changed, as to render all religions, but that of Christ, the objects of his aversion. All that we know, with certainty, concerning this matter is, that this change was first published to the world by the laws and edicts\* which he issued in the year 324, when, after the defeat and death of Licinius, he reigned as the sole lord of the Roman empire. His designs, however, with respect to the abolition of the ancient religion of the Romans, and the toleration of no other form of worship than the Christian, were only made known toward the latter end of his life, by his edicts for destroying the heathen temples, and prohibiting sacrifices.†

VIII. The sincerity of Constantine's zeal for Christianity can scarcely be doubted, unless it be maintained, that the outward actions of men are, in no degree, a proof of their inward sentiments. It must, indeed, be confessed, that the life and actions of this prince were not such as the Christian religion demands from those who profess to believe its sublime doctrines. It is also certain, that, from his conversion to the last period of his life, he continued in the state of a catechumen, and was not received by baptism into the number of the faithful, until a few days before his death, when that sacred rite was administered to him at

\* Eusebius, de vita Constant. lib. ii. cap. xx., xlvii.

† See Godofred ad Codic. Theodosian. tom. vi part i.

Nicomedia, by Eusebius, bishop of that place.\* But these circumstances are not sufficient to prove that he doubted the divinity of the Christian religion, or that his profession of the Gospel was an act of mere dissimulation; for it was a custom with many, in this century, to put off their baptism to the last hour, that thus, immediately after receiving by this rite the remission of their sins, they might ascend pure and spotless to the mansions of life and immortality. Nor are the crimes of Constantine any proof of the insincerity of his profession, since nothing is more evident, though it be strange and unaccountable, than that many who believe, in the firmest manner, the truth and divinity of the Gospel, violate its laws by repeated transgressions, and live in contradiction to their own inward principles. Another question of a different nature might be proposed here, viz. Whether motives of a worldly kind did not contribute, in a certain measure, to give Christianity, in the esteem of Constantine, a preference to all other religious systems? It is indeed probable, that this prince perceived the admirable tendency of the Christian doctrine and precepts to promote the stability of government, by preserving the citizens in their obedience to the reigning powers, and in the practice of those virtues which render a state happy; and he must naturally have observed, how defective the Roman superstition was in this important point.†

IX. The doubts and difficulties that naturally arise in the mind, concerning the *miraculous cross* that Constantine solemnly declared he had seen, about noon, in the air, are many and considerable. It is easy, indeed, to refute the opinion of those who look upon this prodigy as a cunning fiction, invented by the emperor to animate his troops in the ensuing battle, or who consider the narration as wholly fabulous.‡ The sentiment also of those, who imagine that this pretended cross was no more

\* Eusebius, de vita Constantini, lib. iv. cap. lvi. lxii. Those who, upon the authority of certain records (whose date is modern, and whose credit is extremely dubious) affirm, that Constantine was baptised in the year 324, at Rome, by Sylvester, the bishop of that city, are evidently in an error. Those, even of the Romish church, who are the most eminent for their learning and sagacity, reject this notion. See Noris, Hist. Donatist. tom. iv. op. p. 650. Thom. Marciæ Mamachi Origin. et Antiquit. Christian. tom. ii. p. 232.

† Eusebius, de vita Constant. lib. i. cap. xxvii. ¶ It has been sometimes remarked by the more eminent writers of the Roman history, that the superstition of that people, contrary to what Dr. Mosheim here observes, had a great influence in keeping them in their subordination and allegiance. It is more particularly observed, that in no other nation was the solemn obligation of an oath treated with such respect, or fulfilled with such a religious circumspection, and such an inviolable fidelity. But, notwithstanding all this, it is certain, that superstition, if it may be dexterously turned to good purposes, may be equally employed to bad. The artifice of an augur could have rendered superstition as useful to the infernal designs of a Tarquin and a Catiline, as to the noble and virtuous purposes of a Publicola, or a Trajan. But true Christianity can animate or encourage to nothing except what is just and good. It tends to support government by the principles of piety and justice, and not by the ambiguous flight of birds, or the like delusions.

‡ Hornbeck, Comment. ad Bullam Urbani viii. de Imagin. cultu, p. 182. Oselius, Thesaur. Numism. Antiq. p. 463. Tollius, Préface to the French Translation of Longinus, as also his Adnot. ad Lactantium de Mort. Persequit. cap. xlv. Christ. Thomasius, Observat. Hallens. tom. i. p. 380.

than a natural phenomenon in a solar halo, is, perhaps, more ingenious, than solid and convincing.\* Nor, in the third place, do we think it sufficiently proved, that the divine power interposed here to confirm the wavering faith of Constantine by a stupendous miracle. The only hypothesis, then, which remains, is, that we consider this famous cross as a vision represented to the emperor in a dream, with the remarkable inscription, Hac vince, *i. e.* In this conquer; and this opinion is maintained by authors of considerable weight.‡

X. The joy with which the Christians were elated on account of the favourable edicts of Constantine and Licinius, was soon interrupted by the war which broke out between these princes. Licinius, being defeated in a pitched battle, in the year 314, concluded a treaty of peace with Constantine, and observed it during the space of nine years. But his turbulent spirit rendered him an enemy to repose; and his natural violence, seconded, and still farther incensed, by the suggestions of the heathen priests, armed him against Constantine, in the year 324, for the second time. During this war, he endeavoured to engage in his cause all who remained attached to the ancient superstition, that thus he might oppress his adversary

\* Jo. And. Schmidius, Dissert. de luna in Cruce visa. Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Dissert. de Cruce a Constantino visa.

‡ This hypothesis of Dr. Mosheim is not more credible than the real appearance of a cross in the air.—Both events are recorded by the same authority; and, if the veracity of Constantine or of Eusebius be questioned with respect to the appearance of a cross in the day, they can scarcely be confided in with respect to the truth of the nocturnal vision. It is very surprising to see the learned authors of the Universal History adopt, without exception, all the accounts of Eusebius, concerning this cross, which are extremely liable to suspicion, which Eusebius himself seems to have believed but in part, and for the truth of all which he is careful not to make himself answerable. (See that author's Life of Constantine, lib. ii. cap. iv.)

This whole story is attended with difficulties which render it, both as a miracle and as a fact, extremely dubious, to say no more.—It will necessarily be asked, whence it comes to pass, that the relation of a fact, which is said to have been seen by the whole army, is delivered by Eusebius, upon the sole credit of Constantine? This is the more unaccountable, as Eusebius lived and conversed with many who must have been spectators of this event, had it really happened, and whose unanimous testimony would have prevented the necessity of Constantine's confirming it to him by an oath. The sole relation of one man, concerning a public appearance, is not sufficient to give complete conviction; nor does it appear, that this story was generally believed by the Christians, or by others, since several ecclesiastical historians, who wrote after Eusebius, particularly Rufin and Sozomen, make no mention of this appearance of a cross in the heavens. The nocturnal vision was, it must be confessed, more generally known and believed; upon which Dr. Lardner makes this conjecture, that when Constantine first informed the people of the reason that induced him to make use of the sign of the cross in his army, he alleged nothing but a dream for that purpose; but that, in the latter part of his life, when he was acquainted with Eusebius, he added the other particular, of a *luminous cross*, seen *somewhere* by him and his army in the daytime (for the place is not mentioned); and that, the emperor having related this in the most solemn manner, Eusebius thought himself obliged to mention it.

‡ All the writers, who have given any accounts of Constantine the Great, are carefully enumerated by J. A. Fabricius, in his Lux Salut. Evang. toti Orbi exor. cap. xii. p. 260, who also mentions, cap. xiii. p. 237, the laws concerning religious matters, which were enacted by this emperor, and digested into four parts. For a full account of these laws, see Jac. Godofred. Adnotat. ad Codic. Theodos., and Balduinus in his Constantin. Magu seu de Legibus Constantii eccles. et civilibus. lib. ii.

with numbers; and, in order to this, he persecuted the Christians in a cruel manner, and put to death many of their bishops, after trying them with torments of the most barbarous nature.\* But all his enterprises proved abortive; for, after several unsuccessful battles, he was reduced to the necessity of throwing himself at the victor's feet, and imploring his clemency; which, however, he did not long enjoy; for he was strangled, by the order of Constantine, in the year 325. After the defeat of Licinius, the empire was ruled by Constantine alone until his death; and the Christian cause experienced, in its happy progress, the effects of his auspicious administration. This zealous prince employed all the resources of his genius, all the authority of his laws, and all the engaging charms of his munificence and liberality, to efface, by degrees, the superstitions of Paganism, and to propagate Christianity in every corner of the Roman empire. He had learned, no doubt, from the disturbances continually excited by Licinius, that neither himself nor the empire could enjoy a fixed state of tranquillity and safety as long as the ancient superstitions subsisted; and therefore, from this period, he openly opposed the sacred rites of Paganism, as a religion detrimental to the interests of the state.

XI. After the death of Constantine, which happened in the year 337, his three sons, Constantine II. Constantius, and Constans, were, in consequence of his appointment, put in possession of the empire, and were all saluted as emperors and *Augusti* by the Roman senate. There were yet living two brothers of the late emperor, namely, Constantius Dalmatius and Julius Constantius, and they had many sons. These the sons of Constantine ordered to be put to death, lest their ambitious views should excite troubles in the empire; and they all fell victims to this barbarous order, except Gallus and Julian, the sons of Julius Constantius, the latter of whom rose afterwards to the imperial dignity. The dominions allotted to Constantine were Britain, Gaul, and Spain; but he did not possess them long; for, when he had made

himself master, by force, of several places belonging to Constans, this occasioned a war between the brothers, in the year 340, in which Constantine lost his life. Constans, who had received at first, for his portion, Illyricum, Italy, and Africa, added now the dominions of the deceased prince to his own, and thus became sole master of all the western provinces. He remained in possession of this vast territory until the year 350, when he was cruelly assassinated by the order of Magnentius, one of his commanders, who had revolted and declared himself emperor. Magnentius, in his turn, met with the fate he deserved: transported with rage and despair at his ill success in the war against Constantius, and apprehending the most terrible and ignominious death from the just resentment of the conqueror, he laid violent hands upon himself. Thus Constantius, who had, before this, possessed the provinces of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, became, in the year 353, sole lord of the Roman empire, which he ruled until the year 361, when he died at Mopsucene, on the borders of Cilicia, as he was marching against Julian. None of these three brothers possessed the spirit and genius of their father. They all, indeed, followed his example, in continuing to abrogate and efface the ancient superstitions of the Romans and other idolatrous nations, and to accelerate the progress of the Christian religion throughout the empire. This zeal was, no doubt, laudable; its end was excellent; but, in the means used to accomplish it, there were many things not altogether laudable.

XII. This flourishing progress of the Christian religion was greatly interrupted, and the church reduced to the brink of destruction, when Julian, the son of Julius Constantius, and the only remaining branch of the imperial family, was placed at the head of affairs. This active and adventurous prince, after having been declared emperor by the army, in the year 360, in consequence of his exploits among the Gauls, was, upon the death of Constantius, in the following year, confirmed in the undivided possession of the empire. No event could be less favourable to the Christians; for, though he had been educated in the principles of Christianity, he apostatised from that divine religion, and employed all his efforts to restore the expiring superstitions of polytheism to their former vigour, credit, and lustre. His apostasy was imputable, partly to his aversion to the Constantine family, who had murdered his father, brother, and kinsmen; and partly to the artifices of the Platonic philosophers, who abused his credulity, and flattered his ambition, by fictitious miracles, and pompous predictions. It is true, this prince seemed averse to the use of violence, in propagating superstition, and suppressing the truth: indeed, he carried the appearances of moderation and impartiality so far, as to allow his subjects a full power of judging for themselves in religious matters, and of worshipping the Deity in the manner they thought the most rational. But, under this mask of moderation, he attacked Christianity with the utmost bitterness, and, at the same time, with the most consummate dexterity. By art and stratagem he undermined

\* Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. x. cap. viii. *et de vita Constantini*, lib. i. cap. xlix. Julian himself, whose bitter aversion to Constantine gives a singular degree of credibility to his testimony in this matter, could not help confessing that Licinius was an infamous tyrant and a profligate, abandoned to all sorts of wickedness. See the *Cæsars of Julian*. And here I beg leave to make a remark which has escaped the learned. Aurelius Victor, in his book of *Cæsaribus*, cap. xli. has mentioned the persecution under Licinius in the following terms: "Licinio ne insontium quidem ac nobilium philosophorum servili more cunctis adhibiti modum ferere." The philosophers, whom Licinius is here said to have tormented, were, doubtless, the Christians, whom many, through ignorance, looked upon as a philosophical sect. This passage of Aurelius has not been touched by the commentators, who are generally more intent upon the knowledge of words than of things.

† It is more probable that the principal design of this massacre was to recover the provinces of Thrace, Macedon, and Achaia, which, in the division of the empire, Constantine the Great had given to young Dalmatius, son to his brother of the same name; and also Pontus and Cappadocia, which he had granted to Annibalianus, the brother of young Dalmatius. Be that as it will, Dr. Mosheim has attributed this massacre equally to the three sons of Constantine; whereas, almost all authors agree, that neither young Constantine, nor Constans, had any concern in it.

the church, annulling the privileges which had been granted to Christians and their spiritual rulers; shutting up the schools in which they taught philosophy and the liberal arts; encouraging the sectaries and schismatics, who brought dishonour upon the Gospel by their divisions; composing books against the Christians, and using a variety of other means to bring the religion of Jesus to ruin and contempt. Julian extended his views yet farther, and was meditating projects of a still more formidable nature against the Christian church, which would have felt, no doubt, the fatal or ruinous effects of his inveterate hatred, if he had returned victorious from the Persian war, into which he entered immediately after his accession to the empire. But in this war, which was rashly undertaken and imprudently conducted, he fell by the lance of a Persian soldier, and expired in his tent in the 32d year of his age, having reigned, alone, after the death of Constantius, twenty months.\*

XIII. It is to me just matter of surprise, to find Julian placed, by many learned and judicious writers,† among the greatest heroes that shine forth in the annals of time, and even exalted above all the princes and legislators who have been distinguished by the wisdom of their government. Such writers must either be too far blinded by prejudice, to perceive the truth; or they cannot have perused, with any degree of attention, those works of Julian which are still extant; or, if neither of these be their case, they must, at least, be ignorant of that which constitutes true greatness. The real character of Julian has few lines of that uncommon merit which has been attributed to it: for, if we set aside his genius, of which his works give no very high idea; if we except, moreover, his military courage, his love of letters, and his acquaintance with that vain and fanatical philosophy which was known by the name of modern Platonism, we shall find nothing remaining, that is in any measure worthy of praise, or productive of esteem. Besides, the qualities now mentioned, were, in him, counterbalanced by the most opprobrious defects. He was a slave to superstition, than which nothing is a more evident mark of a narrow soul, of a mean and abject spirit. His thirst of glory and eagerness for popular applause were excessive, even to puerility; his credulity and levity surpass the powers of description; a low cunning, and a profound dissimulation and duplicity, had acquired, in his mind, the force of predominant habits; and all this was accompanied with a total ignorance of true philosophy;‡ so that,

\* For a full account of this emperor, it will be proper to consult (beside Tillemont and other common writers) *La Vie de Julien, par l'Abbe Bletier*, which is a most accurate and elegant production. See also *The Life and Character of Julian*, illustrated in seven Dissertations by Des-Voeux; Ezech. Spanheim, Præfat. et adnot. ad op. Juliani; and Fabricius, *Lux Evangel. toti orbi exorientis*, cap. xiv. p. 294.

† Montesquieu, in chap. x. of the twenty-fourth book of his work, entitled, *L'Esprit des Loix*, speaks of Julian in the following terms: "Il n'y a point eu apres lui de prince plus digne de gouverner des hommes."

‡ Nothing can afford a more evident proof of Julian's ignorance of the true philosophy, than his known attachment to the study of magic, which Dr. Mosheim

though, in some things, Julian may be allowed to have excelled the sons of Constantine the Great, yet it must be granted, on the other hand, that he was, in many respects, inferior to Constantine himself, whom, upon all occasions, he loads with the most licentious invectives, and treats with the utmost disdain.

XIV. As Julian affected, in general, to appear moderate in religious matters, unwilling to trouble any on account of their faith, or to seem averse to any sect or party, so to the Jews, in particular, he extended so far the marks of his indulgence, as to permit them to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem. The Jews set about this important work; from which, however, they were obliged to desist, before they had even begun to lay the foundations of the sacred edifice; for, while they were removing the rubbish, formidable balls of fire, issuing out of the ground with a dreadful noise, dispersed both the works and the workmen, and repeated earthquakes filled the spectators of this phenomenon with terror and dismay. This signal event is attested in a manner that renders its evidence irresistible,\* though, as usually happens in cases of that nature, the Christians have embellished it by augmenting rashly the number of the miracles which are supposed to have been wrought upon that occasion. The causes of this phenomenon may furnish matter of dispute; and learned men have, in effect, been divided upon that point. All, however, who consider the matter with attention and impartiality, will perceive the strongest reasons for embracing the opinion of those who attribute this event to the almighty interposition of the Supreme Being; nor do the arguments offered by some, to prove it the effect of natural causes, or those alleged by others to persuade us that it was the result of artifice and imposture, contain any thing that may not be refuted with the utmost facility.†

XV. Upon the death of Julian, the suffrages of the army were united in favour of Jovian, who, accordingly, succeeded him in the imperial dignity. After a reign of seven months, Jovian died in the year 364, and, therefore, had not time to execute any thing of importance.‡ The emperors who succeeded him, in this century, were Valentinian I., Valens, Gratian, Valentinian II., and Honorius, who professed Christianity, promoted its progress, and endeavoured, though not all with equal zeal, to root out entirely the Gentile superstitions. In this they were all surpassed by the last of

has omitted in his enumeration of the defects and extravagances of this prince.

\* See Jo. Alb. Fabricii *Lux Evang. toti orbi exorientis*, p. 124, where all the testimonies of this remarkable event are carefully assembled; see also Moyle's *Posthumous Works*.

† The truth of this miracle is denied by the famous Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, tom. iv., against whom Cuper has taken the affirmative, and defended it in his *Letters* published by Bayer. A most ingenious discourse was published, in defence of this miracle, by the learned Dr. Warburton, under the title of *Julian, or a Discourse concerning the Earthquake and Fiery Eruption, &c.*, in which the objections of Basnage are particularly examined and refuted.

‡ See Bletier, *Vie de Jovien*, vol. ii. in which the Life of Julian, by the same author, is farther illustrated, and some productions of that emperor are translated into French.

the emperors who reigned in this century, viz. Theodosius the Great, who began to reign in the year 379, and died in 395. As long as this prince lived, he exerted himself, in the most vigorous and effectual manner, for the extirpation of the pagan superstitions throughout all the provinces, and enacted severe laws and penalties against such as adhered to them. His sons, Arcadius and Honorius, pursued with zeal, and not without success, the same end; so that, toward the conclusion of this century, the Gentile religions declined apace, and had also no prospect left of recovering their primitive authority and splendour.

XVI. It is true, that, notwithstanding all this zeal and severity of the Christian emperors, there still remained in several places, and especially in the remoter provinces, temples and religious rites, consecrated to the service of the pagan deities. And, indeed, when we look attentively into the matter, we shall find, that the execution of those rigorous laws, which were enacted against the worshippers of the gods, was rather levelled at the multitude, than at persons of eminence and distinction; for it appears, that, both during the reign, and after the death of Theodosius, many of the most honourable and important posts were filled by persons, whose aversion to Christianity and attachment to Paganism were sufficiently known. The example of Libanius alone is an evident proof of this, since, notwithstanding his avowed and open enmity to the Christians, he was raised by Theodosius himself to the high dignity of prefect, or chief of the Prætorian guards. It is extremely probable, therefore, that, in the execution of the severe laws enacted against the Pagans, there was an exception made in favour of philosophers, rhetoricians, and military leaders, on account of the important services which they were supposed to render to the state, and that they of consequence enjoyed more liberty in religious matters, than the inferior orders of men.

XVII. This peculiar regard shown to the philosophers and rhetoricians will, no doubt, appear surprising when it is considered, that all the force of their genius, and all the resources of their art, were employed against Christianity; and that those very sages, whose schools were reputed of such utility to the state, were the very persons who opposed the progress of the truth with the greatest vehemence and contention of mind. Hierocles, the great ornament of the Platonic school, wrote, in the beginning of this century, two books against the Christians, in which he went so far as to draw a parallel between Jesus Christ and Apollonius Tyanæus. This presumption was chastised with great spirit, by Eusebius, in a treatise written expressly in answer to Hierocles. Lactantius takes notice of another philosopher, who composed three books to detect the pretended errors of the Christians,\* but does not mention his name. After the time of Constantine the Great, beside the long and laborious work which Julian wrote against the followers of Christ, Himerius† and Libanius, in their public ha-

rangues, and Eunapius, in his lives of the philosophers, exhausted all their rage and bitterness in their efforts to defame the Christian religion, while the calumnies that abounded in the discourses of the one, and the writings of the other, passed unpunished.

XVIII. The prejudice which the Christian cause received in this century, from the stratagems of these philosophers and rhetoricians, who were elated with a presumptuous notion of their knowledge, and prepossessed with a bitter aversion to the Gospel, was certainly very considerable. Many examples concur to prove this point; and particularly that of Julian, who was seduced by the artifices of these corrupt sophists. The effects of their disputes and declamations were not, indeed, the same upon all; some who assumed the appearance of superior wisdom, and who, either from moderation or indifference, professed to pursue a middle way in these religious controversies, composed matters in the following manner: they so far listened to the interpretations and discourses of the rhetoricians, as to form to themselves a middle kind of religion, between the ancient theology and the new doctrine that was now propagated in the empire; and they persuaded themselves, that the same truths which Christ taught, had been for a long time concealed by the priests of the gods, under the veil of ceremonies, fables, and allegorical representations.\* Of this number were Ammiannus Marcellinus, a man of singular merit; Themistius, an orator highly distinguished by his uncommon eloquence and the eminence of his station; Chalcedius, a philosopher, and others, who were all of opinion, that the two religions, when properly interpreted and understood, agreed perfectly well in the main points, and that, therefore, neither the religion of Christ, nor that of the gods, ought to be treated with contempt.

XIX. The zeal and diligence with which Constantine and his successors exerted them-

(†) \* This notion, absurd as it is, has been revived, in the most extravagant manner, in a work published at Harderwyk, in 1757, by Mr. Struchtmeier, professor of eloquence and languages in that university. In this work, which bears the title of the Symbolical Hercules, the learned but wrong-headed author maintains (as he had also done in a preceding work, entitled, An Explication of the Pagan Theology,) that all the doctrines of Christianity were emblematically represented in the Heathen mythology; and not only so, but that the inventors of that mythology knew that the Son of God was to descend upon earth; believed in Christ as the only fountain of salvation; were persuaded of his future incarnation, death, and resurrection; and had acquired all this knowledge and faith by the perusal of a Bible much older than either the time of Moses or Abraham, &c. The pagan doctors, thus instructed (according to Mr. Struchtmeier) in the mysteries of Christianity, taught these truths under the veil of emblems, types, and figures. Jupiter represented the true God; Juno, who was obstinate and ungovernable, was the emblem of the ancient Israel; the chaste Diana was a type of the Christian church; Hercules was the figure or fore runner of Christ; Amphitryon was Joseph; the two Serpents, killed by Hercules in his cradle, were the Pharisees and Sadducees, &c. Such are the principal lines of Mr. Struchtmeier's system, which shows the sad havoc that a warm imagination, undirected by a just and solid judgment, makes in religion. It is, however, honourable perhaps to the present age, that a system, from which Ammiannus Marcellinus and other ancient philosophers derived applause, will be generally looked upon, at present, as entitling its restorer to a place in Bethlehem hospital.

\* Institut. Divin. lib. v. cap. ii. p. 535.

† See Photius, Biblioth. Cod. cap. lxx. p. 355.

selves in the cause of Christianity, and in extending the limits of the church, prevent our surprise at the number of barbarous and uncivilised nations, which received the Gospel.\* It appears highly probable, from many circumstances, that both the Major and the Minor Armenia were enlightened with the knowledge of the truth, not long after the promulgation of Christianity. The Armenian church was not, however, completely formed and established before this century; in the commencement of which, Gregory, the son of Anax, who is commonly called the *Enlightener*, from his having dispelled the darkness of the Armenian superstitions, converted to Christianity Tiridates, king of Armenia, and all the nobles of his court. In consequence of this, Gregory was consecrated bishop of the Armenians, by Leontius, bishop of Cappadocia; and his ministry was crowned with such success, that the whole province was soon converted to the Christian faith.†

XX. Toward the middle of this century, a certain person, named Frumentius, went from Egypt to Abyssinia or Ethiopia, whose inhabitants derived the name of Axumitæ from Axuma, the capital city of that country. He made known among this people the Gospel of Christ, and administered the sacrament of baptism to their king, and to several persons of the first distinction at his court. As he was returning into Egypt, he received consecration, as the first bishop of the Axumitæ, or Ethiopians, from Athanasius; and this is the reason why the Ethiopian church has, even to our times, been considered as the daughter of the Alexandrian, from which it also receives its bishop.‡

The light of the Gospel was introduced into Iberia, a province of Asia (now called Georgia,) in the following manner: a certain woman was carried into that country as a captive, during the reign of Constantine; and by the grandeur of her miracles, and the remarkable sanctity of her life and manners, she made such an impression upon the king and queen, that they abandoned their false gods, embraced the faith of the Gospel, and sent to Constantinople for proper persons to give them and their people a more satisfactory and complete knowledge of the Christian religion.§

XXI. A considerable part of the Goths, who had inhabited Thrace, Mœsia, and Dacia, had received the knowledge and embraced the doctrines of Christianity before this century; and Theophilus, their bishop, was present at the

\* Gaudent. vita Philastrii, sect. 3. Philast. de hæres. Præf. Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. xix. Georg. Cedren. Chronograph.

† Narratio de rebus Armeniæ in Franc. Comtedessii Auctario Biblioth. Patrum Græcor. tom. ii. p. 287. Mich. Lequien, Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 419, 1356. Jo. Joach. Schrod. Thesaur. lingue Armenicæ, p. 149.

‡ Athanasius, Apolog. ad Constantium, tom. i. op. part. ii. p. 315, edit. Benedict. Socrates et Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. book i. chap. xix. of the former, book ii. ch. xxiv. of the latter. Theodoret. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. xxiii. p. 54. Ludolf, Comment. ad Hist. Æthiopicæ, p. 281. Hier. Lobo, Voyage d'Abyssinie, tom. ii. p. 13. Justus Fontanus, Hist. Liter. Aquileiæ, p. 174.

§ Rufinus, Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. x. Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. v. Lequien, Oriens Christ. tom. i. p. 1333.

council of Nice. Constantine, after having vanquished them and the Sarmatians, engaged great numbers of them to become Christians;\* yet a large body continued in their attachment to their ancient superstition, until the time of the emperor Valens. This prince permitted them, indeed, to pass the Danube, and to inhabit Dacia, Mœsia, and Thrace; but it was on condition that they should live in subjection to the Roman laws, and embrace the profession of Christianity;† which stipulations were accepted by their king Fritigern. The celebrated Ulphilas, bishop of those Goths who dwelt in Mœsia, lived in this century, and distinguished himself by his genius and piety. Among other eminent services which he rendered to his country, he invented a set of letters for their peculiar use, and translated the Scriptures into the Gothic language.‡

XXII. There remained still, in the European provinces, an incredible number of persons who adhered to the worship of the gods; and though the Christian bishops continued their pious efforts to gain them over to the Gospel, yet the success was, by no means, proportionable to their diligence and zeal, and the work of conversion went on but slowly. In Gaul, the great and venerable Martin, bishop of Tours, set about this important work with tolerable success; for, in his various journeys among the Gauls, he converted many, every where, by the energy of his discourses, and by the power of his miracles, if we may rely upon the testimony of Sulpitius Severus. He destroyed also the temples of the gods, pulled down their statues,§ and on all these accounts merited the high and honourable title of Apostle of the Gauls.

XXIII. There is no doubt that the victories of Constantine, the fear of punishment, and the desire of pleasing this mighty conqueror and his imperial successors, were the weighty arguments that moved whole nations, as well as particular persons, to embrace Christianity. None, however, that have any acquaintance with the transactions of this period of time, will attribute the whole progress of Christianity to these causes; for it is undeniably manifest, that the indefatigable zeal of the bishops and other pious men, the innocence and sanctity which shone forth with such lustre in the lives of many Christians, the translations that were published of the sacred writings, and the intrinsic beauty and excellence of the Christian religion, made as strong and deep impressions upon some, as worldly views and selfish considerations did upon others.

As to the miracles attributed to Antony, Paul the Hermit, and Martin, I give them up without the least difficulty, and join with those who treat these pretended prodigies with the

\* Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. xviii.

† Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. xxxiii. Lequien, Oriens Christ. tom. i. p. 1240. Eric. Benzelius, Præf. ad Quatuor Evangelia Gothica, quæ Ulphilæ tribuuntur, cap. v. p. 18, published at Oxford, in 1750.

‡ Jo. Jac. Mascevi Historia Germanorum, tom. i. p. 317; tom. ii. not. p. 49. Acta SS. Martii, tom. iii. p. 619. Benzelius, cap. viii.

§ See Sulpit. Severus, Dial. i. de Vita Martini, cap. xiii. xv. xvii. et Dial. ii.

contempt they deserve.\* I am also willing to grant, that many events have been rashly deemed miraculous, which were the result of the ordinary laws of nature; and also, that pious frauds were sometimes used, for the purpose of giving new degrees of weight and dignity to the Christian cause. But I cannot, on the other hand, assent to the opinions of those who maintain, that, in this century, miracles had entirely ceased; and that, at this period, the Christian church was not favoured with any extraordinary or supernatural mark of a divine power engaged in its cause.†

XXIV. The Christians, who lived under the Roman government, were not afflicted with any severe calamities from the time of Constantine, except those which they suffered during the troubles and commotions raised by Licinius, and under the transitory reign of Julian. Their tranquillity, however, was, at different times, disturbed in several places.—Among others, Athanaric, king of the Goths, persecuted, for some time, with great bitterness, that part of the Gothic nation which had embraced Christianity.‡ In the remoter provinces, the Pagans often defended their ancient

superstitions by the force of arms, and massacred the Christians, who, in the propagation of their religion, were not always sufficiently attentive, either to the rules of prudence, or the dictates of humanity.\* The Christians who lived beyond the limits of the Roman empire, had a harder fate: Sapor II., king of Persia, vented his rage against those of his dominions, in three dreadful persecutions. The first of these happened in the eighteenth year of the reign of that prince; the second, in the thirtieth; and the third in the thirty-first year of the same reign. This last was the most cruel and destructive of the three; it carried off an incredible number of Christians, and continued during the space of forty years, having commenced in the year 330, and ceased only in 370. It was not, however, the religion of the Christians, but the ill-grounded suspicion of their treasonable designs against the state, that drew upon them this terrible calamity; for the Magi and the Jews persuaded the Persian monarch, that all the Christians were devoted to the interest of the Roman emperor, and that Simeon, archbishop of Scelencia and of Ctesiphon, sent to Constantinople intelligence of all that passed in Persia.†

\* Hier. a Prato, in his Preface to Sulpitius Severus, disputes warmly in favour of the miracles of Martin, and also of the other prodigies of this century.

† See Eusebius' book against Hierocles, chap. iv. and Henry Dodwell's Diss. ii. in frencum, sect. 55, p. 195.

‡ See Dr. Middleton's Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers which are said to have subsisted in the Christian Church, &c. in which a very different opinion is maintained. See, however, on the other side, the answers of Church and Dodwell to Middleton's Inquiry.

§ See Acta Martyr. sincera, published by Ruinart, and (in that collection,) Acta S. Sabæ, p. 598.

\* See Ambrosius, de Officiis, lib. i. cap. xlii. sect. 17.

† See Sozomen. Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. i. xiii. There is a particular and express account of this persecution in the Bibliothec. Oriental. Clement. Vatican. tom. i. p. 6, 16, 181; tom. iii. p. 52; with which it will be proper to compare the preface to the Acta Martyrum Orientalem et Occidentalium, by the learned Assemani, who has published the Persian Martyrology in Syria, with a Latin translation, and enriched this valuable work with many excellent observations.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

*Which contains the History of Learning and Philosophy.*

I. PHILOLOGY, eloquence, poetry, and history, were the branches of learning particularly cultivated at this time, by those among the Greeks and Latins, who were desirous of acquiring fame. But, though several persons of both nations obtained reputation by their literary pursuits, they came all far short of the summit of fame. The best poets of this period, such as Ausonius, appear insipid, harsh, and inelegant, when compared with the sublime bards of the Augustan age. The rhetoricians, departing now from the noble simplicity and majesty of the ancients, instructed the youth in the fallacious art of pompous declamation; and the majority of historical writers were more intent upon embellishing their narrations with vain and tawdry ornaments, than upon rendering them interesting by their order, perspicuity, and truth.

II. Almost all the philosophers of this age were of that sect which we have already dis-

tinguished by the title of Modern Platonists. It is not therefore surprising, that we find the principles of Platonism in all the writings of the Christians. Of these philosophers, however, the number was not so considerable in the west as in the eastern countries. Jamblichus of Chalcis explained, in Syria, the philosophy of Plato, or rather propagated his own particular opinions under that respectable name. He was an obscure and credulous man, and his turn of mind was highly superstitious and chimerical, as his writings abundantly testify.\* His successors were, Aedesius, Maximus, and others, whose follies and puerilities are exposed at length by Eusebius. Hypatia, a female philosopher of distinguished merit and learning, Isidorus, Olympiodorus, Synesius, afterwards a Semi-Christian, with others of inferior reputation, were the principal persons con-

\* Dr. Mosheim speaks here of only one Jamblichus, though there were three persons who bore that name. It is not easy to determine which of them wrote the works that have reached our times under the name of Jamblichus; but, whoever it was, he does not certainly deserve so mean a character as our learned historian here gives him.

cerned in propagating this new modification of Platonism.

III. As the emperor Julian was passionately attached to this sect (which his writings abundantly prove,) he employed every method to increase its authority and lustre; and, for that purpose, engaged in its cause several men of learning and genius, who vied with each other in exalting its merit and excellence.\* But, after his death, a dreadful storm of persecution arose, in the reign of Valentinian, against the Platonists; many of whom, being accused of magical practices, and other heinous crimes, were capitally convicted. During these commotions, Maximus, the master and favourite of Julian, by whose persuasions this emperor had been engaged to renounce Christianity, and to apply himself to the study of magic, was put to death with several others.† It is probable, indeed, that the friendship and intimacy that had subsisted between the apostate emperor and these pretended sages were greater crimes, in the eye of Valentinian, than either their philosophical system or their magic arts; and hence it happened, that such of the sect as lived at a distance from the court, were not involved in the dangers or calamities of this persecution.

IV. From the time of Constantine the Great, the Christians applied themselves with greater zeal and diligence to the study of philosophy and of the liberal arts, than they had formerly done. The emperors encouraged this taste for the sciences, and left no means unemployed to excite and maintain a spirit of literary emulation among the professors of Christianity. For this purpose, schools were established in many cities: libraries were also erected, and men of learning and genius were nobly recompensed by the honours and advantages that were attached to the culture of the sciences and arts.‡ All this was indispensably necessary to the successful execution of the scheme that was laid for abrogating, by degrees, the worship of the gods; for the ancient religion was maintained, and its credit supported by the erudition and talents which distinguished in so many places the sages of Paganism; and there was just reason to apprehend, that the truth might suffer, if the Christian youth, for want of proper masters and instructors of their own religion, should have recourse, for their education, to the schools of the pagan philosophers and rhetoricians.

V. From what has been here said concerning the state of learning among the Christians, let not any reader conclude, that an acquaintance with the sciences had become universal in the church of Christ; for, as yet, there was no law enacted, which excluded the ignorant and

illiterate from ecclesiastical preferments and offices, and it is certain that the greatest part, both of the bishops and presbyters, were men entirely destitute of learning and education. Besides, that savage and illiterate party, who looked upon all sorts of erudition, particularly that of a philosophical kind, as pernicious, and even destructive of true piety and religion, increased both in number and authority. The ascetics, monks, and hermits, augmented the strength of this barbarous faction; and not only the women, but also all who took solemn looks, sordid garments, and a love of solitude, for real piety (and in this number we comprehend the generality of mankind,) were vehemently prepossessed in their favour.

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Government of the Church, and the Christian Doctors, during this Century.*

I. CONSTANTINE the Great made no essential alterations in the form of government that took place in the Christian church before his time; he only corrected it in some particulars, and gave it a greater extent. Although he permitted the church to remain a body-politic, distinct from that of the state, as it had formerly been, yet he assumed to himself the supreme power over this sacred body, and the right of modelling and governing it in such a manner as should be most conducive to the public good. This right he enjoyed without any opposition, as none of the bishops presumed to call his authority in question. The people therefore continued, as usual, to choose freely their bishops and their teachers. The bishop governed the church, and managed the ecclesiastical affairs of the city or district, where he presided in council with the presbyters, not without a due regard to the suffrages of the whole assembly of the people. The provincial bishops also deliberated together upon those matters which related to the interests of the churches of a whole province, as also concerning religious controversies, the forms and rites of divine service, and other things of like moment. To these minor councils, which were composed of the ecclesiastical deputies of one or more provinces, were afterwards added *ecumenical councils*, consisting of commissioners from all the churches in the Christian world, and which, consequently, represented the church universal. These were established by the authority of the emperor, who assembled the first of these councils at Nice. This prince thought it equitable, that questions of superior importance, and such as intimately concerned the interests of Christianity in general, should be examined and decided in assemblies that represented the whole body of the Christian church; and in this it is highly probable, that his judgment was directed by that of the bishops. There were never, indeed, any councils holden, which could, with strict propriety, be called *universal*; those, however, whose laws and decrees were approved and admitted by the universal church, or the greatest part of that sacred body, are commonly called *ecumenical* or *general* councils.

II. The rights and privileges of the several ecclesiastical orders were, however, gradually

\* See the learned Spanheim's Preface to the works of Julian; and that also which he has prefixed to his French translation of Julian's *Cæsars*, and his Annotations to the latter; see also Elterrie, *Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, lib. i. p. 26.

† Ammian. Marcellin. *Hist. lib. xxix. cap. i. p. 556.* edit. Valesii. Elterrie, *Vie de Julien*, p. 306—155, 159, and *Vie de Jovien*, tom. i. p. 194.

‡ See Godofred. ad *Codicis Theodos. titulos de Professoribus et Artibus Liberalibus*. Franc. Balduini in *Constantino M. p. 122.* Herm. Conring. *Dissert. de Studiis Romæ et Constantinop. at the end of his Antiquitates Academicæ.*



changed and diminished, from the time that the church began to be torn with divisions, and agitated with those violent dissensions and tumults, to which the elections of bishops, the diversity of religious opinions, and other things of a like nature, too frequently gave rise. In these religious quarrels, the weaker generally fled to the court for protection and succour; and thereby furnished the emperors with opportunities of setting limits to the power of the bishops, of infringing the liberties of the people, and of modifying, in various ways, the ancient customs according to their pleasure.— And, indeed, even the bishops themselves, whose opulence and authority were considerably increased since the reign of Constantine, began to introduce innovations into the forms of ecclesiastical discipline, and to change the ancient government of the church. Their first step was an entire exclusion of the people from all part in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs; and, afterwards, they by degrees divested even the presbyters of their ancient privileges, and their primitive authority, that they might have no importunate protesters to control their ambition, or oppose their proceedings; and, principally, that they might either engross to themselves, or distribute as they thought proper, the possessions and revenues of the church. Hence, at the conclusion of this century, there remained no more than a mere shadow of the ancient government of the church. Many of the privileges which had formerly belonged to the presbyters and people, were usurped by the bishops; and many of the rights, which had been formerly vested in the universal church, were transferred to the emperors, and to subordinate officers and magistrates.

III. Constantine, in order to prevent civil commotions, and to fix his authority upon solid and stable foundations, made several changes, not only in the laws of the empire, but also in the form of the Roman government;\* and as there were many important reasons, which induced him to suit the administration of the church to these changes in the civil constitution, this necessarily introduced, among the bishops, new degrees of eminence and rank. Three prelates had, before this, enjoyed a certain degree of pre-eminence over the rest of the episcopal order, *viz.* the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria; and to these the bishop of Constantinople was added, when the imperial residence was transferred to that city. These four prelates answered to the four *Pretorian præfects* created by Constantine; and it is possible that, in this very century, they were distinguished by the Jewish title of patriarchs. After these, followed the exarchs, who had the inspection over several provinces, and answered to the appointment of certain civil officers who bore the same title. In a lower class were the metropolitans, who had only the government of one province; under whom were the archbishops, whose inspection was confined to certain districts. In this gradation, the bishops brought up the rear; the sphere of their

authority was not, in all places, equally extensive; being in some considerably ample, and in others confined within narrow limits. To these various ecclesiastical orders, we might add that of the *chorëpiscopi*, or superintendants of the country churches; but this order was, in most places, suppressed by the bishops, with a design to extend their own authority, and enlarge the sphere of their power and jurisdiction.†

IV. The administration of the church was divided, by Constantine himself, into an *external* and an *internal* inspection.‡ The latter, which was committed to bishops and councils, related to religious controversies, the forms of divine worship, the offices of the priests, the vices of the ecclesiastical orders, &c. The external administration of the church, the emperor assumed to himself. This comprehended all those things which relate to the outward state and discipline of the church; it likewise extended to all contests and debates that might arise among the ministers of the church, superior as well as inferior, concerning their possessions, their reputation, their rights and privileges, their offences against the laws, and things of a like nature;§ but no controversies that related to matters purely religious were cognisable by this external inspection. In consequence of this artful division of the ecclesiastical government, Constantine and his successors called councils, presided in them, appointed the judges of religious controversies, terminated the differences which arose between the bishops and the people, fixed the limits of the ecclesiastical provinces, took cognisance of the civil causes that subsisted between the ministers of the church, and punished the crimes committed against the laws by the ordinary judges appointed for that purpose; leaving all causes purely ecclesiastical to the cognisance of bishops and councils. But this famous division of the administration of the church was never explained with perspicuity, or determined with a sufficient degree of accuracy and precision; so that, both in this and the following centuries, we find many transactions that seem absolutely inconsistent with it. We find the emperors, for example, frequently determining matters purely ecclesiastical, which belonged to the internal jurisdiction of the church; and, on the other hand, nothing is more frequent than the decisions of bishops and councils concerning things that relate merely to the external form and government of the church.

V. In the episcopal order, the bishop of Rome was the first in rank, and was distinguished by a sort of pre-eminence over all other prelates. Prejudices, arising from a great variety of causes, contributed to establish this superiority; but it was chiefly owing to certain circumstances of grandeur and opulence, by which mortals, for the most part, form their ideas of pre-eminence and dignity, and which they generally confound with the reasons of a

\* This appears from several passages in the useful work of Lud. Thomassinus, entitled, *Disciplina Ecclesie vet. et novæ circa Beneficia*, tom. i.

† Euseb. de vita Constantini, lib. iv. cap. xxiv. p. 536.

‡ See the imperial laws both in Justinian's Code, and in the Theodosian; as also Godofred. ad Code. Theodos. tom. vi.

\* See Bos, *Histoire de la Monarchie Francoise*, tom. 2. p. 64. Giannone, *Historia di Napoli*, vol. 1.

just and legal authority. The bishop of Rome surpassed all his brethren in the magnificence and splendour of the church over which he presided; in the riches of his revenues and possessions; in the number and variety of his ministers; in his credit with the people; and in his sumptuous and splendid manner of living.\* These dazzling marks of human power, these seeming proofs of true greatness and felicity, had such a mighty influence upon the minds of the multitude, that the see of Rome became, in this century, a most seducing object of sacerdotal ambition. Hence it happened, that when a new pontiff was to be elected by the suffrages of the presbyters and the people, the city of Rome was generally agitated with dissensions, tumults, and cabals, whose consequences were often deplorable and fatal. The intrigues and disturbances that prevailed in that city in the year 366, when, upon the death of Liberius, another pontiff was to be chosen in his place, are a sufficient proof of what we have now advanced. Upon this occasion, one faction elected Damasus to that high dignity, while the opposite party chose Ursicinus, a deacon of the vacant church, to succeed Liberius. This double election gave rise to a dangerous schism, and even to a civil war within the city of Rome, which was carried on with the utmost barbarity and fury, and produced the most cruel massacres and desolation. This inhuman contest ended in the victory of Damasus; but whether his cause was more just than that of Ursicinus, is a question not so easy to determine.† To neither, indeed, can we attribute such principles as constitute a good Christian, much less that exemplary virtue which should distinguish a Christian bishop.

VI. Notwithstanding the pomp and splendour that surrounded the Roman see, it is certain that the bishops of that city had not acquired, in this century, that pre-eminence of power and jurisdiction in the church which they afterwards enjoyed. In the ecclesiastical commonwealth, they were, indeed, the most eminent order of citizens; but still they were citizens, as well as their brethren, and subject, like them, to the edicts and laws of the emperors. All religious causes of extraordinary importance were examined and determined, either by judges appointed by the emperors, or in councils assembled for that purpose, while those of inferior moment were decided, in each district, by its respective bishop. The ecclesiastical laws were enacted, either by the emperor, or by councils. None of the bishops acknowledged that they derived their authority from the permission and appointment of the bishop of Rome, or that they were created bishops by the favour of the apostolic see. On the contrary, they all maintained, that they were the ambassadors and ministers of Jesus Christ, and that their authority was derived from above.‡ It must,

however, be observed, that, even in this century, several of those steps were laid, by which the bishops of Rome mounted afterwards to the summit of ecclesiastical power and despotism. These steps were partly laid by the imprudence of the emperors, partly by the dexterity of the Roman prelates themselves, and partly by the inconsiderate zeal and precipitate judgment of certain bishops.\* The fourth canon of the council, holden at Sardis in the year 347, is considered, by the votaries of the Roman pontiff, as the principal step to his sovereignty in the church; but, in my opinion, it ought by no means to be looked upon in this point of view; for, not to insist upon the reasons that prove the authority of this council to be extremely dubious, or upon those which have induced some to regard its laws as grossly corrupted, and others, to consider them as entirely fictitious and spurious,† it will be sufficient to observe the impossibility of proving, by the canon in question, that the bishops of Sardis were of opinion, that, in all cases, an appeal might be made to the bishop of Rome, in quality of supreme judge;‡ but if we suppose, for a moment, that this was their opinion, what would follow? Surely that pretext for assuming a supreme authority, must be very slender, which arises only from the decree of one obscure council.

VII. Constantine the Great, by removing the seat of the empire to Byzantium, and building the city of Constantinople, raised up, in the bishop of this new metropolis, a formidable rival to the Roman pontiff, and a bulwark which menaced his growing authority with vigorous opposition; for, as the emperor, in order to render Constantinople a second Rome, enriched it with all the rights and privileges, honours, and ornaments, of the ancient capital of the world; so its bishop, measuring his own dignity and rank by the magnificence of the new city, and by its eminence, as the

dotii et Imperii; Du Pin, de antiqua Ecclesiæ disciplina; and the very learned and judicious work of Blondel, de la Primauté dans l'Église.

\* The imprudence of the emperor, and the precipitation of the bishops, were singularly discovered in the following event, which favoured extremely the rise and the ambition of the Roman pontiff. About the year 372, Valentinian enacted a law, empowering the occupant of the see of Rome to examine and judge other bishops, that religious disputes might not be decided by profane or secular judges. The bishops assembled in council at Rome in 378, not considering the fatal consequences that must arise, from this imprudent law, both to themselves and to the church, declared their approbation of it in the strongest terms, and recommended the execution of it in an address to the emperor Gratian. — Some think, indeed, that this law authorised the Roman prelate to judge only the bishops within the limits of his jurisdiction, i. e. those of the suburbicarian provinces. Others are of opinion, that this power was given only for a time, and extended to those bishops alone, who were concerned in the present schism. The latter notion seems probable: but still this privilege was an excellent instrument in the hands of sacerdotal ambition.

† See Mich. Goddes, Diss. de Canonibus Sardicensibus, among his Miscellaneous Tracts, tom. ii.

‡ The fourth canon of the council of Sardis, supposing it genuine and authentic, related only to the particular case of a bishop's being deposed by the neighbouring prelates, and demanding permission to make his defence. In that case, this canon prohibited the election of a successor to the deposed individual, before the pontiff had examined the cause, and pronounced sentence.

\* Ammianus Marcellinus gives a striking description of the luxury in which the bishops of Rome lived. See his Hist. lib. xxvii. cap. iii.

† Among the other writers of the papal history, see Bowyer's History of the Popes, vol. i.

‡ Those who desire a more ample account of this matter, may consult Pet. de Marca, de Concordia Sacra-

august residence of the emperor, assumed an equal degree of dignity with the bishop of Rome, and claimed a superiority over all the rest of the episcopal order. Nor did the emperors disapprove these high pretensions, since they considered their own dignity as connected, in a certain measure, with that of the bishop of their imperial city. Accordingly, in a council convoked at Constantinople in the year 381, by the authority of Theodosius the Great, the bishop of that city was, during the absence of the bishop of Alexandria, and against the consent of the Roman prelate, placed, by the third canon of that council, in the first rank after the bishop of Rome, and, consequently, above those of Alexandria and Antioch. Nectarius was the first who enjoyed these new honours accumulated upon the see of Constantinople. His successor, the celebrated John Chrysostom, extended the privileges of that see, and subjected to its jurisdiction all Thrace, Asia Minor, and Pontus;\* nor were the succeeding bishops of that imperial city destitute of a fervent zeal for the augmentation of their privileges and the extension of their dominion.

This sudden revolution in the ecclesiastical government, and this unexpected promotion of the bishop of Byzantium to a higher rank, to the detriment of other prelates of the first eminence in the church, were productive of the most disagreeable effects; for this promotion not only filled the bishops of Alexandria with the bitterest aversion to those of Constantinople, but also excited those deplorable contentions and disputes between the latter and the Roman pontiffs, which were carried on, for many ages, with such various success, and concluded, at length, in the entire separation of the Latin and Greek churches.

VIII. The additions made by the emperors and others to the wealth, honours, and advantages of the clergy, were followed by a proportionable augmentation of vices and luxury, particularly among those of that sacred order, who lived in great and opulent cities; and that many such additions were made to that order after the time of Constantine, is a matter that admits no dispute. The bishops, on one hand, in the most scandalous manner, mutually disputed the extent of jurisdiction; while, on the other, they trampled upon the rights of the people, violated the privileges of the inferior ministers, and imitated, in their conduct and in their manner of living, the arrogance, voluptuousness, and luxury of magistrates and princes.† This pernicious example was soon imitated by the several ecclesiastical orders. The presbyters, in many places, assumed an equality with the bishops in point of rank and

authority. We find also many complaints made, at this time, of the vanity and effeminacy of the deacons. Those presbyters and deacons, more particularly, who filled the first stations of these orders, carried their pretensions to an extravagant length, and were offended at the notion of being placed upon an equal footing with their colleagues. For this reason, they not only assumed the titles of archpresbyters and archdeacons, but also claimed a degree of authority and power much superior to that which was vested in the other members of their respective orders.

IX. Several writers of great reputation lived in this century, and were shining ornaments to the countries to which they belonged. Among those who flourished in Greece, and in the eastern provinces, the following seem to deserve the first rank:

Eusebius Pamphilus, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, was a man of immense reading, justly famous for his profound knowledge of ecclesiastical history, and singularly versed in other branches of literature, more especially in all the different parts of sacred erudition. These eminent talents and acquisitions were, however, accompanied with errors and defects, and he is said to have inclined toward the sentiments of those, who looked upon the three persons in the Godhead as different from each other in rank and dignity. Some have represented this learned prelate as a thorough Arian, but without foundation, if by an Arian be meant one who embraces the doctrine taught by Arius, presbyter of Alexandria.‡

Peter of Alexandria is mentioned by Eusebius with the highest encomiums.†

Athanasius, patriarch of Alexandria, is celebrated on account of his learned and pious labours, and particularly famous for his warm and vigorous opposition to the Arians.‡

Basil, surnamed the Great, bishop of Cæsarea, in point of genius, controversial skill, and a rich and flowing eloquence, was surpassed by very few in this century.§

Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, left some catechetical discourses, which he delivered in that city: he has been accused by many of intimate connexions with the Semi-Arians.¶

John, surnamed Chrysostom on account of

\* No writer has accused Eusebius of Arianism, with more bitterness and erudition, than Le Clerc, in the second of his *Epist. Eccles.* et *Crit. et Natalis Alexander, Hist. Eccles.* Nov. T. Sæc. iv. All, however, that these writers prove, is, that Eusebius maintained that a certain disparity and subordination subsisted between the persons of the Godhead. If we suppose this to have been his opinion, it will not thence follow that he was an Arian, unless that word be taken in a very extensive and improper sense. Nothing is more common than the abusive application of this term to persons, who have entertained opinions opposite to those of Arius, though perhaps they may have erred in other respects.

† *Hist. Eccles.* lib. ix. cap. vi.

‡ Eusebius Renaudot, in his *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, has collected all the accounts which the Oriental writers give of Athanasius, of whose works the learned and justly celebrated Benedictine, Bernard de Montfaucon, gave a splendid edition.

§ The works of Basil were published at Paris by Julian Garnier, a learned Benedictine.

¶ The later editions of the works of this prelate, are those published by Mr. Milles and by Augustus Toutee, a Benedictine monk.

\* See *Pet. de Marca, Diss. de Constantinop. Patriarchatus Institutione*, subjoined to his book of *Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*; and *Mich. Lequien, Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. See also an Account of the Government of the Christian Church for the first six hundred years, by Dr. Parker, bishop of Oxford.

† See *Sulpit. Sever. Hist. Sacr.* lib. i. cap. xxiii. lib. ii. cap. xxxii. *Dialog.* i. cap. xvi. Add to this the account given by Clarkson (in his *Discourse upon Liturgies*) of the corrupt and profligate manners of the clergy, and, particularly, of the unbounded ambition of the prelates, to enlarge the sphere of their influence and authority.

his extraordinary eloquence, a man of a noble genius, governed successively the churches of Antioch and Constantinople,\* and left several monuments of his profound and extensive erudition; as also discourses† which he had preached with great applause.

Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, in the isle of Cyprus, wrote a book against all the heresies that had sprung up in the church until his time. This work has little or no reputation, as it is full of inaccuracies and errors, and betrays in almost every page the levity and ignorance of its author.‡

Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa have obtained a very honourable place among the celebrated theological and polemic writers of this century, and not without foundation, as their works sufficiently testify.§ Their reputation, indeed, would have been yet more confirmed, had they been less attached to the writings of Origen,|| and less infected with the false and vicious eloquence of the sophists.

Ephraim the Syrian acquired an immortal name by the sanctity of his conversation and manners, and by the multitude of those excellent works in which he combated the sectaries, explained the sacred writings, and unfolded the moral duties and obligations of Christians.¶

Beside the learned men now mentioned, there are several others, of whose writings but a small number have survived the ruins of time; such as Pamphilus, a martyr, and an intimate friend of Eusebius; Diodorus, bishop of Tarsus; Hosius, of Cordova; Didymus, of Alexandria; Eustathius, bishop of Antioch; Amphilocheus, bishop of Iconium; Palladius, the writer of the *Lausiac History*;\*\* Macarius, the elder and the younger; Apollinaris the elder; and some others, who are frequently mentioned on account of their erudition, and the remarkable events in which they were concerned.

X. The Latins also were not without writers of considerable note, the principal of whom we shall point out here.

\* It must not be understood by this, that Chrysostom was bishop of both these churches; he was preacher at Antioch (a function, indeed, which before him was always attached to the episcopal dignity,) and afterwards patriarch of Constantinople.

† The best edition of the works of Chrysostom, is that published by Montfaucon, in eleven volumes folio.

‡ The works of Epiphanius were translated into Latin, and published with notes, by the learned Petau. His life, written by Gervase, appeared at Paris in 1738.

§ There are some good editions of these two writers, which we owe to the care and industry of two learned French editors of the seventeenth century.—Namely, the abbot Billy, who published the works of Gregory Nazianzen at Paris, in 1609, with a Latin translation and learned notes, and father Fronton du Due, who published those of Gregory of Nyssa in 1695.

¶ The charge of Origenism seems to have been adduced by the ancient writers only against Gregory of Nyssa.

\*\* There is a large and accurate account of this excellent writer in the *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatic.* of Joseph Simon Asseman, tom. i. Several works of Ephraim were published at Oxford in Greek; and of these Gerard Vossius has given a Latin translation. An edition of the same works, in Syriac, appeared at Rome, under the auspices of Steph. Enoad. Asseman.

\*\*\* This is the history of the solitaries, or hermits, which derived the name of *Lausiac history* from Lausus, governor of Cappadocia, at whose request it was composed, and to whom it was dedicated by Palladius.

Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, acquired a name by twelve books concerning the Trinity, which he wrote against the Arians, and several other productions. He was a man of penetration and genius; notwithstanding which, he has, for the most part, rather copied in his writings Tertullian and Origen, than given us the fruits of his own study and invention.\*

Lactantius,† the most eloquent of the Latin writers in this century, exposed the absurdity of the pagan superstitions in his *Divine Institutions*, which are written with uncommon purity and elegance. He wrote also upon other subjects, but was much more successful in refuting the errors of others, than careful in observing and correcting his own.‡

Ambrose, prefect, and afterwards bishop of Milan, was not destitute of a certain degree of elegance both of genius and style; his sentiments of things were, by no means, absurd; but he did not escape the prevailing defect of that age, a want of solidity, accuracy, and order.§

Jerome, a monk of Palestine, rendered, by his learned and zealous labours, such eminent services to the Christian cause, as will hand down his name with honour to the latest posterity. But this superior and illustrious merit was accompanied, and, in some measure, obscured, by very great defects. His complexion was excessively warm and choleric, his bitterness against those who differed from him extremely keen, and his thirst of glory insatiable. He was so prone to censure, that several persons, whose lives were not only irreproachable, but even exemplary, became the objects of his unjust accusations. All this, joined to his superstitious turn of mind, and the enthusiastic encomiums which he lavished upon a false and degenerate sort of piety which prevailed in his time, sunk his reputation greatly, even in the esteem of the candid and the wise. His writings are voluminous, but not all equally adapted to instruct and edify. His interpretations of the holy scriptures, and his epistles, are those of his productions which seem the most proper to be read with profit.||

The fame of Augustin, bishop of Hippo in Africa, filled the whole Christian world; and not without reason, as a variety of great and

\* There is a very accurate and ample account of Hilary, in the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. 1. The best edition we have of his works is that published by the French Benedictines.

† See a complete account of Lactantius, *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. i.

‡ Lactantius considers Christ's mission as having no other end, than that of leading mankind to virtue by the most sublime precepts and the most perfect example. The charge of Manicheism, brought against this eminent writer, is refuted in the most evident and satisfactory manner by Dr. Lardner, in the seventh volume of his *Credibility of the Gospel History*, where the reader may find an ample and interesting account of his character and writings. Among those who have been editors of the works of Lactantius, the most reputed are Benemann, Heumann, Walchius, and Lenglet du Fresnoy.

§ The works of St. Ambrose have been published, by the Benedictines, in two volumes in folio.

|| The defects of Jerome are exposed by Le Clerc, in his *Quæst. Hieronym.* published at Amsterdam in 1700. The Benedictine monks have given an edition of the works of this father in five volumes, republished at Verona by Vallarsius with considerable additions.

shining qualities were united in the character of that illustrious man. A sublime genius, an uninterrupted and zealous pursuit of truth, an indefatigable application, an invincible patience, a sincere piety, and a subtle and lively wit, conspired to establish his fame upon the most lasting foundations. It is, however, certain, that the accuracy and solidity of his judgment were, by no means, proportionable to the eminent talents now mentioned; and that, on many occasions, he was more guided by the violent impulse of a warm imagination, than by the cool dictates of reason and prudence. Hence arose that ambiguity which appears in his writings, and which has sometimes rendered the most attentive readers uncertain with respect to his real sentiments; and hence also the just complaints which many have made of the contradictions that are so frequent in his works, and of the levity and precipitancy with which he set himself to write upon a variety of subjects, before he had examined them with a sufficient degree of attention and diligence.\*

Optatus, bishop of Milevi in Numidia, acquired no small degree of reputation, by a work which he wrote against the schism of the Donatists.†

Paulinus, bishop of Nola, wrote some poems and epistles, which are still extant. They are not remarkable either for their excellence or their meanness.‡

Rufinus, presbyter of Aquileia, is famous on account of his Latin translations of Origen and other Greek writers, his commentaries on several books of the holy scriptures, and his bitter contest with Jerome. He would have obtained a very honourable place among the Latin writers of this century, had it not been his misfortune to have the powerful and foul-mouthed Jerome for his adversary.§

As to Philastrius, Damasus, Juvenius, and other writers of that obscure class, we refer the reader, for an account of them, to those authors whose principal object is to give an exact enumeration of the Christian writers. We shall add, nevertheless, to the list already given, Sulpitius Severus, by birth a Gaul, and the most eminent historical writer of this century;|| as also Prudentius, a Spaniard, a poet of a happy and elegant genius.

\* An accurate and splendid edition of the works of St. Augustin, has been given by the Benedictines, since that of the divines of Louvain. This elegant edition bears the title of Antwerp, where it was published, with some augmentations, by Le Clerc, under the fictitious name of Jo. Plercomus. The Jesuits, however, pretend to have found many defects in this edition.

† Since the edition of Optatus, published by Albaspinæus, another has appeared, which we owe to the care and industry of M. Du-Pin, doctor of the Sorbonne.

‡ The best edition of Paulinus is that which was published at Paris, in 1685, by Le Brun.

§ See Rufinus and Jerome had lived for many years in the most intimate and tender friendship, which ended in a violent rupture, on occasion of a translation which the former made of some of the works of Origen, particularly his Book of Principles. For an account of Rufinus, see Rich. Simon, Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques, par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. An ample account of the same writer is given by Justus Fontaninus, Hist. Literar. Aquileiens. lib. v.

|| See Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. ii.; and consult also Hieron. a Prato, who has written, with great accuracy the life of this historian.

## CHAPTER III.

*Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church in this Century.*

I. THE fundamental principles of the Christian doctrine were preserved hitherto incorrupt and entire in most churches, though it must be confessed, that they were often explained and defended in a manner that discovered the greatest ignorance, and an utter confusion of ideas. The disputes carried on in the council of Nice, concerning the three persons in the Godhead, afford a remarkable example of this, particularly in the language and explanations of those who approved the decisions of that council. So little light, precision, and order, reigned in their discourses, that they appeared to substitute three gods in the place of one.

Nor did the evil end here; for those vain fictions, which an attachment to the Platonic philosophy, and to popular opinions, had engaged the greatest part of the Christian doctors to adopt, before the time of Constantine, were now confirmed, enlarged, and embellished, in various ways. Hence arose that extravagant veneration for departed saints, and those absurd notions of a certain fire destined to purify separate souls, that now prevailed, and of which the public marks were every where to be seen. Hence also the celibacy of priests, the worship of images and relics, which, in process of time, almost utterly destroyed the Christian religion, or at least eclipsed its lustre, and corrupted its very essence in the most deplorable manner.

II. An enormous train of different superstitions were gradually substituted for true religion and genuine piety. This odious revolution proceeded from a variety of causes. A ridiculous precipitancy in receiving new opinions, a preposterous desire of imitating the pagan rites, and of blending them with the Christian worship, and that idle propensity, which the generality of mankind have toward a gaudy and ostentatious religion, all contributed to establish the reign of superstition upon the ruins of Christianity. Accordingly, frequent pilgrimages were undertaken to Palestine, and to the tombs of the martyrs, as if there alone the sacred principles of virtue and the certain hope of salvation, were to be acquired.\* The reins being once let loose to superstition, which knows no bounds, absurd notions and idle ceremonies multiplied almost every day. Quantities of dust and earth brought from Palestine, and other places remarkable for their supposed sanctity, were bandied about as the most powerful remedies against the violence of wicked spirits, and were sold and bought every where at enormous prices.† The public processions and supplications, by which the Pagans endeavoured to appease their gods,

\* See Gregor. Nysseni Orat. ad eos qui Hierosolymam adeunt, tom. iii. op.—Hieronym. Epist. xiii. ad Paulinum de instituto Monachi, tom. i.—Jac. Godofred. ad Codicum Theodosian. tom. vi.—Petri Westlingii Dissertat. de causis Pregmat. Hierosolymit. quam Itinerario Burdigalensis præmisit, inter vetera Romanor. Itineraria, p. 537.

† Augustinus, de Civitate Dei, lib. xxii. cap. viii. sect. 6.

were now adopted into the Christian worship, and celebrated in many places with great pomp and magnificence. The virtues which had formerly been ascribed to the heathen temples, to their lustrations, to the statues of their gods and heroes, were now attributed to Christian churches, to water consecrated by certain forms of prayer, and to the images of holy men. And the same privileges, that the former enjoyed under the darkness of Paganism, were conferred upon the latter under the light of the Gospel, or, rather, under that cloud of superstition which was obscuring its glory. It is true, that, as yet, images were not very common; nor were there any statues at all. But it is, at the same time, as undoubtedly certain, as it is extravagant and monstrous, that the worship of the martyrs was modelled, by degrees, according to the religious services that were paid to the gods before the coming of Christ.\*

From these facts, which are but small specimens of the state of Christianity at this time, the discerning reader will easily perceive what detriment the church received from the peace and prosperity procured by Constantine, and from the imprudent methods employed to allure the different nations to embrace the Gospel. The brevity we have proposed to observe in this history, prevents our entering into an ample detail of the dismal effects that arose from the progress and the baneful influence of superstition, which had now become universal.

III. This, indeed, among other unhappy effects, opened a wide door to the endless frauds of those odious impostors, who were so far destitute of all principle, as to enrich themselves by the ignorance and errors of the people. Rumors were artfully spread abroad of prodigies and miracles to be seen in certain places (a trick often practised by the heathen priests;) and the design of these reports was to draw the populace, in multitudes, to these places, and to impose upon their credulity. These stratagems were generally successful; for the ignorance and slowness of apprehension of the people, to whom every thing that is new and singular appears miraculous, rendered them easily the dupes of this abominable artifice.† Nor was this all; certain tombs were falsely given out for the sepulchres of saints; and confessors; the list of the saints was augmented with fictitious names, and even robbers were converted into martyrs.‡ Some buried the bones of dead men in certain retired places, and then affirmed, that they were divinely admonished, by a dream, that the body of some friend of God lay there.¶ Many, especially of the monks, travelled through the different provinces; and not only sold, with the most frontless impudence, their fictitious relics, but also deceived the eyes of the multitude with ludicrous combats with evil spirits or genii.¶ A

whole volume would be requisite to contain an enumeration of the various frauds which artful knaves practised, with success, to delude the ignorant, when true religion was almost entirely superseded by horrid superstition.

IV. Many of the learned, in this century, undertook translations of the Scriptures; but few succeeded in this arduous enterprise.— Among the many Latin versions of the sacred books, that of Jerome was distinguished by its undoubted superiority.‡ The same ingenious and indefatigable writer, whose skill in the languages was by no means inconsiderable, employed much pains upon the Greek version of the seventy interpreters, in order to give a more correct edition of it than had appeared before his time; and it is said, that Eusebius, Athanasius, and Euthalius, had embarked in an undertaking of the same nature.† Of interpreters the number was very considerable, among whom Jerome, Hilary, Eusebius, Diodorus of Tarsus, Rufinus, Ephraim the Syrian, Theodore of Heraclea, Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Didymus, are generally esteemed worthy of the first rank. It is however certain, that, even of these first-rate commentators, few have discovered a just discernment, or a sound judgment, in their laborious expositions of the sacred writings. Rufinus, Theodore, and Diodorus, with some others, have, indeed, followed the natural signification of the words;‡ the rest, after the example of Origen, are laborious in the search of far-fetched interpretations, and pervert the expressions of Scripture, which they very imperfectly understand, by applying them, or rather straining them, to points with which they have no connexion.§ St. Augustin and Tychonius endeavoured to establish plain and wise rules for the interpretation of Scripture; but their efforts were unsuccessful.¶

V. The doctrines of Christianity had not a better fate than the sacred writings from which they are drawn. Origen was the great model whom the most eminent of the Christian doctors followed in their explications of the truths of the Gospel, which were consequently explained, according to the rules of the Platonic philosophy, as it was corrected and modified by that learned father for the instruction of the youth. Those who desire a more ample and accurate account of this matter, may consult Gregory Nazianzen among the Greeks, and Augustin among the Latins, who were followed, for a long time, as the only patterns worthy of imitation, and who, next to Origen, may be considered as the parents and supporters of the *philosophical or scholastic theology*. They were both zealous Platonists; and holding, for certain, all the tenets of that philosopher which were not totally repugnant to the truths of Christianity, they laid them down as fundamental principles, and drew from them a great

\* For a full account of this matter, see Beausobre, *Hist. du Manichéisme*, tom. ii.

† Henry Dodwell, *Dissert. ii. in Irenæum*, sect. 56. Le Clerc, in his *Appendix Augustinianæ*, p. 492, 550, 575.

‡ Council. Carthag. v. Can. xiv.

§ Sulpitius Severus, de vita S. Martini, cap. viii.

¶ Augustin. *Serm. cccxviii. sect. i. tom. v. op.*

¶ See Godofred. ad cod. Theod. tom. iii.—Augustin. de opere Monachor. cap. xxviii. sect. 36.—Hieronymi. *Epist. ad Rusticum*, tom. i. op.

\* Jo. Fraue. *Budæi Isagoge ad Theologiam*, tom. ii.

† Friccius, de *Canone N. T.*

‡ Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiast.* par Du Pin, tom. i. iv. as also Hist. *Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* cap. vi.

§ See Gregor. Nazianz. *Carmen de Scipso*, in *Tollius' Insignia Iunioris*.

¶ This may be seen in the six books which Augustin wrote concerning the Christian doctrine, and in the rules of interpretation laid down by Tychonius, which are to be found in the *Biblioth. Patr. Maxim.* tom. vi.

variety of subtle conclusions, which neither Christ nor Plato ever thought of.

This, however, was not the only sect that flourished at this time. That order of fanatics, who maintained that the knowledge of divine truth was to be acquired, not by reasoning, but by still contemplation, and by turning the eye of the mind upon itself in an entire absence from all external and sensible objects, became now much more numerous. This appears from many circumstances, particularly from the swarms of monks that almost overspread the Christian world, and also from the books of Dionysius, the pretended chief of the Mystics, which seem to have been forged in this century, under that venerable name, by some member of that fanatical tribe.

VI. Among the writers of this century, who published expositions of the Christian doctrine, the first place is due to Cyril of Jerusalem, justly celebrated for his catechetical discourses, which nothing but a partial blindness to the truth could have induced any to attribute to a more modern author.\* Some have ranked Lactantius in the class of writers now under consideration, but without reason, since it is well known, that the labours of that eloquent author were rather employed in refuting the errors of idolatry, than in explaining the truths of the Gospel. The system of Doctrine addressed to the Clergy and Laity, which, by many, has been attributed to Athanasius, seems to be of a much later date. There are, however, many things in the works of Chrysostom, Athanasius, the Gregories, and others, by which we may be enabled to form a just idea of the manner in which the principal points of the Christian doctrine were explained by learned men in this century. We may more particularly be assisted in this matter by the twelve books of Hilary, concerning the Trinity; the Acoratus of Epiphanius, in which the doctrine of Scripture, concerning Christ and the Holy Ghost, is explained at large; the treatise of Pacian, concerning baptism, addressed to the catechumens; and the two books of Chrysostom on the same subject. We need not mention here the various works of Jerome and Augustin, in which appear the laborious and noble efforts of those great men to inspire into the minds of the people just notions of religion, and to detect and refute the errors of those who were enemies of the truth.

VII. The controversial writings, that were levelled against those who were considered as heretics, were entirely destitute of that ancient simplicity, which is the natural and the beautiful garb of truth. That simplicity was now succeeded by logical subtilities, acute sophisms, sharp invectives, and other disingenuous arts, more worthy of the patrons of error, than of the defenders of that "wisdom which is from above." We find, accordingly, many great and eminent men complaining of this abuse, and endeavouring in vain to oppose the ruddy torrent of scurrility and dialectic that was overflowing the Christian schools.† I pass in

silence those rhetorical figures and ornaments, by which many evaded the arguments of their adversaries, and artfully perplexed the true state of the case; that odious custom, also, observed by some, of exciting the popular resentment against those who differed from them, and the total want of order and of perspicuity, chargeable upon almost all. Several writers of this age are so far from disowning these indecorous qualities, that they seem, on the contrary, to glory in them. It must, indeed, be observed, that the adversaries of the truth used the same inglorious arms, though this does not in the least diminish the reproach which is on that account due to its friends.

VIII. New methods of disputing were also added to those which were practised in former times: for the truth of a doctrine was now proved by the number of martyrs that had professed it, by miracles, by the confession of *demons*, i. e. of persons possessed with evil spirits. The smallest degree of discernment will persuade any one how ambiguous this method of reasoning was; how dangerous to the truth, by furnishing innumerable occasions for the exercise of fraud and imposture; and I apprehend, that the greatest part of those who used such arguments, however illustrious and respectable they may have been, will be found, upon examination, chargeable with the dangerous and criminal design of imposing upon their brethren. Ambrose, in his disputes with the Arians, produced men possessed with devils, who, on the approach of the relics of Gervasius and Protasius, were obliged to acknowledge, with loud cries, that the doctrine of the council of Nice, concerning the three persons of the godhead, was true; and that of the Arians not only false, but also of most dangerous consequence. This testimony of the prince of darkness was regarded, by Ambrose, as an unexceptionable argument in favour of his hypothesis. The Arians, on the other hand, held this prodigy in the utmost derision, and maintained that Ambrose had suborned these infernal witnesses by a weighty bribe; and I make no doubt, that many will be more disposed to believe the Arians, than to credit Ambrose, though he be enrolled in the order of the saints, and they stigmatised in the list of heretics.‡

IX. There were, in this century, several controversialists of considerable note; for, beside Apollinarius, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, and others who distinguished themselves in the lists against the emperor Julian, many others disputed, with victorious force and a happy success, against the worshippers of the gods. Of this number were, Lactantius, Athanasius, Julius Firmicus Maternus, Apollinarius the younger, whose excellent writings against Porphyry are unhappily lost; Augustin, in those books of the City of God, and in the three books against the Pagans, which have also perished; and, above all, Eusebius of Casarea, in his Evangelical Preparation, and his book against Hierocles. Eusebius Emese-

\* See Jo. Fechtii Comment. de Origine Missarum in Honorem Sanctorum, p. 404.

† Methodius apud Epiphanius, Hæres. lxxv. tom. i. op. —Gregor. Nazian. in many places; and others.

\* Ambros. Epist. xxii. Paulinus, vita Ambrosii, p. 81.

† See Le Clerc, Appendix Augustiniana, p. 375. Gregor. Nyss. vita Gregorii Neocesariensis, tom. ii. op. Sulpitius Severus, Hist. Sacr. lib. ii. cap. xxxviii.

nus, Diodorus of Tarsus, and St. Chrysostom, whose treatise on the subject is still extant, employed their learned labours to bring over the Jews to the profession of Christianity. Ephraim the Syrian,\* James of Nisibis, Didymus and Audentius, attacked the whole body of heretics; as did also Epiphanius, in his voluminous work concerning heresies, entitled Panarium, and Gregory Nazianzen with more brevity in his discourse concerning faith. The books of Augustin and Philastrius, on the same subject, contain rather a list than a refutation of the several sects.

X. If the growth and perfection of a science were to be estimated by the multitude of writers it produces, that of *morals* must have flourished greatly at this time; for a very considerable number of persons applied themselves to that excellent study. Among the eastern writers, James, bishop of Nisibis,† and Ephraim, bishop of Syria, became eminent for their zeal and assiduity in inculcating the precepts of morality. The writings of Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustin, and several others, upon moral subjects, are neither worthy of high encomiums, nor of entire contempt, as they contain a strange mixture of excellent reflections, and insipid details, concerning the duties of the Christian life. Among the productions of these writers, many give the preference to the three books of Ambrose, concerning the duty of the ministers of the church, which are written in the manner of Cicero, and are justly commended for the pious intention they discover, and the beautiful sentiments they contain, though there be many things in them worthy of reprehension. But Macarius, an Egyptian monk,‡ undoubtedly deserves the first rank among the practical writers of this time, as his works display, some few things excepted,§ the brightest and most lovely portraiture of sanctity and virtue.

XI. It must, however, be observed, that almost all the writers of this class are defective in several respects. They have been entirely negligent of order in their compositions, and have taken no sort of care to treat with method and precision the subjects they undertook to explain. They seldom define their terms, and pour out their pious but incoherent ideas in fortuitous combinations, just as they offer themselves. They, moreover, neglect deducing the duties of mankind from their true principles, and even sometimes derive them from doctrines and precepts which are either manifestly false, or, at least, whose nature and meaning are not determined with any degree of accuracy. And hence it is, that the greatest part of them are

extremely defective, when they come to demonstrate the obligations of virtue, and the incongruity and unfitness of vice. These pretended demonstrations, instead of being deduced by proper conclusions from the reason of things and the divine laws, are nothing more than a collection of airy fancies, cold and insipid allegories, quaint and subtle conceits, which are more proper to afford amusement to the imagination, than light to the understanding, or conviction to the judgment.

XII. But, however defective this method of inculcating the duties of morality may have been, it was much more tolerable than that which was followed by the amphibious disciples of Christ and Plato, those Alexandrian philosophers, of whom Ammonius Sacca was the chief. The double doctrine of morals which they invented, and which was compounded of two systems, one surpassing the other in perfection, gained much ground in this century, to the great detriment of true religion. A circumstance that strongly tends to convince us of the growth and progress of this fanatical sect is, that those who in former times had inculcated a secret doctrine concerning divine things, totally different from that which was publicly propagated among the multitude, gave now the finishing touch to this doctrine, and formed it into a system. The famous Grecian fanatic, who declared himself to be Dionysius the Areopagite, disciple of St. Paul, and who, under the protection of this venerable name, gave laws and instructions to such as were desirous of raising their souls above all human things, in order to unite them to their great source by sublime contemplation, lived most probably in this century, though some place him before, others after the present period.\* No sooner were the writings and instructions of this fanatic handed about among the Greeks and Syrians, and particularly among the solitaries and monks, than a gloomy cloud of religious darkness began to spread itself over the minds of many. An incredible number of proselytes joined those chimerical sectaries, who maintained that communion with God was to be sought by mortifying the senses, by withdrawing the mind from all external objects, by macerating the body with hunger and labour, and by a holy sort of indolence, which confined all the activity of the soul to a lazy contemplation of things spiritual and eternal.

XIII. The progress of this sect appears evidently from the prodigious number of solitary monks and sequestered virgins, which, upon the return of tranquillity to the church, had

\* See Jos. Sim. Asseman. Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic. tom. i. p. 118, 125. From the extracts, which this learned compiler has given of the works of Ephraim, it appears, that he was more distinguished by his pious and genius, than by his skill in the management of controversy. ¶

† Jos. Sim. Assemanus, in the work quoted in the preceding note, tom. i., thinks, that the writings attributed to the bishop of Nisibis, belong rather to the bishop of Saruga; he however corrects, in some measure, this notion in his Addenda, p. 558.

‡ See the Acta Sanctorum, tom. i. Januar. p. 1005.

§ The things here excepted by Dr. Mosheim, are some superstitious tenets that are to be found in the writings of Macarius, and also certain opinions that seem tainted with Origenism

\* Those who have written concerning this impostor, are enumerated by Jo. Franc. Buddeus, in his *Isagoge ad Theologian*, lib. ii. cap. iv. See also Jo. Lاونou *Judicium de Scriptis Dionysii*, tom. ii. op. part. i. La Croze (in his *Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie*.) endeavours to prove, that Synesius, an Egyptian bishop, and also the most celebrated philosopher of the fifth century, composed the writings attributed to Dionysius, in order to defend the doctrine of those who held, that Christ only possessed one nature. The arguments, however, of La Croze are weak. Nor are those more satisfactory, which the learned Barater has employed, in a dissertation added to his book de *Successione Rom. Episcop.* p. 286, to prove that Dionysius of Alexandria was the true author of the writings in question.



overrun the whole Christian world with an amazing rapidity. Many of this order of men had, for a long time, been known among the Christians, and had led silent and solitary lives in the deserts of Egypt; but Antony was the first who formed them into a regular body, engaged them to live in society with each other, and prescribed rules to them for the direction of their conduct.\* These regulations, which Antony brought forward in Egypt, in 305, were, in the year following, introduced into Palestine and Syria, by his disciple Hilarion. Almost about the same time, Aones and Eugenius, with their companions, Gaddanas and Azyzus, instituted the monastic order in Mesopotamia and the adjacent countries;† and their example was followed with such rapid success, that, in a short time, the east was filled with a lazy set of mortals, who, abandoning all human connexions, advantages, pleasures, and concerns, wore out a languishing and miserable life, amidst the hardships of want and various kinds of suffering, in order to arrive at a more close and rapturous communion with God and angels. The Christian church would never have been disgraced by this cruel and insocial enthusiasm, nor would any have been subjected to those keen torments of mind and body to which it gave rise, had not many Christians been unwarily caught by the specious appearance and the pompous sound of that maxim of the ancient philosophy, "That, in order to the attainment of true felicity and communion with God, it was necessary that the soul should be separated from the body, even here below, and that the body was to be macerated and mortified for this purpose."

XIV. From the east this gloomy institution passed into the west, and first into Italy, and its neighbouring islands, though it is utterly uncertain who transplanted it thither.‡ St. Martin, the celebrated bishop of Tours, erected the first monasteries in Gaul, and recommended this religious solitude with such power and efficacy, both by his instructions and his example, that his funeral is said to have been attended by no less than two thousand monks.§ Thence, the monastic discipline gradually extended its progress through the other provinces and countries of Europe.

It is, however, proper to observe, that there

\* For a full account of Antony, and the discipline established by him, see the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Januar. ad d. 17.

† See Jos. Simon. *Asseman. Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatican.* tom. iii. part. ii.

‡ Most writers, following the opinion of Baronius, maintain that St. Athanasius brought the monastic institution from Egypt into Italy, about the year 310, and was the first who built a monastery at Rome. See Mabillon, *Præf. ad Acta Sanctorum Ord. Bened.* tom. i.—The learned Muratori (*Antiq. Ital.* tom. v.) combats this opinion, and pretends that the first monastery, known in Europe, was erected at Milan; and Just. Fontaninus, in his *Hist. Liter. Aquilensis*, affirms, that the first society of monks was formed at Aquileia. But these writers do not produce unexceptionable evidence for their opinions. If we may give credit to the Ballerini (*Dissert. in ad Zenonem Veronensem*), the first convent of nuns was erected toward the end of this century, at Verona, by Zeno, bishop of that city.

§ See Sulpit. Sever. *de vita Martini*, cap. v. p. 17, edit. Veron., where the method of living, used by the Martinian monks, is accurately described. See also *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. i. part. ii. p. 42.

was a great difference in point of austerity between the western and oriental monks: the former of whom could never be brought to bear the severe rules to which the latter voluntarily submitted. And, indeed, the reason of this difference may be partly derived from the nature of the respective climates in which they dwelt. The European countries abound not so much with delirious fanatics, or with persons of a morose and austere complexion, as those arid regions that lie toward the burning east; nor are our bodies capable of supporting that rigid and abstemious method of living, which is familiar and easy to those who are placed under a glowing firmament, and breathe in a sultry and scorching atmosphere. It was, therefore, rather the name only than the thing itself, which was transported into the European countries,\* though this name was indeed accompanied with a certain resemblance or distant imitation of the monastic life instituted by Antony and others in the east.

XV. The monastic order, of which we have been taking a general view, was distributed into several classes. It was first divided into two distinct orders, of which one received the denomination of Cœnobites, the other that of Eremites. The former lived together in a fixed habitation, and made up one large community under a chief, whom they called *father*, or *abbot*, which signifies the same thing in the Egyptian language. The latter drew out a wretched life in perfect solitude, and were scattered here and there in caves, in deserts, in the cavities of rocks, sheltered from the wild beasts only by the cover of a miserable cottage, in which each lived sequestered from the rest of his species.

The Anachoretes were yet more excessive in the austerity of their manner of living than the Eremites. They frequented the wildest deserts without either tents or cottages; nourished themselves with the roots and herbs which grew spontaneously out of the uncultivated ground; wandered about without having any fixed abode, reposing wherever the approach of night happened to find them; and all this, that they might avoid the view and the society of mortals.‡

Another order of monks were those wan-

\* This difference between the discipline of the eastern and western monks, and the cause of it, have been ingeniously remarked by Sulpitius Severus, *Dial. i. de Vita Martini*, where one of the interlocutors, in the dialogue, having mentioned the abstemious and wretched diet of the Egyptian monks, adds what follows: "Placuit tibi prandium, fasciculum herbarum et panis dimidius vix quinque." To this question the Gaul answers, "Eadem tu more, qui nullum occasione omittis, quin nos (i. e.) (the Gallic monks) edacantibus fatigas. Sed facis inhumane, qui nos Gallos homines cogis exemplo angelorum vivere—Sed contentus sit hoc [prandio] Cyrenensis illi, cui vel necessitas vel natura est esurire: nos, quod tibi sarpe testatum, Galli sumus." The same speaker, in the above mentioned dialogue, cap. vii. reproaches Jerome with having accused the monks of gluttony; and proceeds thus: "Sentio de orientabilibus illum potius monachis, quam de occidentalibus disputasse; nam edacitas in Græcis et Orientalibus quæ est, in Galis natura." It appears, therefore, that, immediately after the introduction of the monastic order into Europe, the western differed greatly from the eastern monks in their manners and discipline, and were, in consequence of this, accused by the latter of voraciousness and gluttony.

‡ See Sulpit. Sever. *Dial. i. de vita Martini*, cap. x.

dering fanatics, or rather impostors, whom the Egyptians called Sarabaites, who, instead of procuring a subsistence by honest industry, travelled through various cities and provinces, and gained a maintenance by fictitious miracles, by selling relics to the multitude, and other frauds of a like nature.

Many of the Cœnobites were chargeable with vicious and scandalous practices. This order, however, was not so generally corrupt as that of the Sarabaites, who were for the most part profligates of the most abandoned kind. As to the Eremites, they seem to have deserved no other reproach than that of a delirious and extravagant fanaticism.\* All these different orders were hitherto composed of the laity, and were subject to the jurisdiction and the inspection of the bishops. But many of them were now adopted among the clergy, even by the command of the emperors; and the fame of monastic piety and sanctity became so general, that bishops were frequently chosen out of that fanatical order.†

XVI. If the enthusiastic phrensy of the monks exaggerated, in a manner pernicious to the interests of morality, the discipline that is obligatory upon Christians, the interests of virtue and true religion suffered yet more grievously by two monstrous errors which were almost universally adopted in this century, and became a source of innumerable calamities and mischiefs in the succeeding ages. Of these maxims one was, "That it was an act of virtue to deceive and lie, when by such means the interests of the church might be promoted;" and the second, equally horrible, though in another point of view, was, that errors in religion, when maintained and adhered to after proper admonition, were punishable with civil penalties and corporal tortures." Of these erroneous maxims the former was now of a long standing; it had been adopted for some ages past, and had produced an incredible number of ridiculous fables, fictitious prodigies, and pious frauds, to the unspeakable detriment of that glorious cause in which they were employed. And it must be frankly confessed, that the greatest men, and most eminent saints of this century, were more or less tainted with the infection of this corrupt principle, as will appear evidently to such as look with an attentive eye into their writings and their actions. We would willingly except, from this charge, Ambrose and Hilary, Augustin, Gregory Nazianzen, and Jerome; but truth, which is more respectable than these venerable fathers, obliges us to involve them in the general accusation. We may add also, that it was, probably, the contagion of this pernicious maxim, that engaged Sulpitius Severus, who is far from being, in general, a puerile or credulous historian, to attribute so

many miracles to St. Martin. The other maxim, relating to the justice and expediency of punishing error, was introduced in those serene and peaceful times which the accession of Constantine to the imperial throne procured to the church. It was from that period approved by many, enforced by several examples during the contests that arose with the Priscilianists and Donatists, confirmed and established by the authority of Augustin, and thus transmitted to the following ages.

XVII. When we cast an eye toward the lives and morals of Christians at this time, we find, as formerly, a mixture of good and evil; some eminent for their piety, others infamous for their crimes. The number, however, of immoral and unworthy Christians began so to increase, that the examples of real piety and virtue became extremely rare. When the terrors of persecution were totally dispelled; when the church, secured from the efforts of its enemies, enjoyed the sweets of prosperity and peace; when the major part of the bishops exhibited to their flock the contagious examples of arrogance, luxury, effeminacy, animosity, and strife, with other vices too numerous to mention; when the inferior rulers and doctors of the church fell into a slothful and opprobrious negligence of the duties of their respective stations, and employed, in vain wranglings and idle disputes, that zeal and attention which were due to the culture of piety and to the instruction of their people; and when (to complete the enormity of this horrid detail) multitudes were drawn into the profession of Christianity, not by the power of conviction and argument, but by the prospect of gain or by the fear of punishment; then it was, indeed, no wonder that the church was contaminated with shoals of profligate Christians, and that the virtuous few were, in a manner, oppressed and overwhelmed by the superior numbers of the wicked and licentious. It is true, that the same rigorous penitence, which had taken place before the time of Constantine continued now in full force against flagrant transgressors; but, when the reign of corruption becomes universal, the vigour of the law yields to its sway, and a weak execution defeats the purposes of the most salutary discipline. Such was now unhappily the case: the age was gradually sinking from one period of corruption to another; the great and the powerful sinned with impunity; and the obscure and the indigent alone felt the severity of the laws.

XVIII. Religious controversies among Christians were frequent in this century; and, as it often happens in the course of civil affairs, external peace gave occasion and leisure for the excitation of intestine troubles and dissensions. We shall mention some of the principal of these controversies, which produced violent and obstinate schisms, not so much, indeed, by their natural tendency, as by incidental occurrences.

In the beginning of this century, about the year 306, arose the famous Meletian controversy, so called, from its author, and which, for a long time, divided the church. Peter, bishop of Alexandria, had deposed, from the episcopal office, Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis

\* Whoever is desirous of a more ample account of the vices of the monks in this century, may consult the above mentioned dialogue of Sulp. Sever. cap. viii. p. 69, 70. cap. xxi. p. 88, where he particularly chastises the arrogance and ambition of those who aspired to clerical honours. See also Dial. ii. cap. viii. and also cap. xv. and Consultat. Apollonii et Zachari, published by Dacierius, Spicileg. tom. i. lib. iii. cap. iii.

† See J. Godofred. ad Codicem Theodosianum, tom. vi.

in the Upper Egypt. The reasons that occasioned this violent act of authority, have not been sufficiently explained.

The partisans of Peter allege, that Meletius had sacrificed to the gods, and charge him also with various crimes;\* while others affirm, that his only failing was an excessive severity against the lapsed.† However that may be, Meletius treated the sentence of Peter with the utmost contempt, and not only continued to perform all the duties of the episcopal function, but even assumed the right of consecrating presbyters; a privilege, which, by the laws of Egypt, belonged only to the bishop of Alexandria. The venerable gravity and eloquence of Meletius drew many to his party; and, among others, a considerable number of monks adhered to his cause. The council of Nice made several ineffectual attempts to heal this breach; the Meletians, on the other hand, whose chief aim was to oppose the authority of the bishop of Alexandria, joined themselves to the Arians, who were his irreconcilable enemies. Hence it happened, that a dispute, which had for its first object the authority and jurisdiction of the bishop of Alexandria, gradually degenerated into a religious controversy. The Meletian party was yet subsisting in the fifth century.‡

XIX. Some time after this, a certain person named Eustathius, was the occasion of great disorders and divisions in Armenia, Pontus, and the neighbouring countries; and he was consequently condemned and excommunicated by the council of Gangra, which soon followed that of Nice. Whether this was the same Eustathius, who was bishop of Sebastia in Armenia, and the chief of the Semi-Arians; or whether the ancient historians have confounded two different persons of the same name, is a matter extremely difficult to determine.§ However that may be, the leader of the Eustathian sect does not seem so much chargeable with the corruption of any religious doctrine, as with having set up a fanatical form of sanctity, an extravagant system of practical discipline, destructive of the order and happiness of society; for he prohibited marriage, the use of wine and flesh, feasts of charity, and other things of that nature. He prescribed immediate divorce to those who were joined in wedlock, and is said to have granted to children and servants the liberty of violating the commands of their parents and masters upon pretexts of a religious nature.||

XX. Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, a man remarkable for his prudence, the austerity of his character, and the steadiness of his resolution and courage, was banished by the emperor Constantius, for having defended the Nicene doctrine, concerning the three per-

sons in the Godhead. He broke the bonds of fraternal communion with Eusebius, bishop of Verecil, in the year 363, because the latter had consecrated Paulinus, bishop of Antioch; and he afterwards separated himself from the whole church, on account of the absolution which it had decreed in favour of those who, under Constantius, had deserted to the Arians.\* The small tribe, at least, that followed this prelate, under the title of Luciferians, scrupulously and obstinately avoided all commerce and fellowship, both with those bishops who had declared themselves in favour of the Arians, and with those also who consented to an absolution for such as returned from this desertion, and acknowledged their error; and thus of consequence they dissolved the bonds of their communion with the church in general.† The Luciferians are also said to have entertained erroneous notions concerning the human soul, whose generation they considered as of a carnal nature, and maintained, that it was transfused from the parents into the children.‡

XXI. About this time Ærius, a presbyter monk, and a Semi-Arian, erected a new sect, and excited divisions throughout Armenia, Pontus, and Cappadocia, by propagating opinions different from those which were commonly received. His principal tenet was, that bishops were not distinguished from presbyters by any divine right, but that, according to the institution of the New Testament, their offices and authority were absolutely the same. How far Ærius pursued this opinion, through its natural consequences, is not certainly known; but we know, with certainty, that it was highly agreeable to many good Christians, who were no longer able to bear the tyranny and arrogance of the bishops of this century. There were other things in which Ærius differed from the common notions of the time; he condemned prayers for the dead, stated fasts, the celebration of Easter, and other rites of that nature, in which the multitude erroneously imagine that the life and soul of religion consists.§ His great purpose seems to have been that of reducing Christianity to its primitive simplicity; a purpose, indeed, laudable and noble when considered in itself, though the principles whence it springs, and the means by which it is executed, may in some respects deserve censure.||

\* Rufin. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. xxx.—Socrates, lib. iii. cap. ix. See also Tallemont's Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. vii.

† See, in the works of Sirmond, a book of Prayers, addressed to Theodosius by Marcellinus and Faustinus, who were Luciferians.

‡ Augustin. de Hæres. cap. lxxxi. with the observations of Lamb. Danaus, p. 346.

§ Epiphanius, Hæres. lxxv. p. 905.—Augustin. de Hæres. cap. lvi.

|| The desire of reducing religious worship to the greatest possible simplicity, however rational it may appear in itself, when abstractedly considered, will be considerably moderated in such as bestow a moment's attention upon the imperfection and infirmities of human nature in its present state. Mankind, generally speaking, have too little elevation of mind to be much affected with those forms and methods of worship, in which there is nothing striking to the outward senses. The great difficulty lies in determining the lengths, which it is prudent to go in the accommodation of religious ceremonies to human infirmity; and the grand point is, to fix a medium, in which a due regard may be shown to the senses and imagination, without violating the dictates of right rea-

\* Athanasius, Apologia secunda, tom. i. op.  
 † Epiphanius, Hæres. lxxviii. tom. i. op. See also Dion. Petavius, Not. in Epiphanius, tom. ii. and Sam. Basnage Exercit. de Rebus sacris contra Baronium.  
 ‡ Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. i. c. vi. p. 14. Theodor. Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. viii. p. 548.  
 § See Sam. Basnage, Annal. Polit. Eccles. tom. ii.  
 || Socrates, lib. i. cap. xliiii.—Sozomen, lib. iii. cap. xiv. lib. iv. cap. xxv.—Epiphanius, Hæres. lxxv.—Philostorgius, Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xvi.—Wolff. Gundling, Not. ad Concilium Gangrense.

XXII. The progress of superstition in this century, and the erroneous notions that prevailed concerning the true nature of religion, excited the zeal and the efforts of many to stem the torrent. But their labours only exposed them to infamy and reproach. Of these worthy opposers of the reigning superstitions, the most eminent was Jovinian, an Italian monk, who, toward the conclusion of this century, taught first at Rome, and afterwards at Milan, that all those who kept the vows they made to Christ at their baptism, and lived according to the rules of piety and virtue laid down in the Gospel, had an equal title to the rewards of futurity; and that, consequently, those who passed their days in insocial celibacy, and severe mortifications and fastings, were in no respect more acceptable in the eye of God, than those who lived virtuously in the bonds of marriage, and nourished their bodies with moderation and temperance. These judicious opinions, which many began to adopt, were first condemned by the church of Rome, and afterwards by Ambrose, in a council holden at Milan in the year 390.\* The emperor Honorius seconded the authoritative proceedings of the bishops by the violence of the secular arm, answered the judicious reasonings of Jovinian by the terror of coercive and penal laws, and banished this pretended heretic to the island of Boa. Jovinian published his opinions in a book, against which Jerome, in the following century, wrote a most bitter and abusive treatise, still extant.†

XXIII. Among all the religious controversies that divided the church, the most celebrated, both for their importance and their duration, were those relating to Origen and his doctrine.

This illustrious man, though he had been, for a long time, charged with many errors, was deemed, by the generality of Christians, an object of high veneration; and his name was so sacred as to give weight to the cause in which it appeared. The Arians, who were sagacious in searching for succours on all sides to maintain their sect, affirmed that Origen had adopted their opinions. In this they were believed by some, who consequently included this great man in the hatred which they entertained against the sect of the Arians. But several writers of the first learning and note opposed this report, and endeavoured to vindicate the honour of their master from these injurious insinuations. Of these the most eminent was

Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, as appears by his learned work, entitled, *An Apology for Origen*. It is extremely probable, that these clamours raised against the memory and reputation of a man, whom the whole Christian world beheld with respect, would have been soon hushed, had it not been for the rise of new commotions, which proceeded from another source, and of which we shall treat in the following section.

XXIV. The monks in general, and the Egyptian monks in particular, were enthusiastically devoted to Origen, and spared no labour to propagate his opinions in all places. Their zeal, however, met with opposition, nor could they convince all Christians of the truth and soundness of the notions invented or adopted by that eminent writer. Hence arose a controversy concerning the reasons and foundations of Origenism, which was at first managed in a private manner, but afterwards, by degrees, broke out into an open flame. Among the numerous partisans of Origen, was John, bishop of Jerusalem; which furnished Epiphanius and Jerome with a pretext to cast an odium upon this prelate, against whom they had been previously exasperated on other accounts. But the ingenious bishop conducted matters with such admirable dexterity, that, in defending himself, he vindicated, at the same time, the reputation of Origen, and drew to his party the whole monastic body, and also a prodigious number of those who were spectators of this interesting combat. This was merely the beginning of the vehement contests concerning the doctrine of Origen, that were carried on both in the eastern and western provinces. These contests were particularly fomented in the west by Rufinus, a presbyter of Aquileia, who translated into Latin several books of Origen, and insinuated, with sufficient plainness, that he acquiesced in the sentiments they contained,\* which drew upon him the implacable rage of the learned and choleric Jerome. But these commotions seemed to cease in the west after the death of Rufinus, and in consequence of the efforts which men of the first order made to check, both by their authority and by their writings, the progress of Origenism in those parts.

XXV. The troubles which the writings and doctrines of Origen excited in the east were more grievous and obstinate. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, irritated for several reasons against the Nitrian monks, represented them as infected with the contagion of Origenism, and ordered them to give up and abandon all the productions of Origen. The monks refused obedience to this command, and alleged in their defence two considerations: one was, that the passages in the writings of this holy and venerable man, which seemed to swerve from the truth, were inserted in them by ill-designing heretics; and the other, that a few censurable things were not sufficient to justify the condemnation of the rest. Matters were more exasperated by this refusal of submission to the order of Theophilus; for this violent pre-

son, or tarnishing the purity of true religion. It has been said, that the Romish church has gone thus far solely in concession to the infirmities of mankind; and this is what the ablest defenders of its motley worship have alleged in its behalf. But this observation is not just: the church of Rome has not so much accommodated itself to human weakness, as it has abused that weakness by taking occasion from it to establish an absurd variety of ridiculous ceremonies, destructive of true religion, and only adapted to promote the riches and despotism of the clergy, and to keep the multitude still hoodwinked in their ignorance and superstition. How far a just antipathy to the church puppet-shows of the Papists has unjustly driven some Protestant churches into the opposite extreme, is a matter that I shall not now examine, though it certainly deserves a serious consideration.

\* Hieronymus in Jovinianum, tom. ii. op. — Augustin. de Heres. cap. lxxxii. — Ambros. Epist. vi.

† Codex Theod. ian., tom. iii. vi.

\* See Just. Fontaninus, *Historia Literar. Aquileiensis*, lib. iv. cap. iii.

late called a council at Alexandria, in the year 399, in which, having condemned the followers of Origen, he sent a band of soldiers to drive the monks from their residence on mount Nitria. The poor monks, thus scattered abroad by an armed force, fled first to Jerusalem, whence they retired to Scythopolis; and, finding that they could not live here in security and peace, determined, at length, to set sail for Constantinople, and there plead their cause in presence of the emperor.\* The issue of these proceedings will come under the history of the following century.

It is, however, necessary to observe here, that we must not reduce to the same class all those who are called Origenists in the records of this century; for this ambiguous title is applied to persons who differed widely in their religious notions. Sometimes it merely signifies such friends of Origen, as acknowledged his writings to have been adulterated in many places, and who were far from patronising the errors of which he was accused; in other places, this title is attributed to those who confess Origen to be the author of all the doctrines which are imputed to him, and who resolutely support and defend his opinions; of which latter there was a considerable number among the monastic orders.

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### *Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. WHILE the Roman emperors were studious to promote the honour of Christianity by the auspicious protection they afforded to the church, and to advance its interests by their most zealous efforts, the inconsiderate and ill-directed piety of the bishops cast a cloud over the beauty and simplicity of the Gospel, by the prodigious number of rites and ceremonies which they had invented to embellish it. And here we may apply that well-known saying of Augustin,† that “the yoke under which the Jews formerly groaned, was more tolerable than that imposed upon many Christians in his time.” The rites and institutions, by which the Greeks, Romans, and other nations, had formerly testified their religious veneration for fictitious deities, were now adopted, with some slight alterations, by Christian bishops, and employed in the service of the true God. We have already mentioned the reasons alleged for this imitation, so likely to disgust all who have a just sense of the native beauty of genuine Christianity. These fervent heralds of the Gospel, whose zeal outran their candour and integrity, imagined that the nations would receive Christianity with more facility, when they saw the rites and ceremonies to which they were accustomed, adopted in the church, and the same worship paid to Christ and his martyrs, which they had formerly offered to their idol deities. Hence it happened, that, in these

times, the religion of the Greeks and Romans differed very little, in its external appearance, from that of the Christians. They had both a most pompous and splendid ritual. Gorgeous robes, mitres, tiaras, wax-tapers, crosiers,\* processions,† lustrations, images, gold and silver vases, and many such circumstances of pageantry, were equally to be seen in the heathen temples and in the Christian churches.

II. No sooner had Constantine abolished the superstitions of his ancestors, than magnificent churches were every where erected for the Christians, which were richly adorned with pictures and images, and bore a striking resemblance to the pagan temples, both in their outward and inward form.‡ Of these churches some were built over the tombs of martyrs, and were frequented only at stated times; while others were set apart for the ordinary assemblies of Christians in divine worship. The former were called *Martyria*, from the places where they were erected; and the latter *Tituli*.§ Both of them were consecrated with great pomp, and with certain rites borrowed mostly from the ancient laws of the Roman pontiffs.

But our wonder will not cease here; it will rather be augmented when we learn, that, at this time, it was looked upon as an essential part of religion, to have in every country a multitude of churches; and here we must look for the true origin of what is called the *right of patronage*, which was introduced among Christians with no other view than to encourage the opulent to erect a great number of churches, by giving them the privilege of appointing the ministers that were to officiate in them.¶ This was a new instance of that servile imitation of the ancient superstitions which reigned at this time; for it was a very common notion among the people of old, that nations and provinces were happy and free from danger, in proportion to the number of fanes and temples, which they consecrated to the worship of gods and heroes, whose protection and succour could not fail, as it was thought, to be

\* The lituus, which, among the ancient Romans, was the chief ensign of the augurs, and derived its name from its resemblance to the *military trumpet*, became a mark of episcopal dignity. We call it the crosier, or bishop's staff.

† The word *supplications*, which I have rendered by that of *processions*, signified, among the pagans, those solemn and public acts of gratitude for national blessings, or deprecation of national calamities, which were expressed by the whole body of the people by a religious approach to the temples of the gods, which, by a decree of the senate, were open to all without distinction. See Cic. Catil. iii. 6. Liv. x. 23.

‡ See Ezek. Spanheim, *Preuves sur les Césars de Julien*, and particularly Le Brun's *Explication littérale et historique des Ceremonies de la Messe*, tom. ii. A description of these churches may be found in Eusebius, *de vita Constantini* M. lib. iii. cap. xxxv. and an exact plan of their interior structure is accurately engraven in bishop Beveridge's *Adnotationes in Pandectas Canonum*, tom. ii. and in Frederic Spanheim's *Institut. Hist. Eccles.* It must also be observed, that certain parts of the Christian churches were formed after the model of the Jewish temples. See Camp. Vitrinae *de Synagoga veteri*, lib. iii.

§ Jo. Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* tom. ii. in *Comment. ad ordin. Roman.* p. xvi. ¶ The *Tituli* were the smaller churches, so called from this circumstance, that the presbyters, who officiated in them, were called by the names of the places where they were erected, i. e. received titles, which fixed them to those particular cures. || Just. Hen. Bohmeri *ius Eccles. Protestant.* tom. iii. p. 466.—Bibliothèque Itaque, tom. v. p. 166.

\* See Pierre Daniel Huet, *Origeniana*, lib. ii. cap. iv.—Louis Doucin, *Histoire de l'Origenisme*, livr. iii.—Hier. a Prato, *Diss. vi.* in Sulpitium Severum *de Monachis ob Origenis nomen ex Nitria totaque Ægypto pulsos*, p. 273.

† Augustin. *Epist. exix.* ad Januarium, according to the ancient division.

shed abundantly upon those who worshipped them with such zeal, and honoured them with so many marks of veneration and respect. The Christians unhappily contracted the same erroneous way of thinking. The more numerous were the temples which they erected in honour of Christ, and his chosen friends and followers, the more sanguine did their expectations grow of powerful succours from them, and of a peculiar interest in the divine protection. They were so weak as to imagine, that God, Christ, and celestial intelligences, were delighted with those marks and testimonies of respect, which captivate the hearts of wretched mortals.

III. The Christian worship consisted in hymns, prayers, the reading of the Scriptures, and a discourse addressed to the people; and concluded with the celebration of the Lord's supper. To these were added various rites, more adapted to please the eyes, and strike the imagination, than to kindle in the heart the pure and sacred flame of genuine piety.\* We are not, however, to think, that the same method of worship was uniformly followed in every Christian society; for this was far from being the case. Every bishop, consulting his own private judgment, and taking into consideration the nature of the times, the genius of the country in which he lived, and the character and temper of those whom he was appointed to rule and instruct, formed such a plan of divine worship as he thought the wisest and the best. Hence arose that variety of liturgies which were in use, before the bishop of Rome had usurped the supreme power in religious matters, and persuaded the credulous and unthinking, that the model, both of doctrine and worship, was to be given by the mother-church, and to be followed implicitly throughout the Christian world.

IV. It would be almost endless to enter into a minute detail of all the different parts of public worship, and to point out the disadvantageous changes they underwent. A few observations will be sufficient upon this head. The public prayers had lost much of the solemn and majestic simplicity that characterised them in the primitive times, and which now began to degenerate into a vain and swelling bombast. The Psalms of David were now received among the public hymns that were sung as a part of divine service.† The sermons, or public discourses addressed to the people, were composed according to the rules of human eloquence, and rather adapted to excite the stupid admiration of the populace, who delight in vain embellishments, than to enlighten the understanding, or to reform the heart. It would even seem as if all possible means had been industriously used, to give an air of folly and extravagance to the Christian assemblies; for the people were permitted, and even exhorted by the preacher himself, to crown his

talents with clapping of hands and loud acclamations of applause;\* a recompense that was hitherto peculiar to the actors on the theatre, and the orators in the forum. How men, set apart by their profession to exhibit examples of the contempt of vain glory, and to demonstrate to others the vanity and emptiness of all temporal things, could indulge such a senseless and indecent ambition, is difficult to be conceived, though it is highly to be deplored.

V. The first day of the week, which was the ordinary and stated time for the public assemblies of Christians, was, in consequence of a peculiar law enacted by Constantine, observed with greater solemnity than it had formerly been.‡ The festivals celebrated in most of the churches, were five in number. They were appointed in commemoration of the birth, the sufferings and death, the resurrection and the ascension of the divine Saviour; and also the effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the apostles and first heralds of the Gospel on the day of Pentecost. Of these festivals, the Christians kept none with so much solemnity and respect as the fourteen days that were appointed for the commemoration of the resurrection.†

The eastern Christians celebrated the memory of Christ's birth and baptism in one festival, which was fixed on the sixth of January; and this day was by them called the Epiphany, as on it the immortal Saviour was manifested to the world.§ On the other hand, the Christians of the west seem to have always celebrated the birth of our Lord on the 25th of December; for there appears to be very little certainty in the accounts of those who allege, that the Roman pontiff, Julius I., removed the festival of Christ's birth from the 6th of January to the 25th of December.||

The unlucky success which some had in discovering the carcasses and remains of certain holy men, multiplied the festivals and commemorations of the martyrs in the most extravagant manner. The increase of these festivals would not have been offensive to the wise and the good, if Christians had employed the time they took up, in promoting their spiritual interests, and in forming habits of sanctity and virtue. But the contrary happened. These days, which were set apart for pious exercises, were squandered away in indolence, voluptuousness, and criminal pursuits, and were less consecrated to the service of God, than employed in the indulgence of sinful passions. It is well known, among other things, what opportunities of sinning were offered to the licentious, by what were called the vigils of Easter and Whitsuntide, or Pentecost.

VI. Fasting was considered, in this century, as the most effectual and powerful means of repelling the force, and disconcerting the stratagems of evil spirits, and of appeasing the anger of an offended Deity. Hence we may easily understand what induced the rulers of

\* For a full account of the forms of public worship, or the *Liturgies* of this century, the reader will do well to consult the twenty-second catechetical discourse of Cyril of Jerusalem, and the apostolical constitutions, which are falsely attributed to Clement of Rome. These writers are most learnedly illustrated and explained by Pierre Le Brun, in his *Explication literale et historique de la Messe*, tom. ii.

† Beausobre, *Hist. du Manicheisme*, tom. ii. p. 614.

\* Franc. Bern. Ferrarius, de *Veterum Acclamationibus et Plausu*, p. 66.

‡ Jac. Godofred. ad *Codicem Theodos.* tom. i. p. 135.

† Godofred. tom. i. p. 143.

§ Beausobre, *Hist. du Manicheisme*, tom. ii. p. 693.

|| See Jos. Snn. Asseman. *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatican.* tom. ii. and Alph. des Vignoles, *Diss. dans la Bibliothèque Germanique*, tom. ii.

the church to establish this custom by express laws, and to impose, as an indispensable duty, an act of humiliation, the observance of which had hitherto been left to every one's choice. The Quadragesimal or Lent-fast was regarded as more sacred than all the rest, though it was not yet confined to a fixed number of days.\* We must, however, remark, that the fasts observed in this century, were very different from those which were solemnised in the preceding times. Formerly those who submitted themselves to the discipline of fasting abstained wholly from meat and drink; but now a mere abstinence from flesh and wine was, by many, judged sufficient for the purposes of fasting,† and the latter opinion prevailed from this time, and became universal among the Latins.

VII. Baptismal fonts were now erected in the porch of each church, for the more commodious administration of that initiating sacrament. Baptism was administered during the vigils of Easter and Whitsuntide, with lighted tapers, by the bishop, and the presbyters commissioned by him for that purpose. In cases, however, of urgent necessity, and in such only, a dispensation was granted for performing this sacred rite at other times than those now mentioned. In some places salt was employed, as a symbol of purity and wisdom, and was thrown, with this view, into the mouth of the person baptised; and a double unction was every where used in the celebration of this ordinance, one preceding its administration, and the other following it. The persons who were admitted into the church by baptism, were obliged, after the celebration of that holy ordinance, to go clothed in white garments during the space of seven days. Many other rites and ceremonies might be mentioned here; but, as they neither acquired stability by their duration, nor received the sanction of universal approbation and consent, we shall pass them over in silence.

VIII. The institution of catechumens, and the discipline through which they passed, suffered no variation in this century, but continued upon its ancient footing. It appears farther, by innumerable testimonies, that the Lord's supper was administered, (in some places two or three times in a week, in others on Sunday only,) to all those who were assembled to worship God. It was also sometimes celebrated at the tombs of martyrs and at funerals; which custom, undoubtedly, gave rise to the *masses*, that were afterwards performed in honour of the saints, and for the benefit of the dead. In many places, the bread and wine were holden up to view before their distribution, that they might be seen by the people, and contemplated with religious respect; and hence, not long after, the adoration of the symbols was unquestionably derived. Neither catechumens, penitents, nor those who were supposed to be under the influence and impulse of evil spirits, were admitted to this holy ordinance; nor did the sacred orators in their public discourses ever dare to unfold its true and genuine nature with freedom and simpli-

city. The reason of thus concealing it from the knowledge and observation of many, was a very mean and shameful one, as we have already observed: many, indeed, offer a much more decent and satisfactory argument in favour of this custom, when they allege, that, by these mysterious proceedings, the desire of the catechumens would naturally burn to penetrate, as soon as was possible, the sublime secret, and that they would thereby be animated to prepare themselves with double diligence for receiving this privilege.

## CHAPTER V.

### *Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. THE sects which had sprung up in the preceding ages, transmitted their contagious principles to this century. Many of them yet remained, particularly in the east, and, notwithstanding their absurdity, continued to attract followers. The Manichean faction surpassed the rest in its influence and progress. The very turpitude and enormity of its doctrines seemed to seduce many into its snares; and, what is still more surprising, men of genius and penetration were deluded by its enchantments, as the example of Augustin sufficiently testifies. It is true, the wisest and most learned writers of the times (and, among others, Augustin, when he returned from his errors,) endeavoured to oppose the growth of this spreading pestilence; nor were their efforts entirely unsuccessful. But the root of this horrible disease was deep; and neither the force of argument, nor the severity of the most rigorous laws, were sufficient to extirpate it thoroughly.\* For some time, indeed, it seemed to disappear, and many thought it utterly eradicated; but it gathered force secretly, and broke out afterwards with new violence. To avoid the severity of the laws, the Manicheans concealed themselves under a variety of names, which they adopted successively, and changed, in proportion as they were discovered under them. Thus they assumed the names of Encratites, Apotactics, Saccophori, Hydroparastates, Solitaries, and several others, under which they lay concealed for a certain time, but could not long escape the vigilance of their enemies.†

II. The state had little danger to apprehend from a sect, which the force of severe laws and of penal restraints could not fail to undermine, gradually, throughout the Roman empire. But a new and much more formidable faction started up in Africa, which, though it arose from small beginnings, afflicted most grievously both the church and state for more than a century. Its origin was as follows:

Mensurius (bishop of Carthage) dying in

\* The severe laws enacted by the emperors against the Manicheans, are to be found in the Theodosian code, vol. vi. part i. In 372, Valentinian the elder prohibited their assemblies, and imposed heavy penalties on their doctors. In 381, Theodosius the Great branded them with infamy, and deprived them of all the rights and privileges of citizens. Add, to these, several edicts more dreadful, which may be seen in pages 137, 138, 170, of the above-mentioned work.

† See the law of Theodosius, tom. vi. p. 134, &c.

\* Jo. Dallæus, de Jejunii et Quadragesima, lib. iv.

† See Barbeyrac, de la Morale des Peres, p. 250.

the year 311, the greatest part of the clergy and the people chose, in his place, the archdeacon Cæcilianus, who, without waiting for the assembly of the Numidian bishops, was consecrated by those of Africa Minor alone. This hasty proceeding was the occasion of much trouble. The Numidian prelates, who had always been present at the consecration of the bishops of Carthage, were highly offended at their being excluded from this solemn ceremony, and assembling at Carthage, called Cæcilianus before them, to give an account of his conduct. The flame, thus kindled, was greatly augmented by several Carthaginian presbyters, who were competitors with Cæcilianus, particularly Botrus and Celsus. Lucilla, also, an opulent lady, who had been reprimanded by Cæcilianus for her superstitious practices, and had conceived against him a bitter enmity on that account, was active in exasperating the spirits of his adversaries, and distributed a large sum of money among the Numidians, to encourage them in their opposition to the new bishop. In consequence of all this, Cæcilianus, refusing to submit to the judgment of the Numidians, was condemned in a council, assembled by Secundus, bishop of Tigris, consisting of seventy prelates, who, with the consent of a considerable part of the clergy and people, declared him unworthy of the episcopal dignity, and chose his deacon Majorinus for his successor. By this proceeding, the Carthaginian church was divided into two factions, and groaned under the contests of two rival bishops, Cæcilianus and Majorinus.

III. The Numidians alleged two important reasons to justify their sentence against Cæcilianus; first, that Felix of Aptungus, the chief of the bishops who assisted at his consecration, was a *traitor* (i. e. one of those who, during the persecution under Diocletian, had delivered the sacred writings and the pious books of the Christians to the magistrates in order to be burned;) and that, as he had thus apostatised from the service of Christ, it was not possible that he could impart the Holy Ghost to the new bishop. A second reason for their sentence against Cæcilianus was drawn from the harshness and even cruelty that he had discovered in his conduct, while he was a deacon, towards the Christian confessors and martyrs during the persecution above-mentioned, whom he abandoned, in the most merciless manner, to all the extremities of hunger and want, leaving them without food in their prisons, and precluding the grant of relief from those who were willing to succour them. To these accusations they added the insolent contumacy of the new prelate, who refused to obey their summons, and to appear before them in council to justify his conduct.

There was none of the Numidians who opposed Cæcilianus with such bitterness and vehemence, as Donatus, bishop of Casæ Nigræ, and hence the whole faction was called after him, as most writers think; though some are of opinion, that they derived this name from another Donatus, whom the Donatists surnamed the Great.\* This controversy, in a short

time, spread far and wide, not only throughout Numidia, but even through all the provinces of Africa, which entered so zealously into this ecclesiastical war, that in most cities there were two bishops, one at the head of Cæcilianus's party, and the other acknowledged by the followers of Majorinus.

IV. The Donatists having brought this controversy before Constantine, that prince, in the year 313, commissioned Melchides, bishop of Rome, to examine the matter, and named three bishops of Gaul to assist him in this inquiry. The result of this examination was favourable to Cæcilianus, who was entirely acquitted of the crimes laid to his charge. The accusations adduced against Felix, by whom he was consecrated, were at that time left out of the question; but, in the year 314, the cause of that prelate was examined separately by Ælian, proconsul of Africa, by whose decision he was absolved. The Donatists, whose cause necessarily suffered by these proceedings, complained much of the judgment pronounced by Melchides and Ælian. The small number of bishops, that had been appointed to examine their cause jointly with Melchides, excited, in a particular manner, their reproaches, and even their contempt. They looked upon the decision of seventy venerable Numidian prelates as infinitely more respectable than that pronounced by nineteen bishops (for such was the number assembled at Rome,) who, besides the inferiority of their number, were not sufficiently acquainted with the African affairs to be competent judges in the present question. The indulgent emperor, willing to remove these specious complaints, ordered a second and a much more numerous assembly to meet at Arles in the year 314, composed of bishops from various provinces, from Italy, Gaul, Germany, and Spain. Here again the Donatists lost their cause, but renewed their efforts by appealing to the immediate judgment of the emperor, who condescended so far as to admit their appeal; and, in consequence thereof, examined the whole affair himself in the year 316, at Milan, in presence of the contending parties. The issue of this third trial was not more favourable to the Donatists than that of the two preceding councils, whose decisions the emperor confirmed by the sentence he pronounced.† Hence

persons of the name of Donatus; one was a Numidian, and bishop of Casæ Nigræ; the other succeeded Majorinus, bishop of Carthage, as leader of the Donatists, and received from this sect, on account of his learning and virtue, the title of Donatus the Great. Hence it has been a question among the learned, from which of these the sect derived its name? The arguments that support the different sides of this trivial question are nearly of equal force; and why may we not decide it by supposing that the Donatists were so called from them both?

§\* The emperor, in his letter to Melchides, named no more than three prelates, viz. Maternus, Rheticius, and Marinus, bishops of Cologne, Autun, and Arles, to sit with him as judges of this controversy; but afterwards he ordered seven more to be added to the number, and as many as could soon and conveniently assemble; so that there were at last nineteen in all.

† The proofs of the supreme power of the emperors, in religious matters, appear so inconceivable in this controversy, that it is amazing it should ever have been called in question. Certain it is, that, at this time, the notion of a supreme judge set over the church universal, by the appointment of Christ, never had entered into any one's head. The assemblies of the clergy at Rome and Arles

\* In the faction of the Donatists, there were two eminent



this perverse sect loaded Constantine with the bitterest reproaches, and maliciously complained that Osius, bishop of Cordova, who was honoured with his friendship, and was intimately connected with Cæcilianus, had, by corrupt insinuations, engaged him to pronounce an unrighteous sentence. The emperor, animated with a just indignation at such odious proceedings, deprived the Donatists of their churches in Africa, and sent into banishment their seditious bishops; and he carried his resentment so far as to put some of them to death, probably on account of the intolerable petulance and malignity they discovered, both in their writings and in their discourses. Hence arose violent commotions and tumults in Africa, as the Donatists were exceedingly powerful and numerous in that part of the empire. Constantine endeavoured, by ambassies and negotiations, to allay these disturbances; but his efforts were fruitless.

V. These unhappy commotions gave rise, no doubt, to a horrible confederacy of desperate ruffians, who passed under the name of Circumcelliones. This furious, fearless, and bloody set of men, composed of the rough and savage populace, who embraced the party of the Donatists, maintained their cause by the force of arms, filled the African provinces with slaughter and rapine, and committed the most enormous acts of perfidy and cruelty against the followers of Cæcilianus. This outrageous multitude, whom no prospect of sufferings could terrify, and who, upon urgent occasions, faced death itself with the most audacious temerity, contributed to render the sect of the Donatists an object of the utmost abhorrence; though it cannot be proved, by any records of undoubted authority, that the bishops of that faction (those, at least, who had any reputation for piety and virtue) either approved the proceedings, or stirred up the violence of this odious rabble. In the mean time, the flame of discord gathered strength daily, and seemed to portend the approaching horrors of a civil war; to prevent which, Constantine, having tried in vain every other method of accommodation, abrogated at last, by the advice of the governors of Africa, the laws that had been enacted against the Donatists, and allowed to the people a full liberty of adhering to that party which they in their minds preferred.

VI. After the death of Constantine the Great, his son Constans, to whom Africa was allotted in the division of the empire, sent Macarius and Paulus into that province, with a view to heal this deplorable schism, and to engage the Donatists to conclude a peace. Their principal bishop opposed all methods of reconciliation with the utmost vehemence, and his example was followed by the other prelates of the party. The Circumcelliones also continued to support the cause of the Donatists by assassinations and massacres, executed with the most unrelenting fury. They were, however, stopped in their career, and were defeated by Macarius in the battle of Bagnia. Upon this, the affairs of the Donatists rapidly declined:

are commonly called *councils*, but improperly, since, in reality, they were nothing more than meetings of judges or *commissaries* appointed by the emperor.

and Macarius no longer used the soft voice of persuasion to engage them to an accommodation, but employed his authority for that purpose. A few submitted; the greatest part saved themselves by flight; numbers were sent into banishment, among whom was Donatus the Great; and many of them were punished with the utmost severity. During these troubles, which continued near thirteen years, several steps were taken against the Donatists, which the equitable and impartial will be at a loss to reconcile with the dictates of humanity and justice; nor, indeed, do the Catholics themselves deny the truth of this assertion.\* Such treatment naturally excited, among the Donatists, loud complaints of the cruelty of their adversaries.†

VII. The emperor Julian, upon his accession to the throne in the year 362, permitted the exiled Donatists to return to their country, and restored them to the enjoyment of their former liberty. This step so far renewed their vigour, that they brought over, in a short time, the majority of the African provincials to their interests. Gratian, indeed, published several edicts against them, and, in the year 377, deprived them of their churches, and prohibited all their assemblies public and private. But the fury of the Circumcelliones, who may be considered as the soldiery of the Donatists, and the apprehension of intestine tumults, prevented, no doubt, the vigorous execution of these laws. This appears from the number of churches which this people had in Africa toward the conclusion of the century, and which were served by no less than four hundred bishops. Two things, however, diminished considerably the power and lustre of this flourishing sect, and made it decline apace about the end of this century: one was, a violent division that arose among them, on account of a person named Maximin; and this division, so proper to weaken the common cause, was the most effectual instrument the Catholics could use to combat the Donatists. But a second circumstance which precipitated their decline, was the zeal and fervent opposition of Augustin, first presbyter, and afterwards bishop of Hippo. This learned and ingenious prelate attacked the Donatists in every way. In his writings, in his public discourses, and in his private conversation, he exposed the dangerous and seditious principles of this sect in the strongest manner; and as he was of a warm and active spirit, he animated against them the whole Christian world, as well as the imperial court.

VIII. The doctrine of the Donatists was

\* The testimony of Optatus of Milevi is beyond exception in this matter; it is quoted from the third book of his treatise, *de Schismate Donatistarum*, and runs thus: "Ab operariis Unitatis (i. e. the emperor's ambassadors Macarius and Paulus) multa quidem aspera gesta sunt. Egerunt omnes episcopi cum clericis suis; aliqui sunt mortui; qui fortiores fuerunt, capti et longe relegati sunt." Optatus, through the whole of this work, endeavours to excuse the severities committed against the Donatists, of which he lays the principal fault upon that sect itself, confessing, however, that, in some instances, the proceedings against them were too rigorous to deserve approbation, or admit an excuse.

† See Collat. Carthag. diei tertiz, sect. 258, at the end of Optatus.

conformable to that of the church, as even their adversaries confess; nor were their lives less exemplary than those of other Christian societies, if we except the enormous conduct of the Circumcelliones, which the greatest part of the sect regarded with the utmost detestation and abhorrence. The crime, therefore, of the Donatists lay properly in the following points; in their declaring the church of Africa, which adhered to Cæcilianus, fallen from the dignity and privileges of a true church, and deprived of the gifts of the Holy Ghost, on account of the offences with which the new bishop, and Felix, who had consecrated him, were charged; in their pronouncing all the churches, which held communion with that of Africa, corrupt and polluted; in maintaining, that the sanctity of their bishops gave their community alone a full right to be considered as the true, the pure, and holy church; and in their avoiding all communication with other churches, from an apprehension of contracting their impurity and corruption. This erroneous principle was the source of that most shocking uncharitableness and presumption which appeared in their conduct to other churches. Hence they pronounced the sacred rites and institutions void of all virtue and efficacy among those Christians who were not precisely of their sentiments, and not only re-baptised those who came over to their party from other churches, but, even with respect to those who had been ordained ministers of the Gospel, they observed the severe custom, either of depriving them of their office, or obliging them to be ordained a second time. This schismatic pestilence was almost wholly confined to Africa: for the few pitiful assemblies, which the Donatists had formed in Spain and Italy, had neither stability nor duration.\*

IX. The faction of the Donatists was not the only one that troubled the church during this century. In the year 317, a contest arose in Egypt upon a subject of much higher importance, and its consequences were of a yet more pernicious nature. The subject of this warm controversy, which kindled such deplorable divisions throughout the Christian world, was the doctrine of *three persons in the God-head*; a doctrine which, in the three preceding centuries, had happily escaped the vain curiosity of human researches, and been left undefined and undetermined by any particular set of ideas. The church, indeed, had frequently decided, against the Sabellians and others, that there was a real difference between the Father and the Son, and that the Holy Ghost was distinct from both; or, as we commonly speak, that three distinct persons exist in the Deity; but the exact relation of these persons to each other, and the nature of the distinction

that subsists between them, are matters that hitherto were neither disputed nor explained, and with respect to which the church had, consequently, observed a profound silence. Nothing was dictated on this head to the faith of Christians, nor were there any modes of expression prescribed as requisite to be used in speaking of this mystery. Hence it happened, that the Christian doctors entertained different sentiments upon this subject without giving the least offence, and discoursed variously, concerning the distinctions in the Godhead, each following his respective opinion with the utmost liberty. In Egypt, and the adjacent countries, the greatest part embraced, in this as well as in other matters, the opinion of Origen, who held that the Son was, in God, that which reason is in man, and that the Holy Ghost was nothing more than the divine energy, or active force. This notion is attended with many difficulties; and, when it is not proposed with the utmost caution, tends, in a particular manner, to remove all real distinction between the persons in the God-head, or, in other words, leads directly to Sabellianism.

X. In an assembly of the presbyters of Alexandria, the bishop of that city, whose name was Alexander, expressed his sentiments on this subject with a high degree of freedom and confidence, maintaining, among other things, that the Son was not only of the same eminence and dignity, but also of the same essence, with the Father.\* This assertion was opposed by Arius, one of the presbyters, a man of a subtle turn, and remarkable for his eloquence. Whether his zeal for his own opinions, or personal resentment against his bishop, was the motive that influenced him, is not very certain. Be that as it will, he first treated, as false, the assertion of Alexander, on account of its affinity to the Sabellian errors, which had been condemned by the church; and then, rushing into the opposite extreme, he maintained, that the Son was totally and essentially distinct from the Father; that he was the first and noblest of those beings, whom God had created out of nothing, the instrument by whose subordinate operation the Almighty Father formed the universe, and therefore inferior to the Father, both in nature and in dignity. His opinions concerning the Holy Ghost are not so well known. It is however certain, that his notion concerning the Son of God was accompanied and connected with other sentiments, that were very different from those commonly received among Christians, though none of the ancient writers have given us a complete and coherent system of those religious tenets which Arius and his followers really held.†

\* See Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. v. and Theodoret, lib. i.

† For an account of the Arian controversy, the curious reader must consult the Life of Constantine, by Eusebius; the various libels of Athanasius, which are to be found in the first volume of his works; the Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, the sixty ninth Heresy of Epiphanius, and other writers of this and the following age. But, among all these, there is not one to whom the merit of impartiality can be attributed with justice; so that the Arian history stands yet in need of a pen guided by integrity and candour, and unbiassed by affection or hatred. Both sides have deserved reproach upon this head; and those who have hitherto written the

\* A more ample account of the Donatists will be found in the following writers: Henr. Valesius, dissert. de Schismate Donatistarum, (subjoined to his edition of the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius).—Thom. Ittigius' History of Donatism, published in the Appendix to his book concerning the Heresies of the apostolic age.—Herm. Witsius, Miscellanea Sacra, tom. i. lib. iv.; Henr. Noris, Hist. Donat. augmented by the Ballerini, op. tom. iv.—Long's History of the Donatists, London, 1677. These are the sources whence we have drawn the accounts that we have given of this troublesome sect.

XI. The opinions of Arius were no sooner divulged, than they found in Egypt, and the neighbouring provinces, a multitude of abettors, and, among these, many who were distinguished as much by the superiority of their learning and genius, as by the eminence of their rank and station. Alexander, on the other hand, in two councils assembled at Alexandria, accused Arius of impiety, and caused him to be expelled from the communion of the church. Arius received this severe and ignominious shock with great firmness and constancy of mind; retired into Palestine; and thence wrote several letters to the most eminent men of those times, in which he endeavoured to demonstrate the truth of his opinions, and that with such surprising success, that vast numbers were drawn over to his party; and among these Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, a man distinguished in the church by his influence and authority. The emperor Constantine, looking upon the subject of this controversy as a matter of small importance, and as little connected with the fundamental and essential doctrines of religion, contented himself at first with addressing a letter to the contending parties, in which he admonished them to put an end to their disputes. But when the prince saw that his admonitions were without effect, and that the troubles and commotions, which the passions of men too often mingle with religious disputes, were spreading and increasing daily throughout the empire, he convoked, in the year 325, a great council at Nice in Bithynia, hoping and desiring that the deputies of the church universal would put an end to this controversy. In this general assembly, after many keen debates, and violent efforts of the two parties, the doctrine of Arius was condemned; Christ was declared *consubstantial*,\* or of the same essence with the Father; the vanquished presbyter was banished among the Illyrians, and his followers were compelled to give their assent to the creed,† or confession of faith, which was composed on this occasion.

XII. The council assembled by Constantine at Nice, is one of the most famous and interesting events that are presented to us in ecclesiastical history; and yet, what is most surprising, scarcely any part of the history of the church has been unfolded with such negligence, or rather passed over with such rapidity.‡ The ancient writers are neither agreed with respect to the time or place in which it was assembled,

history of the Arian controversy have only espied the faults of one side; e. g. it is a common opinion, that Arius was too much attached to the opinions of Plato and Origen (see Petav. Dogm. Theol. tom. ii. lib. i. cap. viii.) but this common opinion is a vulgar error. Origen and Plato entertained notions entirely different from those of Arius; whereas Alexander, his antagonist, undoubtedly followed the manner of Origen, in explaining the doctrine of the three persons. See Cudworth's Intellectual System of the Universe.

\* *ὁμοουσιος*.  
† John Christ. Suicer has illustrated this famous creed from several important and ancient records, in a very learned book published at Utrecht in 1718.

‡ See Ittigus, Hist. Concilii Nicæni.—Le Clerc, Bibliothèque Histor. et Universelle, tom. x. xvii.—Beausobre, Histoire du Manichéisme, tom. i. The accounts, which the Oriental writers have given of this council, have been collected by Euseb. Renaudot, in his history of the Patriarchs of Alexandria.

the number of those who sat in the council, nor the bishop who presided in it; and no authentic acts of its famous sentence are now extant.\*

The eastern Christians differ from all others both with regard to the number and the nature of the laws which were enacted in this celebrated council. The latter mention only twenty canons; but, in the estimate of the former, they amount to a much greater number.† It appears, however, by those laws which all parties have admitted as genuine, and also from other authentic records, not only that Arius was condemned in this council, but that some other points were determined, and certain measures agreed upon, to calm the religious tumults that had so long troubled the church.—The controversy concerning the time of celebrating Easter was terminated;‡ the troubles which Novatian had excited, by opposing the re-admission of the lapsed to the communion of the church, were composed; the Meletian schism was condemned.§ and the jurisdiction of the greater bishops precisely defined and determined,|| with several other matters of a like nature. But, while these good prelates were employing all their zeal and attention to correct the errors of others, they were upon the point of falling into a very capital one themselves; for they had almost come to a resolution of imposing upon the clergy the yoke of perpetual celibacy, when Paphnutius put a stop to their proceedings, and warded off that unnatural law.¶

XIII. But, notwithstanding all these determinations, the commotions excited by this controversy remained yet in the minds of many,

\* See the annotations of Valesius upon the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, and Jos. Sim. Asseman. Bibl. Oriental. Clement. Vatican. tom. i. The history of this council was written by Maruthas, a Syrian, but is long since lost.

† Th. Ittigus, Supplem. op. Clement. Alex.—J. S. Asseman. tom. i.—Euseb. Renaudot.

‡ The decision, with respect to Easter, was in favour of the custom of the western churches; and accordingly all churches were ordered to celebrate that festival on the Sunday which immediately followed the 14th of the first moon that happened after the vernal equinox.

§ Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis in Egypt, was accused and convicted of having offered incense to idols; and, in consequence thereof, was deposed by Peter, bishop of Alexandria, whose jurisdiction extended over all Egypt. Meletius, upon this, became the head of a schism in the church, by assuming to himself the power of ordination, which was vested in the bishop of Alexandria, and exercised by him in all the Egyptian churches.—Epiphanius attributes the dissensions between Meletius and Peter to another cause (Hær. 68.) he alleges, that the vigorous proceedings of Peter against Meletius were occasioned by the latter's refusing to re-admit into the church those who had fallen from the faith during Diocletian's persecution, before their penitential trial was entirely finished. The former opinion is maintained by Socrates and Theodoret, whose authority is certainly more respectable than that of Epiphanius.

|| The confusion that Meletius introduced, by presuming (as was observed in the preceding note) to violate the jurisdiction of Peter, the metropolitan of Alexandria, by conferring ordination in a province where he alone had a right to ordain, was rectified by the council of Nice, which determined, that the metropolitan bishops, in their respective provinces, should have the same power and authority that the bishops of Rome exercised over the suburbicarian churches and countries.

¶ Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. i. cap. viii. compared with Franc. Balduino, in Constant. Magn. and George Calixtus, de Conjugio Clericorum.

and the spirit of dissension triumphed both over the decrees of the council and the authority of the emperor. For those who, in the main, were far from being attached to the party of Arius, found many things reprehensible, both in the decrees of the council, and in the forms of expression which it employed to explain the controverted points; while the Arians, on the other hand, left no means untried to heal their wounds, and to recover their place and their credit in the church. And their efforts were crowned with the desired success: for, a few years after the council of Nice, an Arian priest, who had been recommended to the emperor, in the dying words of his sister Constantia, found means to persuade him, that the condemnation of Arius was utterly unjust, and was rather occasioned by the malice of his enemies, than by their zeal for the truth. In consequence of this, the emperor recalled him from banishment in the year 330,\* repealed the laws that had been enacted against him, and permitted his chief protector Eusebius of Nicomedia, and his vindictive faction, to vex and oppress the partisans of the Nicene council in various ways. Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, was one of those who suffered most from the violent measures of the Arian party. Inevitably firm in his purpose, and deaf to the most powerful solicitations and entreaties, he obstinately refused to restore Arius to his former rank and office. On this account he was deposed, by the council holden at Tyre, in the year 335, and was afterwards banished into Gaul, while Arius and his followers were, with great solemnity, reinstated in their privileges, and received into the communion of the church. The people of Alexandria, unmoved by these proceedings in favour of Arius, persisted in refusing to grant him a place among their presbyters; upon which the emperor invited him to Constantinople in the year 336, and ordered Alexander, the bishop of that city, to admit him to his communion. But, before this order could be put in execution, Arius died in the imperial city in a very dismal manner;† and his sovereign did not long survive him.

\* The precise time in which Arius was recalled from banishment, has not been fixed with such perfect certainty as to prevent a diversity of sentiment on that head. The Annotations of the learned Valesius (or Valois) upon Sozomen's History, will throw some light upon this matter, and make it probable, that Dr. Mosheim has placed the recall of Arius too late, at least by two years. Valesius has proved, from the authority of Philostorgius, and from other most respectable monuments and records, that Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Theoguis, who were banished by the emperor about three months after the council of Nice (i. e. in 325) were recalled in 328. Now, in the writing by which they obtained their return, they pleaded the restoration of Arius, as an argument for theirs, which proves that he was recalled before the year 329. The same Valesius proves, that Arius, the first head of the Arian sect, was dead before the council of Tyre, which was transferred to Jerusalem; and that the letters which Constantine addressed to that council in favour of Arius and his followers, were in behalf of a second chief of that name, who put himself at the head of the Arians, and who, in conjunction with Euzois, presented to Constantine such a confession of their faith, as made him imagine their doctrine to be orthodox, and procured their reconciliation with the church at the council of Jerusalem.

† The dismal manner in which Arius is said to have expired, by his entrails falling out as he was discharging one of the natural functions, is a fact that has been cal-

XIV. After the death of Constantine the Great, one of his sons, Constantius, who, in the division of the empire, became ruler of the east, was warmly attached to the Arian party, whose principles were also zealously adopted by the empress, and, indeed, by the whole court. On the other hand, Constantine and Constans, emperors of the west, maintained the decrees of the council of Nice in all the provinces over which their jurisdiction extended. Hence arose endless animosities and seditions, treacherous plots, and open acts of injustice and violence between the contending parties. Council was assembled against council; and their jarring and contradictory decrees spread perplexity and confusion through the Christian world.

In the year 350, Constans was assassinated; and, about two years after this, a great part of the western empire, particularly Rome and Italy, fell into the hands of Constantius. This change was extremely unfavourable to those who adhered to the decrees of the council of Nice. The emperor's attachment to the Arians animated him against their adversaries, whom he involved in various troubles and calamities; and he obliged many of them, by threats and punishment, to come over to the sect which he esteemed and protected. One of these forced proselytes was Liberius, the Roman pontiff, who was compelled to embrace Arianism in the year 357. The Nicene party meditated reprisals, and waited only a convenient time, a fit place, and a proper occasion, for executing their resentment. Thus the history of the church, under the emperor Constantius, presents to the reader a perpetual scene of tumult and violence, and the deplorable spectacle of a war, carried on between brothers, without religion, justice, or humanity.

XV. The death of Constantius, in the year 362, changed considerably the face of religious affairs, and diminished greatly the strength and influence of the Arian party. Julian, who, by his principles, was naturally prevented from taking a part in the controversy, bestowed his protection on neither side, but treated them both with an impartiality which was the result of a perfect indifference. Jovian, his successor, declared himself in favour of the Nicene doctrine; and immediately the whole west, with a considerable part of the eastern provinces, changed sides, conformed to the decrees of the council of Nice, and abjured the Arian system.

The scene, however, changed again in the year 364, when Valentinian, and his brother Valens, were raised to the empire. Valentinian

ed in question by some modern writers, though without foundation, since it is confirmed by the unexceptionable testimonies of Sozrates, Sozomen, Athanasius, and others. The causes of this tragical death have, however, furnished much matter of dispute. The ancient writers, who considered this event as a judgment of Heaven, miraculously drawn down, by the prayers of the just to punish the impiety of Arius, will find little credit in our times, among such as have studied with attention and impartiality the history of Arianism. After having considered this matter with the utmost care, it appears to me extremely probable, that this unhappy man was a victim to the resentment of his enemies, and was destroyed by poison, or some such violent method. A blind and fanatical zeal for certain systems of faith, has in all ages produced such horrible acts of cruelty and injustice.

adhered to the decrees of the Nicene council; and hence the Arian sect, a few churches excepted, suffered extirpation in the west. Valens, on the other hand, favoured the Arians; and his zeal for their cause exposed their adversaries, the Nicenians, in the eastern provinces, to many severe trials and sufferings. These troubles, however, ended with the reign of this emperor, who fell in a battle which was fought against the Goths in the year 378, and was succeeded by Gratian, a friend to the Nicenians, and the restorer of their tranquillity. His zeal for their interests, though fervent and active, was surpassed by that of his successor, Theodosius the Great, who raised the secular arm against the Arians, with a terrible degree of violence; drove them from their churches; enacted laws, whose severity exposed them to the greatest calamities; and rendered, throughout his dominions, the decrees of the council triumphant over all opposition; so that the public profession of the Arian doctrine was confined to the barbarous and unconquered nations, such as the Burgundians, Goths, and Vandals.

During this long and violent contest between the Nicenians and Arians, the attentive and impartial will acknowledge, that unjustifiable measures were taken, and great excesses committed on both sides: so that when, abstractedly from the merits of the cause, we only consider with what temper, and by what means the parties defended their respective opinions, it will be difficult to determine which of the two exceeded most the bounds of propriety, charity, and moderation.

XVI. The efforts of the Arians to maintain their cause, would have been much more prejudicial to the church than they were in effect, had not the members of that sect been divided among themselves, and torn into factions, which viewed each other with the bitterest aversion. Of these the ancient writers make mention under the names of Semi-Arians, Eusebians, Aetians, Eunomians, Acacians, Psathyrians, and others; but they may all be ranked with propriety in three classes. The first of these were the primitive and genuine Arians, who, rejecting all those forms and modes of expression which the moderns had invented to render their opinions less shocking to the Nicenians, taught simply, "That the Son was not begotten of the Father (*i. e.* produced out of his substance,) but was only created out of nothing." This class was opposed by the Semi-Arians, who, in their turn, were abandoned by the Eunomians, or Anomeans, the disciples of Aetius and Eunomius, of whom the latter was eminent for his knowledge and penetration. The Semi-Arians held, that the Son was *ὁμοιωσις*, *i. e.* similar to the Father in his essence, not by nature but by a peculiar privilege; and the leading men of this party were George of Laodicea and Basilins of An-cyra.† The Eunomians, who were also called Aetians and Exconitians, and may be reckoned in the number of pure Arians, maintained,

that Christ was *ὑποσυστασις*, or *ὑποκείμενος*, *i. e.* unlike the Father, as well in his essence, as in other respects.\* Under this general division, many other subordinate sects were comprehended, whose subtilities and refinements have not been clearly developed by the ancient writers. The Arian cause suffered as much from the discord and animosities that reigned among these sects, as from the laboured confutations and the zealous efforts of the orthodox party.

XVII. The Arian controversy produced new sects, occasioned by the indiscreet lengths to which the contending parties pushed their respective opinions; and such, indeed, are too generally the unhappy effects of disputes, in which human passions have so large a part. Some, while they were careful in avoiding, and zealous in opposing, the sentiments of Arius, ran headlong into systems of doctrine of an equally dangerous and pernicious nature. Others, in defending the Arian notions, went farther than their chief, and thus fell into errors much more extravagant than those which he maintained. Thus does it generally happen in religious controversies: the human mind, amidst its present imperfection and infirmity, and its unhappy subjection to the empire of imagination and the dictates of sense, rarely follows the middle way in the search of truth, or contemplates spiritual and divine things with that accuracy and simplicity, that integrity and moderation, which alone can guard against erroneous extremes.

Among those who fell into such extremes by their inconsiderate violence in opposing the Arian system, Apollinaris the younger, bishop of Laodicea, may be justly placed, though otherwise a man of distinguished merit, and one whose learned labours had rendered to religion the most important services. He strenuously defended the *divinity* of Christ against the Arians; but, by indulging himself too freely in philosophical distinctions and subtilities, he was carried so far as to deny, in some measure, his *humanity*. He maintained, that the body which Christ assumed, was endowed with a sensitive, and not a rational, soul; and that the Divine Nature performed the functions of reason, and supplied the place of what we call the mind, the spiritual and intellectual principle in man; and from this it seemed to follow, as a natural consequence, that the divine nature in Christ was blended with the human, and suffered with it the pains of crucifixion and death itself.‡ This great man was led astray, not only by his love of disputing, but also by an immoderate attachment to the Platonic doctrine, concerning the two-fold nature of the soul, which was too generally adopted by the divines of this age; and which, undoubtedly, perverted their judgment in several respects.

\* See Basnage's Dissert. de Eunomio, in the *Lectiones Antiquæ de Cansibus*, tom. i. where we find the confession and apology of Eunomius yet extant. See also Jo. Alb. Fabric. *Bibliotheca Græc.* vol. viii. and the *Codex Theodos.* tom. vi.

‡ However erroneous the hypothesis of Apollinaris may have been, the consequences here drawn from it are not entirely just; for if it is true, that the human soul does not, in any respect, suffer death by the dissolution of the body, the same must hold good with respect to the divine nature.

\* See the Theodosian Code, tom. vi. p. 5, 10, 130, 146; as also Godofred's annotations upon it.

† See Prud. Maran's Dissert. sur les Semi-Arians, published in Voigt's *Biblioth. Hæresiolog.* tom. ii.

and led them into erroneous and extravagant decisions on various subjects.

Other errors, beside that now mentioned, are imputed to Apollinaris by certain ancient writers; but it is not easy to determine how far they deserve credit upon that head.\* Be that as it may, his doctrine was received by great numbers in almost all the eastern provinces, though, by the different explications that were given of it, its votaries were subdivided into various sects. It did not, however, long maintain its ground; but, being attacked at the same time by the laws of the emperors, the decrees of councils, and the writings of the learned, it sunk by degrees under their united force.

XVIII. Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, in Galatia, may be ranked in the same class with Apollinaris, if we are to give credit to Eusebius of Cæsarea, and the rest of his adversaries, who represent his explication of the doctrine of the Trinity as bordering upon the Sabellian and Samosatene errors. Many however are of opinion that this Eusebius, and that bishop of Nicomedia who bore the same name, represented with partiality the sentiments of Marcellus, on account of the bitterness and vehemence which he discovered in his opposition to the Arians, and their protectors. But though it should be acknowledged, that, in some particulars, the accusations of his enemies carried an aspect of partiality and resentment, yet it is manifest that they were far from being entirely groundless; for, if the doctrine of Marcellus be attentively examined, it will appear, that he considered the Son and the Holy Ghost as two emanations from the Divine Nature, which, after performing their respective offices, were at length to return into the substance of the Father; and every one will perceive, at first sight, how incompatible this opinion is with the belief of three distinct Persons in the Godhead. Beside this, a particular circumstance, which augmented considerably the aversion of many to Marcellus, and strengthened the suspicion of his erring in a capital manner, was his obstinately refusing, toward the conclusion of his life, to condemn the tenets of his disciple Photinus.†

XIX. Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, may, with propriety, be placed at the head of those whom the Arian controversy was the occasion of seducing into the most extravagant errors. This prelate published, in the year 343, his opinions concerning the Deity, which were equally repugnant to the orthodox and Arian systems. His notions, which have been obscurely, and indeed sometimes inconsistently represented by the ancient writers, amount to this, when attentively examined: "That Jesus Christ was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary; that a certain *divine emanation*,

or ray (which he called the *word*) descended upon this extraordinary man; that, on account of the union of the divine word with his human nature, Jesus was called the *Son of God*, and even *God himself*; and that the Holy Ghost was not a distinct person, but a celestial virtue proceeding from the Deity." The temerity of this bold innovator was chastised, not only by the orthodox in the councils of Antioch\* and Milan, holden in the years 345 and 347, and in that of Sirmium, whose date is uncertain, but also by the Arians in one of their assemblies at Sirmium, convoked in 351. In consequence of all this, Photinus was degraded from the episcopal dignity, and died in exile in 372.‡

XX. After him arose Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, a very eminent Semi-Arian doctor, who, through the influence of the Eusebians, was deposed by the council of Constantinople, in 360, and sent into exile, where he formed the sect of the Macedonians, or Pneumatomachians. In his exile, he declared with the utmost freedom those sentiments which he had formerly either concealed, or, at least, taught with much circumspection. He considered the Holy Ghost as "a divine energy, diffused throughout the universe, and not as a person distinct from the Father and the Son."‡ This opinion had many partisans in the Asiatic provinces; but the council assembled by Theodosius, in 381, at Constantinople, (to which the second rank, among the œcumenical or general councils, is commonly attributed,) put a stop by its authority to the growing evil, and crushed this rising sect before it had arrived at maturity. A hundred and fifty bishops, who were present at this council, gave the finishing touch to what the council of Nice had left imperfect, and fixed, in a full and determinate manner, the doctrine of *three persons in one God*, which is still received among the generality of Christians. This venerable assembly did not stop here; they branded, with infamy, all the errors, and set a mark of execration upon all the heresies, that were hitherto known; they advanced the bishop of Constantinople, on account of the eminence and extent of the city in which he resided, to the first rank after the Roman pontiff, and determined several other points, which they looked upon as essential to the well-being of the church in general.§

XXI. The phrensy of the ancient Gnostics, which had been so often vanquished, and in appearance removed, by the various remedies that had been used for that purpose, broke out anew in Spain. It was transported thither, in the beginning of this century, by a certain person named Marc, of Memphis in Egypt, whose converts at first were not very numerous. They increased, however, in process of time, and

\* See Basnage's *Historia Hæres. Apollin.*, published by Voigt in his *Bibliotheca Hæretologica*, tom. i. fascic. 1. p. 1-96, and improved by some learned and important additions. See also tom. i. fascic. iii. and p. 607 of the latter work. The laws, enacted against the followers of Apollinaris, are extant in the Theodosian Code, tom. vi. See an account of Apollinaris, and his heresy, in the English edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

† See Montfaucou's *Diatriba de Causa Marcelli* in *Nova Collectio Patrum Græcorum*, tom. ii. p. 51; as also Gervaise, *Vie de S. Epiphane*, p. 42.

\* According to Dr. Lardner's account, this council of Antioch, in 345, was holden by the Arians, or Eusebians, and not by the orthodox, as our author affirms. See Lardner's *Credibility*, &c. vol. ix. p. 13; see also Athanas. de *Synod. N. vi. vii.* compared with *Socrat. lib. ii. cap. xviii. xix.*

‡ Or in 375, as is concluded from Jerome's *Chronicle*.—Matt. Larroque, de *Photino, et ejus multiplici condemnatione*.—Thom. Ittigius, *Historia Photini*, in *Ap. ad librum de Hæresarchis Ævi Apostolici*.

§ *Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. iv.*  
§ *Socrat. lib. v. cap. viii. Sozomen, lib. vii. cap. vii.*

counted in their number several persons highly eminent for their learning and piety. Among others, Priscillian, a layman, distinguished by his birth, fortune and eloquence, and afterwards bishop of Abila, was infected with this odious doctrine, and became its most zealous and ardent defender. Hence he was accused by several bishops, and, by a rescript obtained from the emperor Gratian, he was banished with his followers from Spain;\* but he was restored, some time after, by an edict of the same prince, to his country and his functions. His sufferings did not end here; for he was accused a second time, in 381,† before Maximus, who had procured the assassination of Gratian, and made himself master of Gaul; and, by the order of that prince, he was put to death at Treves with some of his associates. The agents, however, by whose barbarous zeal this sentence was obtained, were justly regarded with the utmost abhorrence by the bishops of Gaul and Italy;‡ for Christians had not yet learned, that giving over heretics to be punished by the magistrates, was either an act of piety or justice.§ [No: this abominable doctrine was reserved for those times, when religion was to become an instrument of despotism, or a pretext for the exercise of pride, malevolence, and vengeance.]

The death of Priscillian was less pernicious to the progress of his opinions, than might naturally have been expected. His doctrine not only survived him, but was propagated through the greatest part of Spain and Gaul; and even so far down as the sixth century, the followers of this unhappy man gave much trouble to the bishops and clergy in those provinces.

XXII. No ancient writer has given an accurate account of the doctrine of the Priscillianists. Many authors, on the contrary, by their injudicious representations of it, have highly disfigured it, and added new degrees of obscurity to a system which was before sufficiently dark and perplexed. It appears, however, from authentic records, that the differ-

ence between their doctrine, and that of the Manicheans, was not very considerable. For "they denied the reality of Christ's birth and incarnation; maintained, that the visible universe was not the production of the Supreme Deity, but of some demon, or malignant principle; adopted the doctrine of avens, or emanations from the divine nature; considered human bodies as prisons formed by the author of evil, to enslave celestial minds; condemned marriage, and disbelieved the resurrection of the body." Their rules of life and manners were rigid and severe; and the accounts which many have given of their lasciviousness and intemperance deserve not the least credit, as they are totally destitute of evidence and authority. That the Priscillianists were guilty of dissimulation upon some occasions, and deceived their adversaries by cunning stratagems, is true; but that they held it as a maxim, that lying and perjury were *lawful*, is a most notorious falsehood, without even the least shadow of probability;‖ however commonly this odious doctrine has been laid to their charge. In the heat of controversy, the eye of passion and of prejudice is too apt to confound the principles and opinions of men with their practice.

XXIII. To what we have here said concerning those sects which made a noise in the world, it will not be improper to add some account of those of a less considerable kind.

Audeus, a man of remarkable virtue, being excommunicated in Syria, on account of the freedom and importunity with which he censured the corrupt and licentious manners of the clergy, formed an assembly of those who were attached to him, and became, by his own appointment, their bishop. Banished into Scythia by the emperor, he went among the Goths, where his sect flourished, and augmented considerably. The ancient writers are not agreed about the time in which we are to date the origin of this sect. With respect to its religious institutions, we know that they differed in some points from those observed by other Christians; and, particularly, that the followers of Audeus celebrated Easter, or the Paschal feast, with the Jews, in repugnance to the express decree of the council of Nice. With respect to their doctrine, several errors have been imputed to them;‡ and this, among others, that they attributed to the Deity a human form.

XXIV. The Grecian and Oriental writers place, in this century, the rise of the sect of the Messalians, or Euchites, whose doctrine and discipline were, indeed, much more an-

\* This banishment was the effect of a sentence pronounced against Priscillian, and some of his followers, by a synod convened at Saragossa in 380; in consequence of which, Ithacius and Ithacius, two cruel and persecuting ecclesiastics, obtained from Gratian the rescript above-mentioned. See Sulpit. Sever. Hist. Sacr. lib. ii. cap. xlvii.

† Upon the death of Gratian, who had favoured Priscillian toward the latter end of his reign, Ithacius presented to Maximus a petition against him; whereupon this prince appointed a council to be holden at Bourdeaux, from which Priscillian appealed to the prince himself. Sulp. Sever. lib. ii. cap. xlv. p. 287.

‡ It may be interesting to the reader to hear the character of the first person that introduced *civil* persecution into the Christian church. "He was a man abandoned to the most corrupt indolence, and without the least tincture of true piety. He was talkative, audacious, impudent, luxurious, and a slave to his belly. He accused as heretics, and as profanators of Priscillian, all those whose lives were consecrated to the pursuit of piety and knowledge, or distinguished by acts of mortification and abstinence." &c. Such is the character which Sulpitius Severus, who had an extreme aversion to the sentiments of Priscillian, gives us of Ithacius, bishop of Sossuha, by whose means he was put to death.

§ See Sulp. Sever. Hist. Sacr. edit. Leips. 1769, where Martin, the truly apostolical bishop of Tours, says to Maximus, "novum esse et inauditum nefas ut causam ecclesie judex seculi judicaret." See also Dial. in de vita Martini, cap. xi. p. 495.

‖ See Simon de Vries, Dissert. Critica de Priscillianistis, printed at Utrecht, in 1745. The only defect in this dissertation is the implicit manner in which the author follows Beausobre's History of the Manicheans, taking every thing for granted which is affirmed in that work. See also Franc. Girardi Historia Priscillianistarum Chronologica, published at Rome in 1750. We find, moreover, in the twenty seventh volume of the Opuscula Scientifica of Angelus Calogera, a treatise entitled Bacharius Illustratus, seu de Priscilliana Heresi Dissertatio; but this dissertation seems rather intended to clear up the affair of Bacharius, than to give a full account of the Priscillianists and their doctrine.

† Epiphanius, Heres. lxx. p. 811.—Augustin. de Heres. cap. l.—Theodoret. Fabul. Heret. lib. iv. cap. ix.—J. Joseph. Schroder, Dissertation de Audeanis, published in Voigt's Bibliotheca Historica Heresiology, tom. i.

cient, and subsisted, even before the birth of Christ, in Syria, Egypt, and other eastern countries, but who do not seem to have been formed into a religious body before the latter part of the century of which we now write. These fanatics, who lived after the monkish fashion, and withdrew from all commerce and society with their fellow creatures, seem to have derived their name from their habit of continual *prayer*. "They imagined that the mind of every man was inhabited by an evil dæmon, whom it was impossible to expel by any other means than by constant prayer and singing of hymns; and that, when this malignant spirit was cast out, the pure mind returned to God, and was again united to the divine essence from which it had been separated." To this leading tenet they added many other enormous opinions, which bear a manifest resemblance to the Manichean doctrine, and are evidently drawn from the same source whence the Manicheans derived their errors, even from the tenets of the Oriental philosophy.\* In a word, the Euchites were a sort of Mystics, who imagined, according to the Oriental notion, that two souls resided in man, the one good, and the other evil; and who were zealous in hastening the return of the good spirit to God,

\* Epiphanius, Hæres. lxxx. p. 1067.—Theodoret. Hæret. Fabul. lib. iv. cap. x. p. 672.—Timotheus, Presbyter, de receptione Hæreticor. published in the third volume of Cotelierus' Monumenta. Eccles. Græcæ.—Jac. Tollii Insignia Itineris Italici, p. 110.—Assenani Bibliotheca Orientalis Vaticana, tom. i. ct. iii.

by contemplation and prayer. The external air of piety and devotion, which accompanied this sect, imposed upon many, while the Greeks, on the other hand, opposed it with vehemence in all succeeding ages.

It is proper to observe here, that the title of Massalians or Euchites had a very extensive application among the Greeks and the Orientals, for they gave it to all those who endeavoured to raise the soul to God by recalling and withdrawing it from terrestrial and sensible objects, however these enthusiasts might differ from each other in their opinions upon other subjects.

XXV. Toward the conclusion of this century, two opposite sects involved Arabia and the adjacent countries in the troubles and tumults of a new controversy. These jarring factions went by the names of Antidico-Marianites and Collyridians. The former maintained, that the Virgin Mary did not always preserve her immaculate state, but received the embraces of her husband Joseph after the birth of Christ. The latter, on the contrary, (who were singularly favoured by the female sex,) running into the opposite extreme, worshipped the Blessed Virgin as a goddess, and judged it necessary to appease her anger, and seek her favour and protection, by libations, sacrifices, oblations of cakes (*collyrida*,) and the like services.\*

Other sects might be mentioned here; but they are too obscure and inconsiderable to deserve notice.

\* See Epiphanius. Hæres. lxxviii. lxxix.



# THE FIFTH CENTURY.

## PART I.

### THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the Prosperous Events that happened to the Church.*

I. IN order to arrive at a true knowledge of the causes to which we are to attribute the outward state of the church, and the events which happened to it during the fifth century, we must keep in view the civil history of this period. It is, therefore, proper to observe, that, in the beginning of this century, the Roman empire was divided into two sovereignties; one of which comprehended the eastern provinces, the other those of the west. Arcadius, the emperor of the east, reigned at Constantinople; and Honorius, who governed the western provinces, chose Ravenna for the place of his residence. The latter prince, remarkable only for the sweetness of his temper and the goodness of his heart, neglected the great affairs of the empire; and, inattentive to the weighty duties of his station, held the reins of government with an unsteady hand. The Goths, taking advantage of this criminal indolence, made incursions into Italy, laid waste its fairest provinces, and sometimes carried their desolations as far as Rome, which they ravaged and plundered in the most dreadful manner. These calamities, which fell upon the western part of the empire from the Gothic depredations, were followed by others still more dreadful under the succeeding emperors. A fierce and warlike people, issuing from Germany, overspread Italy, Gaul, and Spain, the noblest of all the European provinces, and erected new kingdoms in these fertile countries; and Odoacer, at last, at the head of the Herali, having conquered Augustulus, in 476, gave the mortal blow to the western empire, and reduced all Italy under his dominion. About sixteen years after this, Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, made war upon these barbarian invaders, at the request of Zeno, emperor of the east; conquered Odoacer in several battles; and obtained, as the fruit of his victories, a kingdom for the Ostrogoths in Italy, which subsisted under various turns of fortune from the year 493 to 552.\*

These new monarchs of the west pretended to acknowledge the supremacy of the emperors who resided at Constantinople, and gave some faint external marks of a disposition to reign in subordination to them; but, in reality,

\* See, for a fuller illustration of this branch of history, the learned work of M. de Bos, entitled, *Histoire Critique de la Monarchie Francoise*, tom. i. p. 258; as also Masow's *History of the Germans*.

they ruled with an absolute independence, in their respective governments; and, as appears particularly from the dominion exercised by Theodoric in Italy, they left nothing to the eastern emperors but a mere shadow of power and authority.†

II. These constant wars, and the inexpressible calamities with which they were attended, were undoubtedly detrimental to the cause and progress of Christianity. It must, however, be acknowledged that the Christian emperors, especially those who ruled in the east, were active and assiduous in extirpating the remains of the ancient superstitions. Theodosius the younger, distinguished himself in this pious and noble work, and many remarkable monuments of his zeal are still preserved;‡ such as the laws which enjoined either the destruction of the heathen temples, or the dedication of them to Christ and his saints; the edicts, by which he abrogated the sacrilegious rites and ceremonies of Paganism, and removed from all offices and employments in the state such as persisted in their attachment to the absurdities of Polytheism.

This spirit of reformation appeared with less vigour in the western empire. There the feasts of Saturn and Pan, the combats of the gladiators, and other rites that were instituted in honour of the pagan deities, were celebrated with the utmost freedom and impunity; and persons of the highest rank and authority publicly professed the religion of their idolatrous ancestors.‡ This liberty was, however, from time to time, reduced within narrower limits; and all those public sports and festivals, which were more peculiarly incompatible with the genius and sanctity of the Christian religion, were every where abolished.§

III. The limits of the church continued to extend themselves, and gained ground daily upon the idolatrous nations, both in the eastern and western empires. In the east, the inhabi-

† Car. du Fresne, *Di-vert.* xviii. ad *Hist.* Ludovici S. p. 289.—Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.* tom. ii. p. 578, 832.—Gianone, *Historia di Napoli*, tom. i. p. 297.—*Vita Theodorici Ostrogothorum Regis*, a Johanne Coelheo, printed in 1629, with the observations of Pringskold.

‡ See the Theodosian code, tom. vi. p. 325.  
§ See the *Saturalia* of Macrobius, lib. i.—Scipio Maffei *delli Antichità*, lib. i. p. 56.—*Pierre le Brun*, *Hist. Critique des Pratiques superstitieuses*, tom. i. p. 237; and, above all, Montfaucon's *Di-ct.* de *Mariims Tempore Theodosii M.* et *Arcobii*, which is to be found in Latin, in the eleventh volume of the works of St. Chrysostom, and in French, in the twentieth volume of the *Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres*, p. 197.

§ Anastasius prohibited, toward the conclusion of this century, the combats with the wild beasts, and other shows. *Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. i. p. 246.

tants of the mountains Libanus and Anti-Libanus, being dreadfully infested with wild beasts, implored the assistance and counsels of the famous Simeon the Stylite, of whom we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. Simeon gave them for answer, that the only effectual method of removing this calamity was, to abandon the superstitious worship of their ancestors, and substitute the Christian religion in its place. The docility of this people, joined to the extremities to which they were reduced, engaged them to follow the counsels of this holy man. They embraced Christianity, and, in consequence of their conversion, they had the pleasure of seeing their savage enemies abandon their habitations, if we may believe the writers who affirm the truth of this prodigy. The same Simeon, by his influence and authority, introduced the Christian worship into a certain district of the Arabians: some allege, that this also was effected by a miracle, which to me appears more than doubtful.\* To these instances of the progress of the Gospel, we may add the conversion of a considerable number of Jews in the isle of Crete: finding themselves grossly deluded by the impious pretensions of an impostor, called Moses Cretensis,† who gave himself out for the Messiah, they opened their eyes upon the truth, and spontaneously embraced the Christian religion.‡

IV. The German nations, who rent in pieces the Roman empire in the west, were not all converted to Christianity at the same time. Some of them had embraced the truth before the time of their incursion; and such, among others, was the case of the Goths. Others, after having erected their little kingdoms in the empire, embraced the Gospel, that they might thus live with more security amidst a people, who, in general, professed the Christian religion. It is, however, uncertain (and likely to continue so) at what time, and by whose ministry, the Vandals, Sueves, and Alans, were converted to Christianity. With respect to the Burgundians, who inhabited the banks of the Rhine, and thence passed into Gaul, we are informed, by Socrates,§ that they embraced the Gospel of their own accord, from a notion that Christ, or the God of the Romans, who had been represented to them as a most powerful being, would defend them against the rapines and incursions of the Huns. They afterwards sided with the Arian party, to which also the Vandals, Sueves, and Goths, were zealously attached. All these fierce and warlike nations considered a religion as excellent, in proportion

to the success which crowned the arms of those who professed it; and, therefore, when they saw the Romans in possession of an empire much more extensive than that of any other people, they concluded that Christ, their God, was of all others the most worthy of religious homage.

V. It was the same principle, as well as the same views, that engaged Clovis,\* king of the Salii, a nation of the Franks, to embrace Christianity. This prince, whose signal valour was accompanied with barbarity, arrogance, and injustice, founded the kingdom of the Franks in Gaul, after having made himself master of a great part of that country, and meditated with remarkable eagerness and avidity the conquest of the whole. His conversion to the Christian religion is dated from the battle he fought with the Alemans, in 496, at a village called Tolbiacum;‡ in which, when the Franks began to give ground, and their affairs seemed desperate, he implored the assistance of Christ (whom his queen Clotildis, daughter of the king of the Burgundians, had often represented to him, in vain, as the Son of the true God,) and solemnly engaged himself, by a vow, to worship him as his God, if he would render him victorious over his enemies. Victory decided in favour of the Franks; and Clovis, faithful to his engagement, received baptism at Rheims,‡ toward the conclusion of the same year, after having been instructed by Remigius, bishop of that city, in the doctrines of Christianity.§ The example of the king had such a powerful effect upon the minds of his subjects, that three thousand of them immediately followed it, and were baptized with him. Many are of opinion, that the desire of extending his dominions principally contributed to render Clovis faithful to his engagement, though some influence may also be allowed to the zeal and exhortations of his queen Clotildis. Be that as it will, nothing is more certain than that his profession of Christianity was, in effect, of great use to him, both in confirming and enlarging his empire.

The miracles, which are said to have been wrought at the baptism of Clovis, are unworthy of the smallest degree of credit. Among others, the principal prodigy, that of the phial full of oil said to have been brought from heaven by a milk-white dove during the ceremony of baptism, is a fiction, or rather, perhaps, an imposture; a pretended miracle contrived by artifice and fraud.¶ Pious frauds of this na-

\* Vide idem Opus, tom. i. p. 246.

† We shall give the relation of Socrates, concerning this impostor, in the words of the learned and estimable author of the Remarks on Ecclesiastical History. "In the time of Theodosius the younger, an impostor arose, called Moses Cretensis. He pretended to be a second Moses, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete, and promised to divide the sea, and give them a safe passage through it. They assembled together, with their wives and children, and followed him to a promontory. He there commanded them to cast themselves into the water; and many were taken up and saved by fishermen. Upon this, the deluded Jews would have torn the impostor to pieces; but he escaped them, and was seen no more." See Jortin's Remarks, vol. iii.

‡ Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. xxxviii. p. 383.

§ Socrat. lib. vii. cap. xxx. p. 371.

\* Beside the name of Clovis, this prince was also called Clodoveus, Hindovicus, Ludovicus, and Ludicm.

‡ Tolbiacum is thought to be the present Zulpick, which is about twelve miles from Cologne.

§ See Gregory of Tours, Historia Francorum, lib. ii. cap. xxx. xxxi.—Count Buaui's Historia Imperii Romano-Germanici, tom. i. p. 588.—Du Bos' Histoire Critique de la Monarchie Francoise, tom. ii. p. 340.

¶ The opinionner of the history of the Franks tells us, that Remigius having preached to Clovis, and those who had been baptized with him, a sermon on the passion of our Saviour, the king, in hearing him, could not forbear crying out, "If I had been there with my Franks, that should not have happened."

¶ The truth of this miracle has been denied by the learned John James Chillet, in his book De Ampulla Rheimsi, printed at Antwerp, in 1651; and it has been affirmed by Vertot, in the Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres, tom. iv. p. 350. After

ture were very frequently practised in Gaul and in Spain at this time, in order to captivate, with more facility, the minds of a rude and barbarous people, who were scarcely susceptible of a rational conviction.

The conversion of Clovis is looked upon by the learned as the origin of the titles of most Christian King, and Eldest Son of the Church, which have been so long attributed to the kings of France;\* for, if we except this prince, all the kings of those barbarous nations, who seized the Roman provinces, were either yet involved in the darkness of Paganism, or infected with the Arian heresy.

VI. Celestine, the Roman pontiff, sent Palladius into Ireland, to propagate the Christian religion among the rude inhabitants of that island. This first mission was not attended with much fruit; nor did the success of Palladius bear any proportion to his laborious and pious endeavours. After his death, the same pontiff employed, in this mission, Succathus, a native of Scotland, whose name he changed into that of Patrick, and who arrived among the Irish in 432. The success of his ministry, and the number and importance of his pious exploits, stand upon record as undoubted proofs, not only of his resolution and patience, but also of his dexterity and address. Having attacked, with much more success than his predecessor, the errors and superstitions of that uncivilized people, and brought great numbers of them over to the Christian religion, he founded, in 472, the archbishopric of Armagh,†

which has ever since remained the metropolitan see of the Irish nation. Hence this famous missionary, though not the first who brought among that people the light of the Gospel, has yet been justly entitled the Apostle of the Irish, and the father of the Hibernian church, and is still generally acknowledged and revered in that honourable character.

VII. The causes and circumstances by which these different nations were engaged to abandon the superstition of their ancestors, and to embrace the religion of Jesus, may be easily deduced from the facts we have related in the history of their conversion. It would, indeed, be an instance of the blindest and most perverse partiality, not to acknowledge, that the labours and zeal of great and eminent men contributed to this happy purpose, and were the means by which the darkness of many was turned into light. But, on the other hand, they must be very inattentive and superficial observers of things, who do not perceive that the fear of punishment, the prospect of honours and advantages, and the desire of obtaining succour against their enemies from the countenance of the Christians, or the miraculous influences of their religion, were the prevailing motives that induced the greatest part to renounce the service of their impotent gods.

How far these conversions were due to real miracles attending the ministry of the early preachers, is a matter extremely difficult to be determined; for, though I am persuaded that those pious men, who, in the midst of many dangers, and in the face of obstacles seemingly invincible, endeavoured to spread the light of Christianity among the barbarous nations, were sometimes accompanied with the more peculiar presence and succours of the Most High,‡ yet I am equally convinced, that the greatest part of the prodigies, recorded in the histories of this age, are liable to the strongest suspicions of falsehood or imposture. The simplicity and ignorance of the generality in those times furnished the most favourable occasion for the exercise of fraud, and the impudence of impostors, in contriving false miracles, was artfully proportioned to the credulity of the vulgar,§ while the sagacious and the wise, who perceived these cheats, were overawed into silence by the dangers that threatened their lives and fortunes, if they should expose the artifice.¶ Thus does it generally happen in human life, that, when danger attends the discovery and profession of the truth, the prudent are *silent*, the multitude *believe*, and impostors *triumph*.

a mature consideration of what has been alleged on both sides of the question, I can scarcely venture to deny the fact: I am therefore of opinion, that, in order to confirm and fix the wavering faith of this barbarian prince, Remigius had prepared his measures beforehand, and traced a pigeon, by great application and dexterity, in such a manner, that, during the baptism of Clovis, it descended from the roof of the church with a phial of oil. Among the records of this century, we find accounts of many such miracles. ¶ There is one circumstance, which obliges me to differ from Dr. Mosheim upon this point, and to look upon the story of the famous phial rather as a mere fiction, than as a pious fraud, or pretended miracle brought about by artifice; and that circumstance is, that Gregory of Tours, from whom we have a full account of the conversion and baptism of Clovis, and who, from his proximity to this time, may almost be called a contemporary writer, has not made the least mention of this famous miracle. This omission, in a writer who the Roman catholics themselves consider as an over-credulous historian, amounts to a proof, that, in his time, this fable was not yet invented.

\* See Gab. Daniel et De Camps, Dissert. de Titulo Regis Christianissimi, in the Journal des Savans for the year 1720, p. 243, 326, 404, 448.—Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions, tom. xx, p. 466.

¶ From the fragments of the lives of some Irish bishops who are said to have converted many of their countrymen in the fourth century, archbishop Usher concludes, that Palladius was not the first bishop of Ireland (see his Antiquities of the British Church); but it has been evidently proved, among others by Bollandus, that these fragments are of no earlier date than the twelfth century, and are besides, for the most part, fabulous. Dr. Mosheim's opinion is farther confirmed by the authority of Prosper, which is decisive in this matter.

‡ See the Acta Sanctorum, tom. ii. Martii, p. 517, tom. iii. Februar. p. 131, 159; and the Hibernia Sacra of Sir James Ware, printed at Dublin in 1717. The latter published at London, in 1636, the Works of St. Patrick. Accounts of the synods, that were holden by this eminent missionary, are to be found in Wilkins' Concilia Magnae Brit. et Hiberniae, tom. i. With respect to the famous cave, called the Purgatory of St. Patrick, the reader may

consult Le Bruin, Histoire Critique des Pratiques superstitieuses, tom. iv. p. 34.

\* There is a remarkable passage, relating to the miracles of this century, in the dialogue of Aeneas Gorgens concerning the immortality of the soul, entitled *Theophrastus*. See the controversy concerning the time when miracles ceased in the church, that was carried on about the middle of the eighteenth century, on occasion of Dr. Middleton's Free Inquiry.

‡ This is ingeniously confessed by the Benedictine monks in their Literary History of France, tom. ii. p. 33, and happily expressed by Livy, Hist. lib. xxv. cap. x. sect. 6. "Prodigia nulla umbrata sunt, quae quo magis eroduntur simpliciter et religiosi homines, eo plura nuntiantur."

§ Sulpitius Severus, Dial. i. p. 438. Ep. i. p. 457. Di d. iii. cap. ii. p. 487.

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Calamitous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. It has been already observed, that the Goths, Heruli, Franks, Huns, and Vandals, with other fierce and warlike nations, for the most part strangers to Christianity, had invaded the Roman empire, and rent it asunder in the most deplorable manner. Amidst these calamities, the Christians were grievous (we may venture to say, the principal) sufferers. It is true, these savage nations were much more intent upon the acquisition of wealth and dominion, than upon the propagation or support of the pagan superstitious; nor did their cruelty and opposition to the Christians arise from any religious principle, or from an enthusiastic desire to ruin the cause of Christianity; it was merely by the instigation of the Pagans who remained yet in the empire, that they were excited to treat with such severity and violence the followers of Christ. The painful consideration of their abrogated rites, and the hopes of recovering their former liberty and privileges by the means of their new masters, induced the worshippers of the gods to seize with avidity every opportunity of inspiring them with the most bitter aversion to the Christians. Their endeavours, however, were without the desired effect, and their expectations were entirely disappointed. The greatest part of these barbarians embraced Christianity, though it be also true, that, in the beginning of their usurpations, the professors of that religion suffered heavily under the rigour of their government.

II. To destroy the credit of the Gospel, and to excite the hatred of the multitude against the Christians, the Pagans took occasion, from the calamities and tumults which distracted the empire, to renew the obsolete complaint of their ancestors against Christianity, as the source of these complicated woes. They alleged, that, before the coming of Christ, the world was blessed with peace and prosperity; but that, since the progress of his religion every where, the gods, filled with indignation to see their worship neglected and their altars abandoned, had visited the earth with those plagues and desolations, which increased every day. This feeble objection was entirely removed by Augustin, in his book *de Civitate Dei*; a work exceedingly rich and ample in point of matter, and filled with the most profound and diversified erudition. It also drew a complete confutation from the learned pen of Orosius, who, in a history written expressly for that purpose, showed, with the strongest evidence, that not only the same calamities now complained of, but also plagues of a much more dreadful kind, had afflicted mankind before the Christian religion appeared in the world.

The misfortunes of the times produced still more pernicious effects upon the religious sentiments of the Gauls. They introduced among that people the most desperate notions, and led many of them to reject the belief of a superintending providence, and to exclude the Deity

from the government of the universe. Against these phrenetic infidels, Salvian wrote his book concerning the divine government.

III. Hitherto we have given only a general view of the sufferings of the Christians; it is, however, proper, that we should enter into a more distinct and particular account of those misfortunes.

In Gaul, and the neighbouring provinces, the Goths and Vandals (whose cruel and sacrilegious soldiery respected neither the majesty of religion, nor the rights of humanity) committed acts of barbarity and violence against a multitude of Christians.

In Britain, a long series of tumults and divisions involved the Christians in many troubles. When the affairs of the Romans declined in that country, the Britons were tormented by the Picts and Scots, nations remarkable for their violence and ferocity. Hence, after many sufferings and disasters, they chose, in 445, Vortigern for their king. This prince, finding himself too weak to make head against the enemies of his country, called the Anglo-Saxons from Germany to his aid, about the year 449. The consequences of this measure were pernicious; and it soon appeared, that the warriors, who came as auxiliaries into Britain, oppressed it with calamities more grievous than those which it had suffered from its enemies; for the Saxons aimed at nothing less than to subdue the ancient inhabitants of the country, and to reduce the whole island under their dominion. Hence a most bloody and obstinate war arose between the Britons and Saxons, which, after having been carried on, during a hundred and thirty years, with various success, ended in the final defeat of the Britons, who were at length constrained to seek a retreat in Wales. During these commotions, the state of the British church was deplorable beyond expression; it was almost totally overwhelmed and extinguished by the Anglo-Saxons, who adhered to the worship of the gods, and put an immense number of Christians to the most cruel deaths.\*

IV. In Persia, the Christians suffered grievously by the imprudent zeal of Abdas, bishop of Susa, who pulled down the Pyraeum, which was a temple dedicated to fire; for, when this obstinate prelate was ordered by the king (Yezdejrd) to rebuild that temple, he refused to comply; for which he was put to death in 414, and the churches of the Christians were demolished. This persecution was not, however, of long duration, but seems to have been extinguished soon after its commencement.

Warharan or Bahram, the son of the monarch already mentioned, treated the Christians, in 421, in a manner yet more barbarous and inhuman, to which he was led partly by the instigation of the Magi, and partly by his keen aversion to the Romans, with whom he was at war; for, as often as the Persians and the Romans were at variance, the Christians, who dwelt in Persia, felt new and redoubled effects of their monarch's wrath; and this from a prevailing notion, not perhaps entirely ground-

\* See, beside Bede and Gildas, archbishop Usher's *Antiquitat. Ecclesie Britannicæ*, cap. xiii. p. 415, and Rapin's *Histoire d'Angleterre*, tom. i. livr. ii.

less, that they favoured the Romans, and rendered real services to their empire.\* In this persecution, a prodigious number of Christians perished in the most exquisite tortures, and by various kinds of punishment.† But they were, at length, delivered from these cruel oppressions by the peace that was made in 427, between Warharan and the emperor Theodosius the younger.‡

It was not from the Pagans only that the Christians were exposed to suffering and persecution; they were also harassed and oppressed in a variety of ways by the Jews, who lived in great opulence, and enjoyed a high degree of favour and credit in several parts of the east.§ Among these, none treated them with greater rigour and arrogance than Gamaliel, the patriarch of that nation, a man of the greatest power and influence, whose authority and

\* Theodoret, Hist. Eccles. lib. v. cap. xxix. p. 245. Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Abdas. Barbeyrac, de la Morale des Peres, p. 320.

† Jos. Sim. Assenani Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. i. p. 182, 248.

‡ Socrates, Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. xx.

§ Socrat. lib. vii. cap. xiii. xvi. Codex Theodos. tom. vi. p. 265.

violence were, on that account, restrained, in 415, by an express edict of Theodosius.\*

V. It does not appear, from extant records, that any writings against Christ and his followers were published in this century, unless we consider as such the histories of Olympiodorus, and Zosimus, of whom the latter loses no opportunity of reviling the Christians, and loading them with the most unjust and bitter reproaches. But, though so few books were written against Christianity, we are not to suppose that its adversaries had laid aside the spirit of opposition. The schools of the philosophers and rhetoricians were yet open in Greece, Syria, and Egypt; and there is no doubt that these artful teachers laboured assiduously to corrupt the minds of the youth, and to instil into them, at least some of the principles of the ancient superstition.† The history of these times, and the writings of several Christians who lived in this century, exhibit evident proofs of these clandestine methods of opposing the progress of the Gospel.

\* Codex Theodos. tom. vi. p. 262.

† Photii Biblioth. cod. lxxx.

‡ Zacharias Mitylen. de Officio Dei.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the State of Learning and Philosophy.*

I. **THOUGH**, in this century, the illiterate and ignorant were advanced to eminent and important stations, both ecclesiastical and civil, yet we must not thence conclude, that the sciences were treated with universal contempt. The value of learning, and the excellence of the fine arts, were yet generally acknowledged among the thinking part of mankind.— Hence public schools were erected in almost all the great cities, such as Constantinople, Rome, Marseilles, Edessa, Nisibis, Carthage, Lyons, and Treves; and public instructors of capacity and genius were set apart for the education of the youth, and maintained at the expense of the emperors. Several bishops and monks contributed also to the advancement of knowledge, by imparting to others their small stock of learning and science. But the infelicity of the times, the incursions of the barbarous nations, and the scarcity of great geniuses, rendered the fruits of these excellent establishments much less important than their generous founders and promoters expected.

II. In the western provinces, and especially in Gaul, there were indeed some men eminently distinguished by their learning and talents, and every way proper to serve as models to the lower orders in the republic of letters. Of this we have abundant proof in the writings of Macrobius, Salvian, Vincentius bishop of Liris, Ennodius, Sidonius Apollinaris, Claudian, Marcellinus, Dracontius, and others, who, though

in some respects inferior to the celebrated authors of antiquity, are yet far from being destitute of elegance, and discover in their productions a most laborious application to literary researches of various kinds. But the barbarous nations, which either spread desolation, or formed settlements in the Roman territories, choked the growth of those genial seeds, which the hand of science had sown in more auspicious times. These savage invaders, who possessed no other ambition than that of conquest, and considered military courage as the only source of true virtue and solid glory, beheld, in consequence, the arts and sciences with the utmost contempt. Wherever therefore they extended their conquests, ignorance and darkness followed their steps; and the culture of science was confined to the priests and monks alone; and even among these, learning degenerated from its primitive lustre, and put on the most unseemly and fantastic form. Amidst the seduction of corrupt examples, the alarms of perpetual danger, and the horrors and devastations of war, the sacerdotal and monastic orders gradually lost all taste for solid science, in the place of which they substituted a lifeless spectre, an enormous phantom of barbarous erudition. They indeed kept public schools, and instructed the youth in what they called the *seven liberal arts*;\* but these, as we learn from Augustin's account of them, consisted only of a certain number of dry, subtle,

\* These arts were grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. See cent. viii. part 2. ch. ii. in this volume.

and useless precepts, and were consequently more adapted to load and perplex the memory, than to improve and strengthen the judgment: so that, toward the conclusion of this century, the sciences were almost totally extinguished; at least, what remained of them was no more than a shadowy form, without solidity or consistence.

III. The few who applied themselves to the study of philosophy in this age, had not yet embraced the doctrine or method of Aristotle. They looked upon the system of this eminent philosopher, as a labyrinth beset with thorns and thistles;\* and yet, had they been able to read and understand his works, it is probable that many of them would have become his followers. The doctrine of Plato had a more established reputation, which it had enjoyed for several ages, and was considered, not only as less subtle and difficult than that of the Stagirite, but also as more conformable to the genius and spirit of the Christian religion. Besides, the most valuable of Plato's works were translated into Latin by Victorinus, and were thus adapted to general use;† and Sidonius Apollinaris‡ informs us, that all those, among the Latins, who had any inclination to the study of truth, fell into the Platonic notions, and followed that sage as their philosophical guide.

IV. The fate of learning was less deplorable among the Greeks and Orientals, than in the western provinces; and not only the several branches of polite literature, but also the more solid and profound sciences, were cultivated by them with tolerable success. Hence we find among them more writers of genius and learning than in other countries. Those, who were inclined to the study of law, resorted generally to Berytus, famous for its learned academy,§ or to Alexandria,|| which was frequented by the students of physic and chemistry. The professors of eloquence, poetry, philosophy, and the other liberal arts, taught the youth in public schools, which were erected in almost every city. Those however of Alexandria, Constantinople, and Edessa, were deemed superior to all others, both in point of erudition and method.¶

V. The doctrine and sect of the modern Platonists, or Platonists, retained, among the Syrians and Alexandrians, a considerable part of their ancient splendour. Olympiodorus, Hero,\*\* and other philosophers of the first rank, added a lustre to the Alexandrian school. That of Athens was rendered famous by the talents and erudition of Theophrastus, Plutarch, and his successor Syrianus. These were the instruc-

tors of the renowned Proclus, who far surpassed the Platonic philosophers of this century, and acquired such a high degree of the public esteem, as enabled him to give new life to the doctrine of Plato, and restore it to its former credit in Greece.\* Marinus, of Neapolis, Ammonius the son of Hermias, Isidorus and Damascius, the disciples of Proclus, followed, with an ardent emulation, the traces of their master, and formed successors who resembled them in all respects. But the imperial laws, and the daily progress of the Christian religion, gradually diminished the lustre and authority of these philosophers;‡ and, as there were many of the Christian doctors who adopted the Platonic system, and were sufficiently qualified to explain it to the youth, this naturally prevented the schools of these heathen sages from being so much frequented as they had formerly been.

VI. The credit of the Platonic philosophy, and the preference that was given to it, as more excellent in itself, and less repugnant to the genius of the Gospel than other systems, did not prevent the doctrine of Aristotle from coming to light after a long struggle, and forcing its way into the Christian church. The Platonists themselves interpreted, in their schools, some of the writings of Aristotle, particularly his *Dialectics*, and recommended that work to such of the youth as had a taste for logical discussions, and were fond of disputing. In this, the Christian doctors imitated the manner of the heathen schools; and this was the first step to that universal dominion, which the Stagirite afterwards obtained in the republic of letters. A second and yet larger stride toward this universal empire was made by the Aristotelian philosophy during the controversies which Origen had occasioned, and the Arian, Eutychian, Nestorian, and Pelagian dissensions, which, in this century, were so fruitful of calamities to the Christian church. Origen, as is well known, was zealously attached to the Platonic system. When, therefore, he was publicly condemned, many, to avoid the imputation of his errors, and to preclude their being reckoned among the number of his followers, adopted openly the philosophy of Aristotle, which was entirely different from that of Origen. The Nestorian, Arian, and Eutychian controversies were managed, or rather drawn out, on both sides, by a perpetual recourse to subtle distinctions and captious sophisms; and no philosophy was so proper to furnish such weapons, as that of Aristotle; for that of Plato was far from being adapted to form the mind to the polemic arts. Besides, the Pelagian doctrine bore a striking resemblance to the Platonic opinions concerning God and the human soul; and this was an additional reason which engaged many to desert the Platonists, and to assume, at least, the name of Peripatetics.

\* The passages of different writers, that prove what is here advanced, are collected by Launoy, in his book, *de varia Aristotelis Fortuna in Academia Parisiensis*.

† See Augustinus Confess. lib. i. cap. ii. sect. i. p. 105, 106, tom. i. op.

‡ See his Epistles, book iv. ep. iii. xi. book ix. ep. ix.

§ See Hasei Lib. de Academia Jurconsultorum Berytensium; as also Mitylenæus, de Opificio Dei, p. 164.

|| Mitylenæus de Opificio Dei, p. 179.

¶ Æneas Gazæus in Theophrasto.

\*\* Marinus, Vita Procli, cap. ix.

\* The life of Proclus, written by Marinus, was published at Hamburg, in 1700, by John Albert Fabricius, and was enriched by this famous editor, with a great number of learned observations.

† See Æneas Gazæus in Theophrasto.

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Christian Church, and its form of Government.*

I. SEVERAL causes contributed to bring about a change in the external form of ecclesiastical government. The power of the bishops, particularly those of the first order, was sometimes augmented, and sometimes diminished, according as the times and the occasions offered; and in all these changes the intrigues of the court and the political state of the empire had much more influence, than the rules of equity and wisdom.

These alterations were, indeed, matters of small moment. But an affair of much greater consequence now drew the general attention; and this was the vast augmentation of honours and rank, accumulated upon the bishops of Constantinople, in opposition to the most vigorous efforts of the Roman pontiff. In the preceding century, the council of Constantinople had, on account of the dignity and privileges of that imperial city, conferred on its bishops a place among the first rulers of the Christian church. This new dignity added fuel to their ambition, they extended their views of authority and dominion; and, encouraged, no doubt, by the consent of the emperor, reduced the provinces of Asia Minor, Thrace, and Pontus, under their spiritual jurisdiction. In this century, they grasped at still further accessions of power; so that not only the whole eastern part of Illyricum was added to their former acquisitions, but they were also exalted to the highest summit of ecclesiastical authority; for, by the 28th canon of the council holden at Chalcedon in 451, it was resolved, that the same rights and honours, which had been conferred upon the bishop of Rome, were due to the bishop of Constantinople, on account of the equal dignity and lustre of the two cities, in which these prelates exercised their authority. The same council confirmed also, by a solemn act, the bishop of Constantinople in the spiritual government of those provinces over which he had ambitiously usurped the jurisdiction. Pope Leo the Great, bishop of Rome, opposed with vehemence the passing of these decrees; and his opposition was seconded by that of several other prelates. But their efforts were vain, as the emperors threw their weight into the balance, and thus supported the decisions of the Grecian bishops.\* In consequence then of the decrees of this famous council, the prelate of Constantinople began to contend obstinately for the supremacy with the Roman pontiff, and to crush the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, so as to make them feel the oppressive effects of his pretended superiority; and no one distinguished himself more by his ambition and arrogance in this affair, than Acacius.†

II. It was much about this time that Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, or rather of Ælia, attempted to withdraw himself and his church

from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Casarea, and aspired to a place among the first prelates of the Christian world. The high degree of veneration and esteem, in which the church of Jerusalem was holden among all other Christian societies (on account of its rank among the apostolical churches, and its title to the appellation of *mother-church*, as having succeeded the first Christian assembly founded by the apostles.) was extremely favourable to the ambition of Juvenal, and rendered his project much more practicable than it would otherwise have been. Encouraged by this, and animated by the favour and protection of the younger Theodosius, the aspiring prelate not only assumed the dignity of patriarch of all Palestine,\* a rank that rendered him supreme and independent of all spiritual authority, but also invaded the rights of the bishop of Antioch, and usurped his jurisdiction over the provinces of Phœnicia and Arabia. Hence arose a warm contest between Juvenal and Maximus, bishop of Antioch, which the council of Chalcedon decided, by restoring to the latter the provinces of Phœnicia and Arabia, and confirming the former in the spiritual possession of all Palestine.‡ and in the high rank which he had assumed in the church.§ Thus were created, in the fifth century, five superior rulers of the church, who were distinguished from the rest by the title of Patriarchs.¶ The oriental historians mention a sixth, viz. the bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, to whom, according to their account, the bishop of Antioch voluntarily ceded a part of his jurisdiction.‖ But this addition to the number of the patriarchs is unworthy of credit, as the only proof of it is drawn from the Arabic laws of the council of Nice, which are notoriously destitute of all authority.

III. The patriarchs were distinguished by considerable and extensive rights and privileges, that were annexed to their high station. They alone consecrated the bishops, who lived in the provinces that belonged to their jurisdiction. They assembled yearly in council the clergy of their respective districts, in order to regulate the affairs of the church. The cognisance of all important causes, and the determination of the more weighty controversies, were referred to the patriarch of the province where they arose. They also pronounced a decisive judgment in those cases, where accusations were brought against bishops; and, last-

[17] \* By all Palestine, the reader is desired to understand three distinct provinces, of which each bore the name of Palestine; and accordingly the original is thus expressed, *Tria Palestina Episcoporum seu Patriarchum*. After the destruction of Jerusalem, the face of Palestine was almost totally changed; and it was so parcelled out and wasted by a succession of wars and invasions, that it scarcely preserved any trace of its former condition. Under the Christian emperors there were three Palestines formed out of the ancient country of that name, each of which was an episcopal see; and it was of these three dioceses that Juvenal usurped and maintained the jurisdiction. See, for a farther account of the three Palestines, Spanhemi *Geographia Sacra*.

† See also, for an account of the Three Palestines, Caroli a S. Paulo *Geographia Sacra*, p. 307.

‡ See Mich. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. iii.

§ See the authors who have written of the patriarchs, mentioned and recommended by the learned Fabricius, in his *Bibliograph. Antiquar.* cap. xiii. p. 453.

‖ Asseniani *Biblioth. Orient. Vaticanæ* tom. i.

\* Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* tom. i. p. 36.

† See Bayle's *Dictionnaire Historique*, at the article Acacius.

ly, they appointed vicars,\* or deputies, clothed with their authority, for the preservation of order and tranquillity in the remoter provinces. Such were the great and distinguishing privileges of the patriarchs; and they were accompanied with others of less moment, which it is needless to mention.

It must, however, be carefully observed, that the authority of the patriarchs was not acknowledged through all the provinces without exception. Several districts, both in the eastern and western empires, were exempted from their jurisdiction.† The emperors, who reserved to themselves the supreme power in the Christian hierarchy, and received, with great facility and readiness, the complaints of those who considered themselves as injured by the patriarchs; and the councils also, in which the majesty and legislative power of the church immediately resided; were obstacles to the arbitrary proceedings of the patriarchal order.

IV. This constitution of ecclesiastical government was so far from contributing to the peace and prosperity of the Christian church, that it proved, on the contrary, a perpetual source of dissensions and animosities, and was productive of various inconveniences and grievances. The patriarchs, who, by their exalted rank and extensive authority, were equally able to do much good and much mischief, began to encroach upon the rights, and trample upon the prerogatives of their bishops, and thus introduced, gradually, a sort of spiritual bondage into the church; and that they might invade, without opposition, the rights of the bishops, they permitted the latter, in their turn, to trample with impunity, upon the ancient rights and privileges of the people; for, in proportion as the bishops multiplied their privileges and extended their usurpations, the patriarchs gained new accessions of power by the despotism which they exercised over the episcopal order. They fomented also divisions among the bishops, and excited animosities between them and the other ministers of the church. They went still farther, and sowed the seeds of discord between the clergy and the people, that all these combustions might furnish them with perpetual matter for the exercise of their authority, and procure them a multitude of clients and dependents. They left no artifice unemployed to strengthen their own authority, and to raise opposition against the prelates from every quarter. For this purpose it was that they engaged in their cause by the most alluring promises, and attached to their interests by the most magnificent acts of liberality, whole swarms of monks, who served as intestine enemies to the bishops, and as a dead weight on the side of patriarchal tyranny. The efforts of these monastic hirelings contributed more than any other means to ruin the ancient ecclesiastical discipline, to diminish the authority of the bishops, and raise, to an enormous and excessive height,

the power and prerogatives of their insolent and ambitious patrons.

V. To these lamentable evils, were added the ambitious quarrels, and the bitter animosities, that rose among the patriarchs themselves, and which produced the most bloody wars, and the most detestable and horrid crimes. The patriarch of Constantinople distinguished himself in these odious contests. Elate with the favour and proximity of the imperial court, he cast a haughty eye on all sides, where any objects were to be found on which he might exercise his lordly ambition. On one hand, he reduced under his jurisdiction the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, as prelates only of the second order; and, on the other, he invaded the diocese of the Roman pontiff, and despoiled him of several provinces. The two former prelates, though they struggled with vehemence, and raised considerable tumults by their opposition, laboured intellectually, both for want of strength, and likewise on account of a variety of unfavourable circumstances. But the pope, far superior to them in wealth and power, contended also with more vigour and obstinacy, and, in his turn, gave a deadly wound to the usurped supremacy of the Byzantine patriarch.

The attentive inquirer into the affairs of the church, from this period, will find, in the events now mentioned, the principal source of those most scandalous and deplorable dissensions, which divided first the eastern church into various sects, and afterwards separated it entirely from that of the west. He will find, that these ignominious schisms flowed chiefly from the unchristian contentions for dominion and supremacy, which reigned among those who set themselves up for the fathers and defenders of the church.

VI. No one of the contending bishops found the occurrences of the times so favourable to his ambition, as the Roman pontiff. Notwithstanding the redoubled efforts of the bishop of Constantinople, a variety of circumstances concurred to augment his power and authority, though he had not yet assumed the dignity of supreme lawgiver and judge of the whole Christian church. The bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, unable to make head against the lordly prelate of Constantinople, often fled to the Roman pontiff for succour against his violence; and the inferior order of bishops used the same method, when their rights were invaded by the prelates of Alexandria and Antioch: so that the bishop of Rome, by taking all these prelates alternately under his protection, daily added new degrees of influence and authority to the Roman see, rendered it every where respected, and was thus imperceptibly establishing its supremacy. Such were the means by which that pontiff extended his dominion in the east. In the west its increase arose from other causes. The declining power and the supine indolence of the emperors, left the authority of the bishop, who presided in their capital, almost without control. The incursions, moreover, and triumphs of the barbarians were so far from being prejudicial to his rising dominion, that they rather contributed to its advancement; for the kings, who penetrated into the empire, were only solicitous

\* Dav. Blondel, de la Primaute de l'Eglise, chap. xxx. p. 332. Theod. Ruinart, de Pallio Archi-Episcopali, p. 445; tom. ii. of the posthumous works of Mabillon.

† Brerewood's Dissert. de veteris Ecclesie Gubernatione patriarchali, printed at the end of archbishop Usher's book, entitled, Opusculum de Origine Episcoporum et Metropolitanorum.



about the methods of giving a sufficient degree of stability to their respective governments; and when they perceived the subjection of the multitude to the bishops, and the dependence of the latter upon the Roman pontiff, they immediately resolved to reconcile this ghostly ruler to their interests, by loading him with benefits and honours of various kinds.

Among all the prelates who ruled the church of Rome during this century, there was not one who asserted his authority and pretensions with such vigour and success, as Leo, surnamed the Great. It must however be observed, that neither he, nor the other promoters of the same claims, were able to overcome all the obstacles that were laid in their way, or the various checks which were given to their ambition. Many examples might be alleged in proof of this assertion, particularly the case of the Africans, whom no threats or promises could engage to submit the decision of their controversies, and the determination of their causes, to the Roman tribunal.\*

VII. The vices of the clergy were now carried to the most enormous excess; and all the writers of this century, whose probity and virtue render them worthy of credit, are unanimous in their accounts of the luxury, arrogance, avarice, and voluptuousness of the sacerdotal orders. The bishops, and particularly those of the first rank, created various delegates, or ministers, who managed for them the affairs of their dioceses; and courts were gradually formed, where these pompous ecclesiastics gave audience, and received the homage of a cringing multitude. The office of a presbyter was looked upon of such a high and eminent nature, that Martin, bishop of Tours, audaciously maintained, at a public entertainment, that the emperor was inferior, in dignity, to one of that order.† As to the deacons, their pride and licentiousness occasioned many and grievous complaints, as appears from the decrees of several councils.‡

These opprobrious stains, in the characters of the clergy, would never have been endured, had not the greatest part of mankind been sunk in superstition and ignorance, and people in general formed their ideas of the rights and liberties of Christian ministers from the model exhibited by the sacerdotal orders among the Hebrews, during the prevalence of the law of Moses, and among the Greeks and Romans in the darkness of paganism. The barbarous nations also, which, on the ruin of the Romans, divided among themselves the western empire, bore, with the utmost patience and moderation, both the dominion and vices of the bishops and priests, because, upon their conversion to Christianity, they became naturally subject to their jurisdiction; and still more, because they considered the ministers of Christ as invested with the same rights and privileges, which distinguished the priests of their fictitious deities.

VIII. The corruption of an order, appointed to promote, by doctrine and example, the sacred interests of piety and virtue, will appear less surprising when we consider, that multitudes of people were in every country admitted, without examination or choice, into the body of the clergy, the greatest part of whom had no other view, than the enjoyment of a lazy and inglorious repose. Many of these ecclesiastics were confined to no fixed places or assemblies, and had no employment of any kind, but samtered about wherever they pleased, gaining their maintenance by imposing upon the ignorant multitude, and sometimes by mean and dishonest practices. But if any should ask, how this account is reconcileable with the number of saints, who, according to the testimonies both of the eastern and western writers, are said to have shone forth in this century, the answer is obvious; these saints were canonised by the ignorance of the times; for, in an age of darkness and corruption, those who distinguished themselves from the multitude, either by their genius, their writings, or their eloquence, by their prudence and dexterity in conducting affairs of importance, or by their meekness and moderation, and the ascendancy which they had gained over their resentments and passions, were esteemed something more than men; they were revered as gods; or, to speak more properly, they appeared to others as men divinely inspired, and full of the Deity.

IX. The monks, who had formerly lived only for themselves in solitary retreats, and had never thought of assuming any rank among the sacerdotal orders, were now gradually distinguished from the populace, and were endowed with such opulence and such honourable privileges, that they found themselves in a condition to chain an eminent station among the supports and pillars of the Christian community.§ The fame of their piety and sanctity was at first so great, that bishops and presbyters were often chosen out of their order;¶ and the passion of erecting edifices and convents, in which the monks and holy virgins might serve God in the most commodious manner, was at this time carried beyond all bounds.‡

The monastic orders did not all observe the same rule of discipline, or the same manner of living. Some followed the rule of Augustine, others that of Basil, others that of Antony, others that of Athanasius, others that of Pachomius; but they must all have become extremely negligent and remiss in observing the laws of their respective orders, since the licentiousness of the monks, even in this century, was even proverbial.§ and they are said to have excited in various places the most dreadful tumults and seditions. All the monastic orders were under the protection of the bishops in whose provinces they lived; nor did the patriarchs claim any authority over them, as ap-

\* Du Pin, de Antiqua Ecclesie Disciplina, Diss. ii. p. 166. Melech, Leydeck, Historia Eccles. Africane, tom. ii. Diss. ii. p. 505.

† Sulpitius Severus, de Vita Martini, cap. xx. p. 329, compared with Dialog. ii. cap. vi. p. 457.

‡ See Dav. Blondel, Apologia pro Sententia Hieronymi de Episcopis et Presbyteris, p. 140.

\* Epiphanius, Expositio. Fidei, tom. i. op. p. 1094.—Magillon's Reponse aux Chanoines Regulars.

† Severus, de Vita Martini, cap. x. p. 320. Dial. i. cap. xxi. p. 426.

‡ Severus, Dial. i. p. 419.—Norisius, Histor. Pelag. lib. i. cap. iii. p. 273 tom. i. op.—Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. ii. p. 35.

§ Sulp. Severus, Dial. i. cap. viii. p. 399.

pears with the utmost evidence from the decrees of the councils holden in this century.\*

X. Several writers of considerable merit adorned this century. Among the Greeks and Orientals, the first place is due to Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, so famous for his learned productions, and the various controversies in which he was engaged. It would be unjust to derogate from the praises which are due to this eminent man: but it would betray, on the other hand, a criminal partiality, if we should pass uncensured the turbulent spirit, the litigious and contentious temper, and other defects, which are laid to his charge.†

After Cyril, we may place Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus (or Cyropolis,) an eloquent, copious, and learned writer, eminent for his acquaintance with all the branches of sacred erudition, but unfortunate in his attachment to some of the Nestorian errors.‡

Isidore, of Pelusium, was a man of uncommon learning and sanctity. A great number of his epistles are yet extant, and discover more piety, genius, erudition, and wisdom, than are to be found in the voluminous productions of many other writers.||

Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, few of whose writings are now extant, acquired an immortal name, by his violent opposition to Origen and his followers.¶

Palladius deserves a rank among the better sort of authors by his *Lausiac History* and his *Life of Chrysostom*.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, though accused after his death of the greatest errors, was one of the most learned men of his time. Those who have read, with any attention, the fragments of his writings, which are to be found in Photius, will lament the want of these excellent compositions, which are either entirely lost, or, if any remain,\*\* are only extant among the Nestorians, and in the Syriac language.††

Nilus, disciple of Chrysostom, composed several treatises of a practical and pious kind; but these performances derive more merit from the worthy and laudable intention of their author than from any other circumstance.

We pass over in silence Basilus of Seleucia, Theodotus of Ancyra, and Gelasius of Cyzicum, for the sake of brevity.

XI. A Roman pontiff, Leo I. surnamed the Great, shines forth at the head of the Latin writers of this century. He was a man of uncommon genius and eloquence, which he employed however too much in extending his authority; a point in which his ambition was both indefatigable and excessive.\*

Orosius acquired a considerable degree of reputation by the History which he wrote to refute the cavils of the Pagans against Christianity, and by his books against the Pelagians and Priscillianists.†

Cassian, an illiterate and superstitious man, inculcated in Gaul, both by his discourse and his writings, the discipline and manner of living which prevailed among the Syrian and Egyptian monks, and was a sort of teacher to those who were called Semi-Pelagians.‡

Maximus of Turin published several Homilies, which are yet extant, and, though short, are for the most part recommended both by elegance and piety.

Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, was one of the most considerable moral writers that flourished among the Latins in this century.§

Pontius of Nola,|| distinguished by his eminent and fervent piety, is also esteemed for his poems, and other good performances.

Peter, bishop of Ravenna, obtained by his eloquence the title of *Chrysologus*; nor are his discourses entirely destitute of genius.¶

Salvian was an eloquent, but, at the same time, a melancholy and sour writer, who, in his vehement declamations against the vices of his times, unwarily discovers the defects of his own character.\*\*

\* See Jo. Launoii Inquisitio in Chartam Immunitatis B. Germani, op. tom. iii. part ii. p. 3. In the ancient records, posterior to this century, the monks are frequently called Clerks. (See Mabillon's *Pref. ad Sac. ii. Actor. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti.*) And this shows, that they now began to be ranked among the clergy, or ministers of the church.

† The works of Cyril were published at Paris by Aubert, in six volumes, folio, in 1638.

‡ The Jesuit Sirmond gave at Paris, in 1642, a noble edition of the works of this prelate in four volumes; a fifth was added by Garnier, in 1685. ¶ We must observe, in favour of this excellent ecclesiastic, so renowned for the sanctity and simplicity of his manners, that he abandoned the doctrines of Nestorius, and thus effaced the stain he had contracted by his personal attachment to that heretic, and to John of Antioch.

§ These epistles amount to 2012, and are divided into five books. They are short, but admirably written, and are equally recommendable for the solidity of the matter, and the purity and elegance of their style.

¶ The best edition of Isidore's Epistles, is that which was published by the Jesuit Scott, at Paris, in 1638.

¶ See Euseb. Renaudot, *Historia Patriarchar. Alexandrinor.* p. 103.

\*\* See Assemani *Biblioth. Oriental. Clement. Vatic. tom. iii. part ii. p. 227.*

†† It appears by this account of the works of Theodore, that Dr. Moshem had not seen the Dissertations of the late duke of Orleans, in one of which that learned prince has demonstrated, that the commentary upon the Psalms, which is to be found in the Chain or Collection of Corderius, and which bears the name of Theodore, is the production of Theodore of Mopsuestia. There exists, also, beside the fragments that are to be

found in Photius, a manuscript commentary of this illustrious author upon the twelve minor prophets.

\* All the works of Leo were published at Lyons, in 1700, by the care of the celebrated Quesnel of the Oratory.

† See Bayle's Dictionary, at the article *Orosius*. A valuable edition of this author, enriched with ancient coins and medals, was published at Leyden, in 1738, by the learned Havercamp.

‡ *Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. ii. p. 215.*—Simon. *Critique de la Biblioth. Ecclesiastique par Dupin, tom. i. p. 156.*—The works of Cassian were published at Frankfort, in 1722, with a copious Commentary by Alardus Gazaeus.

§ See a satisfactory account of this prelate, in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. ii. p. 275.*

¶ This pious and ingenious ecclesiastic is more generally known by the name of Paulin. See the *Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. ii. p. 179.* The best edition of his works is that published by Le Brun, at Paris, in 1685.

\*\* *Agelli Liber Pontificalis Ecclesie Ravennatis, tom. i. p. 321.*

†† *Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. ii. p. 517.* ¶ The authors of the history here referred to, give a different account of Salvian's character. They acknowledge, that his declamations against the vices of the age, in his *Treatise against Avarice*, and his *Discourse concerning Providence*, are warm and vehement; but they represent him, notwithstanding, as one of the most humane and benevolent men of his time. It is, however, beyond all doubt, that he was extravagantly austere in the rules he prescribed for the conduct of life. For what is more

Prosper of Aquitaine, and Marius Mercator, are abundantly known to such as have employed any part of their time and attention in the study of the Pelagian disputes, and the other controversies that were agitated in this century.

Vincent of Lerins gained a lasting reputation by his short, but excellent treatise against the sects, entitled *Communitorium*.<sup>2</sup>

Sidonius Apollinaris, a timid writer, though not entirely destitute of eloquence; Vigilins of Tapsus; Arnobius the younger, who wrote a commentary on the book of Psalms; Dracontius, and others of that class, are of too little consequence to deserve more particular notice.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Doctrine of the Church during this Century.*

I. MANY points of religion were more largely explained, and many of its doctrines determined with more accuracy and precision, than they had been in the preceding ages. This was one result of the controversies that were multiplied, at this time, throughout the Christian world, concerning the person and nature of Christ; the innate corruption and depravity of man; the natural ability of men to live according to the dictates of the divine law; the necessity of the divine grace in order to salvation; the nature and existence of human liberty; and other such intricate and perplexing questions. The sacred and venerable simplicity of the primitive times, which required no more than a true faith in the word of God, and a sincere obedience to his holy laws, appeared little better than rusticity and ignorance to the subtle doctors of this quibbling age. Yet so it happened, that many of the over-curious divines, who attempted to explain the nature, and remove the difficulties of these intricate doctrines, succeeded very ill in this matter. Instead of leading men into the paths of humble faith and genuine piety, they bewildered them in the labyrinths of controversy and contention, and rather darkened than illustrated the sacred mysteries of religion by a thick cloud of unintelligible subtleties, ambiguous terms, and obscure distinctions. Hence arose new matter of animosity and dispute, of bigotry and uncharitableness, which flowed like a torrent through succeeding ages, and which all human efforts seem unable to vanquish. In these disputes, the heat of passion, and the excessive force of religious antipathy and contradiction,

unnatural than to recommend to Christians, as a necessary condition of salvation, their leaving their whole substance to the poor, to the utter ruin of their children and relations? It must, however, be confessed, that his austerity in point of discipline was accompanied with the most amiable moderation toward those who differed from him in articles of faith. There is a most remarkable passage to this purpose, in his Treatise concerning Providence, book v. p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> \* This work of Vincent, which is commended by our author, seems scarcely worthy of such applause. I see nothing in it, but that blind veneration for ancient opinions, which is so fatal to the discovery and progress of truth, and an attempt to prove that nothing but the voice of tradition is to be consulted in fixing the sense of the Scriptures.

An ample account of Vincent, Prosper, and Arnobius, is to be found in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 305, 342, 369.

frequently hurried the contending parties into the most dangerous and disgraceful extremes.

II. If, before this time, the lustre of religion was clouded with superstition, and its divine precepts were adulterated with a mixture of human inventions, this evil, instead of diminishing, increased daily. The happy souls of departed Christians were invoked by numbers, and their aid implored by assiduous and fervent prayers, while none stood up to censure or oppose this preposterous worship. The question, how the prayers of mortals ascended to the celestial spirits (a question which afterwards produced much wrangling, and many idle fancies,) did not yet occasion any difficulty; for the Christians of this century did not imagine that the souls of the saints were so entirely confined to the celestial mansions, as to be deprived of the privilege of visiting mortals, and travelling, when they pleased, through various countries. They were farther of opinion, that the places most frequented by departed spirits were those where the bodies which they had formerly animated were interred; and this opinion, borrowed by the Christians from the Greeks and Romans, rendered the sepulchres of the saints the general rendezvous of suppliant multitudes. The images of those who, during their lives, had acquired the reputation of uncommon sanctity, were now honoured with a particular worship in several places; and many imagined that this worship drew down into the images the propitious presence of the saints or celestial beings they represented; deluded, perhaps, into this idle fancy by the crafty fictions of the heathen priests, who had published the same things concerning the statues of Jupiter and Mercury.† A singular and irresistible efficacy was also attributed to the bones of martyrs, and to the figure of the cross, in defeating the attempts of Satan, removing all sorts of calamities, and in healing, not only the diseases of the body, but also those of the mind.‡ We shall not enter into a particular account of the public supplications, the holy pilgrimages, the superstitious services paid to departed souls, the multiplication of temples, chapels, altars, penitential garments, and a multitude of other circumstances, that showed the decline of genuine piety, and the corrupt darkness that was eclipsing the lustre of primitive Christianity. As none in these times forbade the Christians to retain the opinions of their pagan ancestors concerning departed souls, heroes, demons, temples, and other things, or even to transfer them into their religious services; and as, instead of entirely abolishing the rites and institutions of ancient times, these institutions were still observed, with only some slight alterations; all this swelled of necessity the torrent of superstition, and deformed the beauty of the

\* See the *Institutiones Divinæ* of Lactantius, lib. i. p. 161, and Hesiod's *Op. et Dies*, ver. 122.—Compare with these, Sulp. Severus, *Epist. ii. p. 371.* Dial. ii. esp. xiii. p. 471. Dial. iii. p. 512.—Eneas Gazæus, in Theophrasto.—Mæcarius in Jac. Tollii *Insignibus Itineris Italici*, and other writers of this age.

† Clementina, *Homil. x. p. 697*, tom. i. PP. Apostolicæ.—Arnobius adv. *Gentes*, lib. vi. p. 251.—Casp. Bartholus, ad *Rutilium Numantianum*, p. 250.

‡ Prudentius, *Hymn xl. de Coronis*, p. 150.—Sulp. Severus, *Ep. i. p. 364.*—Eneas Gazæus, in Theophrasto

Christian religion and worship with those corrupt remains of paganism, which still subsist in a certain church.

It will not be improper to observe here, that the famous pagan doctrine, concerning the purification of departed souls, by means of a certain kind of fire, was now more amply explained and established than it had formerly been.\* Every one knows, that this doctrine proved an inexhaustible source of riches to the clergy through the succeeding ages, and that it still enriches the Romish church with its nutritious streams.

III. The interpretation of the Scriptures employed fewer pens in this century than in the preceding age, in which the Christian doctors were less involved in the labyrinths of controversy. Yet, notwithstanding the multiplication of religious disputes, a considerable number of learned men undertook this useful and important task. We shall not mention those who confined their illustrations to some one, or a few books of the divine word, such as Victor of Antioch, Polychronius, Philo Carpathius, Isidore of Cordova, Salonius, and Andrew of Cæsarea. We must not, however, pass over in silence Theodoret and Theodore, bishops of Cyrus and Mopsuestia, the two most famous expositors of this age, who illustrated a great part of the Scriptures by their pious labours. They were truly eminent, both in point of learning and genius; and, free and unprejudiced in their search after truth, they followed the explications given by their predecessors, only as far as they found them agreeable to reason. The commentaries of Theodoret are yet extant, and in the hands of the learned;† those of Theodore are concealed in the east among the Nestorians, though on many accounts worthy to see the light.‡ Cyril of Alexandria, deserves also a place among the commentators of this century; but a still higher rank, among that useful and learned body, is due to Isidore of Pelusium, whose epistles contain many observations, which east a considerable degree of light upon several parts of Scripture.§

IV. It is, however, to be lamented, that the greatest part of the commentators, both Greek and Latin, following the idle fancies of Ori-

gen, overlooked the true and natural sense of the words, and hunted after subtle and hidden significations, or *mysterics* (as the Latins then termed them,) in the plainest precepts of the Scriptures. Several of the Greeks, and particularly Theodoret, laboured, with success and precision, in illustrating the books of the New Testament; and their success in that task is to be principally attributed to their perfect knowledge of the Greek language, which they had learned from their infancy. But neither the Greeks nor Latins threw much light upon the Old Testament, which was cruelly tortured by the allegorical pens of almost all who attempted to illustrate and explain it; for nothing is more common, than to see the interpreters of the fifth century straining all the passages of that sacred book, either to typify Christ, and the blessings of his kingdom, or Antichrist, and the wars and desolations which he was to bring upon the earth,—without the least spark of judgment, or the smallest air of probability.

V. A few chosen spirits, superior to the others in sagacity and wisdom, were bold enough to stand up against these critical delusions, and to point out a safer and plainer way to divine truth. This we learn from the epistles of Isidore of Pelusium, who, though he was not himself entirely free from this allegorical contagion, censures judiciously, in many places, such as abandoned the historical sense of the Old Testament, and applied its narrations and predictions to Christ alone. But none went greater lengths in censuring the fanciful followers of Origen, than Theodore of Mopsuestia, who not only wrote a book concerning allegory and history, against Origen,\* but also, in his commentary on the prophets, did not hesitate to apply the greater part of their predictions to various events in ancient history.† This manner of interpreting Scripture was very ill received, and contributed, perhaps, more to raise the general cry against him, than all the erroneous doctrines with which he was charged.‡ The Nestorians followed the example of this remarkable and eminent man;§ and they continue to consider him as a saint of the first order, and to preserve his writings with the utmost care, as precious monuments of his piety and learning.

VI. The doctrines of religion were, at this time, understood and represented in a manner that savoured little of their native purity and simplicity. They were drawn out by laboured commentaries beyond the terms in which the

\* See, particularly concerning this matter, Augustin's book de viii. Questionibus ad Dulcitium, N. xvi. tom. vi. op. p. 128; de fide et op. ribus, cap. xvi. p. 182; de fide, spe, et caritate, sect. 118, p. 222. Enarratione Psal. xxxv. sect. 3, &c.

† See Simon's Histoire critique des principaux Commentaires du N. Test. chap. xvii. p. 314; or also his Critique de la Biblioth. Ecclesiast. de M. Du Pin. tom. i. p. 180. ‡ Theodoret wrote Commentaries upon the five books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, the Psalms, the Canticles, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, the 12 minor Prophets, and St. Paul's 14 Epistles.

§ Asseman's Biblioth. Orient. Clem. Vatic. tom. iii. sect. 2. p. 227.—Simon's Critique de la Biblioth. Eccles. tom. i. p. 108, 677. ¶ We are assured by Fabricius, upon the testimony of Lambecius, that Theodoret's commentary upon the twelve Prophets is still extant in MS. in the emperor's library at Vienna. See Fabr. Bibl. Græc. tom. ix. p. 162. See also, for an ample and learned account of the writings of this author, Lardner's Credibility, vol. ix. p. 329.

§ See, for an account of these two authors, Simon's Histoire des principaux Commentateurs du Nouveau Testament, ch. xxi p. 300.

\* Faustinus Hermianensis, de tribus Capitulis, lib. iii. cap. vi.—Liberatus in Breviario, cap. xxv.

† Acta Concilii Constantinopol. II. seu Eucemenici V. tom. in. Conciliorum, p. 58, edit. Harduin.

‡ Theodoret, after his death, was considered as the parent of the Pelagian and Nestorian heresies, though during his life he was an object of the highest esteem, and died in the communion of the church.

§ This appears by the testimony of Cosmas Indicopleustes, a writer of the sixth century, who was undoubtedly a Nestorian; for this author, in the fifth book of his Christian Topography, which Montfaucon published in his new collection of the Greek fathers, maintains that, of all the Psalms of David, four only are applicable to Christ; and, to confirm this opinion, he boldly asserts, that the writers of the New Testament, when they apply to Jesus the prophecies of the Old, do this by a mere accommodation of the words, without any regard to their true and genuine sense.

divine wisdom had thought fit to reveal them; and were examined with that minuteness and subtlety which were only calculated to cover them with obscurity; and (what was still worse) the theological notions that generally prevailed, were proved rather by the authorities and logical discussions of the ancient doctors, than by the unerring dictates of the divine word. It does not appear that in this century any attempted to form a complete system of theology, unless we give that title to six books of instruction, which Nicetas is said to have composed for the use of the Neophytes.\* But, as we have already observed, the principal branches of religion were laboriously explained in the various books that were written against the Nestorians, Eutychians, Pelagians, and Arians.

VII. The number of those who disputed in this century against paganism and infidelity, was very considerable, yet not greater than the exigency of the times, and the frequent attacks made upon Christianity, rendered necessary. Theodoret in his ingenious and learned treatise, *de curandis Græcorum Affectionibus*, Orientius in his *Commentorium*, and Evagrius in his *Dispute between Zachæus and Apollonius*, opposed, with fortitude and vigour, those who worshipped images, and who offered their religious services to the pagan deities.† To these we may add Philip Sides and Philostorgius, of whom the latter attacked Porphyry, and the former Julian. Basilus of Selesia, Gregentius in his Controversy with Herbanns, and Evagrius in his Dialogue between Theophilus and Judæus, exposed and refuted the errors and cavils of the Jews. Voconius the African, Syagrius in his book concerning Faith, Gemadius of Marseilles, who deserves to be placed in the first rank, and Theodoret in his Treatise concerning the Fables of the Heretics, opposed all the different sects; not to mention those who wrote only against the errors of one or other party of sectaries.

VIII. Those who disputed against the Christian sects, observed a most absurd and vicious method of controversy. They proceeded rather according to the rules of the ancient sophists, and, what is still more surprising, according to the spirit of the Roman law, than by the examples and instructions of Christ and his apostles. In the Roman courts, matters of a difficult and doubtful nature were decided by the authority of certain aged lawyers, who were distinguished by their abilities and experience; and, when they happened to differ in opinion, the point was determined either by a plurality of voices, or by the sentiments of the more learned and illustrious members of that venerable body.‡ This procedure of the Roman tribunals, was, in this century, admitted as a standing law, both in the deliberations of councils, and in the management of religious controversy, to the great and unspeakable detriment of truth; for, by this reason, and even common sense, were in some measure excluded

from every question; and that was determined as right and true, which appeared such to the greatest number, or had been approved by doctors of the greatest note in preceding times. The acts of the various councils, which are yet extant, manifestly show that this was the case; and this circumstance, combined with what we have already observed with respect to the disputants of the age now under consideration, will make it easy for us to imagine the various defects that must have prevailed in the methods of defending truth, and opposing error.

IX. This absurd imitation of the Roman law in the management of religious controversy, and this preposterous method of deciding truth by human authorities, were fruitful sources of spurious and supposititious productions; for many audacious impostors were hence encouraged to publish their own writings under the names of ancient Christian worthies, and even under the sacred names of Christ himself and his holy apostles, that thus, in the deliberations of councils, and in the course of controversy, they might have authorities to oppose to authorities in defence of their respective opinions. The whole Christian church was, in this century, overwhelmed with these spurious productions, these infamous impositions. This is said to have engaged Gelasius, the Roman pontiff, to call a council, composed of the bishops of the Latin church; in which assembly, after a strict examination of those writings which appeared under great and venerable names, the famous decree passed, that deprived so many apocryphal books of their borrowed authority. That something of this kind really happened, it would be, perhaps, an instance of temerity to deny; but many learned men assert, that the decree attributed to Gelasius, labours under the same imputation with the books which it condemns, and was by no means the production of that pontiff, but of some deceiver, who usurped clandestinely his name and authority.\*

X. Eucherius, Salvian, and Nilus, shine with a superior lustre among the moral writers of this century. The epistle of Eucherius, concerning the Contempt of the World and the secular Philosophy, is an excellent performance, both in point of matter and style. The works of Mark the hermit breathe a spirit of fervent piety, but are highly defective in many respects: the matter is ill chosen, and is treated without order, perspicuity, or force of reasoning. Fastidius composed several discourses concerning moral duties; but they have not survived the ruins of time. The works that are yet extant of Diadochus, Prosper, and Severian, are extremely pleasing, on account of the solidity and elegance which are to be found, for the most part, in their moral sentences, though they afford but indifferent entertainment to such as are desirous of precision, method, and sound argumentation; and indeed this want of method in the distribution and arrangement of their matter, and a constant neglect of tracing their subject to its first

\* Gemadius Massiliensis, de Scriptor. Ecclesiast. cap. xxii.

† See, for an account of Orientius and Evagrius, the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. ii. p. 121, and 252.

‡ See the *Codex Theodos.* lib. i. tit. iv. de responsis prudentum.

\* Pearson, *Vindicie Ignatiane*, part i. cap. iv. p. 129.—Cave, *Hist. Liter. Scriptor. Ecclesiast.* p. 260.—Urb. Godofr. Siberus, *Præfat. ad Eucherianum Sæxi*, p. 79.

principles, are defects common to almost all the moral writers of this century.

XI. Had this, indeed, been their only defect, the candid and impartial would have supported it with patience, and attributed it charitably to the infelicity of the times. But many of the writers and teachers of this age did unspeakable injury to the cause of true piety by their crude and enthusiastic inventions. The Mystics, who pretended to higher degrees of perfection than other Christians, drew every where to their party, particularly in the eastern provinces, a vast number of the ignorant and inconsiderate multitude, by the striking appearance of their austere and singular piety. It is impossible to describe the rigour and severity of the laws which these senseless fanatics imposed upon themselves, in order, as they alleged, to appease the Deity, and to deliver the celestial spirit from the bondage of this mortal body. They not only lived among the wild beasts, but also lived after the manner of these savage animals; they ran naked through the lonely deserts with a furious aspect, and with all the agitations of madness and phrensy; they prolonged the existence of their emaciated bodies by the wretched nourishment of grass and wild herbs, avoided the sight and conversation of men, remained motionless in certain places for several years, exposed to the rigour and inclemency of the seasons; and, toward the conclusion of their lives, shut themselves up in narrow and miserable huts; and all this was considered as true piety, the only acceptable method of worshipping the Deity, and rendering him propitious.\* The major part of the Mystics were led into the absurdities of this extravagant discipline, not so much by the pretended force of reason and argument, as by a natural propensity to solitude, a gloomy and melancholy cast of mind, and an implicit and blind submission to the authority and examples of others; for the diseases of the mind, as well as those of the body, are generally contagious, and no pestilence spreads its infection with a more dreadful rapidity than superstition and enthusiasm. Several persons have committed to writing the precepts of this severe discipline, and reduced its absurdities into a sort of system, such as Julianus Pomerius among the Latins,† and many among the Syrians, whose names it is needless to mention.

XII. Of all the instances of superstitious phrensy that disgraced this age, none obtained higher veneration, or excited more the wonder of the multitude, than that of a certain order of men, who were called Stylites by the Greeks, and Sancti Columnares, or Pillar Saints, by the Latins. These were persons of a most singular and extravagant turn of mind, who stood motionless upon the tops of pillars, expressly raised for this exercise of their patience, and remained there for several years, amidst the admiration and applause of the stupid populace. The inventor of this strange and ridiculous discipline was Simeon Sisanites, a Syrian,

who began his follies by changing the agreeable employment of a shepherd for the senseless austerities of the monkish life. But his enthusiasm carried him still greater lengths; for, in order to climb as near heaven as he could, he passed thirty-seven years of his wretched life upon five pillars, of the height of six, twelve, twenty-two, thirty-six, and forty cubits, and thus acquired a most shining reputation, and attracted the veneration of all about him.\* Many of the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine, seduced by a false ambition, and an utter ignorance of true religion, followed the example of this fanatic, though not with the same degree of austerity;‡ and (what is almost incredible) this superstitious practice continued in vogue until the twelfth century, when, however, it was totally suppressed.†

The Latins had too much wisdom and prudence to imitate the Syrians and Orientals in this whimsical superstition; and when a certain fanatic, or impostor, named Wulfilaicus, erected one of these pillars in the country of Treves, and proposed living upon it after the manner of Simeon, the neighbouring bishops ordered it to be pulled down, and thus nipped this species of superstition in the bud.§

XIII. The Mystic rules of discipline and manners had a bad effect upon the moral writers, and those who were set apart for the instruction of Christians. Thus, in instructing the catechumens and others, they were more diligent and zealous in inculcating a regard for the external parts of religion, and an attachment to bodily exercise, than in forming the heart and the affections to inward piety and solid virtue. They even went so far, as to prescribe rules of sanctity and virtue little different from the unnatural rigour and fanatical piety of the Mystics. Salvian, and other celebrated writers, gave it as their opinion, that none could be truly and perfectly holy, but those who abandoned all riches and honours, abstained from matrimony, banished all joy and cheerfulness from their hearts, and macerated their bodies with various sorts of torments and mortifications: and, as all could not support such inordinate degrees of severity, those madmen, or fanatics, whose robust constitutions and savage tempers were the best adapted to this kind of life, were distinguished by the pub-

\* See the *Acta Sanctorum Mensis Januarii*, tom. i. p. 261—277, where the reader will find the account we have given of this whimsical discipline. Theodoret, indeed, had before given several hints of it, alleging, among other things, that Simeon had gradually added to the height of his pillar, in the hope of making nearer approaches to heaven. See Tillenont's *Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. xv. See also the *Acta of Simeon the Stylite*, in *Assemani Act. Martyrum*, vol. ii.

† The learned Frederic Spanheim, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, p. 1154, speaks of a second Simeon the Stylite (mentioned by Evagrius), who lived in the sixth century. This second fanatic seems to have carried his austerities still further than the chief of the sect: for he remained upon his pillar sixty-eight years, and from it, like the first Simeon, he taught, or rather deluded the gazing multitude, declaimed against heresy, pretended to cast out devils, to heal diseases, and to foretell future events.

‡ See *Urb. Godofr. Siberi Diss. de Sanctis Columnaribus*, and *Caroli Majelli Diss. de Stylitis*, published in *Assemani Act. Martyr.* tom. ii. p. 246.

§ Gregor. Turonens. *Histor. Francor. lib. viii. cap. xv.* p. 387.

\* See the *Pratum Spirituale* of Moschus, the *Lausiac History* of Palladius, and *Sulpitius Severus*, Dial. i.

† Pomerius wrote a treatise, *de Vita Contemplativa*, in which the doctrines and precepts of the Mystics were carefully collected.

lic applause, and saw their influence and authority daily increase. Thus saints started up like mushrooms in almost every place.

XIV. A small number of ecclesiastics, animated by the laudable spirit of reformation, boldly attempted to pluck up the roots of this growing superstition, and to bring back the deluded multitude from this vain and chimerical discipline to the practice of solid and genuine piety. But the votaries of superstition, who were superior in number, reputation, and authority, soon reduced them to silence, and rendered their noble and pious efforts utterly ineffectual.\* We have an example of this in the case of Vigilantius, a man remarkable for his learning and eloquence, who was born in Gaul, and thence went to Spain, where he performed the functions of a presbyter. This ecclesiastic, on his return from a voyage he had made into Palestine and Egypt, began, about the commencement of this century, to propagate several doctrines, and to publish repeated exhortations quite opposite to the opinions and manners of the times. Among other things, he denied that the tombs and the bones of the martyrs ought to be honoured with any sort of homage or worship, and therefore censured the pilgrimages that were made to places which were reputed holy. He turned into derision the prodigies which were said to be wrought in the temples consecrated to martyrs, and condemned the custom of performing vigils in them. He asserted, and indeed with reason, that the custom of burning tapers at the tombs of the martyrs in broad day, was imprudently borrowed from the ancient superstition of the Pagans. He maintained, moreover, that prayers addressed to departed saints were void of all efficacy: and treated with contempt fasting and mortifications, the celibacy of the clergy, and the various austerities of the monastic life; and, finally, he affirmed, that the conduct of those who, distributing their substance among the indigent, submitted to the hardships of a voluntary poverty, or sent a part of their treasures to Jerusalem for devout purposes, had nothing in it acceptable to the Deity.

There were among the Gallic and Spanish bishops several who approved the opinions of Vigilantius: but Jerome, the great monk of the age, assailed this bold reformer of religion with such bitterness and fury, that the honest presbyter soon found that nothing but his silence could preserve his life from the intemperate rage of bigotry and superstition. This project then of reforming the corruptions, which a fanatical and superstitious zeal had introduced into the church, was choked in its birth;† and the name of the good Vigilantius remains still in that list of heretics, which is acknowledged as authentic by those who, without any regard to their own judgment or the declarations of Scripture, blindly follow the decisions of antiquity.

XV. The controversies, which had been raised in Egypt, concerning Origen and his doctrine, toward the conclusion of the preceding century, were now renewed at Constantinople, and carried on without either decency or prudence. The Nitrian monks, banished from Egypt on account of their attachment to Origen, took refuge at Constantinople, and were treated by John Chrysostom, the bishop of that city, with clemency and benignity. This no sooner came to the knowledge of Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, than he formed a perfidious project against the eloquent prelate, and sent the famous Epiphanius, with several other bishops, to Constantinople, to compass his fall, and deprive him of his episcopal dignity. No time could be more favourable for the execution of this project than that in which it was formed; for Chrysostom, by his austerity, and his vehement declamations against the vices of the people, and the corrupt manners of the ladies of the court, had incurred the displeasure of many, and had also excited, in a more particular manner, the resentment and indignation of the empress Eudoxia, wife of Arcadius. This violent princess sent for Theophilus and the Egyptian bishops, who, pursuant to her orders, repaired to Constantinople, and, having called a council, inquired into the religious sentiments of Chrysostom, and examined his morals, and the whole course of his conduct and conversation, with the utmost severity. This council, which was holden in the suburbs of Chalcedon, in 403, with Theophilus at its head, declared Chrysostom unworthy of his high rank in the church, on account of his favourable inclinations toward Origen and his followers: and, in consequence of this decree, condemned him to banishment. The people of Constantinople, who were tenderly attached to their pious and worthy bishop, rose in a tumultuous manner, and prevented the execution of this unrighteous sentence.‡ When this tumult was entirely hushed, the same unrelenting judges, in order to satisfy their vindictive rage and that of Eudoxia, renewed their sentence, in the following year, under another pretext,§ and with greater effect; for the pious Chrysostom, yielding to the redoubled efforts of his enemies, was banished to Cucusus, a city of Cilicia, where he died about three years after.¶

The exile of this illustrious man was followed by a terrible sedition of the Johannists (so his votaries were called,) which was calmed, though with much difficulty, by the edicts of

\* This is not quite exact; for it appears, by the accounts of the best historians, that this sentence was really executed, and that the emperor confirmed the decree of this first synod, by banishing Chrysostom into Bithynia; or, as others allege, by ordering him to retire into the country. A violent earthquake and a terrible shower of hail, which were looked upon by the multitude as judgments occasioned by the unrighteous persecution of their pious bishop, alarmed the court, and engaged them to recall Chrysostom to his office.

† See Tillemont and Hermant, who have both written the life of Chrysostom; as also Bayle's Dictionary, at the article *Acacius*.

‡ See Tillemont and Hermant, who have both written the life of Chrysostom; as also Bayle's Dictionary, at the article *Acacius*.

\* Augustin complains of this, in his famous epistle to Januarius, No. 119.

† Bayle's Dictionary, at the article *Vigilantius*.—Barbeyrac, de la Morale des Peres, p. 252.—Ger. Jo. Vos sius, Theses Historico-Theologicæ, p. 170.—Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. ii. p. 57.

Arcadius.\* It is beyond all doubt, that the proceedings against Chrysostom were cruel and unjust; in this however he was to blame, that he assumed the authority and rank, which had been granted by the council of Constantinople to the bishops of that city, and even acted as a judge of the controversy between Theophilus and the Egyptian monks, which the Alexandrian prelate could not behold without the utmost impatience and resentment. These monks, when they lost their protector, were restored to the favour of Theophilus; but the faction of the Origenists continued, notwithstanding all this, to flourish in Egypt, Syria, and the adjacent countries, and held their chief residence at Jerusalem.

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### *Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. To enumerate the rites and institutions that were added, in this century, to the Christian worship, would require a volume of a considerable size. The acts of councils, and the records left us by the most celebrated ancient writers, are the sources from which the curious may draw a particular and satisfactory account of this matter; and to these we refer such as are desirous of something more than a general view of the subject under consideration. Several of these ancient writers, uncorrupted by the contagious examples of the times in which they lived, have ingenuously acknowledged, that true piety and virtue were smothered, as it were, under that enormous burthen of ceremonies under which they lay groaning in this century. This evil was owing, partly to the ignorance and dishonesty of the clergy, partly to the calamities of the times, which were extremely unfavourable to the pursuit of knowledge, and to the culture of the mind; and partly, indeed, to the natural depravity of imperfect mortals, who are much more disposed to worship with the eye than with the heart, and are more ready to offer to the Deity the laborious pomp of an outward service, than the nobler, yet simple oblation of pious dispositions and holy affections.

II. Divine worship was now daily rising from one degree of pomp to another, and degenerating more and more into a gaudy spectacle, only calculated to attract the stupid admiration of a gazing populace. The sacerdotal garments were embellished with a variety of ornaments, with a view of exciting in the minds of the multitude a greater veneration for the sacred order. New acts of devotion were also celebrated. In Gaul, particularly, the solemn prayers and supplications, which usually precede the anniversary of Christ's ascension, were now instituted for the first time.† In other places, perpetual acclamations of praise to God were performed both night and day by successive singers, so that the service

suffered no interruption;\* as if the Supreme Being took pleasure in such noisy and turbulent shouting, or received any gratification from the blandishments of men. The riches and magnificence of the churches exceeded all bounds.† They were also adorned with costly images, among which, in consequence of the Nestorian controversy, that of the Virgin Mary, holding the child Jesus in her arms, obtained the principal place. The altars, and the chests in which the relics were preserved, were in most places made of solid silver; and from this we may easily imagine the splendour and expenses that were lavished upon the other utensils which were employed in the service of the church.

III. On the other hand, the *agapæ*, or feasts of charity, were now suppressed on account of the abuses to which they gave occasion, amidst the daily decline of that piety and virtue, which had rendered these meetings useful and edifying in the primitive ages.

A new method also of proceeding with penitents was introduced into the Latin church; for grievous offenders, who had formerly been obliged to confess their guilt in the face of the congregation, were now delivered from this mortifying penalty, and obtained, from Leo the Great, a permission to confess their crimes privately to a priest appointed for that purpose. By this change of the ancient discipline, one of the greatest restraints upon licentiousness (and the only remaining barrier of chastity,) was entirely removed, and the actions of Christians were subject to no other scrutiny than that of the clergy; a change, which was frequently convenient for the sinner, and also advantageous in many respects to the sacred order.

#### CHAPTER V.

##### *Concerning the Dissensions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. SEVERAL of those sects, which had divided the church in the preceding ages, renewed their efforts at this time, to propagate their respective opinions, and introduced new tumults and animosities among the Christians. We shall say nothing of the Novatians, Marcionites, and Manicheans, those inauspicious and fatal names which disgrace the earlier annals of the church, though it is evident, that those sects still subsisted, and were even numerous in many places. We shall confine ourselves to an account of the Donatists and Arians, who were the pests of the preceding century.

The Donatists had hitherto maintained themselves with a successful obstinacy, and their affairs were in a good state. But, about the beginning of this century, the face of things changed much to their disadvantage, by the means of St. Augustine, bishop of Hippo. The catholic bishops of Africa, animated by the exhortations, and conducted by the counsels of this zealous prelate, exerted themselves with the utmost vigour in the destruction of

\* See Cyrilli Vita Sabæ in Cotelerii Monument. Eccles. Græc. tom. ii. p. 274. Jos. Sim. Asseman. Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 31.

† See Sidonius Apollinaris, Epist. lib. v. Epist. xvi. lib. vi. Epist. i.; as also Martenne, Thesaurus Anecdotorum, tom. v.

\* Gervais, Histoire de Suger, tom. i. p. 23.

† See Zacharias of Mitylene, de Opificio Mundi, p. 185.



those seditious sectaries, whom they justly looked upon, not only as troublesome to the church by their obstinacy, but also as a nuisance to the state by the brutal soldiery\* which they employed in their cause. Accordingly deputies were sent, in 404, from the council of Carthage to the emperor Honorius, to request, that the laws enacted against heretics, by the preceding emperors, might have force against the Donatists, who denied that they belonged to the heretical tribe; and also to desire, that bounds might be set to the barbarous fury of the Circumcelliones. The first step that the emperor took, in consequence of this request, was to impose a fine upon all the Donatists who refused to return into the bosom of the church, and to send their bishops and docters into banishment. In the following year, new laws, much more severe than the former, were enacted against this rebellious sect, under the title of Acts of Uniformity; and, as the magistrates were remiss in the execution of them, the council of Carthage, in 407, sent a second time deputies to the emperor, to desire that certain persons might be appointed to execute the new edicts with vigour and impartiality; and this request was granted.

II. The Donatist faction, though much broken by these repeated shocks, was yet far from being totally extinguished. It recovered a part of its strength in 408, after Stilicho had been put to death by the order of Honorius, and gained an accession of vigour in the following year, in which the emperor published a law in favour of liberty of conscience, and prohibited all compulsion in matters of religion. This law, however, was not of long duration. It was abrogated at the earnest and repeated solicitations of the council, which met at Carthage in 419; and Marcellinus the tribune was sent by Honorius into Africa, with full power to bring to a conclusion this tedious and unhappy contest. Marcellinus, therefore, held at Carthage, in 411, a solemn conference, in which he examined the cause with much attention, heard the contending parties during the space of three days, and, at length, pronounced sentence in favour of the catholics.† The catholic bishops, who were present at this conference, were 286 in number; and those of the Donatists were 279. The latter, upon their defeat, appealed to the emperor, but without effect. The glory of their defeat was due to Augustine, who bore the principal part in this controversy, and who, indeed, by his writings, counsels, and admonitions, governed almost

the whole African church, and also the principal and most illustrious heads of that extensive province.

III. This conference greatly weakened the party of the Donatists; nor could they ever get the better of this terrible shock, though the face of affairs changed afterwards in a manner that seemed to revive their hopes. The greatest part of them, through the fear of punishment, submitted to the emperor's decree, and returned into the bosom of the church; while the severest penalties were inflicted upon those who remained obstinate, and persisted in their rebellion. Fines, banishment, confiscation of goods, were the ordinary punishments of the obstinate Donatists; and even the pain of death was inflicted upon such as surpassed the rest in perverseness, and were the seditious ringleaders of that stubborn faction. Some avoided these penalties by flight, others by concealing themselves, and some were so desperate as to seek deliverance by self-murder, to which the Donatists had a shocking propensity. In the mean time, the Circumcelliones used more violent methods of warding off the execution of the sentence that was pronounced against their sect; for they ran up and down through the province of Africa in the most outrageous manner, committing acts of great cruelty, and defending themselves by force of arms.

The Donatists, indeed, recovered afterwards their former liberty and tranquillity by the success and protection they received from the Vandals, who invaded Africa, with Genseric at their head, in 427, and took that province out of the hands of the Romans. The wounds, however, which this sect had received from the vigorous execution of the imperial laws, were so deep, that, though it began to revive and multiply by the assistance of the Vandals, it could never regain its former strength and lustre.

IV. The Arians, oppressed and persecuted by the imperial edicts, took refuge among those fierce and savage nations, who were gradually overturning the western empire, and found among the Goths, Suevi, Heruli, Vandals, and Burgundians, a fixed residence and a peaceful retreat; and, as their security animated their courage, they treated the catholics with the same violence which the latter had employed against them and other heretics, and harassed and persecuted in various ways such as professed their adherence to the Nicene doctrines. The Vandals, who reigned in Africa, surpassed all the other savage nations in barbarity and injustice toward the catholics. The kings of this fierce people, particularly Genseric and Himeric his son, pulled down the churches of those Christians who acknowledged the divinity of Christ, sent their bishops into exile, and maimed and tormented such as were nobly firm and inflexible in the profession of their faith.\* They however declared, that, in using these severe and violent methods, they were authorised by the example of the emperors, who had enacted laws of the same rigorous nature against the Donatists, the Arians, and

\* The Circumcelliones already mentioned.

† See Fraunce Balduin, Hist. Collationis Carthage, in Optat. Milv. Pimian. p. 337. It is proper to observe here, that this meeting, holden by Marcellinus, is very improperly termed a conference (collatio); for there was no dispute carried on at this meeting, between the catholics and the Donatists, nor did any of the parties endeavour to gain or defeat the other by superiority of argument. This conference, then, was properly a judicial trial, in which Marcellinus was by the emperor, appointed judge, or arbiter, of a religious controversy, and accordingly pronounced sentence after a proper hearing of the cause. It appears, therefore, from this event, that the notion of a supreme spiritual judge of controversy, and ruler of the church appointed by Christ, had not yet entered into any one's head, since we see the African bishops themselves appealing to the emperor in the present religious question.

\* See Victor Vitens. lib. iii. de Persequutione Vandalicæ, which Theod. Ruiuart published at Paris in 1694, with his own history of the same persecution.

other sects who differed in opinion from the Christians of Constantinople.\*

We must not here omit mentioning the stupendous miracle, which is said to have been wrought during these persecutions in Africa, and by which the Supreme Being is supposed to have declared his displeasure against the Arians, and his favour toward their adversaries. This miracle consisted in enabling those catholics, whose tongues had been cut out by the Arian tyrant Huneric, to speak distinctly, and to proclaim aloud the divine majesty of the Saviour of the world. This remarkable fact can scarcely be denied, since it is supported by the testimony of the most credible and respectable witnesses;† but whether it is to be

\* See the edict of Huneric, in the history of Victor, lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 64.

† These witnesses, who had themselves oculardemonstration of the fact, were Victor of Utica, Euseus of Gaza (who examined the mouths of the persons in question, and found that their tongues were entirely rooted out), Procopius, Marcellinus the count, and the emperor Justinian. Upon the authority of such respectable testimonies, the learned Abadie formed a laboured and dexterous defence of the miraculous nature of this extraordinary fact, in his work entitled, *La Triomphe de la Providence*, vol. iii. p. 255, where all the fire of his zeal, and all the subtlety of his logic, seem to have been exhausted. Dr. Berriman, in his *Historical Account of the Trinitarian Controversy*, as also in his sermons, preached at Lady Moyer's Lectures, in 1725, and Dr. Chapman, in his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, have maintained the same hypothesis. To the former, an answer was published by an anonymous writer, under the following title: "An Enquiry into the Miracle said to have been wrought in the fifth century, upon some orthodox Christians, in favour of the Doctrine of the Trinity, &c. in a Letter to a Friend." We may venture to say, that this answer is utterly unsatisfactory. The author of it, after having laboured to invalidate the testimony alleged in favour of the fact, seems himself scarcely convinced by his own arguments; for he acknowledges at last the possibility of the event, but persists in denying the miracle, and supposes, that the cruel operation was so imperfectly performed upon these confessors, as to leave in some of them such a share of the tongue, as was sufficient for the use of speech. Dr. Middleton, (to whom some have attributed the above-mentioned answer) maintains the same hypothesis, in his *Free Enquiry into the Miraculous Powers, &c.* supposing, that the tongues of the persons in question were not entirely rooted out, which he corroborates by the following consideration, that two of the sufferers are said to have utterly lost the faculty of speaking; for, though this might be ascribed to a peculiar judgment of God, punishing the immoralities of which they were afterwards guilty, yet this appears to be a forced and improbable solution of the matter, in the opinion of the doctor, who imagines that he solves it better by supposing, that they had not been deprived of their entire tongues. He goes yet further, and produces two cases from the *Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences at Paris*, which prove, in his opinion, "That this pretended miracle owed its whole credit to our ignorance of the powers of nature." The first is that of "a girl born without a tongue, who yet talked as easily and distinctly, as if she had enjoyed the full benefit of that organ;" and the second, that of "a boy, who, at the age of eight or nine years, lost his tongue by a gangrene, or ulcer, and yet retained the faculty of speaking." See *Middleton's Free Enquiry*, p. 183, 184.

This reasoning of the sceptical doctor of divinity appeared superficial and unsatisfactory to the judicious Mr. Dodwell, who (saying nothing about the case of the two Trinitarians who remained dumb, after their tongues were cut out, and whose dumbness is but indifferently accounted for by their immorality, since *gifts* have been often possessed without *grace*) confines himself to the consideration of the two parallel facts drawn from the *Academical Memoirs* already mentioned. To show that these facts prove little or nothing against the miracle in question, he justly observes, that though, in one or two particular cases, a mouth may be so singularly formed as to utter articulate sounds, without the usual instrument of speech, (some excrescence probably supplying the defect,) yet it cannot be any thing less than miraculous,

attributed to a supernatural and miraculous power, is a point which admits dispute.\*

V. A new sect, which was the source of most fatal and deplorable divisions in the Christian church, was formed by Nestorius, a Syrian bishop of Constantinople, a disciple of the celebrated Theodore of Mopsuestia, and a man remarkable for his learning and eloquence, which were, however, accompanied with much levity, and with intolerable arrogance. Before we enter into a particular account of the doctrine of this sectary, it is pro-

posed that this should happen to a considerable number of persons, whose tongues were cut out to prevent their preaching a discountenanced doctrine. To deny the miracle in question, we must maintain, that it is as easy to speak without a tongue, as with it. See Mr. Dodwell's *Free Answer* to Dr. Middleton's *Free Enquiry*, p. 96.

Mr. Toll, who defended Middleton's hypothesis, has proposed an objection, *a priori*, as it may be justly called, to the truth of this miracle. He observes, that the occasion on which it was wrought was not of sufficient consequence or necessity to require a divine interposition; for it was not wrought to convert infidels to Christianity, but to bring over the followers of Arius to the Athanasian faith; it was wrought, in a word, for the explication of a doctrine, which both sides allowed to be founded in the New Testament. Now, as the Scriptures are a revelation of the will of God, "it seems," (says Mr. Toll) to cast a reflection on his wisdom, as if he did things by halves, to suppose it necessary for him to work miracles, in order to ascertain the sense of those Scriptures. This (continues he) would be multiplying miracles to an infinite degree;—besides, it would destroy the universal truth of that proposition from which we cannot depart, namely, that the Scriptures are sufficiently plain in all things necessary to salvation." See Mr. Toll's *Defence of Dr. Middleton's Free Enquiry*, against Mr. Dodwell's *Free Answer*. To this specious objection Mr. Dodwell replies, that on the doctrine in dispute between the Arians and the orthodox, the true notion, as well as the importance and reality of our salvation, may be said to depend; that the doctrines, duties, and motives of Christianity, are exalted or debased, as we embrace one or the other of those systems; that, on the divinity of Christ, the meritoriousness of the propitiation offered by him must entirely rest; and that, therefore, no occasion of greater consequence can be assigned on which a miracle might be expected. He adds, that the disputes which men have raised about certain doctrines, are no proof that these doctrines are not plainly revealed in Scripture, since this would prove that no truth is there sufficiently revealed, because, at one time or other, they have been all disputed; and he observes judiciously, that the expediency of interposing by miracles, is what we always are not competent judges of, since God alone knows the times, seasons, and occasions, in which it is proper to alter the usual course of nature, in order to maintain the truth, to support the oppressed, and to carry on the great purposes of his gospel kingdom. It is enough, that the present interposition be not *incredible*, to remove Mr. Toll's objection, without considering its particular use, and the unexcusable manner in which it is attested. See Mr. Dodwell's *Full and final Reply to Mr. Toll's Defence*, p. 270.

We must observe here that the latter objection and answer are merely hypotheticalal, i. e. they draw their force only from the different opinions, which the ingenious Mr. Toll and his learned antagonist entertain concerning the importance of the doctrine, in favour of which this pretended miracle is said to have been wrought. The grand question, whose decision alone can finish this controversy, is, whether the tongues of these African confessors were entirely rooted out, or not. The case of the two who remained dumb furnishes a shrewd presumption, that the cruel operation was not equally performed upon all. The immorality of these two, and the judgment of God, suspending with respect to them the influence of the miracle, do not solve this difficulty entirely, since (as we observed above) many have possessed supernatural gifts without grace; and Christ tells us, that many have cast out devils in his name, whom at the last day he will not acknowledge as his faithful servants.

\* See Ruinart's *Histor. Persequut. Vandal.* part ii. cap. vii. p. 422. See *Bibliothèque Britannique*, tom. iii. part ii. p. 339. tom. v. part i. p. 171.

per to observe, that though, by the decrees of former councils, it had been clearly and pre-emptorily determined, that Christ was, at the same time, true God and true man, yet no council had hitherto decreed any thing concerning the *manner* and *effect* of this union of the two natures in the divine Saviour; nor had this point yet become a topic of inquiry or dispute among Christians. The consequence of this was, that the Christian doctors expressed themselves differently on the subject of this mystery. Some used such forms of expression as seemed to widen the difference between the Son of God and the son of man, and thus to divide the nature of Christ into two distinct persons. Others, on the contrary, seemed to confound too much the Son of God with the son of man, and to suppose the nature of Christ composed of his divinity and humanity blended into one.

The heresy of Apollinaris had given occasion to these different ways of speaking; for he maintained that the man Christ was not endowed with a human soul, but with the divine nature, which was substituted in its place, and performed its functions; and this doctrine manifestly supposed a confusion of the two natures in the Messiah. The Syrian doctors, therefore, that they might avoid the errors of Apollinaris, and exclude his followers from the communion of the church, were careful in establishing an accurate distinction between the divine and the human nature in the Son of God; and for this purpose they used such forms of expression as seemed to favour the notion of Christ's being composed of two distinct persons. The manner of speaking, adopted by the Alexandrians and Egyptians, had a different tendency, and seemed to countenance the doctrine of Apollinaris, and, by a confusion of the two natures, to blend them into one. Nestorius, who was a Syrian, and had adopted the sentiments of the divines of his nation, was a violent enemy to all the sects, but to none so much as to the Apollinarian faction, at whose ruin he aimed with an ardent and inextinguishable zeal. He therefore discoursed of the two natures in Christ after the Syrian manner, and commanded his disciples to distinguish carefully between the actions and perceptions\* of the Son of God, and those of the son of man.†

VI. The occasion of this disagreeable controversy was furnished by the presbyter Anastasius, a friend of Nestorius. This ecclesiastic, in a public discourse, delivered in 428, declaimed warmly against the title of *θεοτοκος*, or *mother of God*, which was now more frequently attributed to the Virgin Mary, in the con-

trovery against the Arians, than it had formerly been, and was a favourite term with the followers of Apollinaris. He, at the same time, gave it as his opinion, that the Holy Virgin was rather to be called *Χειροτοκος*, i. e. *mother of Christ*, since the Deity can neither be born nor die, and, of consequence, the son of man alone could derive his birth from an earthly parent. Nestorius applauded these sentiments, and explained and defended them in several discourses.\* But both he and his friend Anastasius were keenly opposed by certain monks of Constantinople, who maintained that the son of Mary was God incarnate, and excited the zeal and fury of the populace to maintain this doctrine against Nestorius. Notwithstanding all this, the discourses of the latter were extremely well received in many places, and had the majority on their side. The Egyptian monks had no sooner perused them, than they were persuaded, by the weight of the arguments they contained, to embrace the opinions of Nestorius, and accordingly ceased to call the Blessed Virgin the mother of God.

VII. The prelate who then ruled the see of Alexandria, was Cyril, a man of a haughty, turbulent, and imperious temper, and painfully jealous of the rising power and authority of the bishop of Constantinople. As soon as this controversy came to his knowledge, he censured the Egyptian monks and Nestorius; and, finding the latter little disposed to submit to his censure, he proceeded to violent measures; took counsel with Celestine, bishop of Rome, whom he had engaged on his side; assembled a council at Alexandria in 439; and hurled twelve anathemas at the head of Nestorius. The thunderstricken prelate did not sink under this violent shock; but, seeing himself unjustly accused of derogating from the majesty of Christ, he retorted the same accusation upon his adversary, charged him with the Apollinarian heresy, with confounding the two natures in Christ, and loaded Cyril with as many anathemas as he had received from him. This unhappy contest between prelates of the first order, proceeded rather from corrupt motives of jealousy and ambition, than from a sincere and disinterested zeal for the truth, and was the source of unnumbered evils and calamities.

VIII. When the spirits were so exasperated on both sides, by reciprocal excommunications and polemic writings, that there was no prospect of an amicable issue to this unintelligible controversy, Theodosius the younger called a council at Ephesus, in 431, which was the third general council in the annals of the church. In this council Cyril presided, though he was the party concerned, and the avowed enemy of Nestorius; and he proposed examining and determining the matter in debate before John of Antioch and the other eastern bishops arrived. Nestorius objected to this proceeding, as irregular and unjust; but, his remonstrances being without effect, he refused to comply with the summons which called him to appear before the council. Cyril, on the other hand, pushing on matters with a lawless violence,

\* The original word *passio*, which signifies properly *suffering* or *passion*, we have here translated by the general term, *perception*, because suffering or passion cannot be, in any sense, attributed to the divine nature.

† The Jesuit Doucin published at Paris, in 1716, a History of Nestorianism: but it is such a history as might be expected from a writer, who was obliged, by his profession, to place the arrogant Cyril among the saints, and Nestorius among the heretics. The ancient writers, on both sides of this controversy, are mentioned by Jo. Franc. Buddeus, in his *Sagece in Theologiam*, tom. ii. The accounts given of this dispute by the oriental writers, are collected by Renaudot, in his *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrin.* and by Jos. Sim. Assmannus, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.*

\* See Harduini *Concilia*, tom. i.; and the *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii.

Nestorius was judged without being heard; and, during the absence of a great number of those bishops who belonged to the council, he was compared with the traitor Judas, charged with blasphemy against the divine majesty, deprived of his episcopal dignity, and sent into exile, where he finished his days.\* The transactions of this council will appear to the candid and equitable reader in the most unfavourable light, as full of low artifice, contrary to all the rules of justice, and even destitute of the least air of common decency. The doctrine, however, that was established in it concerning Christ, was that which has been always acknowledged and adopted by the majority of Christians, viz. "That Christ was *one divine person*, in whom *two natures* were most closely and intimately united, but without being mixed or confounded."

IX. Nestorius, among accusations of less moment, was charged with dividing the nature of Christ into two distinct persons, and with having maintained, that the divine nature was superadded to the human nature of Jesus, after it was formed, and was no more than an auxiliary support to the man Christ, through the whole of his life. Nestorius denied this charge even to the last, and solemnly professed his entire disapprobation of this doctrine.† Nor indeed was this opinion ever proposed by him in any of his writings: it was only charged upon him by his iniquitous adversaries as a consequence drawn from some incautious and ambiguous terms he used, and particularly from his refusing to call the Virgin Mary the *mother of God*.‡ Hence many, and indeed the majority of writers, both ancient and modern, after a thorough examination of this matter, have positively concluded, that the opinions of Nestorius, and of the council which condemned them, were the same in effect; that their difference was in words only, and that the whole blame of this unhappy controversy was to be charged upon the turbulent spirit of Cyril, and his aversion to Nestorius.§

\* Those who desire a more ample account of this council, may consult the *Variorum Patrum Epistole ad Concilium Ephesinum pertinentes*, published at Louvain in 1682, from some Vatican and other manuscripts by Christian Lupus. Nestorius, in consequence of the sentence pronounced against him in this council, was first banished to Petra in Arabia, and afterwards to Oasis, a solitary place in the deserts of Egypt, where he died in 435. The accounts given of his tragical death by Evagrius, in his *Ecl. Hist. lib. i. cap. vii.* and by Theodorus the Reader, *Hist. Ecl. lib. ii. p. 565.* are entirely fabulous. ¶ Dr. Mosheim's account of the time of Nestorius' death is perhaps inexact; for it appears that Nestorius was at Oasis, when Socrates wrote, that is, in 439. See *Socrat. lib. vii. cap. xxiv.*

† See Garnier's edition of the works of Marius Mercator, tom. ii. p. 286. See also the fragments of some letters from Nestorius, which are to be found in the *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. ii.*

‡ It is remarkable, that Cyril would not hear the explanations which Nestorius offered to give of his doctrine. The latter even offered to grant the title of Mother of God to the Virgin Mary, provided that nothing else was thereby meant, but that the man born of her was united to the divinity. See *Socrat. lib. vii. cap. xxiv.*

§ Luther was the first of the modern writers who brought thus; and he inveighed against Cyril, with the most bitter bitterness, in his book of *Conciliis*, tom. viii. op. Altenb. p. 265, 266, 273. See also Bayle's Dictionary, at the articles Nestorius and Rodou.—*Christ. August.*

This judgment may be just upon the whole; but it is, however, true, that Nestorius committed two faults in the course of this controversy. The first was, his giving offence to many Christians by abrogating a trite and innocent term;\* and the second, his presumptuously attempting to explain, by uncouth comparisons and improper expressions, a mystery which infinitely surpasses the extent of our imperfect reason. If to these defects we add the despotic spirit and the excessive warmth of this persecuted prelate, it will be difficult to decide who is most to be blamed, as the principal fomenter of this violent contest, Cyril or Nestorius.†

X. The council of Ephesus, instead of healing these divisions, only inflamed them more and more, and almost destroyed all hope of restoring concord and tranquillity in the church. John of Antioch, and the other eastern bishops, for whose arrival Cyril had refused to wait, met at Ephesus, and pronounced against him and Memnon, the bishop of that city, who was his creature, as severe a sentence as they had thundered against Nestorius. Hence arose a new and obstinate dissension between Cyril and the Orientals, with the bishop of Antioch at their head. This flame indeed abated in 433, after Cyril had received the articles of faith drawn up by John, and abandoned certain phrases and expressions, of which the litigious might make a pernicious use. But the commotions, which arose from this fatal controversy, were more durable in the east.‡ Nothing could oppose the progress of Nestorianism in those parts. The disciples and friends of the persecuted prelate carried his doctrine through all the Oriental provinces, and erected every where congregations which professed an invincible opposition to the decrees of the council of Ephesus. The Persians, among others, opposed Cyril in the most vigorous manner, maintained that Nestorius had been unjustly condemned at Ephesus, and charged Cyril with removing that distinction which subsists between the two natures in Christ. But

Salig. de Eutychnismo ante Eutychem, p. 200.—Otto Fred. Schultzius, de Vita Chytraei, lib. ii. cap. xxix. p. 190, 191.—Jo. Voigt Biblioth. Historie Hæresiologicalæ, tom. i. part. iii. p. 457.—Paul. Ernest. Jablonsky, Exerc. de Nestorianismo.—Thesaur. Epistolic. Crozianus, tom. i. p. 184, tom. iii. p. 175.—La Vie de la Croze, par Jordan, p. 231, and many others. As to the faults that have been laid to the charge of Nestorius, they are collected by Asseman in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. iii. part. ii. p. 210.*

\* The title of *Mother of God*, applied to the Virgin Mary, is not perhaps so innocent as Dr. Mosheim takes it to be. To the judicious and learned it can present no idea at all; and to the ignorant and unwary it may present the most absurd and monstrous notions. The invention and use of such mysterious terms, as have no place in Scripture, are undoubtedly pernicious to true religion.

† There is no difficulty at all in deciding this question. Nestorius, though possessed of an arrogant and persecuting spirit in general, yet does not seem to deserve, in this particular case, the reproaches that are due to Cyril. Anastasius, not Nestorius, was the first who kindled the flame; and Nestorius was the suffering and persecuted party from the beginning of the controversy to his death. His offers of accommodation were refused, his explanations were not read, his submission was rejected, and he was condemned unheard.

‡ See *Christ. Aug. Salig. de Eutychnismo ante Eutychem* p. 243.

nothing tended so much to propagate with rapidity the doctrine of Nestorius, as its being received in the famous school which had for a long time flourished at Edessa. For the doctors of this renowned academy not only instructed the youth in the Nestorian tenets, but translated from the Greek into the Syriac language the books of Nestorius; of his master Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and the writings also of Diodorus of Tarsus, and spread them abroad throughout Assyria and Persia.\*

XI. Of all the promoters of the Nestorian cause, there was not one to whom it has such weighty obligations as to the famous Barsumas, who was removed from his place in the school of Edessa, and created bishop of Nisibis in 435. This zealous prelate laboured with incredible assiduity and dexterity, from the year 440 to 485, to procure, for the Nestorians, a solid and permanent settlement in Persia; and he was vigorously seconded in this undertaking by Maanes bishop of Ardascira. So remarkable was the success which crowned the labours of Barsumas, that his fame extended throughout the east; and those Nestorians who still remain in Chaldæa, Persia, Assyria, and the adjacent countries, consider him alone, and not without reason, as their parent and founder. This indefatigable ecclesiastic not only persuaded Firouz, the Persian monarch, to expel from his dominions such Christians as had adopted the opinions of the Greeks, and to admit the Nestorians in their place, but he even engaged him to put the latter in possession of the principal seat of ecclesiastical authority in Persia, the see of Seleucia, which the Patriarch, or Catholic of the Nestorians, has always filled even down to our time.† The zeal and activity of Barsumas did not end here: he erected a famous school at Nisibis, whence issued those Nestorian doctors, who, in this and the following century, spread abroad their tenets through Egypt, Syria, Arabia, India, Tartary, and China.‡

XII. The Nestorians, before their affairs were thus happily settled, had been divided among themselves with respect to the method of explaining their doctrine. Some maintained, that the manner in which the two natures were united in Christ, was absolutely unknown; others that the union of the divine nature with the man Jesus was only an union of will, operation, and dignity.§ This dissension, how-

ever, entirely ceased, when the Nestorians were gathered into one religious community, and lived in tranquillity under their own ecclesiastical government and laws. Their doctrine, as it was then determined in several councils assembled at Seleucia, amounts to what follows: "That in the Saviour of the world, there were two persons, or *υποστασεις*; of which one was divine, even the eternal word; and the other, which was human, was the man Jesus; that these two persons had only one aspect; that the union between the Son of God and the son of man, was formed in the moment of the Virgin's conception, and was never to be dissolved; that it was not, however, an union of nature or of person, but only of will and affection; that Christ was, therefore, to be carefully distinguished from God, who dwelt in him as in his temple; and that Mary was to be called the mother of Christ, and not the mother of God."

The abettors of this doctrine hold Nestorius in the highest veneration, as a man of singular and eminent sanctity, and worthy to be had in perpetual remembrance: but they maintain, at the same time, that the doctrine he taught was much older than himself, and had been handed down from the earliest times of the Christian church; and for this reason they absolutely refused the title of Nestorians; and, indeed, if we examine the matter attentively, we shall find, that Barsumas and his followers, instead of teaching their disciples precisely the doctrine of Nestorius, rather polished and improved his uncouth system to their own taste, and added to it several tenets of which the good man never dreamed.

XIII. A violent aversion to the Nestorian errors led many into the opposite extreme. This was the case with the famous Eutyches, an abbot at Constantinople, and founder of a sect, which was in direct opposition to that of Nestorius, yet equally prejudicial to the interests of the Christian church, by the pestilential discords and animosities it produced. The opinions of this new faction shot like lightning through the east: and it acquired such strength in its progress, as to create much uneasiness, both to the Greeks and Nestorians, whose most vigorous efforts were not sufficient to prevent its rising to a high degree of credit and splendour. Eutyches began these troubles in 448, when he was far advanced in years; and, to exert his utmost force and vehemence in opposing the progress of the Nestorian doctrine, he expressed his sentiments concerning the person of Christ, in the very terms which the Egyptians made use of for that purpose, and taught, that in Christ there was only one nature, namely, that of the incarnate word.‡

\* See Assmanni Biblioth. tom. i. p. 361; tom. iii. part ii. p. 69. This learned author may be advantageously used to correct what Renaudot has said (in the second tome of his Liturgie Orientales, p. 29.) concerning the rise of the Nestorian doctrine in the eastern provinces. See also the Ecclesiastical History of Theodorus the Reader, book ii. p. 558.

† The bishop of Seleucia was, by the twenty third canon of the council of Nice, honoured with peculiar marks of distinction, and among others with the title of Catholic. He was invested with the power of ordaining archbishops (a privilege which belonged to the patriarchs alone) exalted above all the Grecian Bishops, honoured as a patriarch, and, in the œcumenical councils, was the sixth in rank after the bishop of Jerusalem. See Acta Concilii Niceni Arab. Alphons. Pisan. lib. iii. cap. xxxii. xxxiv.

‡ See, for an ample account of this matter, Assmanni Biblioth. tom. iii. part ii. p. 77.

§ Leontius Byzant. adversus Nestorian. et Eutychian. p. 537. tom. i. Lecton. Antiquar. Henr. Causii. - Jac. Basnage, Prolegomen. ad Canisum, tom. i. cap. ii. p. 19.

‡ This is the only way I know of translating the word *harsopa*, which was the term used by Nestorius, and which the Greeks render by the term *συνεσις*.—The word *person* would have done better in this intelligible phrase, had it not been used immediately before in a different sense from that which Nestorius would convey by the obscure term *aspect*.

† That Cyril expressed himself in this manner, and appealed, for his justification in so doing, to the authority of Athanasius, is evident beyond all possibility of contradiction. But it is uncertain whether this manner of expression was adopted by Athanasius or not, since many are of opinion, that the book, in which it is found, has

Hence he was thought to deny the existence of the human nature in Christ, and was accused of this, by Eusebius of Dorylæum, in the council that was assembled by Flavianus at Constantinople, probably in this same year. By a decree of this council he was ordered to renounce the above mentioned opinion, which he obstinately refused to do, and was, on this account, excommunicated and deposed: unwilling, however, to acquiesce in this sentence, he appealed to the decision of a general council.

XIV. In consequence of this appeal, the emperor Theodosius assembled an œcumenical council at Ephesus, in 449, at the head of which he placed Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, the successor of Cyril, the faithful imitator of his arrogance and fury, and a declared enemy to the bishop of Constantinople. Accordingly, by the influence and caballing of this turbulent man, matters were carried on in this assembly with the same want of equity and of decency that had dishonoured a former Ephesian council, and characterised the proceedings of Cyril against Nestorius. Dioscorus, in whose church a doctrine, almost the same with that of the Eutychians, was constantly taught, confounded matters with such artifice and dexterity, that the doctrine of one incarnate nature triumphed, and Eutyches was acquitted of the charge of error that had been brought against him. Flavianus, on the other hand, was, by the order of this unrighteous council, publicly scourged in the most barbarous manner, and banished to Epipas, a city of Lydia, where he soon after ended his days.\* The Greeks called this Ephesian council, a band or *assembly of robbers*, *concilium latrocinum*, to signify that every thing was carried in it by fraud or violence;† and many councils, indeed, both in this and the following ages, are equally entitled to the same dishonourable appellation.

XV. Affairs soon changed, and assumed an aspect utterly unfavourable to that party which the Ephesian council had rendered triumphant. Flavianus and his followers not only engaged Leo the Great, bishop of Rome, in their interests (for the Roman pontiff was the ordinary refuge of the oppressed and conquered party in this century,) but also remonstrated to the emperor, that a matter of such an arduous and important nature required, in order to its decision, a council composed out of the church universal. Leo seconded the latter re-

quest, and demanded of Theodosius a general council, which no entreaties could persuade this emperor to grant. Upon his death, however, his successor Marcian consented to Leo's demand, and called, in 451, the council of Chalcedon,\* which is reckoned the fourth general or œcumenical council. The legates of Leo, who, in his famous letter to Flavianus, had already condemned the Eutychian doctrine, presided in this grand and crowded assembly. Dioscorus was condemned, deposed, and banished into Paphlagonia; the acts of the council of Ephesus were annulled; the epistle of Leo was received as a rule of faith;‡ Eutyches, who had been already sent into banishment, and deprived of his sacerdotal dignity by the emperor, was now condemned, though absent; and the following doctrine, which is at this time almost generally received, was inculcated upon Christians as an object of faith, viz. "That in Christ two distinct natures were united in one person, without any change, mixture, or confusion."

XVI. The remedy applied by this council, to heal the wounds of a torn and divided church, proved really worse than the disease; for a great number of Oriental and Egyptian doctors, though of various characters and different opinions in other respects, united in opposing, with the utmost vehemence, the council of Chalcedon and the epistle of Leo, which that assembly had adopted as a rule of faith, and were unanimous in maintaining an unity of nature, as well as of person, in Jesus Christ. Hence arose deplorable discords and civil wars, whose fury and barbarity were carried to the most excessive and incredible lengths. On the death of the emperor Marcian, the populace assembled tumultuously in Egypt, massacred Proterius, the successor of Dioscorus, and substituted in his place Timotheus Ælurus, who was a zealous defender of the Eutychian doctrine of one incarnate nature in Christ. This latter, indeed, was deposed and banished by the emperor Leo; but, upon his death, was restored by Basilicus both to his liberty and episcopal dignity. After the death of Ælurus, the defenders of the council of Chalcedon chose, as his successor, Timotheus, surnamed Salophaciolus, while the partisans of the Eutychian doctrine elected schismatically Peter Moggus to the same dignity. An edict of the emperor Zeno obliged the latter to yield. The triumph, however, of the Chalcedonians, on this occasion, was but transitory; for, on the death of Timotheus, John Talaia, whom they had chosen in his place, was removed by the

been falsely attributed to him. See Mich. Le Quien, Dissert. ii. in Damascenum; and Christ. Aug. Salig, de Eutychianismo sate Eutychen, p. 112. It appears, by what we read in the Biblioth. Orient., that the Syrians expressed themselves in this manner before Eutyches, without intending thereby to broach any new doctrine, but rather without well knowing what they said. We are yet in want of a solid and accurate history of the Eutychian troubles, notwithstanding the labours of the learned Salig upon that subject.

\* See the Concilia Jo. Harduini, tom. i. p. 82.—Liberati Breviarium, cap. xii. p. 76.—Leonis M. Epist. xciii.—Necphori Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. xiv. cap. lxxvii.

† Though Flavianus died soon after the council of Ephesus, of the bruises he had received from Dioscorus, and the other bishops of his party in that horrid assembly, yet, before his death, he had appealed to Leo; and this appeal, pursued by the pontiff, occasioned the council; in which Eutyches was condemned, and the sanguinary Dioscorus deposed.

\* This council was first assembled at Nice, but afterwards removed to Chalcedon, that the emperor, who, on account of the irruption of the Huns into Illyricum, was unwilling to go far from Constantinople, might assist at it in person.

‡ This was the letter which Leo had written to Flavianus, after having been informed by him of what had passed in the council of Constantinople. In this epistle, Leo approves the decisions of that council, declares the doctrine of Eutyches heretical and impious, and explains, with great appearance of perspicuity, the doctrine of the catholic church upon this perplexed subject; so that this letter was esteemed a masterpiece, both of logic and eloquence, and was constantly read, during the Advent, in the western churches.

same emperor;\* and *Mogus*, or *Mongus*, by an imperial edict, and the favour of *Acacius*, bishop of Constantinople, was, in 482, raised to the see of Alexandria.

XVII. The abbot *Barsumas* (whom the reader must be careful not to confound with *Barsumas* of Nisibis, the famous promoter of the Nestorian doctrines,) having been condemned by the council of Chalcedon,† propagated the Eutychian opinions in Syria, and, by the ministry of his disciple *Samuel*, spread them amongst the Armenians about the year 460. This doctrine, however, as it was commonly explained, had something so harsh and shocking in it, that the Syrians were easily engaged to abandon it by the exhortations of *Nenaias*, otherwise called *Philoxenus*, bishop of Hierapolis, and the famous *Peter Fullo*. These doctors rejected the opinion, attributed to Eutyches, that the human nature of Christ was absorbed by the divine,‡ and modified matters so as to form the following hypothesis: "That in the Son of God there was one nature, which, notwithstanding its *unity*, was *double and compounded*." This notion was not less repugnant to the decisions of the council of Chalcedon than the Eutychian doctrine, and was therefore strongly opposed by those who acknowledged the authority of that council.§

XVIII. *Peter*, surnamed *Fullo*, from the trade of a fuller, which he exercised in his monastic state, had usurped the see of Antioch, and, after having been several times deposed and condemned on account of the bitterness of his opposition to the council of Chalcedon, was at last fixed in it, in 482, by the authority of the emperor *Zeno*, and the favour of *Acacius*, bishop of Constantinople.|| This troublesome and contentious man excited new discords in the church, and seemed ambitious of forming a new sect under the name of *Theopaschites*;¶ for, to the words, "O God most holy," &c. in the famous hymn which the Greeks called *Trisagium*, he ordered the following phrase to be added in the eastern churches, "who hast suffered for us upon the cross." His design in this was manifestly to raise a new sect, and also to fix more deeply, in the minds of the people, the doctrine of one nature in Christ, to which he was zealously attached. His adversaries, and especially *Felix* the Roman pontiff,

interpreted this addition to the above-mentioned hymn in a quite different manner, and charged him with maintaining, that all the three persons of the Godhead were crucified; and hence those who approved his addition were called *Theopaschites*. The consequence of this dispute was, that the western Christians rejected the addition inserted by *Fullo*, which they judged relative to the whole Trinity, while the Orientals used it constantly after this period, without giving the least offence, because they applied it to Christ alone.\*

XIX. To put an end to this controversy, which had produced the most unhappy divisions both in church and state, the emperor *Zeno*, by the advice of *Acacius*, bishop of Constantinople, published, in 482, the famous *Henoticon*, or Decree of Union, which was designed to reconcile the contending parties.— This decree repeated and confirmed all that had been enacted in the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, against the Arians, Nestorians, and Eutychians, without making any particular mention of the council of Chalcedon;‡ for *Acacius* had persuaded the emperor, that the present opposition was not carried on against the decrees that had passed in the council of Chalcedon, but against the assembly itself; with respect to which, therefore, an entire silence was undoubtedly prudent in a proposal, which, instead of reviving, was designed to put an end to all disputes, and to reconcile the most jarring principles.

In the mean time, *Mongus* and *Fullo*, who filled the sees of Alexandria and Antioch, and headed the sect of the Monophysites,‡ subscribed this Decree of Union, which was also approved by *Acacius*, and by all those of the two contending parties who were at all remarkable for their candour and moderation. But there were on all sides violent and obstinate bigots, who opposed, with vigour, these pacific measures, and complained of the *Henoticon* as injurious to the honour and authority of the most holy council of Chalcedon.§ Hence arose new contests and new divisions not less deplorable than those which the decree was designed to suppress.

XX. A considerable body of the Monophysites, or Eutychians, looked upon the conduct of *Mongus*, who had subscribed the decree, as highly criminal, and consequently formed themselves into a new faction, under the title of *Acephali*, i. e. *headless*, because, by the submission of *Mongus*, they had been deprived of their chief.|| This sect was afterwards divided into three others, who were called *Anthropomorphites*, *Barsanuphites*, and *Esaianists*; and these again, in the following century, were the

\* See *Liberati Breviarium*, cap. xvi. xvii. xviii.—*Evangr. Hist. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. viii. lib. iii. cap. iii.*—*Le Quen, Oriens Christianus*, tom. ii. p. 410.

† § † The *Barsumas*, here mentioned, was he who assisted the bishop of Alexandria (*Dioscorus*) and the soldiers, in beating *Flavianus* to death in the council of Ephesus, and to shun whose fury, the orthodox bishops were forced to creep into holes, and hide themselves under benches, in that *pinus assembly*.

‡ § † Eutyches never affirmed what is here attributed to him; he maintained simply, that the two natures, which existed in Christ before his incarnation, became one after it, by the hypostatical union. This miserable dispute about words was nourished by the contending parties having no clear ideas of the terms *person* and *nature*, as also by an invincible ignorance of the subject.

§ *Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vat. tom. i.*; and the *Dissertation* of the same author, de Monophysitibus.

|| *Valesii Dissertatio* de *Pet. Fullone*, et de Synodis adversus eum collectis, which is added to the third volume of the *Scriptor. Hist. Ecclesiast.*

¶ § † This word expresses the enormous error of those frantic doctors, who imagined that the Godhead suffered in and with Christ.

\* See *Norris, Lib. de uno ex Trinitate carne passo*, tom. iii. op. diss. i. cap. iii. 782.—*Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. i. p. 518*; tom. ii. p. 38, 180.

† § *Evangr. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xiv.*—*Liberati Breviarium*, cap. xviii.

‡ § † This word expresses the doctrine of those who believed, that in Christ there was but one nature, and is, in most respects, the same with the term *Eutychians*.

§ See *Facund. Iterum. Deus. trium Capitulorum lib. xii. cap. iv.*

|| *Evangr. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. xii.*—*Leontius Byzant. de Sectis*, tom. i. *Lectio. Antiq. Causii*, p. 537.—*Timoth. in Cotelieri Monument. Ecclesie Græcæ*, tom. iii. p. 409.

unhappy occasion of new factions, of which the ancient writers make frequent mention.\* It is, however, necessary to observe here, for the information of those whose curiosity interests them in inquiries of this nature, that these subdivisions of the Eutyechian sect are not to be adopted with too much facility.—Some of them are entirely fictitious; others are characterised by a nominal, and not by a real difference; the division is in *words*, and not in *things*; while a third sort are distinguished, not by their peculiar doctrines, but by certain rites and institutions, and matters of a merely circumstantial nature. Be that as it will, these numerous branches of the Eutyechian faction did not flourish long; they declined gradually in the following century; and the influence and authority of the famous Baradeus contributed principally to their total extinction by the union he established among the members of that sect.

XXI. The Roman pontiff, Felix II., having assembled an Italian council, composed of sixty-seven bishops, condemned and deposed Acacius, and excluded him from the communion of the church, as a perfidious enemy to the truth. Several articles were alleged against him, to furnish a pretext for the severity of this sentence; such as his attachment to the Monophysites, and their leaders Mongus and Fullo, the contempt with which he treated the council of Chalcedon, and other accusations of a like nature. But the true reasons of these proceedings, and of the irconcilable hatred which the Roman pontiffs indulged against him, were his denying the supremacy of the bishop of Rome, his opposing it throughout the whole course of his ministry,† and his ambitious efforts to enlarge, beyond all bounds, the authority and prerogatives of the see of Constantinople. The Greeks, however, defended the character and memory of their bishop against all the aspersions which were cast upon him by the Romans. Hence arose a new schism, and a new contest, which were carried on with great violence, until the following century, when the obstinacy and perseverance of the Latins triumphed over the opposition of the oriental Christians, and brought about an agreement, in consequence of which, the

names of Acacius and Fullo were erased from the diptychs, or sacred registers, and thus branded with perpetual infamy.\*

XXII. These deplorable dissensions and contests had, for their object, a matter of the smallest importance. Eutyeches was generally supposed to have maintained, "That the divine nature of Christ had absorbed the human, and that, consequently, in him there was but one nature, namely, the divine;" but the truth of this supposition is destitute of sufficient evidence. However that may have been, this opinion, and also Eutyeches, its pretended author, were rejected and condemned by those who opposed the council of Chalcedon, and principally indeed by Xenaias and Fullo, who are, therefore, improperly called Eutyechians, and belong rather to the class of the Monophysites. They, who assumed this latter title, held, "That the divine and human nature of Christ were so united, as to form only one nature, yet without any change, confusion, or mixture, of the two natures;" and that this caution might be carefully observed, and their meaning be well understood, they frequently expressed themselves thus: "In Christ there is one nature; but that nature is two-fold and compounded.‡" They disowned all relation and attachment to Eutyeches; but regarded, with the highest veneration, Dioscorus, Barsumas, Xenaias and Fullo, as the pillars of their sect; and rejected, not only the *Epistle* of Leo, but also the decrees of the council of Chalcedon. The opinion of the Monophysites, if we judge of it by the terms in which it is here delivered, does not seem to differ in reality, but only in the manner of expression, from that which was established by the council.† But, if we attend carefully to the metaphysical arguments and subtleties which the former employed to confirm their doctrine,§ we shall, perhaps, be induced to think, that the controversy between the Monophysites and Chalcedonians is not merely a dispute about words.

XXIII. A new controversy arose in the church during this century, and its pestilential effects extended themselves through the following ages. The authors of it were Pelagius and Cælestius, both monks; the former a Briton, and the latter a native of Ireland.¶ They lived

\* These sects are enumerated by Basnage, in his *Prolegom. ad Canisii Lection. Antiq. cap. iii.* and by Asseman, in his *Dissertatio de Monophysitis.*

† This again is one of the periods of ecclesiastical history, in which we find a multitude of events, which are so many proofs how far the supremacy of the pope was from being universally acknowledged. Felix II. deposes and excommunicates Acacius the patriarch of Constantinople, who not only receives this sentence with contempt, but, in his turn, anathematises and excommunicates the pope, and orders his name to be stricken out of the diptychs. This conduct of Acacius is approved by the emperor, the church of Constantinople, by almost all the eastern bishops, and even by Andreas of Thessalonica, who was at that time the pope's vicar for East Illyricum. This was the occasion of that general schism, which continued for twenty-five years, between the eastern and western churches. It is here worthy of observation, that the eastern bishops did not adhere to the cause of Acacius, from any other principle, as appears from the most authentic records of those times, than a persuasion of the illegality of his excommunication by the Roman pontiff, who, in their judgment, had not a right to depose the first bishop of the east, without the consent of a general council.

\* Hen. Valesius, *Dissert. de Synodis Roman. in quibus damnatus est Acacius, ad calcem, tom. iii. Scriptor. Eccles. p. 179.*—Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 301, 380, 381.*—Bayle's Dictionary.—David Blondel, *de la Prædicante dans l'Eglise, p. 279.*—*Acta Sanctorum, tom. iii. Februar. p. 502.*

† See the passages drawn from the writings of the Monophysites by the most learned, and, frequently, impartial Asseman, in his *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. tom. iii. p. 25, 26, 29, &c.*

‡ Many learned men treat this controversy as a mere dispute about words. Gregory Abulpharajius, himself a Monophysite, and the most learned of the sect, declares this as his opinion. See the *Biblioth. Italique, tom. xvii. p. 285.*—La Croze, *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes, p. 23;* and the *Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie, p. 14.* Asseman, though a Roman by birth and by religion, seems, in a good measure, to have adopted the same way of thinking, as appears by p. 297 in his second volume.

§ See the subtle argumentation of Abulpharajius, in the *Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 288.*

¶ Nothing very certain can be advanced with respect to the native country of Cælestius, which some say was Scotland, and others Campania in Italy. We know



at Rome in the greatest reputation, and were universally esteemed for their extraordinary piety and virtue.\* These monks looked upon the doctrines, which were commonly received, "concerning the original corruption of human nature, and the necessity of divine grace to enlighten the understanding, and purify the heart, as prejudicial to the progress of holiness and virtue, and tending to lull mankind in a presumptuous and fatal security. They maintained, that these doctrines were as false as they were pernicious; that the sins of our first parents were imputed to them alone, and not to their posterity; that we derive no corruption from their fall, but are born as pure and unspotted as Adam came out of the forming hand of his Creator; that mankind, therefore, are capable of repentance and amendment, and of arriving at the highest degrees of piety and virtue by the use of their natural faculties and powers; that, indeed, external grace is necessary to excite their endeavours, but that they have no need of the internal succours of the divine Spirit." These notions, and others intimately connected with them, were propagated at Rome, though in a private manner, by the two monks already mentioned, who, retiring from that city, in 410, upon the approach of the Goths, went first into Sicily, and afterwards into Africa, where they published their doctrine with greater freedom. From Africa Pelagius passed into Palestine, while Cœlestius remained at Carthage with a view to preferment, desiring to be admitted among the presbyters of that city. But the discovery of his opinions having blasted his hopes, and his errors being condemned in a council holden at Carthage, in 412, he departed from that city, and went into the east. It was from this time that Augustin, the famous bishop of Hippo, began to attack the tenets of Pelagius and Cœlestius in his learned and eloquent writings; and to him, indeed, is principally due the glory of having suppressed this sect in its very birth.†

however, that he was descended of an illustrious family; and that, after having applied himself to the study of the law for some time, he retired from the world, and embraced the monastic life. See Genad. de Script. Eccles. cap. xlv.

§ The learned and furious Jerome, who never once thought of doing common justice to those who had the misfortune to differ from him in opinion, accused Pelagius of gluttony and intemperance, after he had heard of his errors, though he had admired him before for his exemplary virtue. Augustin, more candid and honest, bears impartial testimony to the truth; and, even while he writes against this heretic, acknowledges that he had made great progress in virtue and piety, that his life was chaste and his manners were blameless; and thus, indeed, is the truth.

§ The doctrines that were more immediately connected with the main principles of Pelagius, were, that infant baptism was not a sign or seal of the remission of sins, but a mark of admission to the kingdom of heaven, which was only open to the pure in heart; that good works were meritorious, and the only conditions of salvation;—with many others too tedious to mention.

† The Pelagian controversy has been historically treated by many learned writers, such as Usher, in his *Antiquit. Eccles. Britannicæ*; Laet; Ger. Vossius; Norris; Garnier, in his *Supplement. Oper. Theodoreti*; Jansenius in *Augustinus*, and others. Longueval also, a French Jesuit, wrote a *History of the Pelagians*. See the preface to the ninth volume of his *Historia Eccles. Gallicana*. After all, it must be confessed, that these learned writers have not exhausted this interesting subject, or treated it with a sufficient degree of impartiality.

XXIV. Things went more smoothly with Pelagius in the east, where he enjoyed the protection and favour of John, bishop of Jerusalem, whose attachment to the sentiments of Origen led him naturally to countenance those of Pelagius, on account of the conformity that seemed to exist between these systems. Under the shadow of this powerful protection, Pelagius made a public profession of his opinions, and formed disciples in several places; and though, in 415, he was accused by Orosius, a Spanish presbyter, whom Augustin had sent into Palestine for that purpose, before an assembly of bishops who met at Jerusalem, yet he was dismissed without the least censure; and not only so, but was soon after fully acquitted of all errors by the council of Diospolis.\*

This controversy was brought to Rome, and referred by Cœlestius and Pelagius to the decision of Zosimus,† who was raised to the pontificate in 417. The new pontiff, gained over by the ambiguous and seemingly orthodox confession of faith, that Cœlestius, who was now at Rome, had artfully drawn up, and also by the letters and protestations of Pelagius, pronounced in favour of these monks, declared them sound in the faith, and unjustly persecuted by their adversaries. The African bishops, with Augustin at their head, little affected with this declaration, continued obstinately to maintain the judgment they had pronounced in this matter, and to strengthen it by their exhortations, their letters, and their writings. Zosimus yielded to the perseverance of the Africans, changed his mind, and condemned, with the utmost severity, Pelagius and Cœlestius, whom he had honoured with his approbation, and covered with his protection. This was followed by a train of evils, which pursued these two monks without interruption. They were condemned by the same Ephesian council which had launched its thunder at the head of Nestorius; in short, the Gauls, Britons, and Africans, by their councils, and the emperors, by their edicts and penal laws, demolished this sect in its infancy, and suppressed it entirely before it had acquired any tolerable degree of vigour or consistence.‡

XXV. The unhappy disputes about the opinions of Pelagius occasioned, as usually happens, other controversies equally prejudicial to

\* See Daniel, *Histoire du Concile de Diospolis*, which is to be found in the *Opuscula* of that eloquent and learned Jesuit, published at Paris in 1724. Diospolis was a city of Palestine, known in Scripture by the name of Lydda; and the bishop who presided in this council was Eulogius of Casarea, metropolitan of Palestine.

† To preserve the thread of the history, and prevent the reader's being surprised to find Pelagius and Cœlestius appealing to Rome after having been acquitted at Diospolis, it is necessary to observe, that these monks were condemned anew, in 416, by the African bishops assembled at Carthage, and those of Numidia assembled at Milevum; upon which they appealed to Rome.

‡ See the *Historia Pelagiana* of Ger. J. Vossius, lib. i. cap. iv. p. 130; as also the learned observations that have been made upon this controversy, in the *Bibliothèque Italique*, tom. v. p. 74. The writers on both sides are mentioned by Jo. Fran. Buddeus, in his *Isagoge ad Theologiam*, tom. ii. 1071. The learned Wall, in his *History of Infant Baptism*, vol. i. chap. xix. has given a concise and elegant account of the Pelagian controversy; an account which, though imperfect in several respects, abounds with solid and useful erudition.

the peace of the church, and the interests of true Christianity. In the course of this dispute, Augustin had delivered his opinion, concerning the necessity of divine grace in order to our salvation, and the decrees of God with respect to the future conditions of men, without being always consistent with himself, or intelligible to others. Hence certain monks of Adrumetum, and others, were led into a notion, "That God not only predestinated the wicked to eternal punishment, but also to the guilt and transgression for which they are punished; and that thus both the good and bad actions of all men were determined from eternity by a divine decree, and fixed by an invincible necessity." Those who embraced this opinion, were called Predestinarians. Augustin used his utmost influence and authority to prevent the spreading of this doctrine, and explained his true sentiments with more perspicuity, that it might not be attributed to him. His efforts were seconded by the councils of Arles and Lyons, in which the doctrine in question was publicly rejected and condemned.\* But we must not omit observing, that the existence of this Predestinarian sect has been denied by many learned men, and looked upon as an invention of the Semi-Pelagians, designed to decry the followers of Augustin, by attributing to them unjustly this dangerous and pernicious error.†

XXVI. A new and different modification was given to the doctrine of Augustin by the monk Cassian, who came from the east into France, and erected a monastery near Marseilles. Nor was he the only one who attempted to fix upon a certain temperature between the errors of Pelagius and the opinions of the African oracle: several persons embarked in this undertaking about the year 430, and hence arose a new sect, the members of which were called, by their adversaries, Semi-Pelagians.

The opinions of this sect have been misrepresented, by its enemies, upon several occasions; such is usually the fate of all parties in religious controversies. Their doctrine, as it has been generally explained by the learned, amounted to this: "That inward preventing grace was not necessary to form in the soul the beginnings of true repentance and amendment; that every one was capable of producing these

by the mere power of his natural faculties, as also of exercising faith in Christ, and forming the purposes of a holy and sincere obedience." But they acknowledged, at the same time, "That none could persevere or advance in that holy and virtuous course which they had the power of beginning, without the perpetual support and the powerful assistance of the divine grace."<sup>‡</sup> The disciples of Augustin, in Gaul, attacked the Semi-Pelagians with the utmost vehemence, without being able to extirpate or overcome them.† The doctrine of this sect was so suited to the capacities of the generality of men, so conformable to the way of thinking that prevailed among the monastic orders, and so well received among the gravest and most learned Grecian doctors, that neither the zeal nor industry of its adversaries could stop its rapid and extensive progress. Add to its other advantages, that neither Augustin, nor his followers, had ventured to condemn it in all its parts, or to brand it as an impious and pernicious heresy.

XXVII. This was the commencement of those unhappy contests, those subtle and perplexing disputes concerning grace, or the nature and operation of that divine power, which is essentially required in order to salvation, that rent the church into the most deplorable divisions through the whole course of the succeeding age, and which, to the deep sorrow and regret of every true and generous Christian, have been continued to the present time. The doctrine of Augustin, who was of opinion, that, in the work of conversion and sanctification, all was to be attributed to a divine energy, and nothing to human agency, had many followers in all ages of the church, though his disciples have never agreed entirely about the manner of explaining what he taught on that head.‡ The followers of Cassian were, however, much more numerous; and his doctrine, though variously explained, was received in the greatest part of the monastic schools in Gaul, whence it spread itself through other parts of Europe. As to the Greeks, and other Eastern Christians, they had embraced the Semi-Pelagian doctrine before Cassian, and still adhere firmly to it. The generality of Christians looked upon the opinions of Pelagius as daring and presumptuous

\* See Jac. Sirmondi Historia Prædestiniana, tom. iv. op. p. 271.—Basnage, Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. livr. vii. cap. ii. p. 698.—Dion. Petavius, Dogmat. Theol. tom. vi. p. 168, 174, &c.

† See Gibb. Mauguin Fabula Prædestiniana confutata, which he subjoined to the second tome of his learned work, entitled, Collectio variorum Scriptorum qui Sæc. ix. de Prædestinatione et Gratia scripserunt.—Fred. Spanhemius, Introductio ad Historiam Eccles. tom. i. op. p. 993.—Jac. Basnage, Adnot. ad Prosperi Chronicon et Præf. ad Faustum Regiensem, tom. i. Læction. Antiqu. Canisii, p. 315, 348.—Granet (who wrote the life of Lanouy) observes, that Sirmond had solicited Lanouy to write against Mauguin, who denied the existence of the predestinarian sect; but that the former, having examined the matter with care and application, adopted the sentiment of Mauguin. The whole dispute about the existence of this sect will, when closely looked into, appear to be little more, perhaps, than a dispute about words. ¶ It may be very true, that, about this time, or even from the time of St. Paul, certain persons embraced the predestinarian opinions here mentioned; but there is no solid proof, that the authors of these opinions ever formed themselves into a sect. See Basnage, tom. i. p. 700.

‡ The leading principles of the Semi-Pelagians were the five following: 1. That God did not dispense his grace to one, more than another, in consequence of predestination, i. e. an eternal and absolute decree, but was willing to save all men, if they complied with the terms of his Gospel; 2. That Christ died for all men; 3. That the grace purchased by Christ, and necessary to salvation, was offered to all men; 4. That man, before he received grace, was capable of faith and holy desires; 5. That man, born free, was consequently capable of resisting the influences of grace, or complying with its suggestions. See Basnage, tom. i. livr. xii.

† Basnage, tom. i. livr. xii.—Hist. Littéraire de la France, tom. ii. præf. p. 9.—Vossii Histor. Pelagiana, lib. v. p. 538.—Scipio Maffei (under the fictitious name of Irenæus Veronensis), de Hæresi Palagiana, tom. xxix.—Opuscule. Scientif. Angeli Calogera: p. 399.

‡ It is well known that the Jansenists and Jesuits both plead the authority of St. Augustin, in behalf of their opposite systems with respect to predestination and grace. This knotty doctrine severely exercised the pretended infallibility of the popes, and exposed it to the laughter of the wise upon many occasions; and the famous bull *Unigenitus* set Clement XI. in direct opposition to several of the most celebrated Roman pontiffs. Which are we to believe?

ons; and even to those who adopted them in secret, they appeared too free and too far removed from the notions commonly received, to render the public profession of them advisable and prudent. Certain, however, it is, that

in all ages of the church there have been several persons, who, in conformity with the doctrine attributed to this heretic, have believed mankind endowed with a *natural power* of paying to the divine laws a *perfect obedience*.

## THE SIXTH CENTURY.

### PART I.

#### THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

##### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the Prosperous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THE zeal of the bishops of Constantinople, seconded by the protection and influence of the Grecian emperors, increased the number of Christians in the east, and contributed to the conversion of some barbarous nations; of those, particularly, who lived upon the borders of the Euxine sea, as appears from the most authentic records of Grecian history. Among these nations were the Abasgi, who inhabited the country lying between the coast of the Euxine and mount Caucasus, and who embraced Christianity under the reign of Justinian;\* the Heruli, who dwelt beyond the Danube, and who were converted in the same reign;† as also the Alans, Lazi, and Zani, with other uncivilised people, whose situation, at this time, is only known by vague and imperfect conjectures. These conversions, indeed, however pompously they may sound, were extremely superficial and imperfect, as we learn from the most credible accounts that have been given of them. All that was required of these darkened nations amounted to an oral profession of their faith in Christ, to their abstaining from sacrifices to the gods, and their committing to memory certain forms of doctrine, while little care was taken to enrich their minds with pious sentiments, or to cultivate in their hearts virtuous affections; so that, even after their conversion to Christianity, they retained their primitive ferocity and savage manners, and continued to distinguish themselves by horrid acts of cruelty and rapine, and the practice of all kinds of wickedness. In the greatest part of the Grecian provinces, and even in the capital of the eastern empire, there were still multitudes who preserved a secret attachment to the pagan religion. Of these, however, vast numbers were brought over to Christianity under the reign of Justin, by the ministerial labours of John, bishop of Asia.‡

II. In the western parts, Remigius, or Remi, bishop of Rheims, who is commonly called the Apostle of the Gauls, signalised his zeal in the conversion of those who still adhered to the ancient superstitions;§ and his success was considerable, particularly after that auspicious period when Clovis, king of the Franks, embraced the Gospel.

In Britain, several circumstances concurred to favour the propagation of Christianity.—Ethelbert, king of Kent, the most considerable of the Anglo-Saxon princes, among whom that island was at this time divided, married Bertha, daughter of Cherebert, king of Paris, toward the conclusion of this century. This princess, partly by her own influence, and partly by the pious efforts of the clergy who followed her into Britain, gradually formed, in the mind of Ethelbert, an inclination to the Christian religion. While the king was in this favourable disposition, Gregory the Great, in 596, sent over forty Benedictine monks, with Augustin at their head,|| in order to bring to perfection what the pious queen had so happily begun. This monk, seconded by the zeal and assistance of Bertha, converted the king, and the greatest part of the inhabitants of Kent, and laid anew the foundations of the British church.¶

The labours of Columbus, an Irish monk, were attended with success among the Picts and Scots, many of whom embraced the Gospel.‡

In Germany, the Bohemians, Thuringians, and Boii, are said to have abandoned, in this century, their ancient superstitions,|| and to

\* Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. iii. p. 155.

‡ This British apostle was prior of the Benedictine monastery of St. Andrew at Rome. After his arrival in England, he converted the heathen temples into places of Christian worship, erected Christ Church into a cathedral, opened a seminary of learning, founded the abbey of St. Augustin, received episcopal ordination from the primate of Arles, was invested by pope Gregory with power over all the British bishops and Saxon prelates, and was the first archbishop of Canterbury.

|| Bede's Hist. Eccles. Gentis Anglor. lib. i. cap. xviii.—Rapin's History of England.—Acta Sanctor. tom. iii. Februar. p. 470.

¶ Bede's Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. iv.

|| Henr. Cassin. Lecton. Antiquæ, tom. iii. part ii. p. 208.—Aventin. Annal. Roman.

\* Procopius, de Bello Gothico, lib. iv. cap. iii. Le Queen, Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 1351.

† Procopius, lib. ii. cap. xiv.

‡ Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. tom. ii. p. 85.

have received the light of divine truth; but this assertion appears extremely doubtful to many.

All these conversions and sacred exploits will lose much of their importance in the esteem of such as examine with attention the accounts which have been given of them by the writers of this and the succeeding ages; for by these accounts it appears, that the converted nations now mentioned, retained a great part of their former impiety, superstition, and licentiousness, and that, attached to Christ by a mere outward and nominal profession, they, in effect, renounced the purity of his doctrine, and the authority of his Gospel, by their flagitious lives, and the superstitious and idolatrous rites and institutions which they continued to observe.\*

III. A vast multitude of Jews, converted to Christianity in several places, were added to the church during the course of this century. Many of that race, particularly the inhabitants of Borium in Libya, were brought over to the truth by the persuasion and influence of the emperor Justinian.† In the west, the zeal and authority of the Gallic and Spanish monarchs, the efforts of Gregory the Great, and the labours of Avitus, bishop of Vienne, engaged numbers to receive the Gospel. It must, however, be acknowledged, that, of these conversions, the greatest part arose from the liberality of Christian princes, or the fear of punishment, rather than from the force of argument or the love of truth. In Gaul, the Jews were compelled by Childeric to receive the ordinance of baptism; and the same despotic mode of conversion was practised in Spain.‡ This method, however, was entirely disapproved by Gregory the Great, who, though extremely severe upon the heretics, would suffer no violence to be offered to the Jews.§

IV. If credit is to be given to the writers of this century, the conversion of these uncivilised nations to Christianity was principally effected by the prodigies and miracles which the heralds of the Gospel were enabled to work in its behalf. But the conduct of the converted nations is sufficient to invalidate the force of these testimonies; for certainly, if such miracles had been wrought among them, their lives would have been more suitable to their profession, and their attachment and obedience to the doctrines and laws of the Gospel more steadfast and exemplary than they appear to have been. Besides (as we have already had occasion to observe,) in abandoning their ancient superstitions, the greatest part of them were more in-

fluenced by the example and authority of their princes, than by force of argument, or the power of a rational conviction; and, indeed, if we consider the wretched manner in which many of the first Christian missionaries performed the solemn task they had undertaken, we shall perceive that they wanted not many arguments to enforce the doctrines they taught, and the discipline they recommended; for they required nothing of these barbarous people that was difficult to be performed, or that laid any remarkable restraint upon their appetites and passions. The principal injunctions they imposed upon these rude proselytes were, that they should get by heart certain summaries of doctrine, and pay to the images of Christ and the saints the same religious services which they had formerly offered to the statues of the gods. Nor were they at all delicate or scrupulous in choosing the means of establishing their credit; for they deemed it lawful, and even meritorious, to deceive an ignorant and inattentive multitude, by representing, as prodigies, things that were merely natural, as we learn from the most authentic records of these times.

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the calamitous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. **THOUGH** the abjuration of Paganism was, by the imperial laws, made a necessary step to preferment, and to the exercising of all public offices, yet several persons, respected for their erudition and gravity of manners, persisted in their adherence to the ancient superstition. Tribonian, the famous compiler of the Roman law, is thought, by some, to have been among the number of those who continued in their prejudices against the Christian religion; and such also, in the opinion of many, was the case of Procopius, the celebrated historian. It is at least certain, that Agathias, who was an eminent lawyer at Smyrna, and who had also acquired a considerable reputation as an historical writer, persevered in his attachment to the pagan worship. These illustrious Gentiles were exempted from the severities which were frequently employed to engage the lower orders to abandon the service of the gods. The rigour of the laws, as it usually happens in human life, fell only upon those who had neither rank, fortune, nor court-favour, to ward off their execution.

II. Surprised as we may be at the protection granted to the persons now mentioned, at a time when the Gospel was, in many instances, propagated by unchristian methods, it will appear still more astonishing, that the Platonic philosophers, whose opposition to Christianity was universally known, should be permitted, in Greece and Egypt, to teach publicly the tenets of their sect, which were absolutely incompatible with the doctrines of the Gospel. These doctors indeed affected (generally speaking) a high degree of moderation and prudence, and, for the most part, modified their expressions in such a manner, as to give to the pagan system an evangelical aspect, extremely

\* This is ingenuously confessed by the Benedictine monks, in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iii. Introd. See also the orders given to the Anglo Saxons by Gregory the Great, in his *Epist.* lib. xi. lxxvi. where we find him permitting them to sacrifice to the saints, on their respective holidays, the victims which they had formerly offered to the gods. See also Wilkins' *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i.

† Procopius, de *Fædiciis Justiniani*, lib. vi. cap. ii.

‡ Greg. Turon. *Hist. Francor.* lib. vi. cap. xvii.—Launoius, de veteri More baptizandi Judæos et Infidèles, cap. i. p. 700, 704. tom. ii. part ii. op.

§ See his *Epistles*, particularly those which he wrote to Vigilius of Arles, Theodore of Marseilles, and Peter of Terracina.

adapted to deceive the unwary, as the examples of Chalcidius,\* and Alexander of Lycopolis, abundantly testify.† Some of them, however, were less modest, and carried their audacious efforts against Christianity so far as to revile it publicly. Damascius, in the life of Isidorus, and in other places, casts upon the Christians the most ignominious aspersions;‡ Simplicius, in his illustrations of the Aristotelian philosophy, throws out several malignant insinuations against the doctrines of the Gospel; and the Epicheiremata of Proclus, written expressly against the disciples of Jesus, were universally read, and were, on that account, accurately refuted by Philoponus.§ All this shows, that many of the magistrates, who were witnesses of these calumnious attempts, were not so much Christians in reality, as in appearance; otherwise they would not have permitted the slanders of these licentious revilers to pass without correction or restraint.

§—\* The religion of Chalcidius has been much disputed among the learned. Cave seems inclined to rank him among the Christian writers, though he expresses some uncertainty about the matter. Huet, G. J. Vossius, Fabricius, and Beausobre, decide with greater assurance that Chalcidius was a Christian. Some learned men have maintained, on the contrary, that many things in the writings of this sage entitle him to a place among the pagan philosophers. Our learned author, in his notes to his Latin translation of Cudworth's Intellectual System, and in a Dissertation "de turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia," lays down a hypothesis, which holds the middle way between these extremes. He is of opinion that Chalcidius neither rejected nor embraced the whole system of the Christian doctrine, but selected, out of the religion of Jesus and the tenets of Plato, a body of divinity, in which, however, Platonism was predominant; and that he was one of those Syneretist or Eclectic philosophers, who abounded in the fourth and fifth centuries, and who attempted to unite Paganism and Christianity into one motley system. This account of the matter, however, appears too vague to the celebrated author of the Critical History of Philosophy, M. Brucker. This excellent writer agrees with Dr. Mosheim in this, that Chalcidius followed the motley method of the eclectic Platonists, but does not see any thing in this inconsistent with his having publicly professed the Christian religion. The question is not, whether this philosopher was a sound and orthodox Christian, which M. Brucker denies him to have been, but whether he had abandoned the pagan rites, and made a public profession of Christianity; and this our philosophical historian looks upon as evident; for though, in the commentary upon Plato's Timæus, Chalcidius teaches several doctrines that seem to strike at the foundations of our holy religion, yet the same may be said of Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Arnobius, and others, who are, nevertheless, reckoned among the professors of Christianity. The reader will find an excellent view of the different opinions concerning the religion of Chalcidius, in the third volume of Brucker's History. The truth of the matter seems to be this, that the Eclectics, before Christianity became the religion of the state, enriched their system from the Gospel, but ranged themselves under the standards of Plato; and that they repaired to those of Christ, without any considerable change of their system, when the examples and authority of the emperors rendered the profession of the Christian religion a matter of prudence, as well as its own excellence rendered it most justly a matter of choice.

§—† Alexander wrote a treatise against the Manichæans, which is published by Combès, in the second tome of his Auctor. Noviss. Biblioth. PP. Photius, Combès, and our learned Cave, looked upon Alexander as a proselyte to Christianity; but Beausobre has demonstrated the contrary. See the Histoire du Manichéisme, part. ii. Discours Préliminaire, sect. 13, p. 236.

† Photii Bibliotheca, cod. cexlii. p. 1027.

§ See J. A. Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca, vol. iii. p. 522.

III. Notwithstanding the extensive progress of the Gospel, the Christians, even in this century, suffered grievously, in several countries, from the savage cruelty and bitterness of their enemies. The Anglo-Saxons, who were masters of the greater part of Britain, involved a multitude of its ancient inhabitants, who professed Christianity, in the deepest distresses, and tormented them with all that variety of suffering, which the injurious and malignant spirit of persecution could invent.\* The Huns, in their irruptions into Thrace, Greece, and the other provinces, during the reign of Justinian, treated the Christians with great barbarity; not so much, perhaps, from an aversion to Christianity, as from a spirit of hatred against the Greeks, and a desire of overturning and destroying their empire. The face of affairs was totally changed in Italy, about the middle of this century, by a grand revolution which happened in the reign of Justinian I. This emperor, by the arms of Narses, overturned the kingdom of the Ostrogoths, which had subsisted ninety years; and subdued all Italy. The political state, however, which this revolution introduced, was not of a very long duration; for the Lombards, a fierce and warlike people, headed by Alboinus their king, and joined by several other German nations, issued from Pannonia, in 568, under the reign of Justin; invaded Italy; and, having made themselves masters of the whole country, except Rome and Ravenna, erected a new kingdom at Ticinum. Under these new tyrants, who, to the natural ferocity of their characters, added an aversion to the religion of Jesus, the Christians, in the beginning, endured calamities of every kind. But the fury of these savage usurpers gradually subsided; and their manners contracted, from time to time, a milder character. Autharis, the third monarch of the Lombards, embraced Christianity, as it was professed by the Arians, in 587; but his successor Agilulf, who married his widow Theudefinda, was persuaded by that princess to abandon Arianism, and to adopt the tenets of the Nicene catholics.†

But the calamities of the Christians, in all other countries, were light and inconsiderable in comparison of those which they suffered in Persia under Chosroes, the inhuman monarch of that nation. This monster of impiety aimed his audacious and desperate efforts against heaven itself; for he publicly declared, that he would make war not only upon Justinian, but also upon the God of the Christians; and, in consequence of this blasphemous menace, he vented his rage against the followers of Jesus in the most barbarous manner, and put multitudes of them to the most cruel and ignominious deaths.‡

\* Usher's Chronological Index to his Antiquit. Eccles. Britan. ad annum 508.

† Paul. Diacon. de Gestis Longobardorum, lib. ii. cap. ii. xxvii.—Muratori Antiq. Italia, tom. i. ii.—Giannone, Historia di Napoli, tom. i.

‡ Procopius, de Bello Persico, lib. ii. cap. xxvi.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy, during this Century.*

I. THE incursions of the barbarous nations into the greatest part of the western provinces were extremely prejudicial to the interests of learning and philosophy, as must be known to all who have any acquaintance with the history of those unhappy times. During those tumultuous scenes of desolation and horror, the liberal arts and sciences would have been totally extinguished, had they not found a place of refuge, such as it was, among the bishops, and the monastic orders. Here they assembled their scattered remains, and received a degree of culture which just served to keep them from perishing. Those churches, which were distinguished by the appellation of cathedrals, had schools erected under their jurisdiction, in which the bishop, or a certain person appointed by him, instructed the youth in the seven liberal arts, as a preparatory introduction to the study of the Scriptures.\* Persons of both sexes, who had devoted themselves to the monastic life, were obliged, by the founders of their respective orders, to employ daily a certain portion of their time in reading the ancient doctors of the church, whose writings were looked upon as the rich repertoires of celestial wisdom, in which all the treasures of theology were centred.† Hence libraries were formed in all the monasteries, and the pious and learned productions of the Christian and other writers were copied and dispersed by the diligence of transcribers appointed for that purpose, who were generally such monks as, by weakness of constitution, or other bodily infirmities, were rendered incapable of more severe labour. To these establishments we owe the preservation and possession of all the ancient authors, sacred and profane, who escaped in this manner the savage fury of Gothic ignorance, and are happily transmitted to our times. It is also to be observed, that, beside the schools annexed to the cathedrals, seminaries were opened in the greater part of the monasteries, in which the youth who were set apart for the monastic life were instructed by the abbot, or some of his ecclesiastics, in the arts and sciences.‡

II. But these institutions and establishments, however laudable, did not produce such happy effects as might have been expected from them. For, not to speak of the indolence of certain abbots and bishops, who neglected entirely the duties of their stations, or of the bitter aversion which others discovered towards every

sort of learning and erudition, which they considered as pernicious to the progress of piety;\* not to speak of the *illiberal ignorance* which several prelates affected, and which they injudiciously confounded with *Christian simplicity*;† even those who applied themselves to the study and propagation of the sciences, were, for the most part, extremely unskilful and illiterate; and the branches of learning taught in the schools were inconsiderable, both as to their quality and their number.‡ Greek literature was almost every where neglected; and those who, by profession, had devoted themselves to the culture of Latin erudition, spent their time and labour in grammatical subtleties and quibbles, as the pedantic examples of Isidorus and Cassiodorus abundantly show. Eloquence was degraded into a rhetorical bombast, a noisy kind of declamation which was composed of motley and frigid allegories and barbarous terms, as may even appear from several parts of the writings of those superior geniuses who surpassed their contemporaries in precision and elegance, such as Boethius, Cassiodorus, Ennodius, and others. As to the other liberal arts, they shared the common calamity; and, from the mode in which they were now cultivated, they had nothing very liberal or elegant in their appearance, consisting entirely of a few dry rules, which, instead of a complete and finished system, produced only a ghastly and lifeless skeleton.

III. The state of philosophy was still more deplorable than that of literature; for it was entirely banished from those seminaries which were under the inspection and government of the ecclesiastical order. The greatest part of these zealots looked upon the study of philosophy, not only as useless, but even pernicious to those who had dedicated themselves to the service of religion. The most eminent, indeed almost the only Latin philosopher of this age, was the celebrated Boethius, privy counsellor to Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths. This illustrious senator had embraced the Platonic philosophy,§ and approved also, as was usual among the modern Platonists, the doctrine of Aristotle, and illustrated it in his writings; and it was undoubtedly in consequence of the diligence and zeal with which he explained and recommended the Aristotelian philosophy, that it rose now among the Latins to a higher degree of credit than it had before enjoyed.

IV. The state of the liberal arts, among the

\* Gregory the Great is said to have been of this number, and to have ordered a multitude of the productions of pagan writers, and among others Livy's History, to be committed to the flames. See Liron's *Singularities Hist. et Lit. tom. i.*

† Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sæc. i. Benedict. p. 46.*

‡ See M. Aur. Cassiodori *Liber de septem Disciplinis*, which is extant among his works.

§ This will appear evident to such as, with a competent knowledge of modern Platonism, read attentively the books of Boethius, de *Consolatione*, &c. See also, on this subject, Renat. Vallin. p. 10, 50. Holstenius in Vit. Porphyrii, and Mascov. *Histor. Germanor. tom. ii.*

\* Fleury, *Discours sur l'Histoire Ecclésiastique—Histoire Liter. de la France, tom. iii.—Herm. Conringii Antiqu. Academicæ.*

† Benedict. Anianensis *Concordia Regularum*, lib. ii. iii.—Jo. Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sæc. i. Act. SS. Ord. Bened. p. 44.*

‡ Benedict. *Concord. Reg. lib. ii. p. 232.—Mabillon, Acta Ord. Bened. tom. i.*

Greeks, was, in several places, much more flourishing than that in which we have left them among the Latins: and the emperors raised and nourished a spirit of literary emulation, by the noble rewards and the distinguished honours which they attached to the pursuit of all the various branches of learning.\* It is, however, certain, that, notwithstanding these encouragements, the sciences were cultivated with less ardour, and men of learning and genius were less numerous than in the preceding century. In the beginning of this, the modern Platonists yet maintained their credit, and their philosophy was in vogue. The Alexandrian and Athenian schools flourished under the direction of Damascius, Isidorus, Simplicius, Eulamius, Hermias, Priscianus, and others, who were placed on the highest summit of literary glory. But when the emperor Justinian, by a particular edict, prohibited the teaching of philosophy at Athens, † (which edict, no doubt, was levelled at the modern Platonism already mentioned,) and when his resentment began to flame out against those who refused to abandon the pagan worship, all these celebrated philosophers took refuge among the Persians, who were at that time the enemies of Rome. ‡ They, indeed, returned from their voluntary exile, when the peace was concluded between the Persians and the Romans in 533; § but they could never recover their former credit, and they gradually disappeared from the public schools and seminaries, which ceased, at length, to be under their direction.

Thus expired that famous sect, which was distinguished by the title of the Modern or Later Platonic; and which, for a series of ages, had produced such divisions and tumults in the Christian church, and been, in other respects, prejudicial to the interests and progress of the Gospel. It was succeeded by the Aristotelian philosophy, which arose imperceptibly out of its obscurity, and was placed in an advantageous light by the illustrations of the learned, but especially and principally by the celebrated commentaries of Philoponus; and, indeed, the knowledge of this philosophy was necessary for the Greeks, since it was from the depths of this peripatetical wisdom, that the Monophysites and Nestorians drew the subtilities with which they endeavoured to overwhelm the abettors of the Ephesian and Chalcedonian councils.

V. The Nestorians and Monophysites, who lived in the east, equally turned their eyes toward Aristotle, and, in order to train their respective followers to the field of controversy, and arm them with the subtilities of a contentious logic, translated the principal books of that deep philosopher into their native languages. Sergius, a Monophysite and philosopher,

translated the books of Aristotle into Syriac. † Uranius, a Syrian, propagated the doctrines of this philosopher in Persia, and disposed in their favour Chosroes, the monarch of that nation, who became a zealous abettor of the peripatetic system. ‡ The same prince received from one of the Nestorian faction (which, after having procured the exclusion of the Greeks, triumphed at this time unrivalled in Persia) a translation of the Stagirite's works into the Persian language. §

It is, however, to be observed, that among these eastern Christians there were some who rejected both the Platonic and Aristotelian doctrines, and who, unwilling to be obliged to others for their philosophical knowledge, invented systems of their own, which were inexpressibly chimerical and pregnant with absurdities. Of this class of original philosophers was Cosmas, a Nestorian, commonly called Indicopleustes, whose doctrines are singular, and resemble more the notions of the Orientals than the opinions of the Greeks. § Such also was the writer, from whose Exposition of the Octateuch Photius has drawn several citations. ||

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church.*

I. THE external form of church government continued without any remarkable alteration during the course of this century. But the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, who were considered as the most eminent and principal rulers of the Christian church, were engaged in perpetual disputes about the extent and limits of their respective jurisdictions; and both seemed to aim at the supreme authority in ecclesiastical affairs. The latter prelate not only claimed an unrivalled sovereignty over the eastern churches, but also maintained, that his church was, in point of dignity, no way inferior to that of Rome. The Roman pontiffs beheld, with impatience, these lordly pretensions, and warily asserted the pre-eminence of their church, and its superiority over that of Constantinople. Gregory the Great distinguished himself in this violent contest; and the following event furnished him with an opportunity of exerting his zeal. In 588, John, bishop of Constantinople, surnamed the Faster, on account of his extraordinary abstinence, and austerity, assembled a council, by his own authority, to inquire into an accusation, brought against Peter, patriarch of Antioch; and, on this occasion, assumed the title of œumenical or universal bishop. ¶ Now, although this title

\* See the *Histor. Dynastiarum*, by Abulpharajius, published by Dr. Pocock, p. 94, 172.

† See Agathias, de *Rebus Justiniani*, lib. ii. p. 48.—That Uranius made use of the Aristotelian philosophy in the Eutyrian controversy, is evident from this circumstance, that Agathias represents him disputing concerning the *possibility and immiscibility of God* (καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἀσπυροῦ ἑνότητος.)

‡ Agathias, *ibid.*

§ Bernard de Montfaucon, *Prefat. ad Cosmiam*, p. 10, tom. ii. *Collectionis novæ Patrum Græcorum*.

|| Biblioth. *cod. xxxvi.*

¶ We cannot avoid taking notice of some mistakes which have slipped from the pen of Dr. Mosheim, in his

\* See the *Codex Theodos.* tom. ii. lib. vi. and *Herm. Conringius, de Studiis Urbis Romæ et Constantinop.* in a Dissertation subjoined to his *Antiquitates Academicæ*.

† Johannes Malala, *Historia Chronica*, part ii. p. 187, edit. Oxon. Another testimony concerning this matter is cited from a certain Chronicle, not yet published, by Nic. Alemannus, ad *Procopii Histor. Arcanæ*, cap. xxvi.

‡ Agathias, de *Rebus Justiniani*, lib. ii.

§ See *Wesselingii Observat.* Var. lib. i. cap. xviii.

had been formerly enjoyed by the bishops of Constantinople, and was also susceptible of an interpretation that might have prevented its giving umbrage or offence to any,\* yet Gregory suspected, both from the time and the occasion of John's renewing his claim to it, that he was aiming at a supremacy over all the Christian churches; and therefore he opposed his claim in the most vigorous manner, in letters to that purpose, addressed to the emperor, and to such persons as he judged proper to second his opposition. But all his efforts were without effect; and the bishops of Constantinople continued to assume the title in question, though not in the sense in which it had alarmed the pope.†

II. This pontiff, however, adhered tenaciously to his purpose, opposed with vehemence the bishop of Constantinople, raised new tumults and dissensions among the sacred order, and aimed at no less than an unlimited supremacy over the Christian church. This ambitious design succeeded in the west; while, in the eastern provinces, his arrogant pretensions were scarcely respected by any but those who were at enmity with the bishop of Constantinople; and this prelate was always in a condition to make head against the progress of his authority in the east. How much the opinions of some were favourable to the lordly demands of the Roman pontiffs, may be easily imagined from an expression of Ennodius, that infamous and extravagant flatterer of Symmachus, who was a prelate of ambiguous fame. This parasitical panegyrist, among other impertinent assertions, maintained, that the pontiff was constituted judge in the place of God, which he filled as the vicegerent of the Most High.‡ On the other hand, it is certain, from a variety of the most authentic records, that both the emperors and the nations in general were far from being disposed to bear with patience the yoke of servitude, which the popes were imposing upon the Christian church.§ The Gothic princes set bounds to the power of those arro-

narration of this event. First, the council here mentioned was holden under the pontificate of Pelagius II. and not of Gregory the Great, who was not chosen bishop of Rome before the year 590. Secondly, the person accused before this council was not Peter, but Gregory, bishop of Antioch. Thirdly, it does not appear that the council was summoned by John of Constantinople, but by the emperor Maurice, to whom Gregory had appealed from the governor of the east, before whom he was first accused.

¶ The title of universal bishop, which had been given by Leo and Justinian to the Patriarch of Constantinople, was not attended with any accession of power.

† Gregor. Magni Epist. lib. iv. v. vii. All the passages in these epistles that relate to this famous contest, have been extracted and illustrated by Launoy, in his *Assertio in Privileg. S. Medardi*, tom. iii. op. part ii. p. 266. See also Lequien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 67. Paffi *Dissertatio de Titulo Cœnomen. in the Tempore Helvetica*, tom. iv. p. 99.

‡ See his *Apologeticum pro Synodo*, in the xvth volume of the *Bibliotheca Magna Patrum*. ¶ One would think that this servile adulator had never read the 4th verse of the 2d chapter of St. Paul's 2d Epistle to the Thessalonians, where the Anti-Christ, or man of sin, is described in the very terms in which he represents the authority of the pontiff Symmachus.

§ See particularly the truth of this assertion, with respect to Spain, in Geddes's *Dissertation on the Papal Supremacy*, chiefly with relation to the ancient Spanish Church, which is to be found in the second volume of his *Miscellaneous Tracts*.

gant prelates in Italy, permitted none to be raised to the pontificate without their approbation, and reserved to themselves the right of judging of the legality of every new election.\* They enacted spiritual laws, called the religious orders before their tribunals, and summoned councils by their legal authority.† In consequence of all this, the pontiffs, amidst all their high pretensions, revered the majesty of their kings and emperors, and submitted to their authority with the most profound humility; nor were they yet so lost to all sense of shame, as to aim at the subjection of kings and princes to their spiritual dominion.‡

III. The rights and privileges of the clergy were very considerable before this period, and the riches, which they had accumulated, immense: and both received daily augmentations from the growth of superstition in this century. The arts of a rapacious priesthood were practised upon the ignorant devotion of the simple; and even the remorse of the wicked was made an instrument of increasing the ecclesiastical treasure; for an opinion was propagated with industry among the people, that a remission of sin was to be purchased by their liberalities to the churches and monks, and that the prayers of departed saints, whose efficacy was victorious at the throne of God, were to be bought by offerings presented to the temples, which were consecrated to these celestial mediators. But, in proportion as the riches of the church increased, the various orders of the clergy were infected with those vices which are too often the consequences of an affluent prosperity.— This appears, with the utmost evidence, from the imperial edicts and the decrees of councils, which were so frequently levelled at the immoralities of those who were distinguished by the appellation of *clerks*; for, what necessity would there have been for the enactment of so many laws to restrain the vices, and to preserve the morals of the ecclesiastical orders, if they had fulfilled even the obligations of external decency, or shown, in the general tenor of their lives, a certain degree of respect for religion and virtue? Be that as it will, the effect of all these laws and edicts was so inconsiderable as to be scarcely perceived; for so high was the veneration paid, at this time, to the clergy, that their most flagitious crimes were corrected by the slightest and gentlest punishments; an unhappy circumstance, which added to their presumption, and rendered them more daring and audacious in iniquity.

IV. The bishops of Rome, who considered themselves as the chiefs and fathers of the Christian church, are not to be excepted from this censure, any more than the clergy who were under their jurisdiction. We may form some notion of their *humility* and *virtue* by that long and vehement contention, which arose in 498, between Symmachus and Laurentius, who were, on the same day, elected to the pontifi-

\* See *Moscovii Histor. Germanor.* tom. ii. not. p. 113.

† Basnage, *Histoire des Eglises Reformees*, tom. i. p. 381.

‡ See the citations from Gregory the Great, collected by Launoy, de *regia Potestate in Matrimon.* tom. i. op. part ii. p. 691, and in his *Assertio in Privilegium S. Medardi*, p. 272; tom. iii. op. part ii. See also Giannone, *Historia di Napoli*, tom. ii.



cate by different parties, and whose dispute was, at length, decided by Theodoric king of the Goths. Each of these ecclesiastics maintained obstinately the validity of his election; they reciprocally accused each other of the most detestable crimes; and, to their mutual dishonour, their accusations did not appear, on either side, entirely destitute of foundation. Three different councils, assembled at Rome, endeavoured to terminate this odious schism,\* but without success. A fourth was summoned, by Theodoric, to examine the accusations brought against Symmachus, to whom this prince had, at the beginning of the schism, adjudged the papal chair. This council met about the commencement of the century; and in it the Roman pontiff was acquitted of the crimes laid to his charge. But the adverse party refused to acquiesce in this decision; and this gave occasion to Ennodius of Ticinum (now Pavia,) to draw up his adulatory Apology for the Council and Symmachus.† In this apology, which disguises the truth under the seducing colours of a gaudy rhetoric, the reader will perceive that the foundations of that enormous power, which the popes afterwards acquired, were now laid; but he will in vain seek, in this laboured production, any satisfactory proof of the injustice of the charge brought against Symmachus.‡

V. The number, credit, and influence of the monks augmented daily in all parts of the Christian world. They multiplied so prodigiously in the east, that whole armies might have been raised out of the monastic order, without any sensible diminution of that enormous body. The monastic life was also highly honoured, and had an incredible number of patrons and followers in all the western provinces, as appears from the rules which were prescribed in this century, by various doctors, for directing the conduct of the cloistered monks, and the holy virgins, who had sacrificed their capacity of being useful in the world, to the gloomy charms of a convent.§ In Great Britain, a certain abbot, named Congal, is said to have persuaded an incredible number of persons to abandon the affairs, obligations, and duties of social life, and to spend the remainder of their days in solitude, under a rule of discipline, of which he was the inventor.|| His disciples travelled through many countries, in

which they propagated, with such success, the contagion of this monastic devotion, that, in a short time, Ireland, Gaul, Germany, and Switzerland, swarmed with those lazy orders, and were, in a manner, covered with convents. The most illustrious disciple of the abbot now mentioned, was Columban, whose singular rule of discipline is yet extant, and surpasses all the rest in simplicity and brevity.\* The monastic orders, in general, abounded with fanatics and profligates; the latter were more numerous than the former in the western convents, while, in those of the east, the fanatics were predominant.

VI. A new order, which in a manner absorbed all the others that were established in the west, was instituted, in 529, by Benedict of Nursia, a man of piety and reputation, for the age he lived in. From his rule of discipline, which is yet extant, we learn that it was not his intention to impose it upon all the monastic societies, but to form an order whose discipline should be milder, establishment more solid, and manners more regular, than those of the other monastic bodies; and whose members, during the course of a holy and peaceful life, were to divide their time between prayer, reading, the education of youth, and other pious and learned labours.† But, in process of time, the followers of this celebrated ecclesiastic degenerated sadly from the piety of their founder, and lost sight of the duties of their station, and the great end of their establishment. Having acquired immense riches from the devout liberality of the opulent, they sunk into luxury, intemperance, and sloth, abandoned themselves to all sorts of vices, extended their zeal and attention to worldly affairs, insinuated themselves into the cabinets of princes, took part in political cabals and court factions, made a vast augmentation of superstitious ceremonies in their order, to blind the multitude, and supply the place of their expiring virtue; and, among other *meritorious* enterprises, laboured most ardently to swell the arrogance, by enlarging the power and authority of the Roman pontiff. The good Benedict never dreamed that the great purposes of his institution were to be thus perverted; much less did he give any encouragement or permission to such flagrant abuses. His rule of discipline was neither favourable to luxury nor to ambition; and it is still celebrated on account of its excellence, though it has not been observed for many ages.

It is proper to remark here, that the institution of Benedict changed, in several respects, the obligations and duties of the monastic life, as it was regulated in the west. Among other things, he obliged those who entered into his order to promise, at the time of their being received as novices, and afterwards at their admission as members of the society, to persevere in an obedience to the rules he had laid down, without attempting to change them in any respect. As he was exceedingly solicitous about

\* This schism may be truly termed *odious*, as it was carried on by assassinations, massacres, and all the cruel proceedings of a desperate civil war. See Paulus Diaconus, lib. xvii.

† This apology may be seen in the fifteenth volume of the Magu. Bibl. Patrum, p. 248.

‡ That Symmachus was never fairly acquitted, may be presumed from the first, and proved from the second of the following circumstances: first, that Theodoric, who was a wise and equitable prince, and who had attentively examined the charge brought against him, would not have referred the decision to the bishops, if the matter had been clear, but would have pronounced judgment himself, as he had formerly done with respect to the legality of his election. The second circumstance is, that the council acquitted him without even hearing those who accused him, and he himself did not appear, though frequently summoned.

§ These rules are extant in Holstenius' Codex Regularum, part ii. published at Rome in 1661. See also Edm. Martenne et Ursin. Durand. Thesaur. Anecdot. Nov. tom. i. p. 4.

|| Archbishop Usher's Antiq. Eccles. Britau.

\* Usserii Sylloge Antiquar. Epistolar. Hibernicar. p. 5—15.—Holstenii Codex Regularum, tom. ii. p. 48.—Mabillon, Pref. ad Sæculum ii. Benedictinum, p. 4.

† See Mabillon, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc. i. and Annals Ordin. Ben. tom. i. See also Helyot, and the other writers who have given accounts of the monastic orders

the stability of his institution, this particular regulation was wise and prudent; and it was so much the more necessary, as, before his time, the monks made no scruple of altering the laws and rules of their founders whenever they thought proper.\*

VII. This new order made a most rapid progress in the west, and soon arrived at the most flourishing state. In Gaul, its interests were promoted by St. Maurus; in Sicily and Sardinia, by Placidus; in England, by Augustin and Mellitus; in Italy, and other countries, by Gregory the Great, who is himself reported to have been for some time a member of this society;† and it was afterwards received in Germany by the means of Boniface.‡ This amazing progress of the new order was ascribed by the Benedictines to the wisdom and sanctity of their discipline, and to the miracles wrought by their founder and his followers. But a more attentive view of things will convince the impartial observer, that the protection of the pontiffs, to the advancement of whose grandeur and authority the Benedictines were most servilely devoted, contributed much more to the lustre and influence of their order, than any other circumstances, and indeed more than all other considerations united. But, however general their credit was, they did not reign alone; other orders subsisted in several countries until the ninth century. Then, however, the Benedictines absorbed all the other religious societies, and held, unrivalled, the reins of the monastic empire.§

VIII. The most celebrated Greek and Oriental writers that flourished in this century, were the following:

Procopius of Gaza, who interpreted with success several books of Scripture.||

Maxentius, a monk of Antioch, who, beside several treatises against the sects of his time, composed Scholia on Dionysius the Areopagite.

Agapetus, whose *Scheda Regia*, addressed to the emperor Justinian, procured him a place among the wisest and most judicious writers of this century.

Eulogius, a presbyter of Antioch, who was the terror of heretics, and a warm and strenuous defender of the orthodox faith.

John, patriarch of Constantinople, who, on account of his austere method of life, was surnamed the Faster, and who acquired a certain degree of reputation by several little productions, and more particularly by his Penitential.

Leontius of Byzantium, whose book against the sects, and other writings, are yet extant.

Evagrius, a scholastic writer, whose Ecclesiastical History is, in many places, corrupted with fabulous narrations.

\* See Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sec. iv. Benedict.*

† See Mabillon's preface last mentioned, and his *Dissertation de Vita Monast. Gregorii M.* This circumstance, however, is denied by some writers; and among others by Gallonius, concerning whose book upon that subject, see Simon's *Lettres Choisiës*, tom. iii. p. 63.

‡ Anton. Dadingi Alteserra, *Origines rei Monasticæ*, lib. i. cap. ix. The propagation of the Benedictine order, through the different provinces of Europe, is related by Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sec. i. et ad Sec. iv.*

§ *L'Enfant, Histoire du Concile de Constance*, tom. ii.

|| See Simon's *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclesiastique de M. Du-Pin*, tom. i. p. 197.

Anastasius of Sinai, whom most writers consider as the author of a trifling performance, written against a sort of heretics called Acephali, of whom we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.\*

IX. Among the Latin writers the following are principally worthy of mention:

Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome, who united the most inconsistent and contradictory qualities; as in some cases he discovered a sound and penetrating judgment, and in others the most shameful and superstitious weakness; and in general manifested an extreme aversion to all kinds of learning, as his Epistles and Dialogues sufficiently testify.†

Cæsarius of Arles, who composed some moral writings, and drew up a *rule of conduct and discipline for the Holy Virgins.*‡

Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspina, who attacked with great warmth the Arians and Pelagians in Africa; but whose style and manner were harsh and uncouth, as was generally the case of the African writers.§

Ennodius, bishop of Ticinum, who was not one of the meanest authors of this century, whether we consider his compositions in prose or in verse; though he disgraced his talents, and dishonoured his eloquence, by his infamous adulation of the Roman pontiff, whom he so exalted above all mortals, as to maintain that he was answerable to none upon earth for his conduct, and subject to no human tribunal.||

Benedict of Nursia, who acquired an immortal name, by the rules he laid down for the order which he instituted, and the multitude of religious societies that submitted to his discipline.

Dionysius, who was surnamed the Little, on account of his extraordinary humility, and was deservedly esteemed for his *Collection of the Ancient Canons*, and also for his *Chronological Researches.*

Fulgentius Ferrandus, an African, who acquired a considerable degree of reputation by several treatises, but especially by his *Abridgement of the Canons*, though his style and diction were entirely destitute of harmony and elegance.

Facundus, a strenuous defender of the Three Chapters, of which we shall give an account in their place.

Arator, who translated, with tolerable success, the Acts of the Apostles into Latin verse.

Primasius of Adermetum, whose *Commentary upon the Epistles of St. Paul*, as also his book concerning Heresies, are yet extant.

Liberatus, whose *Compendious History of the Nestorian and Eutychnian controversies*, must entitle him to an eminent rank among the writers of this century.

\* See, for an account of this book, Simon, tom. i. p. 232; as also Barat. *Bibliothèque Choisie*, tom. ii. p. 21.

† A splendid edition of the works of Gregory was published at Paris, in 1705, by father St. Marthe, a Benedictine monk. See an account of this pontiff, *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Martii, p. 121.

‡ Of this writer, the Benedictine monks have given a learned account, in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 190.

§ See, for an account of Fulgentius, the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. Januar. p. 32, &c.

|| *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 96

Fortunatus, a man of various erudition, and whose poetic compositions are far from being destitute of genius.\*

Gregory of Tours, who is esteemed the father of Gallic history; and who would have descended with honour to posterity, did not his Annals of the Franks, and the rest of his writings, carry so many marks of levity, credulity, and weakness.†

Gildas, the most ancient of the British writers, who composed a book concerning the destruction of Britain, in which there are several things not altogether unworthy of the curiosity of the learned.

Columban, a native of Ireland, who became famous on account of the monastic rules he prescribed to his followers, his zeal for establishing religious orders, and his poetical productions.‡

Isidore, bishop of Seville, whose grammatical, theological, and historical productions, discover more learning and pedantry, than judgment and taste.

We may conclude this enumeration of the Latin writers with the illustrious names of Boethius and Cassiodorus, who far surpassed all their contemporaries in learning and knowledge. The former shone forth with the brightest lustre in the republic of letters, as a philosopher, an orator, a poet, and a divine, and both in elegance and subtilty of genius had no superior, nor indeed any equal in this century; the latter, though in many respects inferior to him, was nevertheless far from being destitute of merit.§ Several productions of these writers have been transmitted to our times.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Doctrine of the Church during this Century.*

I. WHEN once the ministers of the church had departed from the ancient simplicity of religious worship, and sullied the native purity of divine truth by a motley mixture of human inventions, it was difficult to set bounds to this growing corruption. Abuses were daily multiplied, and superstition drew from its horrid fecundity an incredible number of absurdities, which were added to the doctrine of Christ and his apostles. The controversial writers in the eastern provinces continued to render perplexed and obscure some of the principal doctrines of Christianity, by the subtle distinctions which they borrowed from a vain and chimerical philosophy. The public teachers and instructors of the people grievously degenerated from the apostolic character. They seemed to aim at nothing else, than to sink the multitude into the most opprobrious ignorance and supersti-

tion, to efface from their minds all sense of the beauty and excellence of genuine piety, and to substitute, in the place of religious principles, a blind veneration for the clergy, and a stupid zeal for a senseless round of ridiculous ceremonies. This, perhaps, will appear less surprising, when we consider, that "the blind led the blind;" for the public ministers and teachers of religion were, for the most part, grossly ignorant; indeed, almost as much so as the people whom they were appointed to instruct.

II. To be convinced of the truth of the dismal representation we have here given of the state of religion at this time, nothing more is necessary than to cast an eye upon the doctrines now taught concerning the worship of images and saints, the fire of purgatory, the efficacy of good works, *i. e.* the observance of human rites and institutions, toward the attainment of salvation, the power of relics to heal the diseases of body and mind; and the like sordid and miserable fancies, which are inculcated in many of the superstitious productions of this century, and particularly in the epistles and other writings of Gregory the Great. Nothing could be more ridiculous on one hand, than the solemnity and liberality with which this good, but silly pontiff, distributed the wonder-working relics; and nothing more lamentable on the other, than the stupid eagerness and devotion with which the deluded multitude received them, and suffered themselves to be persuaded, that a portion of rancid oil, taken from the lamps which burned at the tombs of the martyrs, had a supernatural efficacy to sanctify its possessors, and to defend them from all dangers both of a temporal and spiritual nature.\*

III. Several attempts were made in this century to lay down a proper and judicious method of explaining the Scriptures. Of this nature were the two books of Junilius the African, concerning the various parts of the divine law;‡ a work destitute of precision and method, and from which it appears that the author had not sufficient knowledge and penetration for the task he undertook.

Cassiodorus also, in his two books concerning the divine laws, has delivered several rules for the right interpretation of the Scriptures.

Philoxenus the Syrian translated, into his native language, the Psalms of David, and the Books of the New Testament.†

Interpreters were numerous in this century. Those who made the greatest figure among the Greeks in this character, were Procopius of Gaza, Severus of Antioch, Julian, and a few others; the first was an expositor of no mean abilities.§ The most eminent rank, among the Latin commentators, is due to Gregory the Great, Cassiodorus, Primasius,|| Isidore of Seville,¶ and Bellator.

IV. It must, however, be acknowledged,

\* See the List of sacred Oils which Gregory the Great sent to the queen Theodelinda, in the work of Ruinarus, entitled, *Acta Martyrum sincera et selecta*, p. 619.

† See Simon's Critique, tom. i. p. 229.

‡ Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 83.

§ See Simon's Lettres Choisis, tom. iv.

|| Simon's Critique, tom. i. p. 226; and his *Histoire des principaux Commentateurs du N. T.* chap. xxiv. p. 337.

¶ Simon's Critique, tom. i. p. 259.

\* *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 461.

† The life of Gregory of Tours is to be found in the work last quoted, and his faults are mentioned by Pagi, in his *Dissert. de Dionysio Paris.* sect. 25, which is added to the fourth tome of the *Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* Launoy defends this historian in many things in his works, tom. i. part ii. p. 131.

‡ No writers have given more accurate accounts of Gildas and Columban, than the learned Benedictines, in the *Hist. Lit. de la France*, tom. iii. p. 279, 505.

§ See Simon's Critique de la Bibliotheque de M. Dupin, tom. i. p. 211.

that these writers scarcely deserve the name of expositors, if we except a small number of them, and among these the eastern Nestorians, who, following the example of Theodore of Mopsuestia, were careful in exploring the true sense and the native energy of the words employed in the Scriptures. We may, therefore, divide the commentators of this age into two classes. In the first, we rank those who did nothing more than collect the opinions and interpretations which had been received by the ancient doctors of the church; which collections were afterwards called *chains* by the Latins.\* Such were the chains of Olympiodorus on Job, and of Victor of Capua on the four Gospels; and the commentary of Primasius on the Epistle to the Romans, which was compiled from the works of Augustin, Jerome, Ambrose, and others. Even Procopius of Gaza may be ranked in this class, though not with so much reason as the mere compilers now mentioned, since, in many cases, he has consulted the dictates of his own judgment, and not followed, with a servile and implicit submission, the voice of antiquity. To the second class belong those fanciful expositors, who, setting up Origen as their great model, neglect and overlook entirely the sense of the words employed by the sacred writers, lose themselves in spiritual refinements and allegorical digressions, and, by the aid of a lively and luxuriant imagination, draw from the Scriptures arguments in favour of every whim they have thought proper to adopt. Such was Anastasius the Sinaite, whose Mysterious Contemplations, upon the six-days' Creation, † betray the levity and ignorance of their author. Such also was Gregory the Great, whose Moral Observations upon the Book of Job, formerly met with unmerited commendations. Such were Isidore of Seville and Primasius, as manifestly appears from that Book of Allegories upon the Holy Scriptures, ‡ which was invented by the former, and from the Mystical Exposition of the book of the Revelation, § which was imagined by the latter.

V. It would be needless to expect, from the divines of this century, an accurate view, or a clear and natural explanation, of the Christian doctrine. The greatest part of them reasoned and disputed concerning the truths of the Gospel, as the blind would argue about light and colours; and imagined that they had acquitted themselves nobly, when they had thrown out a heap of crude and indigested notions, and overwhelmed their adversaries with a torrent of words.

We may perceive, however, in the writers of this age, evident marks of the three different methods of explaining and inculcating the doctrines of religion which are yet practised among the Greeks and Latins; for some collected a heap, rather than a system of theological opinions, from the writings of the ancient doctors, from the decrees of councils, and from

the Scriptures; such were Isidore of Seville among the Latins (whose three books of sentences or opinions are still extant,) and Leontius the Cyprian among the Greeks, whose common-place book of divinity was much esteemed. These authors gave rise to that species of divinity, which the Latins afterwards distinguished by the name of *positive theology*.

Others endeavoured to explain the various doctrines of Christianity by reasoning upon their nature, their excellency and fitness; and thus it was, with the strong weapons of reason and argument, that many of the Christian doctors disputed against the Nestorians, the Eutychians, and the Pelagians. These metaphysical divines were called *schoolmen*, and their writings were afterwards characterised by the general term of *scholastic divinity*.

A third class of theological teachers, very different from those already mentioned, comprehended a certain species of fanatics, who maintained that the knowledge of divine truth was only to be derived from inward feeling and mental contemplation. This class assumed the appellation of *mystics*. These three methods of deducing and unfolding the doctrines of the Gospel have been transmitted down to our times. No writer of this century composed a judicious or complete system of divinity, though several branches of that sacred science were occasionally illustrated.

VI. Those who consecrated their pious labours to the advancement of practical religion and moral virtue, aimed at the accomplishment of this good purpose, partly by laying down precepts, and partly by exhibiting edifying examples. They who promoted the cause of piety and virtue in the former way, modified their instructions according to the state and circumstances of the persons for whom they were designed. Peculiar precepts were addressed to those who had not abandoned the connexions of civil society, but lived amidst the hurry of worldly affairs; while different rules were administered to those who aspired to higher degrees of perfection, and lived in a state of seclusion from the contagion and vanities of the world. The precepts, addressed to the former, represent the Christian life, as consisting in certain external virtues and acts of religion; as appears from the Homilies and Exhortations of Cæsarius, the Capita Parænetica of Agæpetus, and especially from the Formula honestæ Vitæ, *i. e.* the Summary of a Virtuous Life, drawn up by Martin, archbishop of Braga.\* The rules administered to the latter sort of Christians, were more spiritual and sublime: they were exhorted to separate, as far as was possible, the soul from the body by divine contemplation; and, for that purpose, to enervate and emaciate the latter by watching, fasting, perpetual prayer, and singing of psalms; as we find in the dissertation of Fulgentius upon fasting, and those of Nicetius, concerning the vigils of the servants of God, and the good effects of psalmody. The Greeks adopted for their leader, in this mystic labyrinth, Dionysius, falsely called the Areopagite, whose pretended writings John of Scythopolis

\* Le Moine, Prolegomena ad varia Sacra, p. 53.—F. b. Biblioth. Græca, lit. v. cap. xvi.

† The title is Contemplationes Anagogicæ in Hexæmæton.

‡ Liber Allegoriarum in Scripturam Sacram.

§ Expositio Mystica in Apocalypsin.

\* See the Acta Sanctor. Martii, tom. iii. p. 56

illustrated with annotations in this century. We need not be at any pains in pointing out the defects of these injudicious zealots; the smallest acquaintance with that rational religion, which is contained in the Gospel, will be sufficient to open the eyes of the impartial to the absurdities of that chimerical devotion we have now been describing.

VII. They who enforced the duties of Christianity, by exhibiting examples of piety and virtue to the view of those for whom their instructions were designed, wrote, for this purpose, the Lives of the Saints; and there was a considerable number of this kind of biographers both among the Greeks and Latins. Eusebius, Eusebius, Cyril of Scythopolis, Dionysius the Little, Cogitosus and others, are to be ranked in this class. But, however pious the intentions of these biographers may have been, it must be acknowledged, that they executed their task in a most contemptible manner. No models of rational piety are to be found among those pretended worthies, whom they propose to Christians as objects of imitation. They amuse their readers with gigantic fables and trifling romances; the examples they exhibit are those of certain delirious fanatics, whom they call saints, men of a corrupt and perverted judgment, who offered violence to reason and nature by the horrors of an extravagant austerity in their own conduct, and by the severity of those singular and inhuman rules which they prescribed to others. For, by what means were these men sainted? By starving themselves with senseless obstinacy, and bearing the useless hardships of hunger, thirst, and inclement seasons, with steadfastness and perseverance; by running about the country, like madmen, in tattered garments, and sometimes half-naked, or shutting themselves up in a narrow space, where they continued motionless; by standing for a long time in certain postures, with their eyes closed, in the enthusiastic expectation of divine light. All this was "saint-like and glorious;" and the more any ambitious fanatic departed from the dictates of reason and common sense, and counterfeited the wild gestures and the incoherent conduct of an idiot or a lunatic, the surer was his prospect of obtaining an eminent rank among the heroes and demi-gods of a corrupt and degenerate church.

VIII. Many writers laboured with diligence to terminate the reigning controversies, but none with success. Nor shall we be much surprised, that these efforts were ineffectual, when we consider how they were conducted; for scarcely can we name a single writer, whose opposition to the Eutychians, Nestorians, and Pelagians, was carried on with probity, moderation, or prudence. Primasius and Philoponus wrote concerning all the sects, but their works are lost; the treatise of Leontius, upon the same extensive subject, is still extant, but is scarcely worth perusing. Isidore of Seville, and Leontius of Neapolis, disputed against the Jews; but with what success and dexterity will be easily imagined by those who are acquainted with the learning and logic of these times. We omit, therefore, any farther mention of the miserable disputants of this century, from a

persuasion that it will be more useful and entertaining to lay before the reader a brief account of the controversies that now divided and troubled the Christian church.

IX. Though the credit of Origen, and his system, seemed to lie expiring under the blows it had received from the zeal of the orthodox, and the repeated thunder of synods and councils, yet it was very far from being totally sunk. On the contrary, this great man, and his doctrine, were held by many, and especially by the monks, in the highest veneration, and cherished with a kind of enthusiasm which became boundless and extravagant. In the west, Belator translated the works of Origen into the Latin language. In the eastern provinces, and particularly in Syria and Palestine, which were the principal seats of Origenism, the monks, seconded by several bishops, and chiefly by Theodore of Casarea in Cappadocia, defended the truth and authority of the doctrines of Origen against all his adversaries with incredible vehemence.\* The cause was, at length, brought before Justinian, who, in a long and verbose edict, addressed to Menas, patriarch of Constantinople,† passed a severe condemnation upon Origen and his doctrine, and ordered it to be entirely suppressed.‡ The effects of this edict were more violent than durable; for, upon the breaking out of the controversy concerning the *three chapters*,§ soon after this time, Origenism not only revived in Palestine, but even recovered new vigour, and spread itself far and wide. Hence many commotions were raised in the church, which were, however, terminated by the fifth general council, assembled at Constantinople by Justinian, in 533, in which Origen and his followers were again condemned.||

X. This controversy produced another, which continued much longer, was carried on with still more excessive degrees of animosity and violence, and the subject of which was of much less moment and importance. The emperor Justinian was eagerly bent upon extirpating that violent branch of the Monophysites, which was distinguished by the name of Accephali; and consulted, upon this matter, Theodore, bishop of Casarea, who was a Monophysite, and, at the same time, extremely attached to the doctrine of Origen. The artful prelate con-

\* Cyril. Scythop. Vit. Sabæ, which is to be found in Cotelærius, Monumenta Ecclesie Græcæ, p. 370.—Henr. Norris, Dissertat. de Synodo Quinta, cap. i. ii. p. 554. tom. i. op.

† This edict is published in Harduini Concilia, tom. iii. p. 243.

‡ This edict was procured by the solicitation of Pelagius, who was legate of Vigilus at the court of Constantinople, with a view to confound the Accephali, who were admirers of Origen, and particularly to vex Theodore, of whose credit with the emperor Pelagius was extremely jealous. It was to return this affront, as well as to effect the purposes mentioned in the following section, that Theodore set on foot the controversy concerning the three chapters, which produced such tedious, cruel, and fatal discussions in the church. See Basnage, Histoire de l'Église, livr. x. ch. vi. p. 520.

§ For an explication of what is meant by the *three chapters*, see note of the 1st section.

|| See Harduini Concilia, tom. iii. p. 283.—Evagrius, Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. cap. xxxviii.—Basnage, livr. x. chap. vi. p. 517, &c.—Pet. Dan. Huetti Origeniana, lib. ii. p. 224.—Domeic's Singular Dis. subjoined to his Historia Origeniana, p. 345.

sidered this as a favourable occasion for procuring repose to the followers of Origen by exciting a new controversy, as also for throwing a reproach upon the council of Chalcedon, and giving a mortal blow to the Nestorians and their cause. In order to effect these three important purposes, he persuaded the emperor, that the Acephali would return to the bosom of the church, under the following easy and reasonable conditions; namely, "That those passages in the acts of the council of Chalcedon, in which Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa, had been pronounced orthodox, should be effaced; and that the productions of these prelates, which were known by the appellation of the *three chapters*,\* as also other writings of theirs, which discovered a manifest propensity toward the Nestorian errors, should be condemned and prohibited." The emperor lent a propitious ear to the counsels of this prelate; and, by an edict, published in 544, ordered the three chapters to be condemned and effaced, without any prejudice, however, to the authority of the council of Chalcedon.† This edict was warmly opposed by the African and western bishops, and particularly by Vigilius, the Roman pontiff, who considered it as highly injurious not only to the authority of the council now mentioned, but also to the memory of those holy men whose writings and characters it covered with reproach.‡ Upon this, Justinian ordered Vigilius to repair immediately to Constantinople, that, having him in his power, he might compel him with greater facility to acquiesce in the edict, and reject the three chapters; and this method was attended with success; for the pontiff yielded. On the other hand, the bishops of Africa and Illyricum obliged Vigilius to retract his *judicatum*, by which, in a council of seventy bishops, he had condemned the three chapters in obedience to the emperor; for they separated themselves from the communion of this pope, refused to acknowledge him as one of their brethren, and even treated him as an apostate, until he approved what he had been obliged to condemn. The effect of this retraction redoubled the zeal and violence of Justinian, who, by a second edict, published in 551, condemned anew the three chapters.

XI. After many cabals, commotions, and dissensions, which were occasioned by this trifling controversy, it was thought proper to submit

\* The pieces that were distinguished by the appellation of the *three chapters*, were, 1. The writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; 2. The books which Theodoret of Cyrus wrote against the twelve Anathemas, which Cyril had published against the Nestorians; 3. The letter which Ibas of Edessa had written to one Maris, a Persian, concerning the council of Ephesus and the condemnation of Nestorius. These writings were supposed to favour the Nestorian doctrine, and such indeed was their tendency. It is, however, to be observed, that Theodore of Mopsuestia lived before the time of Nestorius, and died, not only in the communion of the church, but also in the highest reputation for his sanctity. Nor were the writings of the other two either condemned or censured by the council of Chalcedon; indeed, the faith of Theodoret and of Ibas was there declared entirely orthodox. The decision of the council of Constantinople, in opposition to this, shows that councils, as well as doctors, differ.

† See Harduini Concilia, tom. iii. p. 287.—Evagrius, Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. iv. cap. xxxviii. p. 412.

‡ Hen. Norris, de Synodo quinta, cap. x. p. 579, tom. i. op.—Bassnage, tom. i. livr. x. cap. vi.

the final decision of it to an assembly of the universal church. This assembly was accordingly convoked at Constantinople by Justinian, in 553, and is considered as the fifth œcumenical or general council. The emperor now gained his point; for, beside the doctrines of Origen,\* the three chapters, the condemnation of which he had solely in view, were, by the bishops of the east (for there were very few western prelates present at this council), declared heretical and pernicious. Vigilius, who was now at Constantinople, refused his assent to the decrees of this council; for which reason, after having received various affronts, he was sent into exile. He was not permitted to return before he had acquiesced in the decisions of this assembly,‡ and, changing his sentiments for the fourth time, had declared the opinions contained in the three chapters to be execrable blasphemies. His successor Pelagius, and all the Roman pontiffs that have since lolled in the papal chair, adhered to the decrees of this council; but neither their authority, nor that of the emperor, could prevail upon the western bishops to follow their example in this respect. Many of these, on the contrary, carried matters so far as to separate themselves from the communion of the pope on this account; and the divisions, that hence arose in the church, were too violent to admit an expeditious or easy reconciliation, and could only be healed by length of time.‡

XII. Another controversy, much more important, had been carried on before this period among the Greeks; it was first kindled in the year 519, and it arose upon the following question; Whether it could be said with propriety, that one of the Trinity suffered on the cross? This was designed to embarrass the Nestorians, who seemed to separate too much the two natures in Christ; and the Scythian monks, who seconded this design, and to whom the rise of this controversy is principally to be imputed, maintained the affirmative of this nice and difficult question. Others asserted, on the contrary, that this manner of speaking ought by no

\* We do not find in the acts of this council any one which condemns the doctrines of Origen. It is, however, generally imagined, that these doctrines were condemned by this assembly; and what gave rise to this notion was probably the fifteen Greek canons yet extant, in which the principal errors of Origen are condemned, and which are entitled, The canons of the 160 fathers assembled in the council of Constantinople. The tenets of Origen, which gave the greatest offence, were the following: 1. That, in the Trinity, the Father is greater than the Son, and the Son than the Holy Ghost; 2. The pre-existence of souls, which Origen considered as sent into mortal bodies for the punishment of sins committed in a former state of being; 3. That the soul of Christ was united to the word before the incarnation; 4. That the sun, moon, and stars, &c. were animated and endowed with rational souls; 5. That after the resurrection all bodies will be of a round figure; 6. That the torments of the damned will have an end; and that, as Christ had been crucified in this world to save mankind, he is to be crucified in the next to save the devils.

† See Petr. de Marca, Dissert. de Decreto Vigilius pro Confirmatione Synodi V. which is to be found among the Dissertations subjoined to his learned work, de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii.

‡ The best account of this matter is to be found in Norris, de Synodo quinta œcumenica, though even this excellent author cannot be vindicated from the imputation of a certain degree of partiality. See also Christ. Lupus, Not. ad Concilium quintum, in his Adnot. ad Concilia.

means to be adopted, since it bordered upon the erroneous expressions and tenets of the Theopaschites, who composed one of the sects into which the Eutycheians were subdivided.\* The latter opinion was confirmed by Hormisdas the Roman pontiff; to whom the Scythian monks had appealed in vain; but this, instead of allaying the heat of the present controversy, only added new fuel to the flame. John II., who was one of the successors of Hormisdas, approved the proposition which the latter had condemned; and, confirming the opinion of the Scythian monks, exposed the decisions of the papal oracle to the laughter of the wise. His sentence was afterwards sanctioned by the fifth general council; and thus peace was restored to the church by the conclusion of these unintelligible disputes.†

With the question now mentioned, there was another closely and intimately connected, namely, Whether the person of Christ could be considered as compounded? Of this question the Scythian monks maintained the affirmative, and their adversaries the negative.

CHAPTER IV.

Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.

I. IN this century the cause of true religion sunk apace, and the gloomy reign of superstition extended itself in proportion to the decay of genuine piety. This lamentable decay was supplied by a multitude of rites and ceremonies. In the east the Nestorian and Eutycheian controversies gave occasion to the invention of various rites and external institutions, which were used as marks to distinguish the contending parties. The western churches were loaded with rites by Gregory the Great, who had a marvellous fecundity of genius in inventing, and an irresistible force of eloquence in recommending superstitious observances. Nor will this appear surprising to those who know, that, in the opinion of this pontiff, the words of the sacred writings were images of mysterious and invisible things; for such as embrace this chimerical system will easily be led to express all the doctrines and precepts of religion by external rites and symbols. Gregory, indeed, is worthy of praise in this, that he did not pretend to force others to the observance of his inventions; though this forbearance, perhaps, was as much occasioned by a want of power, as by a principle of moderation.

II. This prodigious augmentation of rites

and ceremonies rendered an augmentation of doctors and interpreters of these mysteries indispensably necessary. Hence a new kind of science arose, which had, for its object, the explication of these ceremonies and the investigation of the causes and circumstances whence they derived their origin. But most of those, who entered into these researches, never went to the fountain-head, to the true sources of these idle inventions. They endeavoured to seek their origin in reason and Christianity; but in this they deceived themselves, or, at least, deluded others, and delivered to the world their own fancies, instead of disclosing the true causes of things. Had they been acquainted with the opinions and customs of remote antiquity, or studied the pontifical law of the Greeks and Romans, they would have discovered the true origin of many institutions, which were falsely looked upon as venerable and sacred.

III. The public worship of God was still celebrated by every nation in its own language, but was enlarged, from time to time, by the addition of various hymns, and other things of that nature, which were considered as proper to enliven devotion by the power of novelty. Gregory the Great prescribed a new method of administering the Lord's supper, with a magnificent assemblage of pompous ceremonies. This institution was called the *canon of the mass*; and, if any are unwilling to give it the name of a new appointment, they must at least acknowledge, that it was a considerable augmentation of the ancient canon for celebrating the eucharist, and occasioned a remarkable change in the administration of that ordinance. Many ages, however, passed before this Gregorian canon was adopted by all the Latin churches.\*

Baptism, except in cases of necessity, was administered only on great festivals. We omit mentioning, for the sake of brevity, the litanies that were addressed to the saints, the different sorts of supplications, the stations or assemblies of Gregory, the forms of consecration, and other such institutions, which were contrived, in this century, to excite a species of external devotion, and to engage the outward senses in religious worship. An inquiry into these topics would of itself deserve to be made the subject of a separate work.

IV. An incredible number of temples arose in honour of the saints, during this century, both in the eastern and western provinces. The places set apart for public worship were already very numerous; but it was now that Christians first began to consider these sacred edifices as the means of purchasing the favour and protection of the saints, and to be persuaded that these departed spirits defended and guarded, against evils and calamities of every kind, the provinces, lands, cities, and villages, in which they were honoured with temples. The number of festivals, which were now observed in the Christian church, and many of which seem to have been instituted upon a pagan model, nearly equalled the amount of the temples. To those that were celebrated in the

\* See Theod. Chr. Lilienthal, *de Canone Missæ Gregoriano*.

† See Historia Controversarum de uno ex Trinitate passo, by Norris, tom. iii. op. p. 771. The ancient writers who mention this controversy, call the monks who set it on foot, Scythians. But La Croze (Thesaur. Epist. tom. iii.) imagines, that the country of these monks was Egypt, and not Scythia; and this conjecture is supported by reasons which carry in them, at least, a high degree of probability.

preceding century, were now added the festival of the purification of the blessed Virgin (invented with a design to remove the uneasiness of the heathen converts on account of the loss of their Lupercalia or feasts of Pan,) the festival of the immaculate conception, the day set apart to commemorate the birth of St. John, and others less worthy of mention

#### CHAPTER V.

##### *Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. THE various sects which had fomented divisions among Christians in the early ages of the church, were far from being effectually suppressed or totally extirpated. Though they had been persecuted and afflicted with a variety of hardships, trials, and calamities, yet they still subsisted, and continued to excite dissensions and tumults in many places. The Manicheans are said to have gained such a degree of influence among the Persians, as to have corrupted even the son of Kobad, the monarch of that nation, who repaid their zeal in making proselytes with a terrible massacre, in which numbers of that impious sect perished in the most dreadful manner. Nor was Persia the only country which was troubled with the attempts of the Manicheans to spread their odious doctrine; other provinces of the empire were, undoubtedly, infected with their errors, as we may judge from the book that was written against them by Heraclian, bishop of Chalcedon.\* In Gaul and Africa, dissensions of a different kind prevailed; and the controversy between the Semi-Pelagians and the disciples of Augustin continued to divide the western churches.

II. The Donatists enjoyed the sweets of freedom and tranquillity, as long as the Vandals reigned in Africa; but the scene was greatly changed with respect to them, when the empire of these barbarians was overturned in 534. They, however, still remained in a separate body, and not only held their church, but, toward the conclusion of this century, and particularly from the year 591, defended themselves with new degrees of animosity and vigour, and were bold enough to attempt the multiplication of their sect. Gregory, the Roman pontiff, opposed these efforts with great spirit and assiduity; and, as appears from his epistles,† tried various methods of depressing this faction, which was pluming its wings anew, and aiming at the revival of those lamentable divisions which it had formerly excited in the church. Nor was the opposition of the zealous pontiff without effect; it seems on the contrary to have been attended with the desired success, since, in this century, the church of the Donatists dwindled away to nothing, and after this period no traces of it are to be found.

III. About the commencement of this century, the Arians were triumphant in several parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe. Many of the Asiatic bishops favoured them secretly,

while their opinions were openly professed, and their cause maintained, by the Vandals in Africa, the Goths in Italy, the Spaniards, the Burgundians, the Suevi, and the greatest part of the Gauls. It is true, that the Greeks, who had received the decrees of the council of Nice, persecuted and oppressed the Arians wherever their influence and authority could reach; but the Nicenians, in their turn, were not less rigorously treated by their adversaries, particularly in Africa and Italy, where they felt, in a very severe manner, the weight of the Arian power, and the bitterness of hostile resentment.\*

The triumphs of Arianism were, however, transitory, and its prosperous days were entirely eclipsed, when the Vandals were driven out of Africa, and the Goths out of Italy, by the arms of Justinian;‡ for the other Arian princes were easily induced to abandon, themselves, the doctrine of that sect; and not only so, but to employ the force of laws and the authority of councils to prevent its progress among their subjects, and to extirpate it entirely out of their dominions. Such was the conduct of Sigismund king of the Burgundians; also of Theodimir king of the Suevi, who had settled in Lusitania; and Recared king of Spain.—Whether this change was produced by the force of reason and argument, or by the influence of hopes and fears, is a question which we shall not pretend to determine. One thing, however, is certain, that, from this period, the Arian sect declined apace, and could never after recover any considerable degree of stability and consistence.

IV. The Nestorians, after having gained a firm footing in Persia, and established the patriarch or head of their sect at Seleucia, extended their views, and spread their doctrines, with a success equal to the ardour of their zeal, through the provinces situated beyond the limits of the Roman empire. There are yet extant authentic records, from which it appears, that throughout Persia, as also in India, Armenia, Arabia, Syria, and other countries, there were vast numbers of Nestorian churches, all under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Seleucia.‡ It is true, indeed, that the Persian monarchs were not all equally favourable to this growing sect, and that some of them even persecuted, with the utmost severity, all those who bore the Christian name throughout their dominions;§ but it is also true, that such of these princes, as were disposed to exercise moderation and benignity toward the Christians, were much more indulgent to the Nestorians, than to their adversaries who adhered to the council of Ephesus, since the latter were con-

\* Procopius, de Bello Vandal. lib. i. cap. viii. and de Bello Gothico, lib. ii. cap. ii.—Evagrius, Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. iv. cap. xv.

† See Mascovii Historia German. tom. ii. p. 76, 91. See also an account of the barbarian kings, who abandoned Arianism, and received the doctrines of the Nicene council, in the Acta Sanctorum, tom. ii. Martii, p. 275, and April, p. 134.

‡ Cosmas Indicopleustes, Topograph. Christian. lib. ii. p. 125, which is to be found in Montfaucon's Collectio nova PP. Græcorum.

§ Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatic. tom. iii. part i. p. 109, 407, 411, 441, 449; tom. iii. part ii. cap. v. sect. ii. p. 83.

\* See Photius, Biblioth. cod. cxiv. p. 291.

† See his Epistles, lib. iv. ep. xxxiv. xxxv. p. 714, 715, lib. vi. ep. lxx. p. 811, ep. xxxvii. p. 821, lib. ix. ep. liii. p. 972, lib. ii. ep. xlviii. p. 611, tom. II. ep.



sidered as spies employed by the Greeks, with whom they were connected by the ties of religion.

V. The Monophysites, or Eutychians, flourished also in this century, and had gained over to their doctrine a considerable part of the eastern provinces. The emperor Anastasius was warmly attached to the doctrine and sect of the Acephali, who were reckoned among the more rigid Monophysites;\* and, in 513, he created patriarch of Antioch (in the room of Flavian, whom he had expelled from that see,) Severus, a learned monk of Palestine, from whom the Monophysites were called Severians.† This emperor exerted all his influence and authority to destroy the credit of the council of Chalcedon in the east, and to maintain the cause of those who adhered to the doctrine of one nature in Christ; and, by the ardour and vehemence of his zeal, he excited the most deplorable seditions and tumults in the church.‡ After the death of Anastasius, which happened in 518, Severus was expelled in his turn; and the sect which the late emperor had maintained and propagated with such zeal and assiduity, was every where opposed and depressed by his successor Justin, and the following emperors, in such a manner, that it seemed to be on the very brink of ruin, notwithstanding that it had created Sergius patriarch in the place of Severus.§

VI. When the affairs of the Monophysites were in such a desperate situation, that almost all hope of their recovery had vanished, and their bishops were reduced, by death and imprisonment, to a very small number, an obscure man whose name was Jacob, and who was distinguished from others so called, by the surname of Baradaeus, or Zanzalus, restored this expiring sect to its former prosperity and lustre.|| This poor monk, the greatness of whose views rose far above the obscurity of his station, and whose fortitude and patience no dangers could daunt, nor any labours exhaust, was ordained to the episcopal office by a handful of captive bishops, travelled on foot through the whole east, established bishops and presbyters every where, revived the drooping spirits of the Monophysites, and produced such an astonishing change in their affairs by the power of his eloquence, and by his incredible activity and diligence, that when he died bishop of Edessa, in 578, he left his sect in a most flourishing state in Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia,

Egypt, Nubia, Abyssinia, and other countries.\* This dexterous monk had prudence to contrive the means of success, as well as activity to put them in execution; for he almost totally extinguished all the animosities, and reconciled all the factions, that had divided the Monophysites; and when their churches grew so numerous in the east, that they could not all be conveniently comprehended under the sole jurisdiction of the patriarch of Antioch, he appointed, as his assistant, the primate of the east, whose residence was at Tagritis, on the borders of Armenia.† The laborious efforts of Jacob were seconded, in Egypt and the adjacent countries, by Theodosius bishop of Alexandria; and he became so famous, that all the Monophysites of the east considered him as their second parent and founder, and are to this day called Jacobites, in honour of their new chief.

VII. Thus it happened, that, by the imprudent zeal and violence which the Greeks employed in defending the truth, the Monophysites gained considerable advantages, and, at length, obtained a solid and permanent settlement. From this period their sect has been under the jurisdiction of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, who, notwithstanding the difference of opinion which subsists, with respect to some points, between the Syrian and Egyptian Monophysites, are exceedingly careful to maintain communion with each other, both by letters, and by the exchange of good offices. The Abyssinian primate is subject to the patriarch of Alexandria; and the primate of the east, who resides at Tagritis, is under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Antioch. The Armenians are ruled by a bishop of their own, and are distinguished by certain opinions and rites from the rest of the Monophysites.

VIII. The sect of the Monophysites, before it was thus happily established, was torn with factions and intestine disputes, and suffered, in a particular manner, from that nice and subtle controversy concerning the body of Christ, which arose at Alexandria. Julian, bishop of Haliarnassus, affirmed, in 519, that the divine nature had so insinuated itself into the body of Christ, from the very moment of the Virgin's conception, that the body of our Lord changed its nature, and became incorruptible. This opinion was also embraced by Caianus, bishop of Alexandria; from whom those who adopted it were called Caianists. They were, however, divided into three sects, two of which debated this question, whether the body of Christ was created or uncreated, while the third asserted, that our Lord's body was indeed corruptible, but never actually corrupted, since the energy of the divine nature must have prevented its dissolution.

This sect was warmly opposed by Severus of Antioch, and Damianus, who maintained

\* Evagrius, Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. iii. cap. xxx. xlv., &c. Theodori Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. ii. p. 562. See also the Index Operum Severi, as it stands collected from ancient MSS. in Montfaucon's Bibliotheca Cœsibianæ, p. 53.

† See Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 47, 321.—Euseb. Renaudot, Historia Patriarch. Alexandrinor. p. 127, &c.

‡ Evagrius, Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. iii. cap. xxxviii.—Cyrillus, vita Sabæ in Jo. Bapt. Cotelerii Monument. Ecclesie Græcæ, tom. iii. p. 312.—Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Anastasius.

§ See Abulpharajii Series Patriarch. Antiochen. in Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. ii.

|| See Biblioth. Orient. &c. tom. ii. cap. viii. p. 62, 72, 326, 331, 414. Eusebii Renaud. Hist. Patriarch. Alexandr. p. 119, 133, 425, and the Liturgiæ Orient. tom. ii. p. 333, 342.—Faustus Naironus, Euoplia Fidei Catholice ex Syrorum Monumentis, part. i. p. 40, 41.

\* With regard to the Nubians and Abyssinians, see the Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 330.—Lobo, Voyage d'Abyssinie, tom. ii. p. 36.—Ludolph. Commentar. ad Historiam Æthiopicam, p. 451.

† Asseman. Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 410. See also this learned writer's Dissertatio de Monophysitis.

that the body of Christ, before his resurrection, was truly *corruptible*, i. e. subject to the affections and changes with which human nature is generally attended. Those who embraced the opinion of Julian, were called Aphthartodocetæ, Docetæ, Phantasiasts, and even Manicheans, because it was supposed to follow from their hypothesis, that Christ did not suffer in reality, but only in appearance, hunger and thirst, pain and death; and that he did not actually assume the common affections and properties of human nature. On the other hand, the votaries of Severus were distinguished by the names Phthartolatræ, Ktistolatræ, and Creaticolæ. This miserable controversy was carried on with great warmth under the reign of Justinian, who favoured the Aphthartodocetæ; soon after, it subsided gradually; and, at length, was happily hushed in silence.\* Xenaias of Hierapolis struck out an hypothesis upon this knotty matter, which seemed equally remote from those of the contending parties; for he maintained that Christ had, indeed, truly suffered the various sensations to which humanity is exposed, but that he suffered them not in his nature, but by a submissive act of his will.†

IX. Some of the Corrupticolæ (for so they were called who looked upon the body of Christ to be corruptible,) particularly Themistius, a deacon of Alexandria, and Theodosius, a bishop of that city, were led by the inconsiderate heat of controversy into another opinion, which produced new commotions in the church toward the conclusion of this century. They affirmed, that to the divine nature of Christ all things were known, but that from his human nature many things were concealed. The rest of the sect charged the authors of this opinion with imputing ignorance to the divine nature of Christ, since they held, that there was but one nature in the Son of God. Hence the votaries of this new doctrine were called Agnoetæ;‡ but their sect was so weak and ill-supported, that, notwithstanding their eloquence and activity, which seemed to promise better success, it gradually declined, and came to nothing.

\* Timotheus, de Receptione Hæreticorum, in Cotelerii Monumentis Ecclesiæ Græcæ, tom. iii. p. 409.—Liberatus, in Breviario Controv. cap. xx.—Forbesii Instructiones Historico-Theologicæ, lib. iii. cap. xviii. p. 108.—Asseman. Biblioth. Oriental. tom. iii. part. ii. p. 457.

† Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 23, and 168.

‡ Cotelerius, ad Monumenta Ecclesiæ Græcæ, tom. iii. p. 641.—Mich. le Quien, ad Damascenum de Hæresibus, tom. i. p. 107.—Forbes, Instructiones Historico-Theolog. lib. iii. cap. xix. p. 119.—Photius, Biblioth. Cod. 230.

X. From the controversies with the Monophysites arose the sect of the Tritheists, whose chief was John Aescusnage, a Syrian philosopher, and, at the same time, a Monophysite.\* This man imagined in the Deity three natures, or substances, absolutely equal in all respects, and joined together by no common essence; to which opinion his adversaries gave the name of Tritheism. One of the warmest defenders of this doctrine was John Philoponus, an Alexandrian philosopher, and a grammarian of the highest reputation; and hence he has been considered by many as the author of this sect, whose members have consequently derived from him the title of Philoponists.†

This sect was divided into two parties, the Philoponists and the Cononites; the latter of whom were so called from Conon bishop of Tarsus, their chief.‡ They agreed in the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead, and differed only in their manner of explaining what the Scriptures taught concerning the resurrection of the body. Philoponus maintained, that the form and matter of all bodies were generated and corrupted, and that both therefore were to be restored in the resurrection. Conon held, on the contrary, that the body never lost its form: that its matter alone was subject to corruption and decay, and was consequently to be restored when "this mortal shall put on immortality."

A third faction was that of the Damianists, who were so called from Damian bishop of Alexandria, and whose opinion concerning the Trinity was different from those already mentioned. They distinguished the divine essence from the three persons, and denied that each person was God, when considered in itself, abstractedly from the other two; but affirmed that there was a common divinity, by the joint participation of which each was God. They therefore called the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, *hypostases*, or persons, and the Godhead, which was common to them all, *substance* or *nature*.§

\* See Gregor. Abulpharajius, in Biblioth. Orient. tom. i. p. 328.

† See Fabricii Biblioth. Græc. lib. v. cap. xxxvii. p. 358.—Harduini Concilia, tom. iii. p. 1288.—Timotheus, de Receptione Hæreticorum, apud Cotelerii Monumenta Ecclesiæ Græcæ, tom. iii. p. 414.—Jo. Damascenus, de Hæresibus, tom. i. op.

‡ Photii Biblioth. Cod. xxiv.—Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 329.

§ Biblioth. Orient. tom. ii. p. 78, 332, &c.

# THE SEVENTH CENTURY.

## PART I.

### THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the prosperous Events which happened in the Church during this Century.*

I. IN this century the progress of Christianity was greatly accelerated both in the eastern and western hemispheres; and its divine light was widely diffused through the darkened nations. The Nestorians who dwelt in Syria, Persia, and India, contributed much to its propagation in the east, by the zeal and diligence, the laborious efforts and indefatigable assiduity, with which they preached it to those fierce and barbarous nations, who lived in the remotest regions and deserts of Asia, and among whom, as we learn from authentic records, their ministry was crowned with remarkable success. It was by the labours of this sect, that the light of the Gospel first penetrated into the immense empire of China, about the year 636, when Jesuiabas of Gadala was at the head of the Nestorians, as will appear probable to those who consider as genuine the famous Chinese monument, which was discovered at Sigangfu by the Jesuits during the last century.\* Some, indeed, look upon this monument as a mere forgery of the Jesuits, though, perhaps, without reason: there are, however, some unexceptionable proofs, that the northern parts of China, even before this century, abounded with Christians, who, for many succeeding ages, were under the inspection of a metropolitan sent to them by the Chaldean or Nestorian patriarch.†

\* This celebrated monument has been published and explained by several learned writers, particularly by Kircher, in his *China Illustrata*; by Muller, in a treatise published at Berlin in 1672; by Renaudot, in his *Relations anciennes des Indes et de la Chine, de deux Voyageurs Mahometans*, p. 228—271, published at Paris in 1718; and by Assemanus, in his *Biblioth. Orient.* tom. iii. in part ii. cap. iv. sect. 7. p. 533. A still more accurate edition of this famous monument was promised to us by the learned Theoph. Siegfred Bayer, the greatest proficient of this age in Chinese erudition; but his death has blasted our expectations. For my part, I see no reason to doubt the genuineness of this monument; nor can I understand what advantage could redound to the Jesuits from the invention of such a fable. See Liron, *Singularites Historiques et Literaires*, tom. ii. p. 500.

† See Renaudot, p. 56, 68, &c. also Assemanus *Biblioth. cap. ix. p. 522*; the learned Bayer, in the Preface to his *Museum Sinicum*, assures us, that he had in his hands such proofs of the truth of what is here affirmed, as put the matter beyond all doubt. ¶ See on this subject a very learned dissertation published by M. de Guignes in the thirtieth vol. of the *Memoires de Litterature, tires des Registres de l'Academie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, in which he proves that the Christians were settled in China so early as the seventh century. He remarks indeed, that the Nestorians and other Christians were for a long time confounded in the Chinese annals with the worshippers of Fo, an Indian idol, whose rites were introduced into China about 65 years after the birth

of Christ; and that this circumstance has deceived De la Croze, Beausobre, and some other learned men, who have raised specious objections against the hypothesis that maintains the early introduction of Christianity into this great empire. A reader, properly informed, will pay little or no attention to the account given of this matter by Voltaire in the first volume of his *Essai sur l'Histoire Generale*. A poet, who recounts facts, or denies them, without deigning to produce his authorities, must not expect to meet with the credit that is due to an historian.

II. The attention and activity of the Greeks were so entirely occupied by their intestine divisions, that they were little solicitous about the progress of Christianity. In the west, Augustin laboured to extend the limits of the church, and to spread the light of the Gospel among the Anglo-Saxons; and, after his death, other monks were sent from Rome, to exert themselves in the same glorious cause. Their efforts were attended with the desired success: and the efficacy of their labours was manifested in the conversion of the six Anglo-Saxon kings, who had hitherto remained under the darkness of the ancient superstitions, to the Christian faith, which gained ground by degrees, and was, at length, embraced universally in Britain.\* We are not, however, to imagine, that this general change in favour of Christianity was wholly due to the discourses of the Roman monks and doctors; for other causes were certainly instrumental in accomplishing this great event; and it is not to be doubted that the influence which some Christian queens, and ladies of high distinction, had over their husbands, and the pains they took to convert them to Christianity, as also the severe and rigorous laws that were afterwards enacted against idolaters,‡ contributed much to the progress of the Gospel.

III. Many of the British, Scottish, and Irish ecclesiastics travelled among the Batavian, Belgic, and German nations, with the pious intention of propagating the knowledge of the truth, and of erecting churches, and forming religious establishments. This was the true reason which induced the Germans, in after-times, to found so many convents for the Scotch and Irish, of which some yet remain.‡

Columban, an Irish monk, seconded by the labours of a few companions, had happily extirpated, in the preceding century, the ancient superstitions in Gaul, and the parts adjacent, where idolatry had taken the deepest root; he also carried the lamp of celestial truth among the Suevi, the Boii, the Franks, and other Ger-

\* Bedæ *Historia Ecclesiast. Gentis Anglor.* lib. ii. cap. iii. xiv. lib. iii. cap. xxi.—*Rapin de Thoyras*, tom. i.

‡ Wilkins' *Concilia Magnæ Britanniae*, tom. i. p. 222. † See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Febr. p. 362.

man nations,\* and persevered in these pious and useful labours until his death, which happened in 615. St. Gal, who was one of his companions, preached the Gospel to the Helvetii, and the Suevi.† St. Kilian set out from Scotland, the place of his nativity, and exercised the ministerial function with such success among the eastern Franks, that vast numbers of them embraced Christianity.‡ Toward the conclusion of this century, the famous Willebrod, by birth an Anglo-Saxon, accompanied by eleven of his countrymen, *viz.* Suidbert, Wigbert, Acca, Wilibald, Unibald, Lebwin, the two Ewalds, Werenfrid, Marcellin, and Adalbert, crossed over into Batavia, which lay opposite to Britain, in order to convert the Friselanders to the religion of Jesus. Hence, in 692, they went into Fosteland, which most writers look upon to have been the same with the isle of Heligoland, or Heilgiland; but, being cruelly treated there by Radbod, king of the Friselanders, who put Wigbert, one of the company, to death, they departed thence for Cimbria, and the adjacent parts of Denmark. They, however, returned to Friseland in 693, and were much more successful than they had formerly been in opposing the ancient superstitions, and propagating the knowledge of divine truth. Willebrod was ordained, by the Roman pontiff, archbishop of Witeburg, now Utrecht, and died among the Batavians in a good old age, while his associates continued to spread the light of the Gospel among the Westphalians and the neighbouring nations.§

IV. These voyages, and many others, undertaken in the cause of Christ, carry, no doubt, a specious appearance of piety and zeal; but the impartial and attentive inquirer after truth will find it impossible to form the same favourable judgment of them all, or to applaud, without distinction, the motives that animated these laborious missionaries. That the designs of some of them were truly pious, and their characters without reproach, is unquestionably certain; but it is equally certain, that this was not the case of them all, or even of the greatest part of them. Many of them discovered, in the course of their ministry, the most turbulent passions, and dishonoured the glorious cause in which they were engaged, by their arrogance and ambition, their avarice and cruelty. They abused the power which they had received from the Roman pontiffs, of forming religious establishments among the superstitious nations; and, instead of gaining souls to Christ, they usurped a despotic dominion over their obsequious proselytes, and exercised a princely authority over the countries where their ministry had been successful. Nor are we to consider, as entirely groundless, the suspicions of those who allege that many of the

monks, desirous of rule and authority, concealed their vices under the mask of religion, and endured for a time the austerities of a rigid mortification and abstinence, merely with a view to rise to the episcopal dignity.

V. The conversion of the Jews seemed at a stand in this century; for few or none of the obstinate nation embraced the Gospel in consequence of an inward conviction of its truth, though in many places they were barbarously compelled, by the Christians, to make an outward and feigned profession of their faith in Christ. The emperor Heraclius, incensed against that miserable people by the insinuations, as it is said, of the Christian doctors, persecuted them in a cruel manner, and ordered multitudes of them to be inhumanly dragged into the Christian churches, in order to be baptized by violence and compulsion.\* The same odious method of converting was practised in Spain and Gaul, by the monarchs of those nations, against which even the bishops of Rome expressed their displeasure and indignation. Such were the horrid and abominable practices to which an ignorance of the true spirit of Christianity, and the barbarous genius of this age, led the heralds of that divine religion, which was designed to spread abroad *charity* upon earth, and to render mankind truly and rationally free.

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THE Christians suffered less in this, than in the preceding centuries. They were sometimes persecuted by the Persian monarchs, but usually recovered their former tranquillity after transitory scenes of violence and oppression. In England, the new converts to Christianity suffered various calamities under the petty kings, who governed in those boisterous times; but these kings embraced the Gospel themselves, and then the sufferings of the Christians ceased. In the eastern countries, and particularly in Syria and Palestine, the Jews, at certain times, attacked the Christians with a merciless fury,† but with so little success, that they always had reason to repent of their temerity, which was severely chastised. It is true, the church had other enemies, even those who, under the treacherous profession of Christianity, were laying secret schemes for the restoration of Paganism; but they were too weak and too inconsiderable to form any attempts that could endanger the Christian cause.

II. But a new and most powerful enemy to the Christian cause started up in Arabia in 612, under the reign of Heraclius. This was Mahomet, or Mohammed, an illiterate man,‡ but

\* Mabillon, Acta Sanctor. Ordinis Benedicti, tom. ii. iii.—Adaman. lib. iii. de S. Columbano, in Canisii Lection. Antiq. tom. i.

† Walafridi Strabonis Vit. S. Galli in Actis S. Ord. Benedict. tom. ii.—Canisii Lection. Antiq. tom. i.

‡ Vita S. Kiliani in Canisii Lection. Antiq. tom. iii.—Jo. Pet. de Ludewig, Scriptores Rerum Wurzburgens. p. 966.

§ Alcuini Vita Willebrodi in Mabillon, Act. SS. Ord. Benedict. and Mollerii Cimbria Literata, tom. ii. p. 980.

\* Eutychiei Annales Eccles. Alexandr. tom. ii. p. 212.

† Eutychiei Annales, tom. ii. p. 236. Jo. Henr. Hottingeri Historia Orientalis, lib. i. cap. iii. p. 129.

‡ Mohammed himself expressly declared, that he was totally ignorant of all branches of learning and science, and was even unable either to write or read; and his followers have drawn from this ignorance an argument in favour of the divinity of his mission, and of the religion he taught. It is, however, scarcely credible, that his ignorance was such as it is here described; and several of

endowed by nature with the most flowing and attractive eloquence, and with a vast and penetrating genius,\* distinguished also by the advantages he enjoyed from the place of his birth, which added a lustre to his name and his undertakings. This adventurous impostor publicly declared, that he was commissioned by God to destroy polytheism and idolatry, and then to reform, first the religion of the Arabians, and afterwards the Jewish and Christian worship. For these purposes he delivered a new law, which is known by the name of the *Koran*, i. e. *the book*, by way of eminence;† and, having gained several victories over his enemies, he compelled an incredible multitude of persons, both in Arabia and the neighbouring nations, to receive his doctrine, and range themselves under his standard. Elate with this rapid and unexpected success, he greatly extended his ambitious views, and formed the vast and arduous project of founding an empire. Here again success crowned his adventurous efforts; and his plan was executed with such intrepidity and impudence, that he died master of all Arabia, beside several adjacent provinces.

III. It is, perhaps, impossible, at this time, to form such an accurate judgment of the character, views, and conduct of Mohammed, as would entirely satisfy the curiosity of a sagacious inquirer after truth. To give entire credit to the Grecian writers in this matter, is neither prudent nor safe, since their bitter resentment against this hostile invader led them to invent, without scruple or hesitation, fables and calumnies to blacken his character. The Arabians, on the other hand, are as little to be

his sect have called in question the declarations of their chief relating to this point. See Chardin's *Voyages en Perse*, tom. iv. If we consider that he carried on, for a considerable time, a successful commerce in Arabia and the adjacent countries, this alone will convince us, that he must have been, in some measure, instructed in the arts of reading, writing, and arithmetic, with the knowledge of which a merchant cannot dispense.

\* The writers, to whom we are indebted for the accounts of the life and religion of Mohammed, are enumerated by Fabricius, in his *Delectus et Syllabus Argumentorum, pro Veritate Religionis Christianæ*; to which we may add Boulaivilliers's *Vie de Mahomet*, published at London in 1730, which, however, deserves rather the character of a romance, than of a history; Gagnier's *Vie de Mahomet*, printed at Amsterdam in 1732, and commendable both for the learning and candour with which it appears to have been composed; and, above all, the learned and judicious Sale's *Preliminary Discourse*, prefixed to his English translation of the *Koran*, sect. ii. p. 37.

† For an account of the *Koran*, see principally Sale's preface. See also Vertot's *Discours sur l'Alcoran*, subjoined to the third volume of his *History of the Knights of Malta*, and Chardin's *Voyages en Perse*, tom. ii. p. 281. The book which the Mohammedans call the *Koran*, is composed of several papers and discourses of the impostor, which were discovered and collected after his death, and is by no means that same law whose excellence he vaunted so highly. That some parts of the true *Koran* may be copied in the modern one, is indeed very possible; but that the *Koran*, or Law, given by Mohammed to the Arabians, is entirely distinct from the modern *Koran*, is manifest from this, that, in the latter, he appeals to, and extols the former, and therefore they must be two different compositions. May it not be conjectured, that the true *Koran* was an Arabic poem, which he recited to his followers without giving it to them in writing, ordering them only to commit it to memory? Such were the laws of the Druids in Gaul and Britain, and such also those of the Indians, which the Bramins receive by oral tradition, and get by heart.

trusted to, as their historians are destitute of veracity and candour; they conceal the vices and enormities of their chief, and represent him as the most divine person that ever appeared upon earth, and as the best gift of God to the world. Add to this, that a considerable part of his life, indeed, the part of it that would be the most proper to lead us to a true knowledge of his character, and of the motives from which he acted, is absolutely unknown. It is highly probable, that he was so deeply affected with the odious and abominable superstition which dishonoured his country, that it threw him into a certain fanatical disorder of mind, and made him really imagine that he was supernaturally commissioned to reform the religion of the Arabians, and to restore among them the worship of one God. It is, however, at the same time, undoubtedly evident, that, when he saw his enterprise crowned with the desired success, he made use of impious frauds to establish the work he had so happily begun, de-luded the giddy and credulous multitude by various artifices, and even forged celestial visions to confirm his authority, and remove the difficulties that frequently arose in the course of his affairs. This mixture of imposture is by no means incompatible with a spirit of enthusiasm; for the fanatic, through the unguided warmth of zeal, looks often upon the artifices that are useful to his cause as pious and acceptable to the Supreme Being, and therefore deceives when he can do it with impunity.\* The religion which Mohammed taught, is certainly different from what it would have been, if he had met with no opposition in the propagation of his opinions. The difficulties he had to encounter obliged him to yield, in some respects, to the reigning systems; the obstinate attachment of the Arabians to the religion of their ancestors, on one hand, and the fond hope of gaining over to his cause both the Jews and Christians on the other, engaged, no doubt, this fanatical impostor to admit into his system several tenets, which he would have rejected without hesitation, had he been free from the restraints of ambition and artifice.

IV. The rapid success which attended the propagation of this new religion, was produced by causes that are plain and evident, and must remove, or rather prevent our surprise, when they are attentively considered. The terror of Mohammed's arms, and the repeated victories which were gained by him and his successors, were, without doubt, the irresistible argument that persuaded such multitudes to embrace his religion, and submit to his dominion. Besides, his law was artfully and wonderfully adapted to the corrupt nature of man, and, in a more particular manner, to the manners and opinions of the eastern nations, and the vices to which they were naturally addicted; for the articles of faith which it proposed were few in number, and extremely simple; and the duties it re-

\* This, perhaps, is the best way of adjusting the controversy that has been carried on by some learned men upon this curious question,—whether Mohammed was a fanatic or an impostor. See Bayle's Dictionary; also Ockley's *Conquest of Syria, Persia, and Egypt*, by the Saracens, vol. i.; and Sale's Preface to his Translation of the *Koran*, sect. ii.

quired were neither many nor difficult, nor such as were incompatible with the empire of appetites and passions.\* It is to be observed farther, that the gross ignorance, under which the Arabians, Syrians, Persians, and the greatest part of the eastern nations, laboured at this time, rendered many an easy prey to the artifice and eloquence of this bold adventurer. To these causes of the progress of the Mohammedan faith, we may add the bitter dissensions and cruel animosities that reigned among the Christian sects, particularly the Greeks, Nestorians, Eutychians, and Monophysites, dissensions that filled a great part of the east with carnage, assassinations, and such detestable enormities, as rendered the very name of Christianity odious to many. We might add here, that the Monophysites and Nestorians, full of resentment against the Greeks, from whom they had suffered the bitterest and most injurious treatment, assisted the Arabians in the conquest of several provinces,† into which, consequently, the religion of Mohammed was afterwards introduced. Other causes of the sudden progress of that religion, will naturally occur to such as consider attentively its spirit and genius, and the state of the world at that time.

V. After the death of the pseudo-prophet, which happened in 632, his followers, led on by an amazing intrepidity and a fanatical fury, and assisted, as we have already observed, by those Christians whom the Greeks had treated with such severity, extended their conquests beyond the limits of Arabia, and subdued Syria, Persia, Egypt, and other countries. On the other hand, the Greeks, exhausted with civil discord, and wholly occupied by intestine troubles, were unable to stop these intrepid conquerors in their rapid career.

For some time these enthusiastic invaders used their prosperity with moderation, and treated the Christians, particularly those who rejected the decrees of the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, with the utmost indulgence and lenity. But, as an uninterrupted course of success and prosperity renders, too generally, corrupt mortals insolent and imperious, so the moderation of this victorious sect degene-

\* See Reland, de Religione Mahumetica; also Sale's Preliminary Discourse.

† See Ockley's Conquest of Syria, Persia, and Egypt, by the Saracens.

rated by degrees into severity; and they treated the Christians, at length, rather like slaves than citizens, loading them with insupportable taxes, and obliging them to submit to a variety of vexatious and oppressive measures.

VI. The progress, however, of this triumphant sect received a considerable check by the civil dissensions which arose among them immediately after the death of Mohammed.—Abubeker and Ali, the former the father-in-law, and the latter the son-in-law, of this pretended prophet, aspired to succeed him in the empire which he had erected. Upon this arose a tedious and cruel contest, whose flame reached to succeeding ages, and produced that schism which divided the Mohammedans into two great factions, whose separation not only gave rise to a variety of opinions and rites, but also excited the most implacable hatred and the most deadly animosities. Of these factions, one acknowledged Abubeker as the true *khalif*, or successor of Mohammed, and its members were distinguished by the name of Sunnites; while the other adhered to Ali, and received the appellation of Shiites.\* Both, however, adhered to the Koran as a divine law, and as the rule of faith and manners; to which, indeed, the former added, by way of interpretation, the *sonna*, i. e. a certain law which they looked upon as derived from Mohammed by oral tradition, and which the Shiites refused to admit. Among the Sunnites, or followers of Abubeker, we are to reckon the Turks, Tartars, Arabians, Africans, and the greatest part of the Indian Moslems; whereas the Persians, and the subjects of the great Mogul, are generally considered as the followers of Ali; though the latter indeed seem rather to observe a strict neutrality in this contest.

Beside these two grand factions, there are several subordinate sects among the Moslems, which dispute with warmth upon several points of religion, though without violating the rules of mutual toleration.† Of these sects there are four, which far surpass the rest in point of reputation and importance.

\* See Reland, de Religione Turcica, lib. i. p. 36, 70, 74, 85; and Chardin's Voyages en Perse, tom. ii. p. 236.

† For an account of the Mohammedan sects, see Hottingeri Histor. Orient. lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 340.—Ricaut's Etat de l'Empire Ottoman, liv. ii. p. 242.—Chardin's Voyages en Perse, tom. ii.; and Sale's Preliminary Discourse, sect. viii.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.*

I. NOTHING can equal the ignorance and darkness that reigned in this century; the most impartial and accurate account of which will appear incredible to those who are unacquaint-

ed with the productions of this barbarous period. Any remains of learning and philosophy that yet survived, were, a few particular cases excepted, to be found principally among the Latins, in the obscure retreats of cloistered monks. The monastic institutions prohibited the election of any abbot to the government of a convent, who was not a man of learning,

or, at least, endowed with some share of the erudition of the times. The monks were obliged to consecrate certain hours every day to reading and study: and, that they might improve this appointment to the most advantageous purposes, there were, in most of the monasteries, stated times marked out, at which they were to assemble, in order to communicate to each other the fruits of their studies, and to discuss the matters upon which they had been reading.\* The youth also, who were destined for the service of the church, were obliged to prepare themselves for their ministry by a diligent application to study; and in this they were directed by the monks, one of whose principal occupations it was to preside over the education of the rising priesthood.

It must, however, be acknowledged, that all these institutions were of little use to the advancement of solid learning, or of rational theology, because very few in those days were acquainted with the true nature of the liberal arts and sciences, or with the important ends which they were adapted to serve; and the greatest part of those who were looked upon as learned men, threw away their time in reading the marvellous lives of a parcel of fanatical saints, instead of employing it in the perusal of well-chosen and excellent authors. They, who distinguished themselves most by their taste and genius, carried their studies little farther than the works of Augustin and Gregory the Great; and it was of scraps collected out of these two writers, and patched together without much uniformity, that the best productions of this century were composed.

II. The sciences enjoyed no degree of protection, at this time, from kings and princes; nor did they owe any thing to men of high and eminent stations in the empire. On the other hand, the schools which had been committed to the care and inspection of the bishops, whose ignorance and indolence were now become enormous, began to decline apace, and had, in many places, fallen into ruin.† The bishops in general were so illiterate, that few of them were capable of composing the discourses which they delivered to the people. Such prelates as were not totally destitute of genius composed, out of the writings of Augustin and Gregory, a certain number of insipid homilies, which they divided between themselves and their stupid colleagues, that they might not be obliged through incapacity to discontinue preaching the doctrines of Christianity to the people, as appears from the examples of Cæsarius bishop of Arles, and Eloi bishop of Noyon.‡ There is yet extant a summary of theological doctrine, which was unskillfully compiled by Taion bishop of Saragossa, from the writings of Augustin and Gregory; and which was so highly

extolled in this illiterate age, that its author was called, by the rest of the bishops, the *true salt of the earth*, and a divine light that was sent to illuminate the world.\* Many such instances of the ignorance and barbarity of this century will occur to those who have any acquaintance with the writers it produced. England, it is true, was happier in this respect than the other nations of Europe, which was principally owing to Theodore of Tarsus, of whom we shall have occasion to speak afterwards, who was appointed archbishop of Canterbury, and contributed much to introduce, among the English, a certain taste for literary pursuits, and to excite in that kingdom a zeal for the advancement of learning.†

III. In Greece, the fate of the sciences was truly lamentable. A turgid eloquence, and an affected pomp and splendour of style, which cast a perplexing obscurity over subjects in themselves the most clear and perspicuous, now formed the highest point of perfection to which both prose writers and poets aspired. The Latin eloquence was still very considerably below that of the Greeks; it had not spirit enough even to be turgid, and, a few compositions excepted, it had sunk to the very lowest degree of barbarity and corruption. Both the Greek and Latin writers, who attempted historical compositions, degraded most miserably that important science. Moschus and Sophronius among the former; and among the latter Braulio, Jonas an Iibernian, Audoenus, Dado, and Adamannus, wrote the lives of several saints, or rather a heap of insipid and ridiculous fables, void of the least air of probability, and without the smallest tincture of eloquence. The Greeks related, without discernment or choice, the most vulgar reports that were handed about concerning the events of ancient times: and hence arose that multitude of absurd fables, which the Latins afterwards copied from them with the utmost avidity.

IV. Among the Latins philosophy was at its lowest ebb. If there were any that retained some faint reluctance to abandon it entirely, such confined their studies to the writings of Boethius and Cassiodorus, from which they committed to memory a certain number of phrases and sentences; and that was all their philosophical stock. The Greeks, abandoning Plato to the monks, gave themselves entirely up to the direction of Aristotle, and studied, with eagerness, the subtleties of his logic, which were of signal use in the controversies carried on between the Monophysites, the Nestorians, and Monothelites. All these different sects called the Stagirite to their assistance, when they were to plead their cause, and to defend their doctrines. Hence it was that James, bishop of Edessa, who was a Monophysite, translated, in this century, the dialectics of Aristotle into the Syriac language.‡

\* Mabillon, *Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedicti*, tom. ii. p. 479, 513.

† *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 428.

‡ In the original we read *Eligius Noviomagensis*, which is a mistake either of the author, or printer. It is probable that *Noviomagensis* slipped from the pen of Dr. Mosheim, in the place of *Noviodunensis*; for Eloi was bishop of Noyon, and not of Nimeguen.

\* Mabillon, *Analeceta veteris Ævi*, tom. ii. p. 77.

† *Wilkins' Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i. p. 42.—*Conringii Antiquitat. Academicæ*, p. 277.

‡ See *Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 498.

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government during this Century.*

I. THE disputes about pre-eminence, that had so long subsisted between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, proceeded, in this century, to such violent lengths, as laid the foundation of that deplorable schism, which afterwards separated the Greek and Latin churches. The most learned writers, and those who are most remarkable for their knowledge of antiquity, are generally agreed that Boniface III. engaged Phocas, that abominable tyrant, who waded to the imperial throne through the blood of the emperor Mauritius, to take from the bishop of Constantinople the title of *œcumenical* or *universal bishop*, and to confer it upon the Roman pontiff. They relate this, however, upon the sole authority of Baronius; for none of the ancient writers have mentioned it. If, indeed, we are to give credit to Anastasius and Paul the Deacon,\* something like what we have now related was transacted by Phocas: for, when the bishops of Constantinople maintained that their church was not only equal in dignity and authority to that of Rome, but also the head of all the Christian churches, this tyrant opposed their pretensions, and granted the pre-eminence to the church of Rome: and thus was the papal supremacy first introduced.

II. The Roman pontiffs used all sorts of methods to maintain and enlarge the authority and pre-eminence which they had acquired by a grant from the most odious tyrant that ever disgraced the annals of history. We find, however, in the most authentic accounts of the transactions of this century, that not only several emperors and princes, but also whole nations, opposed the ambitious views of the bishops of Rome. The Byzantine history, and the Formulary of Marcellus, contain many proofs of the influence which the civil magistrate yet retained in religious matters, and of the subordination of the Roman pontiffs to the regal authority. It is true, the Roman writers affirm, that Constantine Pogonatus abdicated the privilege of confirming, by his approbation, the election of the bishop of that city; and, as a proof of this, they allege a passage of Anastasius, in which it is said, that according to an edict of Pogonatus, the *pontiff, who should be elected, was to be ordained immediately, and without the least delay.*† But every one must see, that this passage is insufficient to prove what these writers assert with such confidence. It is however certain, that this emperor abated, some say remitted, the sum which, from the time of Theodoric, the bishops of Rome had been obliged to pay to the imperial treasury before they could be ordained, or have their election confirmed.‡

\* Anastasius, de vitis Pontificum. Paul. Diacon. de rebus gestis Longobard. lib. iv. cap. xxxvii. apud Muratorii Scriptor. rerum Italicar. tom. i. p. 465.

† Anastasii vit. Pontif. in Bened. p. 146, in Muratorii Scriptor. rerum Italicar. tom. iii.

‡ Anastas. vit. Pontif. in Agathone, p. 144, compared with Mascovii Hist. German. tom. ii. p. 121, in the au-

The ancient Britons and Scots persisted long in the maintenance of their religious liberty; and neither the threats nor promises of the legates of Rome could engage them to submit to the decrees and authority of the ambitious pontiff, as appears manifestly from the testimony of Bede. The churches of Gaul and Spain attributed as much authority to the bishop of Rome, as they thought suitable to their own dignity, and consistent with their interests: even in Italy, his supreme authority was obstinately rejected, since the bishop of Ravenna, and other prelates, refused an implicit submission to his orders.\* Beside all this, multitudes of private persons expressed publicly, and without the least hesitation, their abhorrence of the vices, and particularly of the lordly ambition of the Roman pontiffs: and it is highly probable, that the Valdenses or Vaudois had already, in this century, retired into the valleys of Piedmont, that they might be more at liberty to oppose the tyranny of those imperious prelates.†

III. The progress of vice, among the subordinate rulers and ministers of the church, was at this time truly deplorable: neither bishops, presbyters, deacons, nor even the cloistered monks, were exempt from the general contagion, as appears from the unanimous confession of all the writers of this century that are worthy of credit. In those very places, that were consecrated to the advancement of piety, and the service of God, there was little to be seen but spiritual ambition, insatiable avarice, pious frauds, intolerable pride, and a supercilious contempt of the natural rights of the people, with many other vices still more enormous. There reigned also in many places the most bitter dissensions between the bishops and the monks. The former had employed the greedy hands of the latter to augment the episcopal treasure, and to draw the contributions from all parts to support them in their luxury, and the indulgence of their lusts. The monks perceiving this, and also unwilling to serve the bishops in such a dishonourable character, fled for refuge to the emperors and princes, under whose civil jurisdiction they lived; and afterwards, for their farther security, had recourse to the protection of the Roman pontiff.‡ This protection they readily obtained; and the imperious pontiffs, always fond of exerting their authority, exempted, by degrees, the monastic orders from the jurisdiction of the bishops. The monks, in return for this important service, devoted themselves wholly to advance the interests, and to maintain the dignity of the bishop

notations. ¶ It will not be improper to observe here, that by the same edict, which diminished the ordination-money paid by the bishops of Rome to the emperor, Constantine resumed the power of confirming the election of the pope, which his predecessors had invested in the exarchs of Ravenna; so that the bishop elect was not to be ordained till his election was notified to the court of Constantinople, and the imperial decree confirming it was received by the electors at Rome. See Anastasius, in his life of Agatho.

\* See Geddes's Miscellaneous Tracts, tom. ii. p. 6.

† See Antoine Leger's Histoire des Eglises Vaudoises, liv. i. p. 15.

‡ See Launoii Assertio Inquisitionis in Chartam Immunitatis S. Germani, op. tom. iii. par. i. p. 50. Baluzii Miscellan. tom. ii. p. 159; tom. iv. p. 108. Muratorii Antiq. Italic. tom. ii. p. 944, 949.



of Rome. They made his cause their own, and represented him as a sort of god to the ignorant multitude, over whom they had gained a prodigious ascendancy by the notion that generally prevailed of the sanctity of the monastic order. It is, at the same time, to be observed, that this *humanity* toward the monks proved a fruitful source of licentiousness and disorder, and occasioned the greatest part of the vices with which they were afterwards so justly charged. Such, at least, is the judgment of the best writers upon this subject.\*

IV. In the mean time the monks were every where in high repute, and their cause was accompanied with the most surprising success, particularly among the Latins, through the protection and favour of the Roman pontiff, and their pharisaical affectation of uncommon piety and devotion. The heads of families, striving to surpass each other in their zeal for the propagation and advancement of monkery, dedicated their children to God, by shutting them up in convents, and devoting them to a solitary life, which they looked upon as the highest felicity;† nor did they fail to send with these innocent victims a rich dowry. Abandoned profligates, who had passed their days in the most vicious pursuits, and whose guilty consciences filled them with terror and remorse, were comforted with the delusive hopes of obtaining pardon, and making atonement for their crimes, by leaving the greatest part of their fortune to some monastic society. Multitudes, impelled by the unnatural dictates of a gloomy superstition, deprived their children of fertile lands and rich patrimonies, in favour of the monks, by whose prayers they hoped to render the Deity propitious. Several ecclesiastics laid down rules for the direction of the monastic orders. Those among the Latins, who undertook this pious task, were Fructuosus, Isidore, Johannes Gerundinensis, and Columban.‡ The rule of discipline, prescribed by St. Benedict, was not yet universally followed, so as to exclude all others.

V. The writers of this age, who distinguished themselves by their genius or erudition, were very few in number. Among the Greeks, the first rank is due to Maximus, a monk, who disputed with great obstinacy and warmth against the Monothelites, composed some illustrations upon the Holy Scriptures, and was, upon the whole, a man of no mean capacity, though unhappy through the impatience and violence of his natural temper.

Isychius, bishop of Jerusalem, explained several books of Scripture;§ and left several homilies, and some productions of less importance.

Dorotheus, abbot of Palestine, acquired a considerable name by his *Ascetic Dissertations*, in which he laid down a plan of monastic life and manners.

\* See *Launoi Examen Privilegii S. Germani*, tom. iii. par. i. p. 282. *Wilkins' Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, tom. i. p. 43, 44, 49, &c.

† *Lucez, Histoire de l'Abbe Suger*, tom. i. p. 9—16.

‡ *Lucæ Holstenii Codex Regular.* tom. ii. p. 225.

§ See *Simon's Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques de M. Du Pin*, tom. i. p. 261.

Antiochus, a monk of Saba in Palestine, and a monk of a very superstitious complexion, composed a *Pandect* of the Holy Scriptures, *i. e.* a summary or system of the Christian doctrine, which is by no means worthy of high commendation.

Sophronius, bishop of Jerusalem, was rendered illustrious, and attracted the veneration of succeeding ages, by the controversies he carried on against those who, at this time, were branded with the name of heretics; and particularly against the Monothelites, of whose doctrine he was the first opposer, and also the fomentor of the dispute which it occasioned.\*

There are yet extant several homilies, attributed to Andrew, bishop of Crete, which are destitute of true piety and eloquence, and which are, moreover, considered by some writers as entirely spurious.

Gregory, surnamed Pisides, deacon of Constantinople, beside the *History of Heraclius* and the *Avares*, composed several poems, and other pieces of too little moment to deserve mention.

Theodore, abbot of Raithu, published a book which is still extant, against those sects who seemed to introduce corrupt innovations into the Christian religion, by their doctrine relating to the person of Christ.

VI. Among the Latin writers, a certain number were distinguished from the rest by their superior abilities. Idefonso, archbishop of Toledo, was in repute for his learning; the Spaniards, however, attribute to him without foundation certain treatises concerning the *Virgin Mary*.‡

We have yet extant two books of *Epistles*, written by Desiderius, bishop of Cahors, and published by the learned Canisius.

Eligius, or Eloi, bishop of Limoges, left behind him several homilies, and some other productions.

Marcell, a Gallic monk, composed two books of ecclesiastical forms, which are highly valuable, as they are extremely proper to give us a just idea of the deplorable state of religion and learning in this century.‡

Aldhelm, an English prelate, composed several poems concerning the Christian life, which exhibit but indifferent marks of genius and fancy.§

Julian Pomerius confuted the Jews, and acquired a name by several other productions, which are neither worthy of much applause nor of utter contempt. To all these we might add Cresconius, whose *Abridgement of the Canons* is well known; Fredegarius the historian, and a few others.

\* See the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Martii ad d. xi. p. 65.

† See the *Acta Sanctorum*, Januar. tom. ii. p. 533.

‡ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 363.

§ This prelate certainly deserved a more honourable mention than is here made of him by Dr. Mosheim. His poetical talents were by no means the most distinguishing part of his character. He was profoundly versed in the Greek, Latin, and Saxon languages. He appeared also with dignity in the palæal controversy, that so long divided the Saxon and British churches. See *Collier's Ecclesiastical Hist.* vol. i.

## CHAPTER III.

*Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.*

I. In this barbarous age, religion lay expiring under a motley and enormous heap of superstitious inventions, and had neither the courage nor the force to raise her head, or to display her native charms, to a darkened and deluded world. In the earlier periods of the church, the Christian worship was confined to the one Supreme God, and his Son Jesus Christ: but the Christians of this century multiplied the objects of their devotion, and paid homage to the remains of the true cross, to the images of the saints, and to bones, whose real owners were extremely dubious.\* The primitive Christians, in order to excite men to a course of piety and virtue, set before them that heavenly state, and those mansions of misery, which the Gospel has revealed as the different portions of the righteous and the wicked; while the Christians of this century talked of nothing else but a certain fire which effaced the stains of vice, and purified souls from their corruption. The former taught that Christ, by his sufferings and death, had made atonement for the sins of mortals; the latter seemed, by their superstitious doctrine, to exclude, from the kingdom of heaven, such as had not contributed, by their offerings, to augment the riches of the clergy or the church.† The former were only

\* It will not be amiss to quote here a remarkable passage out of the Life of St. Eligius, or Eloi, bishop of Noyon, which is to be found in M. d'Achery's *Spicilegium veter. Scriptor. tom. ii. p. 92*. This passage, which is very proper to give us a just idea of the piety of this age, is as follows: "Huic sanctissimo viro, inter cetera virtutum suarum miracula, id etiam a Domino concessum erat, ut sanctorum martyrum corpora, quæ per tot secula abdita populis hæctenus habebantur, eo investigante ac nimio ardore fidei indagante, patefacta proderentur." It appears by this passage, that St. Eloi was a zealous relic-hunter; and, if we may give credit to the writer of his life, he was very successful at this kind of game; for he smelt and unknelt the carcasses of St. Quintin, St. Plato, St. Crispina, St. Crispinian, St. Lucian, and many more. The bishops of this age, who were either ambitiously desirous of popular applause, or intent upon accumulating riches, and filling their coffers with the oblations of a superstitious people, pretended to be endowed with a miraculous sagacity in discovering the bodies of saints and martyrs. [\*]

† St. Eloi expresses himself upon this matter in the following manner: "Bonus Christianus est, qui ad ecclesiam frequentius venit, et oblationem, que in altari Deo offeratur, exhibet; qui de fructibus suis non gustat, nisi prius Deo aliquid offerat; qui, quoties sanctæ solemnitates advenerint, ante dies plures castitatem etiam cum propria uxore custodit, ut securâ conscientia Domini altare accedere possit; qui postremo symbolum vel orationem Do-

[\*] That such imposition was practised in this respect, even the catholics must admit. The biographer of Eloi says, that "some relics were honoured with popular worship in places where they did not exist, while no one knew, to a certainty, in what spot they were to be found." To supply this deficiency of knowledge, it became expedient, in the opinion of the clerical zealots, to point out the places of interment; and thus relics were wantonly multiplied, many saints having two or three heads found for each person, and a great number of arms and legs. This reminds us of the remark of a lady, who, having seen at a museum a relic which was said to be Cromwell's skull, asked the keeper of another repository, whether he could produce a skull of the same great personage. "No, Madam," he replied; "we have nothing of the kind."—"That seems very odd," said the lady; "I saw one at Oxford, and I should have thought that you would have had another." —*Edm.*

studious to attain a virtuous simplicity of life and manners, and employed their principal zeal and diligence in the culture of true and genuine piety, while the latter placed the whole of religion in external rites and bodily exercises. The methods also of solving the difficulties, and dissipating the doubts, which often arose in inquisitive minds, were of a piece with the rest of the superstitious system that now prevailed. The two great and irresistible arguments against all doubts, were the authority of

minicam memoriter tenet.—Redimite animas vestras de pena, dum habetis in potestate remedia; oblationes et decimas ecclesiis offerte, luminaria sanctis locis, iuxta quod habetis, exhibete; ad ecclesiam quoque frequentius convenite, sanctorum patrocinia humiliter expetite; quod si observaveritis, securi in die iudicii aute tribunal æterni iudicis venientes dicetis, Da, Domine, quia dedimus." [\*] We see here a large and ample description of the character of a "good Christian," in which there is not the least mention of the love of God, resignation to his will, obedience to his laws, or of justice, benevolence, and charity toward men; and in which the whole of religion is made to consist in coming often to the church, bringing offerings to the altar, lighting candles in consecrated places, and the like vain services. [\*]

[\*] Some modern writers of the Romish persuasion have exclaimed against these strictures in terms of severe reprehension; and Dr. Lingard, in particular, says, "This citation from the writings of St. Eloi holds a distinguished place in every invective which has been published against the clergy of former ages; and this definition of a good Christian has been re-echoed a thousand times by the credulity of writers and their readers;" but it appears, upon due investigation, he adds, that the "bishop of Noyon has been *foully calumniated*;" for his definition of a good Christian is of the following tenor: "Non vobis sufficit, charissimi, quod Christianum nomen accepistis, si opera Christiana non facitis. Illi enim predest, quod Christianus vocatur, qui semper Christi præcepta mente retinet, et opere perficit; qui furtum, scilicet, non facit; qui falsum testimonium non dicit; qui nec mendatur, nec pejerat; qui adulterium non committit; qui nullum hominem odit, sed omnes sicut semetipsum diligit; qui iniurias suis malum non reddit, sed magis pro ipsius orat; qui lites non concitat, sed discordes ad concordiam revocat." "It is not sufficient for your characters or your credit, my dearest friends, that you merely bear the name of a Christian; you must perform the acts and duties of a Christian. He alone is worthy of the name, who retains in his mind the precepts of religion, and carries them into effect; who avoids, as a crime, the commission of theft; who shuns the guilt of perjury or falsehood; who does not commit adultery; who hates no one, but is ready to serve even his enemies; and who is so far from promoting strife, that he is eager to prevent all disputes, and allay all animosities." These and other evidences of the Christian character and temper, in the century to which Dr. Mosheim refers, are given by the catholic historian in the words of Audoenus (St. Ouen,) bishop of Rouen, who wrote the life of St. Eloi; and we are bound to state, because we have ascertained the point, that he has quoted the original *fairly and correctly*, according to the best edition of the *Spicilegium*. (Paris, 1723, 3 vols. folio.) We are induced to mention this circumstance, because some protestant divines have been so eager to exculpate Dr. Mosheim, that they have accused Dr. Lingard of following a spurious edition, in which various interpolations might have been made by the Romanists to support the credit of the early church. We are aware that papists seem to have a fellow-feeling with their religious ancestors, and are frequently hurried by their zeal into misrepresentation, and sometimes into gross deviations from truth; but it is certainly illiberal to suspect them without cause, or to condemn them without inquiry.

In the present case, we cannot conscientiously decide in favour of Dr. Mosheim. His *general* impartiality we readily admit; but he did not, on this occasion, strictly attend to that duty. In the very page from which he extracted the unfavourable passage, he must, we think, have seen (for he was usually keen in his researches) the detail of religious and moral duties quoted by Dr. Lingard, and he ought to have given one as well as the other. Some blame is also imputable to the translator, for not making due inquiry into the validity of Dr. Mosheim's charge against the churchmen of the seventh century.—*Editor*

the church and the working of miracles, and the production of these prodigies required no extraordinary degree of dexterity in an age of such gross and universal ignorance.

II. Few, either of the Greeks or Latins, applied themselves to the interpretation of the Scriptures during this century. There are yet extant some commentaries of Isychius, bishop of Jerusalem, upon certain books of the Old Testament, and upon the Epistle to the Hebrews. Maximus published a solution of sixty-five questions relating to the Scriptures, and other productions of the same nature. Julian Pomerius attempted, but without success, to reconcile the seeming contradictions that are to be found in the sacred writings, and to explain the prophecy of Nahum. All these writers were manifestly inferior to the meanest expositors of modern times. The Grecian doctors, particularly those who pretended to be initiated in the most mysterious depths of theology, were continually hunting after fantastic allegories, as is evident from the Questions of Maximus already mentioned. The Latins, on the contrary, were so diffident of their abilities, that they did not dare to enter these allegorical labyrinths, but contented themselves with what flowers they could pluck out of the rich collections of Gregory and Augustin. Of this we see a manifest example in Paterius' Exposition of the Old and New Testament, which is entirely compiled from the writings of Gregory the Great.\* Among the interpreters of this century, we must not forget Thomas, bishop of Heraclea, who gave a second Syriac version of the New Testament.†

III. While philosophy and theology had scarcely any remains of life, any marks of existence among the Latins, the Greeks were wholly occupied with fruitless controversies about particular branches of religion, and did not think of reducing all the doctrines of Christianity into one regular and rational system. It is true, Antiochus, a monk of Palestine, composed a short summary of the Christian doctrine, which he entitled, the Pandect of the Holy Scriptures. It is, however, easy to perceive what sort of an author he was, how void of dignity and true judgment, from many circumstances, and particularly from that rueful poem which is subjoined to his work; in which he deploras, in lamentable strains, the loss of that precious fragment of the true cross, which is said to have been carried away, by the Persians, among other spoils. The most elegant and judicious summary of theology that appeared among the Latins in this century, was the treatise of Ildefonso, de Cognitione Baptismi, which was saved by Baluze from the ruins of time; a work, indeed, which is not extremely necessary, since the ignoble frauds of superstition have been so fully brought to light, though it contains remarkable proofs, that many of the corrupt inventions and practices, which disgrace Christianity in the popish

churches, were not contrived till after this period.\* The dry and insipid body of divinity composed by Taio, or Tago, bishop of Saragossa, under the title of Five Books of Sentences, and compiled from the writings of Gregory and Augustin, is scarcely worthy of mention, though, in this century, it was considered as an admirable and immortal work.†

Several particular branches of doctrine were treated by the theological writers of this age: thus Maximus wrote of the nature of Theology, and the Manifestation of the Son in the Flesh, and also upon the Two Natures in Christ; and Theodore Raithu composed a treatise concerning Christ's Incarnation. But a small acquaintance with the state of learning and religion at this period, will enable us to form a just, though disadvantageous idea of the merit of these performances, and also of their authors.

IV. The moral writers of this century, and their miserable productions, show too plainly to what a wretched state that noble and important science was now reduced. Among these moralists, the first rank is due to Dorotheus (author of the Ascetic Dissertations), Maximus, Aldhelm, Hesychius, Thallassius, and some others: yet, even in their productions, what grovelling notions do we find! what rubbish, what a heap of superstitious fancies! and how many marks of extravagance, perplexity, and doubt! Besides, the laity had little reason to complain of the severity of their moral directors, whose custom it was to reduce all the obligations of Christianity to the practice of a small number of virtues, as appears from Aldhelm's Treatise concerning the eight principal Virtues. Nor was the neglect of these duties attended with such penalties as were proper to restrain offenders. The false notions also, which prevailed in this age, tended much to diminish a just sense of the nature and obligation of virtue; for the solitude of the monastic life, though accompanied with no marks of solid and genuine piety, was deemed sufficient to atone for all sorts of crimes, and was therefore honoured among the Latins with the title of the second baptism; which circumstance alone may serve to show us the miserable state of Christianity at this time. The greatest part of the Grecian and Oriental monks laboured to arrive at a state of perfection by mere contemplation, and studiously endeavoured to form their tempers and characters after the model of Dionysius, the chief of the Mystics.

V. Theodore of Tarsus, a Grecian monk, restored among the Latins the discipline of *penance*, as it is commonly termed, which had been for a long time almost totally neglected, and enforced it by a body of severe laws bor-

\* See Baluzii Miscellanea, tom. vi. p. l. From the work of Ildefonso it appears evident, that the monstrous doctrine of Transubstantiation was absolutely unknown to the Latins in this century, and that the Scriptures were in the hands of all Christians, and were perused by them without the least molestation or restraint. Ildefonso, it is true, is zealous for banishing reason and philosophy from religious matters; he, however, establishes the Scriptures, and the writings of the ancient doctors, as the supreme tribunals before which all theological opinions are to be tried, p. 13, 22.  
† See Mabillon's *Analecta veteris Ævi*, tom. ii. p. 68.

\* This useless production has been usually published with the works of Gregory the Great; in consequence of which, the Benedictine monks have inserted it in their splendid edition of the works of that pontiff, tom. iv. part ii.  
† *Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 93, 94.

rowed from the Grecian canons. This zealous prelate, being raised beyond his expectation to the see of Canterbury, in 668, formed and executed several pious and laudable projects; and, among other things, reduced to a regular science that branch of ecclesiastical law, which is known by the name of penitential discipline. He published a *Penitential*, which was entirely new to the Latin world, by which the clergy were taught to distinguish sins into various classes, according as they were more or less heinous, private or public; to judge of them, and determine the degrees of their guilt by their nature and consequences, by the intention of the offender, the time and place in which they were committed, and the circumstances with which they were attended. This new Penitential contained also the methods of proceeding with respect to offenders; pointed out the penalties that were suitable to the various classes of transgressions; prescribed the forms of consolation, exhortation, and absolution; and described, in an ample and accurate manner, the duties and obligations of those who were to receive the confessions of the penitent.\* This new discipline, though of Grecian origin, was eagerly adopted by the Latin churches; and, in a short space of time, passed from Britain into all the western provinces, where the book of Theodore became the model of all other penitentials, and was multiplied in a vast number of copies. The duration of this discipline was transitory; for, in the eighth century, it began to decline, and was, at length, entirely supplanted by what was called the new canon of indulgences.

VI. The doctors who opposed the various sects are scarcely worthy of mention, and would still less deserve an attentive perusal, did not their writings contribute to illustrate the history of the times in which they lived. Nicias composed two books against the Gentiles; and Photius informs us, that a certain writer, whose name is unknown, embarked in the same controversy, and supported the good cause by a prodigious number of arguments drawn from ancient records and monuments.† Julian Pomerius exerted his polemic talent against the Jews. The views of Timotheus were yet more extensive; for he gave an ample description and a laboured confutation of all the various *heresies* that divided the church, in his book concerning the reception of Heretics.

As to the dissensions of the catholic Christians among themselves, they produced, at this time, few or no events worthy of mention.—We shall, therefore, only observe, that in this century were sown the seeds of those fatal discords, which rent asunder the bonds of Christian communion between the Greek and Latin churches: indeed, these seeds had already taken root in the minds of the Greeks, to whom the Roman power became insupportable, and the pretensions of the sovereign pontiff odious.

\* The *Penitential* of Theodore is yet extant, though examined and imperfect, in an edition published at Paris in 1679, by Petit, and enriched with learned dissertations and notes of the editor. We have also the *cxx Capitula Ecclesiastica Theodori*, published in the *Spicilegium* of M. d'Achery, and in the *Concilia Harduini*.  
† *Biblioth. cod. clxx. p. 379.*

In Britain, warm controversies concerning baptism and the tonsure, and particularly the famous dispute concerning the time of celebrating the Easter festival, were carried on between the ancient Britons, and the new converts to Christianity, which Augustin had made among the Anglo-Saxons.\* The fundamental doctrines of Christianity were not at all affected by these controversies, which, on that account, were more innocent, and less important than they would have otherwise been. Besides, they were entirely terminated in the eighth century, in favour of the Anglo-Saxons, by the Benedictine monks.†

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### *Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. IN the council of Constantinople, which was called *Quinisextum*,‡ the Greeks enacted several laws concerning the ceremonies that were to be observed in divine worship, which rendered their ritual, in some respects, different from that of the Romans. These laws were publicly received by all the churches, which were established in the dominions of the Grecian emperors; and also by those which were joined with them in communion and doctrine, though under the civil jurisdiction of barbarian princes. Nor was this all: for every Roman pontiff added something new to the ancient rites and institutions, as if each supposed it to be an essential mark of zeal for religion, and of a pious discharge of the ministerial functions, to divert the multitude with new shews and new spectacles of devout mummerly. These superstitious inventions were, in the time of Charlemagne, propagated from Rome among the other Latin churches, whose subjection to the Roman ritual was necessary to satisfy the ambitious demands of the lordly pontiff.

II. It will not be improper to select here a few, out of the many instances we could produce of the multiplication of religious rites in this century. The number of festivals under which the church already groaned, was now augmented; a new festival was instituted in honour of the true cross on which Christ suffered, and another in commemoration of the Saviour's ascension into heaven. Boniface V.

\* *Cummani Epistola in Jac. Userii Sylloge Epistolar. Hibernicar. p. 23.*—Bede *Historia Ecclesiast. gentis Anglor. lib. iii. cap. xxv.*—Wilkins' *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ. tom. i. p. 37, 42.*—*Acta Sanctor. Februar. tom. iii. p. 21, 84.* † See also Dr. Warner's *Ecclesiastical History of England, books ii. and iii.* This history, which has lately appeared, deserves the highest applause, on account of the noble spirit of liberty, candour, and moderation, that seems to have guided the pen of the judicious author. It is, at the same time, to be wished, that this elegant historian had less avoided citing authorities, and been a little more lavish of that erudition which he is known to possess: for then, after having surpassed Collier in all other respects, he would have equalled him in the depth of learning, which is the only meritorious circumstance of his partial and disagreeable history.

‡ Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sæc. iii. Benedictinum, p. 2.* † See also Dr. Warner's *Ecclesiastical Hist. book iii.* ‡ This council was called *Quinisextum*, from its being considered as a supplement to the fifth and sixth councils of Constantinople, in which nothing had been decreed concerning the morals of Christians, or religious ceremonies.

enacted that infamous law, by which the churches became places of refuge to all who fled thither for protection; a law which procured a sort of impunity to the most enormous crimes, and gave indulgence to the licentiousness of the most abandoned profligates. Honorius employed all his diligence and zeal in embellishing churches, and other consecrated places, with the most pompous and magnificent ornaments; for, as neither Christ nor his apostles had left any injunctions of this nature to their followers, their pretended vicar thought it but just to supply this defect by the most splendid display of his ostentatious beneficence. We shall pass in silence the richness and variety of the sacerdotal garments that were now used at the celebration of the eucharist, and in the performance of divine worship, as this would lead us into a tedious detail of minute and unimportant matters.

### CHAPTER V.

*Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. THE Greeks were engaged, during this century, in the most bitter and virulent controversy with the Paulicians of Armenia, and the adjacent countries, whom they considered as a branch of the Manichean sect. This dispute was carried to the greatest height under the reigns of Constans, Constantine Pogonatus, and Justinian II.; and the Greeks were not only armed with arguments, but were also aided by the force of military legions, and the terror of penal laws. A certain person, whose name was Constantine, revived, under the reign of Constans, the drooping faction of the Paulicians, now ready to expire; and propagated with great success its pestilential\* doctrines. But this is not the place to enlarge upon the tenets and history of this sect, whose origin is attributed to Paul and John, two brothers, who revived and modified the doctrine of Manes. As it was in the ninth century that the Paulicians flourished most, and acquired strength sufficient to support the rigours of an open and cruel war with the Greeks, we shall reserve a more particular account of them for our history of that period.

II. In Italy, the Lombards preferred the opinions of the Arians to the doctrine which was established by the council of Nice. In Gaul and in England, the Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian controversies continued to excite the warmest animosities and dissensions. In the eastern provinces, the ancient sects, which had been weakened and oppressed by the imperial laws, but not extirpated or destroyed, began in many places to raise their heads, to recover their vigour, and gain proselytes. The terror of penal laws had obliged them, for some time, to seek safety in obscurity, and therefore to conceal their opinions from the public eye; but, as soon as they saw the fury or the power of their adversaries diminish, their hopes returned, and their courage was renewed.

III. The condition, both of the Nestorians and Monophysites, was much more flourishing under the Saracens, who had now become lords of the east, than it had been hitherto under the Christian emperors, or even the Persian monarchs. These two sects met with a distinguished protection from their new masters, while the Greeks suffered under the same sceptre all the rigours of persecution and banishment. Jesuabab, the sovereign pontiff of the Nestorians, concluded a treaty, first with Mohammed, and afterwards with Omar, by which he obtained many signal advantages for his sect.\* There is yet extant a testamentary diploma of the pseudo-prophet, in which he promises and bequeaths to the Christians, in his dominions, the quiet and undisturbed enjoyment of their religion, together with their temporal advantages and possessions. Some learned men have, indeed, called in question the authenticity of this deed; it is, however, certain, that the Mohammedans unanimously acknowledge it to be genuine.† Accordingly, the successors of Mohammed in Persia employed the Nestorians in the most important affairs, both of the cabinet and of the provinces, and suffered the patriarch of that sect alone to reside in the kingdom of Bagdad.‡ The Monophysites enjoyed in Syria and Egypt an equal degree of favour and protection.—Amrou, having made himself master of Alexandria, in 644, fixed Benjamin, the pontiff of

\* Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vatican. tom. iii. part ii. p. 94.

† This famous *Testament* was brought from the east in the seventeenth century, by Pacificus Scaliger, a Capuchin monk, and was published first in Arabic and Latin at Paris, by Gabriel Sionita, in 1630; afterwards in Latin by the learned Fabricius, in 1638; and also by Hinckelman, in 1690. See Henr. Hottinger. Hist. Orient. lib. ii. cap. xx. p. 237.—Assemani Biblioth. tom. iii. part ii. p. 95; and Renaudot, Histor. Patriarchar. Alexandr. p. 168.—They who, in conformity with the opinion of Grotius, reject this testament, suppose it to have been forged by the Syrian and Arabian monks, with a view to soften the Mohammedan yoke under which they groaned, and to render their despotic masters less severe. Nor is this representation of the matter at all incredible; for it is certain, that the monks of mount Sinai formerly shewed an edict attributed to Mohammed, of the same nature with the one now under consideration, which they pretend was drawn up by him while he was yet in a private station. This edict was extremely advantageous to them, and was, undoubtedly, an artful piece of forgery. The fraud was plain; but the Moslems, in consequence of their ignorance and stupidity, believed it to be a genuine production of their chief, and continue still in the same opinion. There is an account of this fraud given by Cantemir, in his *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, tom. ii. p. 269. The argument therefore which Renaudot and others draw in favour of the testament in question, from the acknowledgement which the Mohammedans make of its authenticity, is of little or no weight, since those infidels of all others are the most liable to be deceived in things of this nature, by their gross and unparalleled ignorance. On the other hand, several of the arguments used by those who deny its authenticity, are equally unsatisfactory; that, particularly, which is drawn from the difference between the style of this deed and that of the Koran, proves absolutely nothing at all, since it is not essential to the genuineness of this testament to suppose it penned by Mohammed himself, because the impostor might have employed a secretary to compose it. But, whether it be genuine or spurious, it is certain that its contents were true, since many learned men have fully proved, that the pseudo-prophet, at his first setting out, prohibited, in the strongest manner, the commission of all sorts of injuries against the Christians, and especially the Nestorians.

‡ Asseman, p. 97.—Renaud Histor. Patriarch. Alexandr. p. 163, 169.

\* Photius, lib. i. contra Manich. p. 61.—Petri Siculi Historia Manich. p. 41.—Georg. Cedrenus, Compend. Hist.

the Monophysites, in the episcopal residence of that noble city; and, from this period, the Melchites\* were without a bishop for almost a whole century.†

IV. Though the Greek church was already torn asunder by the most lamentable divisions, yet its calamities were far from being at an end. A new sect arose, in 620, under the reign of the emperor Heraclius, which, in a short course of time, excited such violent commotions, as engaged the eastern and western churches to unite their forces in order to its extinction. The source of this tumult was an unseasonable plan of peace and union. Heraclius, considering, with pain, the detriment which the Grecian empire had suffered by the emigration of the persecuted Nestorians, and their settlement in Persia, was ardently desirous of reuniting the Monophysites to the bosom of the Greek church, lest the empire should receive a new wound by their departure from it. He therefore held a conference during the Persian war, in 622, with Paul, a man of great credit and authority among the Armenian Monophysites; and another, at Hierapolis, in 629, with Athanasius, the Catholic or bishop of that sect, upon the methods that seemed most proper to restore tranquillity and concord to a divided church. Both these persons assured the emperor, that they who maintained the doctrine of one nature might be induced to receive the decrees of the council of Chalcedon, and thereby to terminate their controversy with the Greeks, provided that the latter would give their assent to the truth of the following proposition, namely, that in Jesus Christ there existed, after the union of the two natures, but one will, and one operation. Heraclius communicated this suggestion to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, who was a Syrian by birth, and whose parents adhered to the doctrine of the Monophysites. This prelate gave it as his opinion, that the doctrine of one will and one operation, after the union of the two natures, might be safely adopted without the least injury to truth, or the smallest detriment to the authority of the council of Chalcedon. In consequence of this, the emperor published an edict, in 630, in favour of that doctrine, and hoped, by this act of authority, to restore peace and concord, both in church and state.‡

V. The first reception of this new project was promising, and things seemed to go on smoothly; for, though some ecclesiastics refused to submit to the imperial edict, Cyrus and Athanasius, the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, received it without hesitation; and the see of Jerusalem was at that time vacant.§ As to the Roman pontiff, he was entirely overlook-

ed in the matter, as his consent was not deemed necessary in an affair that related only to the eastern church. In the mean time, Cyrus, who had been promoted by Heraclius from the see of Phasis to that of Alexandria, assembled a council, by the seventh decree of which, the doctrine of Monothelism, or *one will*, which the emperor had introduced by the edict already mentioned, was solemnly confirmed. This new modification of the doctrine of the council of Chalcedon, which seemed to bring it nearer to the Eutychian system, had the desired effect upon the Monothelites, and induced great numbers of them, who were dispersed in Egypt, Armenia, and other remote provinces, to return into the bosom of the church. They, however, explained the perplexed and ambiguous doctrine of one will in Christ, in a manner peculiar to themselves, and not quite conformable to the true principles of their sect.

VI. This smiling prospect of peace and concord was, however, but transitory, and was unhappily succeeded by the most dreadful tumults, excited by a monk of Palestine, whose name was Sophronius. This monk, being present at the council assembled at Alexandria by Cyrus, in 633, had violently opposed the decree, which confirmed the doctrine of one will in Christ. His opposition, which was then treated with contempt, became more formidable in the following year; when, raised to the patriarchal see of Jerusalem, he summoned a council, in which the Monothelites were condemned as heretics, who had revived and propagated the Eutychian errors concerning the mixture and confusion of the two natures in Christ. Multitudes, alarmed at the cry of heresy raised by this seditious monk, adopted his sentiments; but it was Honorius, the Roman pontiff, that he laboured principally to gain over to his side. His efforts, however, were vain: for Sergius, the patriarch of Constantinople, having informed Honorius, by a long and artful letter, of the true state of the question, determined that pontiff in favour of the doctrine, which maintained one will and one operation in Christ.\* Hence arose those obstinate contests, which rent the church into two sects, and the state into two factions.

VII. In order to put an end to these commotions, Heraclius promulgated, in 639, the famous edict composed by Sergius, and called the *Ecthesis*, or exposition of the faith, by which all controversies upon the question, whether in Christ there were two operations, or

\* The Melchites were those Christians in Syria, Egypt, and the Levant, who, though not Greeks, followed the doctrines and ceremonies of the Greek church. They were called Melchites, i. e. Royalists, by their adversaries, by way of reproach, on account of their implicit submission to the edict of the emperor Marcian, in favour of the council of Chalcedon.

† Renaud. Hist. Patriarch. Alexandr. p. 168.

‡ The authors, who have written of this sect, are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his Biblioth. Græc. vol. x. p. 204. The account which I have here given is drawn from the fountain head, and is supported by the best authorities.

§ See Lequien Oriens Christianus, tom. iii. p. 364.

\* The Roman catholic writers have employed all their art and industry to represent the conduct of Honorius in such a manner, as to save his pretended infallibility from the charge of error in a question of such importance. (See, among others, Harduin, de Sacramento Altaris, published in his Opera Selecta, p. 255.) And, indeed, it is easy to find both matter of accusation and defence in the case of this pontiff. On one hand, it would appear that he himself knew not his own sentiments, nor attached any precise and definite meaning to the expressions he used in the course of this controversy. On the other hand, it is certain, that he gave it as his opinion, that in Christ there existed only one will and one operation. It was for this that he was condemned in the council of Constantinople; and he must consequently have been a heretic, if it is true, that general councils cannot err. See Bossuet's Defence of the Declaration made by the Gallican Clergy, in the year 1682, concerning Ecclesiastical Power; and also Basnage, tom. i.

only one, were strictly prohibited, though in the same edict the doctrine of one will was plainly inculcated. A considerable number of the eastern bishops declared their assent to this new law, which was also submissively received by their chief Pyrrhus, who, on the death of Sergius in 639, was raised to the see of Constantinople. In the west, the case was quite different. John, the fourth pontiff of that name, assembled a council at Rome in 639, in which the *Ecthesis* was rejected, and the *Monothelites* were condemned. Nor was this all: for, in the progress of this contest, a new edict, known by the name of *Type* or *Formulary*, was published in 648 by the emperor Constans, by the advice of Paul of Constantinople,\* by which the *Ecthesis* was suppressed, and the contending parties were commanded to terminate their disputes concerning *one will* and *one operation* in Christ, by observing a profound silence upon that difficult and ambiguous subject. This silence, so wisely commanded in a matter which it was impossible to determine to the satisfaction of the contending parties, appeared highly criminal to the angry and contentious monks. They, therefore, excited Martin, bishop of Rome, to oppose his authority to an edict which hindered them from propagating strife and contention in the church; and their importunities had the desired effect; for this prelate, in a council of a hundred and five bishops assembled at Rome, in 649, condemned both the *Ecthesis* and the *Type*, though without any mention of the names of the emperors who had published those edicts, and thundered out the most dreadful anathemas against the *Monothelites* and their patrons, who were solemnly consigned to the devil and his angels.

VIII. The emperor Constans, justly irritated at these haughty and impudent proceedings of Martin, who treated the imperial laws with such contempt, ordered him to be seized and carried into the isle of Naxos, where he was kept prisoner a whole year. This order, which was followed by much cruel treatment, was executed by Caliopas, exarch of Italy, in 650; and, at the same time, Maximus, the ring-leader of the seditious monks, was banished to Bizyca; and other rioters of the same tribe were differently punished in proportion to the part they had acted in this rebellion. These resolute proceedings rendered Eugenius and Vitalianus, the succeeding bishops of Rome, more moderate and prudent than their predecessor had been; especially the latter, who received Constans, on his arrival at Rome in 663, with the highest marks of distinction and respect, and used the wisest precautions to prevent the flame of that unhappy controversy from breaking out a second time. And thus, for several years, it seemed to be extinguished; but it was so only in appearance; it was a lurking flame, which spread itself secretly, and

gave reason, to those who examined things with attention, to dread new commotions both in church and state. To prevent these, Constantine Pogonatus, the son of Constans, in pursuance of the advice of Agatho, the Roman pontiff, summoned, in 680, the sixth œcumenical or general council, in which he permitted the *Monothelites*, and pope Honorius himself, to be solemnly condemned in presence of the Roman legates, who represented Agatho in that assembly, and confirmed the sentence pronounced by the council, by the sanction of penal laws enacted against such as should dare to oppose it.

IX. It is difficult to give a clear and accurate account of the sentiments of those who were called *Monothelites*; nor is it easy to point out the objections of their adversaries. Neither of the contending parties express themselves consistently with what seem to have been their respective opinions; and they both disavow the errors with which they reciprocally charge each other. The following observations contain the clearest notion we can form of the state of this subtle controversy.

1. The *Monothelites* declared, that they had no connexion with the *Eutychians* and *Monophysites*; but maintained, in opposition to these two sects, that in Christ there were two distinct natures, which were so united, though without the least mixture or confusion, as to form by their union only one person: 2. They acknowledged that the soul of Christ was endowed with a will, or faculty of volition, which it still retained after its union with the divine nature; for they taught that Christ was not only perfect God, but also perfect man; whence it followed, that his soul was endowed with the faculty of volition: 3. They denied that this faculty of volition in the soul of Christ was absolutely inactive, maintaining, on the contrary, that it co-operated with the divine will: 4. They, therefore, in effect, attributed to our Lord two wills, and these, moreover, operating and active: 5. They, however, affirmed, that, in a certain sense, only one will and one manner of operation were in Christ.

X. We must not indeed imagine, that all, who were distinguished by the title of *Monothelites*, were unanimous in their sentiments with respect to the points now mentioned. Some, as appears from undoubted testimonies, meant no more than this, that the two wills in Christ were *one*, i. e. in perfect harmony; that the human will was in perpetual conformity with the divine, and was, consequently, always holy, just, and good; in which opinion there is nothing reprehensible. Others, more nearly approaching the sentiment of the *Monophysites*, imagined that the two wills or faculties of volition in Christ were blended into one, in that which they called the *personal union*: acknowledging, at the same time, that the distinction between these wills was perceivable by reason, and that it was also necessary to distinguish carefully in this matter. The greatest part of this sect, and those who were also the most remarkable for their subtily and penetration, were of opinion, that the human will of Christ was the instrument of the di-

\* It is proper to observe here, that Paul, who was a *Monothelite* in his heart, and had maintained the *Ecthesis* with great zeal, devised this prudent measure with a view to appease the Roman pontiff and the African bishops, who were incensed against him to the highest degree, on account of his attachment to the doctrine of one will.

vine; or, in other words, never operated or acted of itself, but was always ruled, influenced, and impelled by the divine will; in such a manner, however, that, when it was once set in motion, it decreed and operated with the ruling principle. The doctrine of one will, and of one operation in Christ, which the Monothelites maintained with such invincible obstinacy, was a natural consequence of this hypothesis, since the operation of an instrument and of the being who employs it, is one simple operation, and not two distinct operations or energies. According to this view of things, the Eutychian doctrine was quite out of the question; and the only point of controversy to be determined, was, whether the human will in Christ was a self-moving faculty determined by its own internal impulse, or derived all its motion and operations from the divine.

In the mean time, we may learn from this controversy, that nothing is more precarious, and nothing more dangerous and deceitful, than the religious peace and concord which are founded upon ambiguous doctrines, and cemented by obscure and equivocal propositions, or articles of faith. The partisans of the council of Chalcedon endeavoured to ensnare the Monophysites, by proposing their doctrine in a manner that admitted a double explication; and, by this imprudent piece of cunning, which showed so little reverence for the truth, they involved both the church and state in tedious and lamentable divisions.

XI. The doctrine of the Monothelites, condemned and exploded by the council of Constantinople, found a place of refuge among the *Mardaites*, a people who inhabited the mounts *Libanus* and *Anti-Libanus*, and who, about the conclusion of this century, were called *Maronites*, from *Maro* their first bishop, a name which they still retain. No ancient writers give any certain account of the first person who instructed these mountaineers in the doctrine of the Monothelites; it is probable, however, from several circumstances, that it was *John Maro*, whose name they had adopted.\* One thing, indeed, we know, with the utmost certainty, from the testimony of *Tyrius* and other unexceptionable witnesses, as also from the most authentic records,—that the *Maronites* retained the opinions of the Monothelites until the twelfth century, when, abandoning and renouncing the doctrine of one will in Christ, they were re-admitted, in 1182, to the communion of the *Romish church*. The most learned of the modern *Maronites* have left no method unemployed to defend their church against this accusation; they have laboured to prove, by a variety of testimonies, that their ancestors always persevered in the *Catholic faith* and in their attachment to the pope, without ever adopting the doctrines, either of the *Monophysites* or *Monothelites*. But all their efforts are insufficient to prove the truth of these as-

\* This ecclesiastic received the name of *Maro*, from his having lived in the character of a monk in the famous convent of *St. Maro*, upon the borders of the *Orontes*, before his settlement among the *Mardaites*. For an ample account of this prelate, see *Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vatic. tom. i. p. 496*.

sertions to such as have any acquaintance with the history of the church, and the records of ancient times; for, to all such, the testimonies they allege will appear absolutely fictitious and destitute of authority.\*

XII. Neither the sixth general council, in which the *Monothelites* were condemned, nor the fifth, which had been assembled in the preceding century, had determined any thing concerning ecclesiastical discipline, or religious ceremonies. To supply this defect, a new episcopal assembly was holden in pursuance of the order of *Justinian II.* in a spacious hall of the imperial palace called *Trullus*, *i. e.* *Cupola*, from the form of the building. This council, which met in 692, was called *Quinisextum*, as we had occasion to observe formerly, from its being considered, by the *Greeks*, as a supplement to the fifth and sixth œcumenical councils, and as having given to the acts of these assemblies the degree of perfection which they had hitherto wanted. There are yet extant a hundred and two laws, which were enacted in this council, and which related to the external celebration of divine worship, the government of the church, and the lives and manners of *Christians*. Six of these are diametrically opposite to several opinions and rites of the *Romish church*; for which reason the pontiffs have refused to adopt, without restriction, the decisions of this council, or to reckon it in the number of those called œcumenical, though they consider the greatest part of its decrees as worthy of applause.†

\* The cause of the *Maronites* has been pleaded by the writers of that nation, such as *Abraham Ecchellensis*, *Gabriel Sionita*, and others; but the most ample defence of their uninterrupted orthodoxy was made by *Faustus Nairon*, partly in his *Dissertatio de Origine, Nomine, ac Religione Marouitarum*, published at *Rome* in 1679, and partly in his *Euoplia Fidei Catholicæ ex Syrorum et Chaldæorum Monumentis*, published in 1694. None of the learned, however, appeared to be persuaded by his arguments, except *Pagi* [\*] and *La Roque*, of whom the latter has given us, in his *Voyage de Syrie et de Mont-Liban*, tom. ii. p. 28—128, a long dissertation concerning the origin of the *Maronites*. Even the learned *Assemanus*, himself a *Maronite*, and who has spared no pains to defend his nation [†] against the reproach in question, ingeniously acknowledges, that among the arguments used by *Nairon* and others in favour of the *Maronites*, there are many destitute of force. See *Jo. Morinus, de Ordinat. Sacris*, p. 380.—*Rich. Simon, Histoire Critique des Chrétiens Orientaux*, chap. xiii. p. 146.—*Euseb. Renaudot, Historia Patriarchar. alexandrinor.* p. 179., and *Præf. ad Liturgias Orientales*.—*Le Brun, Explication de la Messe*, tom. ii. The arguments of the contending parties are enumerated impartially, in such a manner as leaves the decision to the reader, by *Le Quien*, in his *Oriens Christianus*, tom. iii.

† See *Franc. Pagi Breviar. Pontif. Roman.* tom. i. p. 486., and *Christ. Lupus, Dissertat. de Concilio Trulliano*, in *Notis et Dissertat. ad Concilia*, tom. iii. op. p. 168.—The *Roman Catholics* reject the following decisions of this council—1. The fifth canon, which approves the eighty-five apostolical canons commonly attributed to *Clement*—2. The thirteenth, which allows the priests to marry—3. The fifty-fifth, which condemns the *Sabbath fast*, that was an institution of the *Latin church*—4. The sixty-seventh, which prescribes the most rigorous abstinence from blood and things strangled—5. The eighty-second, which prohibits the representing of *Christ* under the image of a lamb—6. The thirty-sixth, concerning the equal rank and authority of the bishops of *Rome* and *Constantinople*.

[\*] See *Critica Baroniana ad A. 694*.

[†] See *Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican.* tom. i. p. 496.



**ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY;**

## BOOK THE THIRD,

## CONTAINING THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

FROM

**CHARLEMAGNE TO THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER.****THE EIGHTH CENTURY.****PART I.**

## THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

## CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the Prosperous Events which happened to the Church in this Century.*

I. WHILE the Mohammedans were infesting with their arms, and adding to their conquests, the most flourishing provinces of Asia, and obscuring, as far as their influence could extend, the lustre and glory of the rising church, the Nestorians of Chaldea were carrying the lamp of Christianity among those barbarous nations, called Scythians by the ancients, and by the moderns, Tartars, who, unsubjected to the Saracen yoke, had fixed their habitations within the limits of mount Imaus.\* It is now well known, that Timotheus, the Nestorian pontiff, who had been raised to that dignity in 778, converted to the Christian faith, by the ministry of Subchal Jesu, whom he had consecrated bishop, first the Gelæ and Dailamites by whom a part of Hyrcania was inhabited; and afterwards, by the labours of other missionaries, the rest of the nations, who had formed settlements in Hyrcania, Bactria, Margiana, and Sogdia.† It is also certain, that Christianity enjoyed, in these vast regions, notwithstanding occasional attacks from the Mohammedans, the

advantages of a firm and solid establishment for a long course of ages; while the bishops, by whose ministry it was propagated and supported, were all consecrated by the sole authority of the Nestorian pontiff.

II. If we turn our eyes toward Europe, we find many nations that were yet unenlightened with the knowledge of the Gospel. Almost all the Germans, (if we except the Bavarians, who had embraced Christianity under Theoderie, or Thierry, the son of Clovis, and the eastern Franks, with a few other provinces) lay buried in the grossest darkness of pagan superstition. Many attempts were made, by pious and holy men, to infuse the truth into the minds of these savage Germans; and various efforts were used for the same purpose by kings and princes, whose interest it was to propagate a religion that was so adapted to mitigate and tame the ferocity of those warlike nations; but neither the attempts of pious zeal, nor the efforts of policy, were attended with success. This great work was, however, effected in this century, by the ministry of Winfred, a Benedictine monk, born in England of illustrious parents, and afterwards known by the name of Boniface. This famous ecclesiastic, attended by two companions of his pious labours, passed over into Friseland in 715, to preach the Gospel to the people of that country; but this first attempt was unsuccessful; and a war breaking out between Radbod, the king of that country, and Charles Martel, our zealous missionary returned to England. He resumed, however, his pious undertaking in 719; and being solemnly empowered by the Roman pontiff, Gregory II., to preach the Gospel, not only in Friseland, but all over Ger-

† It is also certain, that Christianity enjoyed, in these vast regions, notwithstanding occasional attacks from the Mohammedans, the advantages of a firm and solid establishment for a long course of ages; while the bishops, by whose ministry it was propagated and supported, were all consecrated by the sole authority of the Nestorian pontiff.

\* The southern regions of Scythia were divided by the ancients (to whom the northern were unknown) into three parts, namely, Scythia within, and Scythia beyond Imaus, and Sarmatia. It is of the first of these three that Dr. Moshem speaks, as enlightened at this time with the knowledge of the Gospel; and it comprehended Turkestan, the Mongol, Usbeck, Kalmuck, and Nogaiau Tartary, which were peopled by the Bactrians, Sogdians, Gandari, Saes, and Massagetes, not to mention the land of Siberia, Samoedia, and Nova Zembla, which were uninhabited in ancient times.

† Thomas Margensis, *Historia Monastica*, lib. iii. in *Assemani Biblioth. Orient. V. t. tom. iii.*

many, he performed the functions of a Christian teacher among the Thuringians, Friselanders, and Hessians, with considerable success.\*

III. This eminent missionary was, in 723, consecrated bishop by Gregory II., who changed the name of Winfred into that of Boniface: seconded also by the powerful protection, and encouraged by the liberality of Charles Martel, mayor of the palace to Chilperic, king of France, he resumed his ministerial labours among the Hessians and Thuringians, and finished with glory the task he had undertaken, in which he received considerable assistance from a number of pious and learned men, who repaired to him from England and France. As the Christian churches erected by Boniface were too numerous to be governed by one bishop, this prelate was advanced to the dignity of archbishop, in 738, by Gregory III., by whose authority, and the auspicious protection of Carloman and Pepin, the sons of Charles Martel, he founded the bishoprics of Wurtzburg, Buraburg, Erfort, and Eichstadt, to which he added, in 744, the famous monastery of Fulda. His last promotion (the last recompense of his assiduous labours in the propagation of the truth) was his advancement to the archiepiscopal see of Mentz, in 746, by Zachary, bishop of Rome, by whom he was, at the same time, created primate of Germany and Belgium. In his old age, he returned to Friseland, that he might finish his ministry in the same place where he had entered first upon its functions; but his piety was ill rewarded by that barbarous people, by whom he was murdered in 755, while fifty ecclesiastics, who accompanied him in his journey, shared the same unhappy fate.

IV. Boniface, on account of his ministerial labours and holy exploits, was distinguished by the honourable title of the Apostle of the Germans; nor, if we consider impartially the eminent services he rendered to Christianity, will this title appear to have been undeservedly bestowed. But it is necessary to observe, that this eminent prelate was an apostle of modern fashion, and had, in many respects, departed from the excellent model exhibited in the conduct and ministry of the primitive and true apostles. Beside his zeal for the glory and authority of the Roman pontiff, which equalled, if it did not surpass, his zeal for the service of Christ and the propagation of his religion, † many other things unworthy of a truly Christian minister are laid to his charge. In combating the pagan superstitions, he did not always use those arms with which the ancient heralds of the Gospel gained such victories in be-

half of the truth; but often employed violence and terror, and sometimes artifice and fraud, in order to multiply the number of Christians. His epistles, moreover, discover an imperious and arrogant temper, a cunning and insidious turn of mind, an excessive zeal for increasing the honours and pretensions of the sacerdotal order, and a profound ignorance of many things of which the knowledge was absolutely necessary in an apostle, and particularly of the true nature and genius of the Christian religion.

V. The famous prelate, of whom we have been now speaking, was not the only Christian minister who attempted to deliver the German nations from the miserable bondage of pagan superstition; several others signalised their zeal in the same laudable and pious undertaking. Corbinian, a French Benedictine monk, after having laboured with great assiduity and fervour in planting the Gospel among the Bavarians, and in other countries, became bishop of Freysingen.\* Firmin, a Gaul by birth, preached the Gospel under various kinds of suffering and opposition in Alsatia, Bavaria, and Helvetia, now Switzerland, and had inspection over a considerable number of monasteries. † Lebuin, an Englishman, laboured with the most ardent zeal and assiduity to engage the fierce and warlike Saxons, and also the Friselanders, Belgæ, and other nations, to receive the light of Christianity: but his ministry was attended with very little fruit. ‡ We pass over in silence several apostles of less fame; nor is it necessary to mention Willibrod, and others of superior reputation, who persisted now with great alacrity and constancy in the labours they had undertaken in the preceding century, in order to the propagation of divine truth.

VI. A war broke out at this time between Charlemagne and the Saxons, which contributed much to the propagation of Christianity, though not by the force of a rational persuasion. The Saxons of that age were a numerous and formidable people, who inhabited a considerable part of Germany, and were engaged in perpetual quarrels with the Franks concerning their boundaries, and other matters of complaint. Hence Charlemagne turned his arms against this powerful nation, in 772, with a design, not only to subdue that spirit of revolt with which they had so often troubled the empire, but also to abolish their idolatrous worship, and engage them to embrace the Christian religion. He hoped, by their conversion, to vanquish their obstinacy, imagining that the divine precepts of the Gospel would assuage their impetuous and restless passions, mitigate their ferocity, and induce them to submit quietly to the government of the Franks. These projects were great in idea, but difficult in execution; accordingly, the first

\* An ample account of this eminent man is to be found in a learned dissertation of Gudenius, de S. Bonifacio Germanorum Apostolo, published at Hlcnstadt in 1722. See also Fabricii Biblioth. Latina mediæ ævi, tom. i. p. 709.—Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. iv. p. 92, and Mabillon, in Annalibus Benedictinis.

† The French Benedictine monks ingeniously confess that Boniface was an over-zealous partisan of the Roman pontiff, and attributed more authority to him than was just and reasonable. Their words, in their Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. iv. p. 106, are as follow: "Il exprime son dévouement pour le Saint Siege en des termes qui ne sont pas assez proportionnés à la dignité du caractère episcopal."

\* Baronius, Annal. Eccles. tom. viii. ad annum 716. sect. 10. Car. Maichelbeck, Historia Frisingensis, tom. i.

† Herm. Bruschii, Chronologia Monaster. German. p. 30. Anton. Pagi Critica in Annales Baronii, tom. ii. ad annum 753, sect. ix. Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. iv. p. 124.

‡ Hucbaldi Vita S. Lebuini in Laur. Surii Vitis Sactor. d. 12. Nov. p. 277.—Jo. Molleri Cimbrica Literata, tom. ii. p. 464.

attempt to convert the Saxons, after having subdued them, was unsuccessful, because it was made, without the aid of violence or threats, by the bishops and monks, whom the victor had left among that conquered people, whose obstinate attachment to idolatry no arguments or exhortations could overcome. More forcible means were afterwards used to draw them into the pale of the church, in the wars which Charlemagne carried on, in the years 775, 776, and 780, against that valiant people, whose love of liberty was excessive, and whose aversion to every species of sacerdotal authority was inexpressible.\* During these wars, their attachment to the superstition of their ancestors was so warmly combated by the allurements of reward, by the terror of punishment, and by the imperious language of victory, that they suffered themselves to be baptised, though with inward reluctance, by the missionaries whom the emperor sent among them for that purpose.† Fierce seditions, indeed, were soon after renewed, and fomented by Witekind and Albion, two of the most valiant among the Saxon chiefs, who attempted to abolish the Christian worship by the same violent methods which had contributed to its establishment. But the courage and liberality of Charlemagne, alternately employed to suppress this new rebellion, engaged these chiefs to make a public and solemn profession of

Christianity in 785, and to promise an adherence to that divine religion for the rest of their days.\* To prevent, however, the Saxons from renouncing a religion which they had embraced with reluctance, many bishops were appointed to reside among them, schools also were erected, and monasteries founded, that the means of instruction might not be wanting. The same precautions were employed among the Huns in Pannonia, to maintain in the profession of Christianity that fierce people whom Charlemagne had converted to the faith, when, exhausted and dejected by various defeats, they were no longer able to make head against his victorious arms, and chose rather to be Christians than *staves*.†

VII. Succeeding generations, filled with a grateful sense of the exploits which Charlemagne had performed in the service of Christianity, canonised his memory, and turned this bloody warrior into an eminent saint. In the twelfth century, Frederic I. emperor of the Romans, ordered Paschal II. whom he had raised to the pontificate, to enroll the name of this mighty conqueror among the tutelary saints of the church;‡ and indeed Charlemagne merited this honour, according to the opinions which prevailed in that dark period; for, to have enriched the clergy with large and magnificent donations,§ and to have extended the boundaries of the church, no matter by what methods, were then considered as the highest merits, and as sufficient pretensions to the honour of *sainthood*; but, in the esteem of those who judge of the nature and characters of sanctity by the decisions of the Gospel upon that head, the sainted emperor will appear to have been utterly unworthy of that dignity; for, not to enter into a particular detail of his vices, the number of which counterbalanced that of his virtues, it is undeniably evident, that his ardent and ill-conducted zeal for the conversion of the Huns, Friselanders, and Saxons, was more animated by the suggestions of ambition, than by a principle of true piety; and that his main view, in these religious exploits, was to subdue the converted nations under his dominion, and to tame them to his yoke, which they supported with impatience, and shook off by frequent revolts. It is, moreover, well known, that this boasted saint made no scruple of seeking the alliance of the infidel Saracens, that he might be more effectually enabled to crush the Greeks, notwithstanding their profession of the Christian religion.||

VIII. The many and stupendous miracles which are said to have been wrought by the Christian missionaries, who were sent to convert the barbarous nations, have lost, in our times, the credit they obtained in former ages.

\* It will be proper here to transcribe, from the epistles of the famous Alcuin, once abbot of Canterbury, a remarkable passage, which will show us the reasons that contributed principally to give the Saxons an aversion to Christianity, and at the same time will expose the absurd and preposterous manner of teaching used by the ecclesiastics who were sent to convert them. This passage in the 10th epistle, and the 167th page of his works, is as follows: "Si tanta instantia leve Christi jugum et omnis ejus leve durissimo Saxonum populo prædicarentur, quanta decimarum redditu vel legalis pro parvissimis quibuslibet culpis edictis necessitas exigebatur, forte baptismatis sacramenta non abhorrerent. Sint tandem aliquando doctores fidei apostolicis eruditi exemplis: sint prædicatores, non prædatores." Here the reader may see a lively picture of the kind of apostles that flourished at this time: apostles who were more zealous in exacting tithes, and extending their authority, than in propagating the sublime truths and precepts of the Gospel; and yet these very apostles are said to have wrought stupendous miracles.

† Alcuinus apud Gul. Malmesbue. de Gestis Regum Anglorum, lib. i. cap. iv. p. 23. inter Rer. Anglic. Script. edit. Francof. 1601. In this work we find the following passage, which proves what we have said with respect to the unworthy methods that were used in converting the Saxons. "Antiqui Saxones et omnes Fræsonum populi, instaute rege Carolo, alios preniis et alios minis sollicitante, ad fidem Christi conversi sunt." See also two passages in the Capitularia Regum Francof. tom. i. p. 246 and 252. From the first we learn, that those Saxons who abandoned the pagan superstitions were "restored to the liberty they had forfeited by the fate of arms, and freed from the obligation of paying tribute;" and, in the second, we find the following severe law, that "every Saxon who contemptuously refused to receive the sacrament of baptism, and persisted in his adherence to Paganism, was to be punished with death." While such rewards and punishments were employed in the cause of religion, there was no occasion for miracles to advance its progress; for these motives were sufficient to draw all mankind to an hypocritical and external profession of the Gospel; but it is easy to imagine what sort of Christians the Saxons must have been, who were dragged into the church in this abominable manner. Compare, with the authors mentioned in this note, Launojus, de veteri More baptizandis Judæos et Infideles, cap. v. vi. p. 703. More ii. op. part ii. This author assures us, that Adrian, the first Roman pontiff of that name, honoured with his approbation Charlemagne's method of converting the Saxons.

\* Eginhartus, de Vita Caroli M.—Adam Bremensis, lib. i. cap. viii. See also the writers of the history and exploits of Charlemagne, enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his Bibliotheca Latina mediæ ævi, tom. i. p. 950.

† Vita S. Rudberti in Henric. Canisii Lectonibus antiquis, tom. iii. part. ii. p. 340.—Pauli Debrecentis Historia Ecclesie Reformat. in Hungar. et Transylvania, a Lampio edita, cap. ii. p. 10.

‡ Henr. Canisii Lect. tom. iii. par. ii. p. 207.—Walchii Dissert. de Caroli Magni Canonizatione.

§ Vid. Caroli Testamentum in Steph. Baluzii Capitularibus Regum Francof. tom. i. p. 487.

|| See Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, tom. ix. cap. ii. p. 40

The corrupt discipline that then prevailed, admitted those fallacious stratagems, which are very improperly called *pious* frauds; nor did the heralds of the Gospel think it at all unlawful to terrify or allure to the profession of Christianity, by fictitious prodigies, those obdurate hearts, which they could not subdue by reason and argument. It is not, however, to be supposed, that all those, who acquired renown by their miracles, were chargeable with this fanatical species of artifice and fraud; for as, on one hand, those ignorant and superstitious nations were disposed to look upon, as miraculous, every event which had an unusual aspect, so, on the other, the Christian doctors themselves were so uninstructed and superficial, so little acquainted with the powers of nature, and the relations and connexions of things in their ordinary course, that uncommon events, however natural, were considered by them as miraculous interpositions of the Most High. This will appear obvious to such as read, without superstition or partiality, the *Acts of the Saints* who flourished in this and the following centuries.

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THE eastern empire had now fallen from its former strength and grandeur through the repeated shocks of dreadful revolutions, and the consuming power of intestine calamities. The throne was now become the seat of terror, inquietude, and suspicion; nor was any reign attended with an uninterrupted tranquillity. In this century three emperors were dethroned, loaded with ignominy, and sent into banishment. Under Leo the Isaurian, and his son Constantine, surnamed Copronymus, arose that fatal controversy about the worship of images, which proved a source of innumerable calamities and troubles, and weakened, almost incredibly, the force of the empire. These troubles and dissensions left the Saracens at liberty to ravage the provinces of Asia and Africa, to oppress the Greeks in the most barbarous manner, and to extend their territories and dominion on all sides, as also to oppose every where the progress of Christianity, and, in some places, even to extirpate it. But the troubles of the empire, and the calamities of the church, did not end here: for, about the middle of this century, they were assailed by new enemies, still more fierce and inhuman than those whose usurpations they had hitherto suffered. These were the Turks, a tribe of the Tartars, or at least their descendants, who, breaking forth from the inaccessible wilds about mount Cau-

casus, overspread Colchis, Iberia, and Albania, rushed into Armenia, and, after having subdued the Saracens, turned their victorious arms against the Greeks, whom, in process of time, they reduced under their dominion.

II. In 714, the Saracens crossed the sea which separates Spain from Africa, dispersed the army of Roderic king of the Spanish Goths,\* whose defeat was principally occasioned by the treachery of their general Julian, and made themselves masters of the greatest part of the territories of this vanquished prince. At that time the empire of the Visigoths, which had subsisted in Spain above three hundred years, was totally overturned by these fierce and savage invaders, who also took possession of all the maritime parts of Gaul, from the Pyrenean mountains to the river Rhone, whence they made frequent excursions, and ravaged the neighbouring countries with fire and sword.

The rapid progress of these bold invaders was, indeed, checked by Charles Martel, who gained a signal victory over them in a bloody action near Poitiers, in 732.† But the vanquished spoilers soon recovered their strength and their ferocity, and returned with new violence to their devastations. This engaged Charlemagne to lead a formidable army into Spain, in the hope of delivering that whole country from the oppressive yoke of the Saracens: but this grand enterprise, though it did not entirely miscarry, was not attended with the signal success that was expected from it.‡

The inroads of this warlike people were felt by several of the western provinces, beside those of France and Spain. Several parts of Italy suffered from their incursions; the island of Sardinia was reduced under their yoke; and Sicily was ravaged and oppressed by them in the most inhuman manner. Hence the Christian religion in Spain and Sardinia suffered in expressibly under these violent usurpers.

In Germany, and the adjacent countries, the Christians were assailed by another sort of enemies; for all such as adhered to the pagan superstitions beheld them with the most inveterate hatred, and persecuted them with the most unrelenting violence and fury.§ Hence, in several places, castles and various fortifications were erected to restrain the incursions of these barbarian zealots.

\* Jo. Mariana, *Rerum Hispanicarum Hist. lib. vi. cap. xxi.*—Renaudot, *Historia Patriarch. Alexandrin. p. 253.*  
—Jo. de Ferreras, *Hist. de Espana, tom. ii. p. 425.*

† Paulus Diaconus, *de Gestis Longobard. lib. vi. cap. xvi. liii.*—Mariana, *lib. vii. cap. iii.*—Bayle's Dictionary, at the article *Abderamus.*—Ferreras, *tom. ii. p. 463.*

‡ Henr. de Bunau, *Teutsche Keyser-und-Reichs-Historie, tom. ii. p. 392.*—Ferreras, *tom. ii. p. 506.*

§ Serrati Lupi *Vita Wigberti, p. 304.*

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.*

I. AMONG the Greeks of this age were some men of genius and talents, who might have contributed to prevent the total decline of literature; but their zeal was damped by the tumults and desolations that reigned in the empire; and while both church and state were menaced with approaching ruin, the learned were left destitute of that protection which gives both vigour and success to the culture of the arts and sciences. Hence few or none of the Greeks were famous, either for elegance of diction, true wit, copious erudition, or a zealous attachment to the study of philosophy, and the investigation of truth. Frigid homilies, insipid narrations of the exploits of pretended saints, vain and subtle disputes about inessential and trivial subjects, vehement and bombastic declamations for or against the erection and worship of images, and histories composed without method or judgment, were the monuments of Grecian learning in this miserable age.

II. It must, however, be observed, that the Aristotelian philosophy was taught every where in the public schools, and was propagated in all places with considerable success. The doctrine of Plato had lost all its credit in the schools, after the repeated sentences of condemnation that had been passed upon the opinions of Origen, and the troubles which the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies had excited in the church; so that Platonism now was almost confined to the solitary retreats of the monastic orders. Of all the writers in this century, who contributed to the illustration and progress of the Aristotelian philosophy, the most eminent was John Damascenus, who composed a concise, yet comprehensive view of the doctrines of the Stagirite, for the instruction of the more ignorant, and in a manner adapted to common capacities. This little work excited numbers, both in Greece and Syria, to the study of that philosophy, whose proselytes increased daily. The Nestorians and Jacobites were also extremely diligent in the study of Aristotle's writings; and from this repository they armed themselves with sophisms and quibbles, which they employed against the Greeks in the controversy concerning the nature and person of Christ.

III. The literary history of the Latins exhibits innumerable instances of the grossest ignorance,\* which will not, however, appear surprising to such as consider, with attention, the state of Europe in this century. If we except some poor remains of learning, which were yet to be found at Rome, and in certain cities of Italy,† the sciences seemed to have

abandoned the continent, and fixed their residence in Britain and Ireland.\* Those, therefore, of the Latin writers, who were distinguished by their learning and genius, were all (a few French and Italians excepted) either Britons or Hibernians, such as Alcuin, Bede, Egbert, Clemens, Dungalus, Acca, and others. Charlemagne, whose political talents were embellished by a considerable degree of learning, and an ardent zeal for the culture of the sciences, endeavoured to dispel the profound ignorance that reigned in his dominions; in which excellent undertaking he was animated and directed by the counsels of Alcuin. With this view he drew, first from Italy, and afterwards from Britain and Ireland, by his liberality, eminent men, who had distinguished themselves in the various branches of literature; and excited the several orders of the clergy and monks, by various encouragements, and the nobility, and others of eminent rank, by his own example, to the pursuit of knowledge in all its branches, human and divine.

IV. In the prosecution of this noble design, the greatest part of the bishops erected, by the express order of the emperor, cathedral schools (so called from their contiguity to the principal church in each diocese,) in which the youth, set apart for the service of Christ, received a learned and religious education. Those abbots also, who had any zeal for the cause of Christianity, opened schools in their monasteries, in which the more learned of the fraternity instructed such as were designed for the monastic state, or the sacerdotal order, in the Latin language, and other branches of learning, suitable to their future destination. It was formerly believed that the university of Paris was erected by Charlemagne; but this opinion is rejected by such as have studied, with impartiality, the history of this age, though it is undeniably evident, that this great prince had the honour of laying, in some measure, the foundation of that noble institution, and that the beginnings from which it arose may be ascribed to him.‡ However this question be decided, it is certain, that the zeal of this emperor, for the propagation and advancement of letters, was very great, and manifested its ardour by a considerable number of excellent establishments; nor among others must we pass with silence the famous Palatine school, which he erected with a view to banish ignorance from his court, and in which the princes of the blood, and the children of the nobility, were educated by the most learned and illustrious masters of the times.‡

\* Jac. Usserius, *Præf. ad Syllogem Epistolarum Hibernicarum.*

‡ The reasons that have been used, to prove Charlemagne the founder of the university of Paris, are accurately collected by Du Boulay, *Historia Academiæ Paris. tom. i. p. 91.* But they have been refuted by the following learned men in a victorious manner, viz. *Mabillon, Act. Sanct. Ord. Benedict. tom. v. Præf. sect. 181, 182. Launoy, Claud. Joly, de Scholis.*

‡ Boulay, *tom. i. p. 251.*—Mabillon, *sect. 179.*

\* See Steph. Baluz. *Observat. ad Regimenem Præmisensem.* p. 540.

† Lud. Ant. Muratori, *Antiq. Italicæ mediæ ævi,* tom. iii. p. 811.

V. These establishments were not, however, attended with the desired success; nor was the improvement of the youth, in learning and virtue, at all proportioned to the pains that were taken, and the bounty that was bestowed to procure them a liberal education. This, indeed, will not appear surprising, when we consider, that the most learned and renowned masters of these times were men of very little genius and abilities, and that their system of erudition and philosophy was nothing more than a lean and ghastly skeleton, equally unfit for ornament and use. The whole circle of science was composed of, what they called, the seven liberal arts, viz. grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy;\* the three former of which they distinguished by the title of *trivium*, and the four latter by that of *quadrivium*. Nothing can be conceived more wretchedly barbarous than the manner in which these sciences were taught, as we may easily perceive from Alcuin's treatise concerning them,† and from the dissertations of St. Augustin on the same subject, which were in the highest repute at this time. In the greatest part of the schools, the public teachers ventured no farther than the *trivium*, and confined their instructions to grammar, rhetoric, and logic: they, however, who, after passing the *trivium* and also the *quadrivium*, were desirous of rising yet higher in their literary pursuits, were exhorted to apply themselves to the study of Cassiodore and Boethius, as if the progress of human knowledge had been bounded by the discoveries of those two learned writers.

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government during this Century.*

I. THAT corruption of manners, which dishonoured the clergy in the former century, increased, instead of diminishing, in this, and discovered itself under the most odious characters, both in the eastern and western provinces. In the east there arose the most violent dissensions and quarrels among the bishops and doctors of the church, who, forgetting the duties of their stations, and the cause of Christ in which they were engaged, threw the state into combustion by their outrageous clamours and their scandalous divisions, and even went so far as to stain their hands with the blood of their brethren, who differed from them in opinion. In the western world, Christianity was not less disgraced by the lives and actions of those who pretended to be the luminaries of the church, and who ought to have been so in reality, by exhibiting examples of piety and virtue to their flock. The clergy abandoned themselves to their passions without moderation or restraint: they were distinguished by

their luxury, their gluttony, and their lust; they gave themselves up to dissipations of various kinds, to the pleasures of hunting, and, what seemed still more remote from their sacred character, to military studies\* and enterprises. They had also so far extinguished every principle of fear and shame, that they became incorrigible; nor could the various laws enacted against their vices by Carloman, Pepin, and Charlemagne, at all contribute to set bounds to their licentiousness, or to bring about their reformation.‡

II. It is, indeed, amazing, that, notwithstanding the shocking nature of such vices, especially in a set of men whose profession required them to display to the world the attractive lustre of virtuous example; and notwithstanding the perpetual troubles and complaints which these vices occasioned; the clergy were still thought worthy of the highest veneration, and honoured, as a sort of deities, by the submissive multitude. This veneration for the bishops and clergy, and the influence and authority it gave them over the people, were, indeed, carried much higher in the west than in the eastern provinces; and the reasons of this difference will appear manifest to such as consider the customs and manners that prevailed among the barbarous nations, which were, at this time, masters of Europe, before their conversion to Christianity. All these nations, during their continuance under the darkness of paganism, were absolutely enslaved to their priests, without whose counsel and authority they transacted nothing of the least importance, either in civil or military affairs.‡ On their conversion to Christianity, they, therefore, thought proper to transfer, to the ministers of their new religion, the rights and privileges of their former priests: and the Christian bishops, in their turn, were not only ready to

\* Steph. Baluzius, ad Regnon. Prumiensem, p. 563.—Wilkins' Concilia Magnæ Britanniae, tom. i. p. 90.

† Steph. Baluz. Capitular. Regum Francor. tom. i. p. 189, 208, 275, 493, &c.

‡ Julius Cæsar, de bello Gallico, lib. vi. cap. 13. "Druides magno sunt apud eos honore: nam fere de omnibus controversiis, publicis privatisque, constituunt; et, si quod est admissum facinus, si cædes facta, si de hereditate, si de finibus controversia est, iidem decernunt, præmia pœnasque constituunt: si quis aut privatus aut publicus eorum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicunt.—Druides a bello abesse consueverunt, neque tributa nam cum reliquis pendunt: militiae vacationem, omniumque rerum habent immunitatem. Tantis excitati præniis, et sua sponte multi in disciplinam conveniunt, et a parentibus propinquisque mittuntur." Tacitus (de Mor. Germanorum, cap. 7.) expresses also the power and authority of the priests or Druids in the following terms: "Neque enim animadvertere, neque vincere, neque verberare quidem, nisi sacerdotibus permissum, non quasi in pœnam, nec duces jussu, sed velut Deo imperante; et again, cap. ii. "Silentium per sacerdotis, quibus et tum coercendi jus est, imperatur." Helmsoldus (Chron. Sclavorum, lib. i. cap. xxxvi.) expresses himself to the same purpose. "Major flammis quam regis, apud ipsos, veneratio est;" and again, lib. ii. cap. xii. "Rex apud eos modicæ estimationis est comparatione flammis; ille enim responsa perquirat;—rex et populus ad illius nutum pudent." This ancient custom of honouring their priests, and submitting in all things to their decisions, was still preserved by the Germans, and the other European nations, after their conversion to Christianity; and this furnishes a satisfactory answer to the question, how it came to pass that the Christian priesthood obtained in the west that enormous degree of authority, which is so contrary to the positive precepts of Christ, and the nature and genius of his divine religion.

\* Herm. Conringii Antiquitat. Academiæ, Diss. iii. p. 50.—Jae. Thomasi Programmatæ, p. 305.—Observat. Hafens. tom. vi. Obs. xiv. p. 118.

† Alcuini Opera, par. ii. p. 1245, edit. Quercetani. It is, however, to be observed, that the treatise of Alcuin, here referred to, is not only imperfect, but is almost entirely transcribed from Cassiodore.

accept the offer, but used all their diligence and dexterity to secure and assert, to themselves and their successors, the dominion and authority which the ministers of paganism had usurped over an ignorant and brutish people.

III. The honours and privileges, which the western nations had voluntarily conferred upon the bishops and other doctors of the church, were now augmented with new and immense accessions of opulence and authority. The endowments of the church and monasteries, and the revenues of the bishops, were hitherto considerable; but in this century a new and ingenious method was found out of acquiring much greater riches to the church, and of increasing its wealth through succeeding ages. An opinion prevailed universally at this time, though its authors are not known, that the punishment which the righteous judge of the world has reserved for the transgressions of the wicked, was to be prevented and annulled by liberal donations to God, to the saints, to the churches and clergy. In consequence of this notion, the great and opulent, who were, generally speaking, the most remarkable for their flagitious and abominable lives, offered, out of the abundance which they had received by inheritance or acquired by rapine, rich donations to departed saints, their ministers upon earth, and the keepers of the temples that were erected to their honour, in order to avoid the sutlerings and penalties annexed by the priests to transgression in this life,\* and to escape the misery denounced against the wicked in a future state. This new and commodious method of making atonement for iniquity, was the principal source of those immense treasures, which, from this period, began to flow in upon the clergy, the churches, and monasteries, and continued to enrich them through succeeding ages down to the present time.†

IV. But here it is highly worthy of observation, that the donations which princes and persons of the first rank presented, in order to make expiation for their sins, and to satisfy the justice of God and the demands of the clergy, did not merely consist of those *private* possessions, which every citizen may enjoy, and with which the churches and convents were already abundantly enriched; for these donations were carried to a much more extravagant length, and the church was endowed with several of those *public* grants, which are peculiar to princes and sovereign states, and which are commonly called *regalia*, or royal domains. Emperors, kings, and princes, signalled their

superstitious veneration for the clergy, by investing bishops, churches, and monasteries, with princely possessions. Those who, by their holy profession, were appointed to proclaim to the world the vanity of human grandeur, and to inspire the minds of men, by their instructions and their example, with a noble contempt of sublunary things, became themselves scandalous spectacles of worldly pomp, ambition, and splendour; were created dukes, counts, and marquises, judges, legislators, and sovereigns; and not only gave laws to nations, but also, upon many occasions, gave battle to their enemies at the head of numerous armies of their own raising. It is here that we are to look for the source of those dreadful tumults and calamities that spread desolation through Europe in after-times, particularly of those bloody wars concerning investitures, and those obstinate contentions and disputes about the *regalia*.

V. The excessive donations that were made to the clergy, and the extravagant liberality that augmented daily the treasures of the European churches (to which those donations and this liberality were totally confined) began in this century; nor do we find any examples of the like munificence in preceding times. Hence we may conclude, that these donations were owing to customs peculiar to the European nations, and to the maxims of policy which were established among those warlike people. The kings of these nations, who were employed either in usurpation or self-defence, endeavoured, by all means, to attach warmly to their interests those whom they considered as their friends and clients; and, for this purpose, they distributed among them extensive territories, cities, and fortresses, with the various rights and privileges belonging to them, reserving to themselves only the supreme dominion, and the military service of their powerful vassals. This then being the method of governing customary in Europe, it was esteemed by princes a high instance of political prudence to distribute among the bishops, and other Christian doctors, the same sort of donations that they had formerly made to their generals and clients; for it is not to be believed, that superstition alone was always the principle that drew forth their liberality. They expected greater fidelity and loyalty from a set of men who were bound by the obligations of religion, and consecrated to the service of God, than from a body of nobility, composed of fierce and impetuous warriors, and accustomed to little else but bloodshed and rapine; and they hoped also to check the seditious and turbulent spirits of their vassals, and maintain them in their obedience, by the influence and authority of the bishops, whose commands were highly respected, and whose spiritual thunderbolts, rendered formidable by ignorance, struck terror into the boldest and most resolute hearts.\*

\* The temporal penalties here mentioned were rigorous fasts, bodily pains and mortifications, long and frequent prayers, pilgrimages to the tombs of saints and martyrs, and the like austerities. These were the penalties which the priests imposed upon such as had confessed their crimes; and, as they were singularly grievous to those who had led voluptuous lives, and were desirous of continuing in the same course of licentious pleasure, effeminacy, and ease, the richer sort of transgressors embraced eagerly this new method of expiation, and willingly gave a part of their substance to avoid such severe and rigorous penalties.

† Hence, by a known form of speech, they who offered donations to the church or clergy were said to do this for the redemption of their souls; and the gifts themselves were generally called the price of transgression. See Lud. Ant. Muratori Diss. de Redemptione Peccatorum, in his Antiquitates Italice medii Ævi, tom. v. p. 712.

\* The account here given of the rise of the clergy to such enormous degrees of opulence and authority, is corroborated by the following remarkable passage of William of Malmesbury (lib. v. de Rebus gestis Regum Angliæ.) "Carolus Magnus, pro contumenda gentium illarum ferocia, omnes pene terras ecclesie contulerat, consilio sine perpenderit, nolle sacri ordinis homines, tam facile quam laicos, fidelitatem Domini rejicere: præterea, si

VI. This prodigious accession to the opulence and authority of the clergy in the west began with their head, the Roman pontiff, and spread gradually from him among the inferior bishops, and also among the sacerdotal and monastic orders. The barbarous nations, who received the Gospel, looked upon the bishop of Rome as the successor of their chief *druid*, or high priest. And as this tremendous druid had enjoyed, under the darkness of paganism, a boundless authority, and had been treated with a degree of veneration, that, through its servile excess, degenerated into terror; so the barbarous nations, on their conversion to Christianity, thought proper to confer upon the chief of the bishops the same honours and the same authority that had formerly been vested in their arch-druid.\* The pope received, with something more than a mere spiritual delight, these august privileges; and lest, upon any change of affairs, attempts might be made to deprive him of them, he strengthened his title to these extraordinary honours, by a variety of passages drawn from ancient history, and (what was still more astonishing) by arguments of a religious nature. This conduct of a superstitious people swelled the arrogance of the Roman druid to an enormous size, and gave to the see of Rome, in civil and political affairs, a high pre-eminence and a despotic authority, unknown to former ages. Hence, among other unhappy circumstances, arose that monstrous and most pernicious opinion, that such persons as were excluded from the communion of the church by the pontiff himself, or any of the bishops, forfeited thereby not only their civil rights and advantages as

citizens, but even the common claims and privileges of humanity. This horrid opinion, which was a fatal source of wars, massacres, and rebellions without number, and which contributed more than any other means to augment and confirm the papal authority, was, unhappily for Europe, borrowed by Christians, or rather by the clergy, from the pagan superstitions.\*

VII. We observe, in the annals of the French nation, the following remarkable and shocking instance of the enormous power that was, at this time, vested in the Roman pontiff. Pepin was mayor of the palace to Childeric III., and, in the exercise of that high office, possessed in reality the royal power and authority; but, not content with this, he aspired to the titles and honours of majesty, and formed the design of dethroning his sovereign. For this purpose, the states of the realm were assembled by Pepin, in 751; and though they were devoted to the interests of this ambitious usurper, they gave it as their opinion, that the bishop of Rome was previously to be consulted, whether the execution of such a project was lawful or not. In consequence of this, ambassadors were sent by Pepin to Zachary, the reigning pontiff, with the following question: Whether the divine law did not permit a valiant and warlike people to dethrone a pusillanimous and indolent monarch, who was incapable of discharging any of the functions of royalty, and to substitute in his place one more

laici rebellant, illos posse excommunicationis auctoritate et potentia severitate comescere." This is, doubtless, the true reason why Charlemaque, who was far from being a superstitious prince, or a slave to the clergy, augmented so vastly the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff in Germany, Italy, and the other countries where he had extended his conquests, and accumulated upon the bishops such ample possessions. He expected more loyalty and submission from the clergy, than from the laity; and he augmented the riches and authority of the former, in order to secure his throne against the assaults of the latter. As the bishops were universally held in the highest veneration, he made use of their influence in checking the rebellious spirit of his dukes, counts, and knights, who were frequently very troublesome. For instance, he had much to fear from the dukes of Benevento, Spoleto, and Capua, when the government of the Lombards was overturned; he therefore made over a considerable part of Italy to the Roman pontiff, whose ghostly authority, opulence, and threatenings, were so proper to restrain those powerful and vindictive princes from seditious insurrections, or to quell such tumults as they might venture to excite. Nor was he the only prince who honoured the clergy from such political views; the other kings and princes of Europe acted much in the same manner, and from the same principles, as will appear evident to all who consider, with attention, the forms of government, and the methods of governing, that took place in this century: so that the excessive augmentation of sacerdotal opulence and authority, which many look upon as the work of superstition alone, was, in many instances, an effect of political prudence. We shall consider, presently, the terrors of excommunication, which William of Malmesbury touches but cursorily in the latter words of the passage above quoted.

\* Cæsar speaks thus of the chief or arch druid: "His omnibus druidibus præest unus, qui summus inter eos (Celtas) habet auctoritatem. Hoc mortuo, si qui reliquis excellit dignitate, succedit. At, si sunt plures pares, suffragio Druidum adlegitur: nonnunquam etiam armis de principatu contendunt." *ful. Cæsar, de Bello Gallico, lib. vi. cap. xiii.*

\* Though excommunication, from the time of Constantine the Great, was, in every part of the Christian world, attended with many disagreeable effects, yet its highest terrors were confined to Europe, where its aspect was truly formidable and hideous. It acquired also, in the eighth century, new accessions of terror; so that, from that period, the excommunication practised in Europe differed entirely from that which was in use in other parts of Christendom. Excommunicated persons were indeed considered, in all places, as objects of aversion both to God and men; but they were not, on this account, robbed of the privileges of citizens, or of the rights of humanity; much less were those kings and princes, whom an insolent bishop had thought proper to exclude from the communion of the church, supposed to forfeit, on that account, their crown or their territories. But, from this century, it was quite otherwise in Europe; excommunication received that infernal power which dissolved all connexions; so that those whom the bishops, or their chief, excluded from church communion, were degraded to a level with the beasts. Under this horrid sentence, the king, the ruler, the husband, the father, and even the man, forfeited all their rights, all their advantages, the claims of nature, and the privileges of society. What then was the origin of this unnatural power which excommunication acquired? It was briefly as follows: On the conversion of the barbarous nations to Christianity, those new and ignorant proselytes confounded the excommunication in use among Christians, with that which had been practised in the times of paganism by the priests of the gods, and considered both as of the same nature and effect. The Roman pontiffs on the other hand, were too artful not to countenance and encourage this error; and, therefore, employed all sorts of means to gain credit to an opinion that tended to gratify their ambition, and to aggrandise, in general, the episcopal order. That this is the true origin of the extensive and horrid influence of the European and papal excommunication, will appear evident to such as cast an eye upon the following passage of Cæsar, *de Bello Gallico, lib. vi. cap. xiii.* "Si quis aut privatus aut publicus Druidum decreto non stetit, sacrificiis interdicitur. Hæc pœna est apud eos gravissima. Quibus ita est interdicitum, ii numero impiorum et sceleratorum habentur, iis omnes decedunt, auditum eorum sermonumque defugiunt, ne quid ex contagione incommodi accipiant; neque iis petentibus jus redditur, neque honores communicantur."



worthy to rule, and who had already rendered most important services to the state? The situation of Zachary, who stood much in need of the aid of Pepin against the Greeks and Lombards, rendered his answer such as the usurper desired. When this favourable decision of the Roman oracle was published in France, the unhappy Childeric was stripped of royalty without the least opposition; and Pepin, without the smallest resistance from any quarter, stepped into the throne of his master and his sovereign. Let the abettors of the papal authority see, how they can justify, in Christ's pretended vicegerent upon earth, a decision which is so glaringly repugnant to the laws and precepts of the divine Saviour.\* This decision was solemnly confirmed by Stephen II., the successor of Zachary. He undertook a journey into France, in 754, in order to solicit assistance against the Lombards; dissolved the obligation of the oath of fidelity and allegiance which Pepin had sworn to Childeric, and violated by his usurpation; and, to render his title to the crown as sacred as possible, anointed and crowned him, with his wife and two sons, for the second time.†

VIII. This compliance of the Roman pontiffs proved an abundant source of opulence and credit to the church, and to its aspiring ministers. When that part of Italy which was yet subject to the Grecian empire, was involved in confusion and trouble, by the seditions and tumults which arose from the imperial edicts‡ against the erection and worship of images, the kings of the Lombards employed the united influence of their arms and negotiations in order to terminate these contests.

\* See Le Cointe, Mezeray, Daniel, and other Gallic and German historians, concerning this important event; but particularly Bossuet, *Defens. Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*, part i. p. 225.—Petr. Rival, *Dissertationes Histor. et Criticæ sur divers Sujets*, Diss. ii. p. 70; Diss. iii. p. 156.—Heur. de Bunsau, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 258. This remarkable event is not, indeed, related in the same manner by all historians, and it is generally represented under false colours by those who, from a spirit of blind zeal and excessive adulation, seize every occasion of exalting the dignity and authority of the bishops of Rome. Such writers assert, that it was by Zachary's authority as pontiff, and not in consequence of his opinion as a consultant or divine, that the crown was taken from the head of Childeric, and placed upon that of Pepin. But this the French absolutely and justly deny. Had it, however, been so, the crime of the pontiff would have been much greater than it was in reality.

‡ Pepin had been anointed by the legate Boniface at Soissons, soon after his election; but, thinking that the performance of such a ceremony by the pope would recommend him more to the respect of his subjects, he desired that the unction should be administered anew by Stephen. Pepin was the first French monarch who received this unction as a ceremony of coronation, at least according to the reports of the most credible historians. His predecessors were proclaimed by being lifted up on a shield; and the *holy phial* of Clovis is now universally regarded as fabulous. The custom of anointing kings at their coronation was, however, more ancient than the time of Pepin, and was observed long before that period both in Scotland and Spain. See Edmund Martenne, *de Antiq. Ecclies. Ritib.* tom. iii. cap. v.; and also Bunsau, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 301, 366.

† The author has here in view the edicts of Leo Isauricus and Constantine Copronymus. The former published, in 726, a famous edict against the worship of images, which occasioned many contests and much disturbance both in church and state; and the latter assembled at Constantinople, in 754, a council of 358 bishops, who unanimously condemned, not only the *worship* but even the *use* of images.

Their success, indeed, was only advantageous to themselves; for they managed matters so as to become, by degrees, masters of the Grecian provinces in Italy, which were subject to the exarch who resided at Ravenna. One of these monarchs, named Aistulphus, carried his views still farther. Elate with these accessions to his dominions, he meditated the conquest of Rome and its territory, and formed the ambitious project of reducing all Italy under the yoke of the Lombards. Stephen now addressed himself to his powerful patron and protector Pepin, represented to him his deplorable condition, and implored his assistance. The French monarch embarked with zeal in the cause of the terrified and suppliant pontiff; crossed the Alps, in 754, with a numerous army; and, having defeated Aistulphus, obliged him, by a solemn treaty, to deliver up to the see of Rome the exarchate of Ravenna, Pentapolis, and all the cities, castles, and territories which he had seized in the Roman dukedom. It was not, however, long before the Lombard prince violated, without remorse, an engagement which he had contracted with reluctance. In 755, he laid siege to Rome for the second time, but was again obliged to sue for peace by the victorious arms of Pepin, who returned into Italy, and, forcing the Lombard to execute the treaty he had so audaciously violated, made a new grant of the exarchate\* and of Pentapolis to the pontiff and his successors. And thus was the bishop of Rome raised to the rank of a temporal prince.

IX. After the death of Pepin, a new attack was made upon the patrimony of St. Peter, by Didier, king of the Lombards, who invaded the territories that had been granted by the

\* See Car. Sigonius, *de Regno Italie*, lib. iii. p. 202, tom. ii. op.—Bunsau, *Historia Imperii Germanici*, tom. ii. p. 301, 306.—Muratori *Annales Italie*, tom. iv. p. 310. The real limits of the exarchate granted by Pepin to the Roman pontiff, have been much controverted among the learned, and have, particularly in our times, employed the researches of several eminent writers. The bishops of Rome extend the limits of this territory as far as they can with any appearance of decency or probability, while their adversaries are as zealous in contracting this famous grant within narrower bounds. See Lud. Ant. Murator. *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique*, cap. i. ii.; as also his *Antiquitat. Ital. mediæ ævi*, tom. i. p. 64, 68, 98, 97. The same author treats the matter with more circumspection, tom. v. p. 790. This controversy can only be terminated with facility by an inspection of Pepin's grant of the territory in question. Funtanini, in his first *Defence* of the temporal Jurisdiction of the See of Rome over the City of Commachio, written in Italian, intimates that this grant is yet extant, and even makes use of some phrases that are said to be contained in it (see the pages 242 and 316 of that work.) This, however, will scarcely be believed. Were it indeed true, that such a deed remains, its being published to the world would be, undoubtedly, unfavourable to the pretensions and interests of the church of Rome. It is at least certain, that, in the dispute between the emperor Joseph I. and the Roman pontiff concerning Commachio, the partisans of the latter, though frequently called upon by those of the emperor to produce this grant, refused constantly to comply with this demand. On the other hand, it must be confessed, that Bianchini, in his *Prolegom. ad Anastasium de Vitis Pontif. Rom.*, has given us, from a Farnesian manuscript, a specimen of this grant, which seems to carry the marks of remote antiquity. Be that as it may, a multitude of witnesses unite in assuring us, that the remorse of a wounded conscience was the source of Pepin's liberality, and that his grant to the Roman pontiff was the superstitious remedy by which he hoped to expiate his enormities, and particularly his horrid perfidy to his master Childeric.

French monarch to the see of Rome. In this extremity, pope Adrian I. fled for succour to Charles, the son of Pepin, who, on account of his heroic exploits, was afterwards distinguished by the name of Charlemagne. This prince, whose enterprising genius led him to seize with avidity every opportunity of extending his conquests, and whose veneration for the Roman see was carried very far, as much from the dictates of policy as superstition, adopted immediately the cause of the trembling pontiff. He passed the Alps with a formidable army, in 774; overturned the empire of the Lombards in Italy, which had subsisted above two hundred years; sent their exiled monarch into France, and proclaimed himself king of the Lombards. These conquests offered to Charlemagne an occasion of visiting Rome, where he not only confirmed the grants which had been made by his father to that see, but added to them new donations, and ceded to the Roman pontiffs several cities and provinces in Italy, which had not been contained in Pepin's grant. What those cities and provinces were, is a question difficult to be resolved at this period, as it is perplexed with much obscurity, from the want of authentic records.\*

\* See Car. Sigonius, de regno Italiae, lib. iii. p. 223, tom. ii. op.—Bunau, Historia Imperii Germanici, tom. ii. p. 368.—Petr. de Marca, de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii, lib. i. cap. xii. p. 67.—Lud. Anton. Muratori Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique, cap. ii. p. 147.—Couringius, de Imperio Roman. German. cap. vi. The extent of Charlemagne's grant to the see of Rome is as much disputed as the magnitude of Pepin's donation, between the partisans of the pope, and those of the emperor. They who plead the cause of the Roman see, maintain that Corsica, Sardinia, Sicily, the territory of Sabino, the duchy of Spoleto, and several other districts, were solemnly granted by Charlemagne to St. Peter and his successors. They, on the other hand, who assert the rights of the emperor, diminish as far as they can the munificence of Charles, and confine this new grant within narrow limits. The reader may consult upon this subject the authors of the present age, who have published their opinions of the pretensions of the emperors and the popes to the cities of Commachio and Florence, and the duchies of Parma and Piacentia; but, above all, the learned Berret's excellent treatise, entitled, Dissertatio Chronographica de Italia mediæ Aevi, f. 33. The spirit of party seems, in this controversy, as in many others, to have blinded the disputants on both sides of the question; and this, together with the difficulty of avoiding mistakes upon a point involved in such deep obscurity, has, in many cases, rendered the truth invisible to both the contending parties. With respect to the motives that induced Charlemagne to make this grant, they are much less doubtful than the extent of the grant itself. Adrian affirms, that the monarch's view was to *atone for his sins* by this act of liberality to the church, as we see in a letter from that pontiff to Charlemagne, which is published in Muratori's Scriptores Rerum Italicar. tom. iii. part. ii. p. 265, and of which the following passage is remarkable: "Venientes ad nos de Capua, quam beato Petro apostolorum principi pro mercede animæ vestre atque sempiterna memoria cum ceteris civitatibus obtulistis." Is it not indeed improbable, that Charlemagne, who affected that kind of piety which was the characteristic of this barbarous age, mentioned this superstitious motive in the act of cession by which he confirmed his donation to the church; but such as are acquainted with the character of this prince, and the history of this period, will be cautious in attributing his generosity to this religious principle alone. His grand motive was, undoubtedly, of an ambitious kind; he was obstinately bent upon adding the western empire to his dominions; and the success of this grand project depended much upon the consent and assistance of the pope, whose approbation, in those times, was sufficient to sanctify the most iniquitous projects. Thus Charlemagne lavished gifts upon the bishops of Rome, that, by their assistance, he might assume, with a certain air of decency, the empire of the west, and confirm his new do-

X. By this act of liberality, which seems to carry in it the contradictory characters of policy and imprudence, Charlemagne opened for himself a passage to the empire of the west, and to the supreme dominion over the city of Rome and its territory, upon which the western empire seemed then to depend.\* He had, no doubt, been meditating for a considerable time this arduous project, which his father Pepin had probably formed before him; but the circumstances of the times obliged him to wait for a favourable occasion of putting it in execution. This was offered him in 800, when the affairs of the Greeks were reduced to extremity after the death of Leo III. and the barbarous murder of his son Constantine, and while the impious Irene held the reins of empire. This opportunity was seized with avidity by Charles, who set out for Rome, where he was received with lively demonstrations of zeal by the sovereign pontiff,† who had entered into his views, and persuaded the people, elate at this time with high notions of their independence and elective power, to unite their suffrages in favour of this prince, and proclaim him emperor of the west.‡

XI. Charles, on his elevation to the empire of the west and the government of Rome, seems to have reserved to himself the supreme dominion, and the inalienable rights of majesty, while he granted to the church of Rome a subordinate jurisdiction over that great city and its annexed territory.§ This grant was

minion in Italy. Of this policy we have already taken notice, and it must appear manifest to all who view things with the smallest degree of impartiality and attention.

\* Charles, in reality, was already emperor of the west, that is, the most powerful of the European monarchs. He wanted, therefore, nothing more than the title of emperor, and the supreme dominion in Rome and its territory, both of which he obtained by the assistance of Leo III.

† Leo III.

‡ See the historians who have transmitted to us accounts of this century, and more especially Bunau, in his Hist. Imperii Romano-German. tom. ii. p. 537. The partisans of the Roman pontiffs generally maintain, that Leo III. by a *divine* right, vested in him as bishop of Rome, transferred the western empire from the Greeks to the Franks, and conferred it upon Charlemagne, the monarch of the latter. Hence they conclude, that the Roman pontiff, as the vicar of Christ, is the supreme lord of the whole earth, and, in a particular manner, of the Roman empire. The temerity of these pretensions, and the absurdity of this reasoning, are exposed with much learning and judgment by the celebrated Fred. Spanheim, de facta translatione Imperii in Carolum M. per Leonem III. tom. ii. op. p. 557.

§ That Charlemagne, in effect, preserved entire his supreme authority over the city of Rome and its adjacent territory, gave law to the citizens by judges of his own appointment, punished malefactors, enjoyed the prerogatives, and exercised all the functions of royalty, has been demonstrated by several of the learned in the most ample and satisfactory manner, and confirmed by the most unexceptionable and authentic testimonies. To be convinced of this, it will be sufficient to consult Muratori's Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique, cap. vi. p. 77. And, indeed, they must have a strange power of resisting the clearest evidence, who are absurd enough to assert, as does Fontanini, in his treatise, entitled, Dominio della S. Sede sopra Commachio, Diss. i. c. 95, 96, that Charles sustained at Rome the character of the *advocate* of the Roman church, and not that of its sovereign or its lord, the dominion of the pontiff being unlimited and universal. On the other hand, we must acknowledge ingenuously, that the power of the pontiff, both in the city of Rome and its annexed territory, was very great, and that, in several cases, he seemed to act with a peculiar authority. But the extent and the foundations of that authori-

undoubtedly suggested to him by the ambitious pontiff as a matter of sacred and indispensable obligation; and many fictitious deeds were probably produced to make out the pretensions, and justify the claims of the church to this high degree of temporal authority and civil jurisdiction. In order to reconcile the new emperor to this grant, it was without doubt alleged, that Constantine the Great, his renowned predecessor, when he removed the seat of empire to Constantinople, delivered up Rome, the old metropolis, with its adjacent territories, commonly called the Roman dukedom, to be possessed and governed by the church, with no other restriction, than that this should be no detriment to his supreme dominion; and it was insinuated to Charles, that he could not depart from the rule established by that pious emperor, without incurring the wrath of God, and the indignation of St. Peter.\*

ty are concealed in the deepest obscurity, and have given occasion to endless disputes. Muratori maintains, in his work above cited, p. 102, that the bishop of Rome discharged the function of *exarch, or vicar*, to the emperor; an opinion which Clement XI. rejected as injurious to the papal dignity, and which, indeed, does not appear to have any solid foundation. After a careful examination of all the circumstances that can contribute toward the solution of this perplexed question, the most probable account of the matter seems to be this: That the Roman pontiff possessed the city of Rome and its territory, by the same right by which he held the exarchate of Ravenna, and the other lands granted by Charlemagne; that is to say, he possessed Rome by a fiefdom tenure, though charged with fewer marks of dependence than other fiefs generally are, on account of the lustre and dignity of a city which had been so long the capital of the empire. This opinion derives much strength from what we shall have occasion to observe in the following note, and it has the peculiar advantage of reconciling the jarring testimonies of ancient writers, and the various records of antiquity relating to this point.

\*Most writers are of opinion, that Constantine's pretended grant was posterior to this period, and was forged in the tenth century. It appears to me, on the contrary, that this fictitious grant was in being in the eighth century; and it is extremely probable, that both Adrian and his successor Leo III. made use of it to persuade Charlemagne to that donation. In favour of this opinion we have the unexceptionable testimony of Adrian himself in his letter to Charlemagne, which is published in Muratori's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, tom. iii. part ii. p. 191, and which is extremely worthy of an attentive perusal. In this letter, Adrian exhorts Charles, before his elevation to the empire, to order the restitution of all the grants and donations that had formerly been made to St. Peter and to the church of Rome. In this demand also he distinguishes, in the plainest manner, the donation of Constantine from those of the other princes and emperors, and what is particularly remarkable, from the *exarchate* which was the gift of Pepin, and even from the additions that Charles had already made to his father's grant; whence we may justly conclude, that by the *donation of Constantine*, Adrian meant the city of Rome, and its annexed territory. He speaks first of this grant in the following terms: "Deprecamus vestram excellentiam . . . pro Dei amore et ipsius clavigeri regni colorum . . . ut secundum promissionem quam polliciti estis eidem Dei apostolo pro annis vestre mercede et stabilitate regni vestri, omnia nostra tempora adimplere jubentis . . . et sicut temporibus beati Silvestri Romani pontificis, a sancte recordationis piissimo Constantino M. imperatore, per eius largitatem (here Constantine's donation is evidently mentioned) sancta Dei catholica et apostolica Romana ecclesia elevata atque exaltata est, et potestatem in his Hesperie partibus largiri dignatus est; ita et in his vestris felicissimis temporibus atque nostris sancta Dei ecclesia germinet . . . et amplius atque amplius exaltata perveniat . . . quia ecce novus Christianissimus Dei gratia Constantinus imperator (here we see Charles, who at that time was only a *king*, styled *emperor* by the pontiff, and compared with Constantine) his temporibus surrexit, per quem omnia Deus sancte sua ecclesia . . .

XII. While the power and opulence of the Roman pontiffs were rising to the greatest height by the events which we have now been relating, they received a mortifying check in consequence of a quarrel which broke out between those haughty priests and the Grecian emperors. Leo the Isaurian, and his son Constantine Copronymus, incensed at the zeal which Gregory II. and III. discovered for the worship of images, not only confiscated the treasures and lands which the church of Rome possessed in Sicily, Calabria, and Apulia, but also withdrew the bishops of these countries, and likewise the various provinces and churches of Illyricum, from the jurisdiction of the Roman see, and subjected them to the spiritual dominion of the bishop of Constantinople. And so inflexibly were the Grecian emperors bent upon humbling the arrogance of the Roman pontiffs, that no intreaties, supplications, or threats, could engage them to abandon their purpose, or to restore this rich and signal portion of St. Peter's patrimony to his greedy successors.\* It is here that we must look for the original source, and the principal cause of that vehement contest between the Roman pontiff and the bishop of Constantinople, which, in the following century, divided the Greek and Latin churches, and proved so pernicious to the interests and advancement of true Christianity. These lamentable divisions, which wanted no new incident to foment them, were nevertheless augmented by a controversy which arose, in this century, concerning the derivation of the Holy Spirit, which we shall have occasion to mention more largely in its proper place. It is more than probable that this controversy would have been terminated with the utmost facility, had not the spirits of the contending parties been previously exasperated by disputes founded upon avarice and ambition, and carried on, without either moderation or decency, by the *holy* patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople, in defence of their respective pretensions.

XIII. The monastic discipline was extremely relaxed at this time both in the eastern and western provinces, and, as appears by the con-

largiri dignatus est." So much for that part of the letter that relates to Constantine's grant: as to the other donations which the pontiff evidently distinguishes from it, observe what follows: "Sed et cuncta alia que per diversos imperatores, patricios, etiam et alios Deum timentes, pro eorum annua mercede et venia didictorum, in partibus Tuscie, Spoletis, seu Benevento, atque Corsica, simul et Pavinensi patrimonio, beato Petro apostolo concessa sunt, et per nefandam gentem Longobardorum per annorum spatia abstracta et ablata sunt, vestris temporibus restituantur." (The pontiff intimates farther, that all these grants were carefully preserved in the office of the Lateran, and that he sends them to Charles by his legates.) "Unde et plures donationes in sacro nostro scriptorio Lateranensi reconditas habemus, tamen et pro sancta fideione Christianissimi regni vestri, pro jam fatos viros, ad demonstrandum eas vobis, direximus, et pro hoc tempore eximiam prececellentem vestram, ut in integro ipsa patrimonia beato Petro et nobis restituere jubentis." By this it appears that Constantine's grant was now in being among the archives of the Lateran, and was sent to Charlemagne with the other donations of kings and princes, whose examples were adduced with a view of exciting his liberality to the church.

\* See Mich. Lequien's *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 96. Among the Greek writers also Theophanes and others acknowledge the fact; but they are not entirely agreed about the reasons to which it may be attributed.

curing testimonies of the writers of this century, had fallen into a total decay. The only monks who escaped this general corruption, were those who passed their days in the deserts of Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia, amidst the austerities of a wretched life, remote from all the comforts of human society: yet the merit of having preserved their discipline was sadly counterbalanced by the gross ignorance, the fanatical madness, and the sordid superstition that reigned among these miserable hermits. Those of the monastic orders, who lived nearer to cities and populous towns, frequently disturbed the public tranquillity by the tumults and seditions they fomented among the multitude, so that it became necessary to check their rebellious ambition by the severe laws that were enacted against them by Constantine Copronymus, and other emperors. The greatest part of the western monks followed, at this time, the rule of St. Benedict; though there were every where convents which adopted the discipline of other orders.\* But, as they increased in opulence, they lost sight of all rules, and submitted, at length, to no other discipline than that of intemperance, voluptuousness, and sloth.† Charlemagne attempted, by various edicts, to put a stop to this growing evil; but his efforts were attended with little success.‡

XIV. This general depravity and corruption of the monks gave rise to a new order of priests in the west, a sort of middle order between the monks or *regulars*, and the *secular clergy*. This new species of ecclesiastics adopted the monastic discipline and manner of life, so far as to have their dwelling and their table in common, and to assemble at certain hours for divine service; but they entered not into the vows which were peculiar to the monks, and they were also appointed to discharge the ministerial functions in certain churches which were committed to their pastoral direction. These ecclesiastics were at first called *fratres dominici*, but soon after received the name of *canons*.§ The common opinion attributes the institution of this order to Chrodegangus, bishop of Metz; nor is this opinion destitute of truth;|| for though, before this time, there were in Italy, Africa, and other provinces, convents of ecclesiastics, who lived after the manner of the ca-

nons,\* yet Chrodegangus, who, toward the middle of this century, subjected to this rule the clergy of Metz, not only added to their religious ceremonies the custom of singing hymns and anthems to God, at certain hours, and probably a variety of rites, but also, by his example, excited the Franks, the Italians, and the Germans, to distinguish themselves by their zeal in favour of the canons, to erect colleges for them, and to introduce their rule into their respective countries.

XV. The supreme dominion, over the church and its possessions, was vested in the emperors and kings, both in the eastern and the western world. The sovereignty of the Grecian emperors, in this respect, has never been contested; and though the partisans of the Roman pontiffs endeavour to render dubious the supremacy of the Latin monarchs over the church, yet this supremacy is too manifest to be disputed by such as have considered the matter attentively;‡ and it is acknowledged by the wisest and most candid writers, even of the Romish communion. Adrian I., in a council of bishops assembled at Rome, conferred upon Charlemagne and his successors the right of election to the see of Rome;‡ and though neither Charlemagne, nor his son Louis, were willing to exercise this power in all its extent, by naming and creating the pontiff upon every vacancy, yet they reserved the right of approving and confirming the person who was elected to that high dignity by the priests and people: nor was the consecration of the elected pontiff of the least validity, unless performed in presence of the emperor's ambassadors.§ The Roman pontiffs obeyed the laws of the emperors, received their judicial decisions as of indispensable obligation, and executed them with the utmost punctuality and submission.|| The kings of the Franks appointed extraordinary judges, whom they called *enrois*, to inspect the lives and manners of the clergy, superior and inferior, take cognizance of their contests, terminate their disputes, enact laws concerning the public worship, and punish the crimes of the sacred order, as well as those of the other citizens.¶ All churches also, and monasteries, were obliged to pay to the public treasury a tribute proportioned to their respective lands and possessions, except such as, by

\* See Mabillon, *Præf. ad acta SS. Ord. Benedicti*, Sec. i. p. 24, and *Sec. iv. part i. p. 26.*

† The author, mentioned in the preceding note, discourses with a noble frankness and courage concerning the corruption of the monks, and its various causes, in the same work, *Præf. ad Sec. iv. part i. p. 64.*

‡ See the *Capitularia Caroli*, published by Baluze, tom. i. p. 148, 157, 237, 355, 366, 375, 503. Laws so severe, and so often repeated, shew evidently that the corruption of the monks must have been truly enormous.

§ See Le Brœuf, *Mémoires sur l'Histoire d'Auvergne*, tom. i. p. 174, the Paris edition, published in 1743.

|| See, for an account of Chrodegangus, the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 128.—Calmet, *Histoire de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 513.—*Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. Martii, p. 452. The rule which he prescribed to his canons, may be seen in *Le Comte's Annales Francoer. Eccles.* tom. v. ad An. 757, sect. 35; as also in the *Concilia Labbei*, tom. vii. 1444. He is not, however, the author of the rule which is published in his name, in the *Spicilegium veter. Scriptorum*, tom. i. p. 565. Longueval, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. iv. p. 435, has given a neat and elegant abridgement of the rule of Chrodegangus

\* Muratori, *Antiq. Italica*, tom. v. p. 185; as also Lud. Thomassin's *Disciplina Ecclesie Vet. et Nov.* part i. lib. iii. The design of this institution was truly excellent. The authors of it, justly shocked at the vicious manners of a licentious clergy, hoped that this new institution would have a tendency to prevent the irregularities of that order, by delivering its members from the cares, anxieties, and occupations of this present life. But the event shewed how much these pious views have been disappointed.

‡ For an accurate account of the rights of the Grecian emperors in religious matters, we refer the reader to Lequien's *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 136.

§ This act is mentioned by Anastasius; it has been preserved by Yvo and Gratian, and has been the subject of a multitude of treatises.

|| See Mabillon, *Comm. in Ordinem Romanum*, in Museo Ital. tom. ii. p. 113.—Muratori, *Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique*, p. 87.

¶ This has been amply demonstrated by Baluze, in his *Præf. ad Capitularia Regum Francoerum*, sect. 21.

¶ See Muratori *Antiq. Ital.*, tom. i. Diss. ix. p. 470.—Franc. de Roye, *de Missis Dominicis*, cap. x. p. 44; cap. viii. p. 118, 134, 168, 195.

the pure favour of the supreme powers, were graciously exempted from this general tax.\*

XVI. It is true, indeed, that the Latin emperors did not assume to themselves the administration of the church, or the cognisance and decision of controversies that were purely of a religious nature. They acknowledged on the contrary, that these affairs belonged to the tribunal of the Roman pontiff and to the ecclesiastical councils.† But this jurisdiction of the pontiff was confined within narrow limits; he could decide nothing by his sole authority, but was obliged to convene a council when any religious differences were to be terminated by an authoritative judgment. Nor did the provinces, when any controversy arose, wait for the decision of the bishop of Rome; but assembled, by their own authority, their particular councils, in which the bishops gave their thoughts with the utmost freedom upon the points in debate, and voted often in direct opposition to what was known to be the opinion of the Roman pontiff; all which is evident from what passed in the councils assembled by the Franks and Germans, in order to determine the celebrated controversy concerning the use and worship of images. It is farther to be observed, that the power of convening councils, and the right of presiding in them, were the prerogatives of the emperors and sovereign princes, in whose dominions these assemblies were holden; and that no decrees of any council obtained the force of laws, until they were approved and confirmed by the supreme magistrate.‡ Thus was the spiritual authority of Rome wisely bounded by the civil power; but its ambitious pontiffs fretted under the imperial curb, and, eager to loosen their bonds, left no means unemployed for that purpose. They even formed projects which seemed less the effects of ambition than of phrensy; for they claimed a supreme dominion, not only over the church, but also over kings themselves, and pretended to reduce the whole universe under their ghostly jurisdiction. However extravagant these pretensions were, they were followed by the most vigorous efforts; and the wars and tumults that arose in the following century, contributed much to render these efforts successful.

XVII. If we turn our eyes toward the writers of this century, we shall find very few that stand distinguished in the lists of fame, either on account of erudition or genius. Among the Greeks, the following only seem worthy of mention.

Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, the

greatest part of whose high renown was due to his violent zeal for image worship.\*

Cosmas, bishop of Jerusalem, who acquired some reputation by his lyric vein, consecrated to the service of religion, and employed in composing hymns for public and private devotion.

George Syncellus and Theophanes, who are not the least considerable among the writers of the Byzantine history, though they be in all respects infinitely below the ancient Greek and Latin historians.

But the writer, who surpassed all his contemporaries among the Greeks and Orientals, was John Damascenus, a man of genius and eloquence, who, in a variety of productions full of erudition, explained the Peripatetic philosophy, and illustrated the capital points of the Christian doctrine. It must, however, be acknowledged that the eminent talents of this great man were tainted with that sordid superstition and that excessive veneration for the ancient fathers, which were the reigning defects of the age he lived in, not to mention his wretched method of explaining the doctrines of the Gospel according to the principles of the Aristotelian philosophy.†

XVIII. The first place, among the Latin writers, is due to Charlemagne, whose love of letters formed one of the brightest ornaments of his imperial dignity. The laws which are known by the title of Capitularia, with several Epistles, and a Book concerning Images, are attributed to this prince; though it seems highly probable that most of these compositions were drawn up by other pens.‡

After this learned prince, we may justly place the venerable Bede, so called from his illustrious virtues;§ Alcuin,|| the preceptor of Charlemagne; Paulinus of Aquileia;¶ who were all distinguished by their laborious application, and their zeal for the advancement of learning and science, and who treated the various branches of literature, known in this century, in such a manner as to convince us, that it was the infelicity of the times, rather than the want of genius, that prevented them from rising to higher degrees of perfection than what they attained to. Add to these, Boniface, of whom we have already spoken: Egino-hard, the celebrated author of the Life of Charlemagne, and other productions; Paul, the deacon, who acquired a considerable and lasting reputation by his History of the Lombards, his Book of Homilies, and his miscellaneous labours; Ambrose Autpert, who wrote

\* See Rich. Simon, Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclesiastique de M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 270.

† Bayle, Diction. tom. ii. p. 950; as also the account of the writings of John Damascenus, which is published in Le Quien's edition of his works, and was composed by Leo Allatius.

‡ See Jo. A. Fabricii Bibliotheca mediæ Ævi Lat. tom. i. p. 936. Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. iv. p. 368.

§ See the Acta Sanctorum, tom. i. April. p. 866, and the Gen. Dictionary, at the article Bede. A list of the writings of this venerable Briton, composed by himself, is published by Muratori, in his Antiq. Italic. mediæ ævi, tom. iii. p. 325.

|| Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. iv. p. 295.—Gen. Dictionary.

¶ See Hist. Littéraire, &c. tom. iv. p. 265.—Acta Sanct. tom. i. Januar. p. 713.

\* See Muratori Antiq. Ital., tom. i. Diss. xvii. p. 926. See also the collection of the various pieces that were published on occasion of the dispute between Louis XV. and his clergy, relating to the immunities of that order in France. These pieces were printed in 1751, under the following title: *Ecrits pour et contre les Immunités prétendues par le Clerge de France.*

† See the Dissertation of Charlemagne, de Imaginibus, lib. i. cap. iv.

‡ All this is fully and admirably demonstrated by Bauluze, in his preface to the Capitularia, or laws of the kings of the Franks, and is also amply illustrated in that work. See also J. Basnage, Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 270.

a commentary on the Revelations; and Theodulphus, bishop of Orleans; and thus we shall have a complete list of all the writers who acquired any degree of esteem in this century by their literary productions, either sacred or profane.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.*

I. THE fundamental doctrines of Christianity were, as yet, respected and preserved in the theological writings, both of the Greeks and Latins, as seems evident from the discourse of John Damascenus concerning the orthodox faith, and the confession of faith which was drawn up by Charlemagne.\* The pure seed of celestial truth was, however, choked by a monstrous and incredible quantity of noxious weeds. The rational simplicity of the Christian worship was corrupted by an idolatrous veneration for images, and other superstitious inventions, and the sacred flame of divine charity was extinguished by the violent contentions and animosities which the progress of these superstitions occasioned in the church. All acknowledged the efficacy of our Saviour's merits: and yet all, in one way or another, laboured, in effect, to diminish the persuasion of this efficacy in the minds of men, by teaching, that Christians might appease an offended Deity by voluntary acts of mortification, or by gifts and oblations lavished upon the church, and by exhorting such as were desirous of salvation to place their confidence in the works and merits of the saints. Were we to enlarge upon all the absurdities and superstitions which were invented to flatter the passions of the misguided multitude, and to increase, at the expense of reason and Christianity, the opulence and authority of a licentious clergy, such an immense quantity of odious materials would swell this work to an enormous size.

II. The piety in vogue, during this and some succeeding ages, consisted in building and embellishing churches and chapels, in endowing monasteries, erecting basilics, hunting after the relics of saints and martyrs, and treating them with an excessive and absurd veneration, in procuring the intercession of the saints by rich oblations or superstitious rites, in worshipping images, in pilgrimages to those places which were esteemed holy, and chiefly to Palestine, and the like absurd and extravagant practices and institutions. The pious Christian, and the profligate transgressor, showed equal zeal in the performance of these superstitious services, which were looked upon as of the highest efficacy in order to the attainment of eternal salvation: they were performed by the latter as an expiation for his crimes, and a mean of appeasing an offended Deity; and by

\* See the treatise of this prince concerning images, book iii. The reader may also consult Mich. Syncellus' Confession of Faith, published by Montfaucon, in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, p. 90: and, among the Latins, an Exposition of the principal Doctrines of the Christian Religion, composed by Benedict, abbot of Aniane, and published by Baluze in his *Miscellanea*, tom. v. p. 56; as also the Creed of Leo iii., published in the same work. tom. vii. p. 18.

the former with a view to obtain, from above, the good things of this life, and an easy and commodious passage to life eternal. The true religion of Jesus, if we except a few of its doctrines contained in the Creed, was utterly unknown in this century, not only to the multitude in general, but also to the doctors of the first rank and eminence in the church; and the consequences of this corrupt ignorance were fatal to the interests of virtue. All orders of men, regardless of the obligations of morality, of the duties of the Gospel, and of the culture and improvement of their minds, rushed headlong with a perfect security into all sorts of wickedness, from the delusive hopes, that by the intercession and prayers of the saints, and the credit of the priests at the throne of God, they might easily obtain the remission of their enormities, and render the Deity propitious. This dismal account of the religion and morals of the eighth century is confirmed by the unanimous testimony of all the historians who have written of the affairs of that period.

III. The Greeks were of opinion, that the holy scriptures had been successfully interpreted and explained by the ancient commentators, and therefore imagined, that they rendered a most important service to the students in divinity, when, without either judgment or choice, they extracted or compiled from the works of these admired sages their explanatory observations on the sacred writings. The commentary of John Damascenus upon the epistles of St. Paul, which was taken from the writings of Chrysostom, is alone sufficient to serve as a proof of the little discernment with which these compilations were generally made.

The Latin expositors may be divided into two classes, according to the different nature of their productions. In the first, we place those writers who, after the example of the Greeks, employed their labour in collecting into one body the interpretations and commentaries of the ancients. Bede distinguished himself among the expositors of this class by his explication of the epistles of St. Paul, drawn from the writings of Augustin and others.\* Still more estimable are the writers of the second class, who made use of their own penetration and sagacity in investigating the sense of the holy scriptures. Such were Alcuin, Ambrose Authpert, the expositor of the Revelations, and Bede also, who belongs, in reality, to both classes. It must, however, be acknowledged, that all these commentators were destitute of the qualities that are essential to the sacred critic; for we find them in their explications neglecting the natural sense of the words of Scripture, and running blindfold after a certain hidden and mystical meaning, which, to use their jargon, they usually divided into *allegorical, anagogical, and tropological*; and thus they delivered their own rash fictions and crude fancies, as the true and genuine sentiments of the sacred writers. Of this we are furnished

\* See, for an account of the commentaries of Bede, Rich. Simon's *Critique de la Biblioth. Ecclesiast. de M. Du-Pin*, tom. i. p. 280. See also Bedæ *Explicatio Geneseos ex Patribus*, in Martenne's *Thesaur. Anecd. tom. v. p. 111, 116, 140*, and his interpretation of Habakkuk, *ibid. p. 295*.

† See Carolus Magnus de *Imaginibus*, lib. i. p. 138.

with many examples in Alcuin's Commentary on St. John, Bede's allegorical illustrations of the Books of Samuel, and Charlemaigne's Book concerning Images, in which various passages of the holy scriptures are occasionally explained according to the taste of the times.\*

IV. The veneration of Charlemaigne for the sacred writings was so excessive,† as to induce him to suppose, that they contained the latent seeds and principles of all arts and sciences; an opinion, no doubt, which he early imbibed from the lessons of his preceptor Alcuin, and the other divines who frequented his court. Hence arose the zeal with which that prince excited and encouraged the more learned among the clergy to direct their pious labours toward the illustration of the holy scriptures. Several laws which he published to encourage this species of learning are yet extant, as also various monuments of his deep solicitude about the advancement and propagation of Christian knowledge.‡ And lest the faults that were to be found in several places of the Latin translation of the Scriptures should prove an obstacle to the execution and accomplishment of his pious views, he employed Alcuin in correcting these errors,§ and is said, in the last years of his life, to have spent a considerable part of his time in the same learned and pious work.|| It is also to his encouragement and direction, that some writers attribute the first German translation of the sacred writings, though others contend that this honour is due to his son and successor Louis, surnamed the Debonnaire.

V. This zeal and industry of the emperor contributed, no doubt, to rouse from their sloth a lazy and ignorant clergy, and to raise up a spirit of application to literary pursuits. We cannot, however, help observing, that this laborious prince imprudently established certain customs, and confirmed others, which had a manifest tendency to defeat, in a great measure, his laudable design of promoting Christian knowledge. He confirmed the practice already in use, of reading and explaining to the people, in the public assemblies, certain portions only of the Scriptures; and reduced the different methods of worship, followed in different churches, into one fixed rule, which was to be observed with the most perfect uniformity in all.¶ Persuaded also that few of

the clergy were capable of explaining with perspicuity and judgment the portions of Scripture, which are distinguished in the ritual by the name of epistle and gospel, he ordered Paul the deacon, and Alcuin, to compile (from the ancient doctors of the church) homilies or discourses upon the epistles and gospels, which a stupid and ignorant set of priests were to commit to memory, and recite to the people. This gave rise to that famous collection, which went by the title of the homiliarium of Charlemaigne,\* and which, being followed as a model by many productions of the same kind, composed by private persons from a principle of pious zeal, contributed much to nourish the indolence, and to perpetuate the ignorance of a worthless clergy.† The zeal and activity of this great prince did not stop here; for he ordered the lives of the principal saints to be written in a moderate volume, of which copies were dispersed throughout his dominions, that the people might have, in the dead, examples of piety and virtue, which were no where to be found among the living. All these projects and designs were certainly formed and executed with upright and pious intentions, and, considering the state of things in this century, were, in several respects, both useful and necessary; they, however, contrary to the emperor's intention, contributed, undoubtedly, to encourage the priests in their criminal sloth, and their shameful neglect of the study of the Scriptures. For the majority of them employed their time and labour only upon those parts of the sacred writings, which the emperor had appointed to be read in the churches,

the same portions of Scripture were not read and explained in them all, he published a solemn edict, commanding all the religious assemblies within his territories to conform themselves, in that respect, to the rules established in the church of Rome. With respect to the portions of Scripture which we call the epistles and gospels, and which, from the time of Charlemaigne down to us, continue to be used in divine worship, it is certain that they were read in the church of Rome so early as the sixth century. It is also certain, that this prince was extremely careful in reforming the service of the Latin churches, and appointed the form of worship used at Rome to be observed in all of them. Hence the churches which did not adopt the Roman ritual, have different epistles and gospels from those which are used by us and the other western churches, who were commanded by Charlemaigne to imitate the Roman service. The church of Corbetta is an example of this, as may be seen in Muratori's Antiq. Ital. tom. iv. p. 836; and also the church of Milan, which follows the rite of St. Ambrose. If any are desirous to know what epistles and gospels were used by the Franks and other western churches before the time of Charlemaigne, they have only to consult the Calendars published by Martene, in his Thesaur. Anecd. tom. v. p. 66, the Discourses of Bede published in the same work, tom. v. p. 339, and Mabillon, de Antiqua Liturgia Gallicana; to all which may be added Peyrat, Antiquites de la Chapelle du Roi de France, p. 566.

\* See, for an account of this book of Homilies, the learned Seelen's Selecta Literaria, p. 252.

† Alan, abbot of Farfa in Italy, wrote in this century a very copious Book of Homilies, the preface to which is published by Bernard Pezium, in the Thesaur. Anecd. tom. vi. part. i. p. 83. In the following age several works under the same title were composed by learned men; one by Hayno, of Halberstadt, which is still extant; another by Rabanus Maurus, at the request of the emperor Lothaire; and a third by Hericus, mentioned by Pezium in the work above quoted, p. 93. All these were written in Latin. The famous Otfrit, of Weissenburg, was the first who composed a Book of Homilies in the Teutonic language; for an account of this work, which was written in the ninth century, see Lambecius, de Biblioth. Vindobon. August. tom. ii. cap. v. p. 419.

\* See the same imperial author, book i. p. 84, 91, 123, 127, 131, 133, 136, 138, 145, 160, 164, 165, &c.

† See Carolus Magnus, de Imagin. lib. i. p. 231, 236.

‡ Jo. Frickius, de Canone Scripturæ Sacræ, p. 184.

§ Baronius, Annal. ad A. DCCCLXXVIII. n. xxvii.—Jo. A. Fabricius, Biblioth. Lat. mediæ Ævi, tom. i. p. 950.—Hist. Lit. de la France.

|| J. A. Fabricius, tom. i. p. 950.—Usserus, de sacris Scripturis vernacul. p. 110.

¶ They who imagine that the portions of Scripture which are still explained, every year, to Christians in their religious assemblies, were selected for that purpose by the order of Charlemaigne, are undoubtedly in an error; since it is manifest, that in the preceding ages there were certain portions of Scripture set apart for each day of worship in the greatest part of the Latin churches. See Jo. Henr. Thameri Schediasma de Origine et Dignitate Pericoparum quæ Evangelia et Epistolæ vulgo vocantur. See also Jo. Franc. Buddei Isagoge ad Theologiam, tom. ii. p. 1640. It must, however, be confessed, that Charlemaigne introduced some new regulations into this part of divine service; for whereas, before his time, the Latin churches differed from each other in several circumstances of the public worship, and particularly in this, that

and explained to the people; and never attempted to exercise their capacities upon the rest of the divine word. The greatest part of the clergy also, instead of composing themselves the discourses they recited in public, confined themselves to the book of homilies, published by the authority of their sovereign, and thus suffered their talents to lie uncultivated and unemployed.

VI. None of the Latins carried their theological enterprises so far as to give a complete, connected, and accurate system of the various doctrines of Christianity. It would be absurd to comprehend, under this title, the various discourses concerning the person and nature of Christ, which were designed to refute the errors of Felix\* and Elipand, or to combat the opinions which were now spread abroad concerning the origin of the Holy Ghost,† and several other points; since these discourses afford no proofs either of precision or diligence in their authors. The labours and industry of the divines of this age were wholly employed in collecting the opinions and authorities of the fathers, by whom are meant the theological writers of the first six centuries; and so blind and servile was their veneration for these doctors, that they regarded their dictates as infallible, and their writings as the boundaries of truth, beyond which reason was not permitted to push its researches. The Irish, or Hibernians, who in this century were known by the name of Scots, were the only divines who refused to dishonour their reason by subjecting it implicitly to the dictates of authority. Naturally subtle and sagacious, they applied their philosophy (such as it was) to the illustration of the truth and doctrines of religion; a method which was almost generally abhorred and exploded by all other nations.‡

\* The doctrine taught by Felix, bishop of Urgel, and his disciple Elipand, archbishop of Toledo, was, that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, not by nature, but by adoption. This doctrine was also intimately connected with the Nestorian hypothesis, and was condemned, in this century, by the synod of Ratisbon, and the councils of Frankfort and Frioul.

† The error now published relating to the Holy Ghost was, that it proceeded from the Father only, and not from the Father and the Son.

‡ That the Hibernians, who were called Scots in this century, were lovers of learning, and distinguished themselves, in those times of ignorance, by the culture of the sciences beyond all the other European nations, travelling through the most distant lands, both with a view to improve and to communicate their knowledge, is a fact with which I have long been acquainted, as we see them, in the most authentic records of antiquity, discharging, with the highest reputation and applause, the doctoreal function in France, Germany, and Italy, both during this and the following century. But that these Hibernians were the first teachers of the scholastic theology in Europe, and, so early as the eighth century, illustrated the doctrines of religion by the principles of philosophy, I learned but lately from the testimony of Benedict, abbot of Aniane, who lived in this period. This learned abbot, in his Letter to Guarnerius, p. 54, expresses himself thus: "Apud modernos scholasticos (i. e. public teachers, or schoolmasters) maxime apud Scotos est syllogismus delusionis, ut dicant, Trinitatem, sicut personarum, ita esse substantiarum;" (by this it appears, that the Irish divines made use of a certain syllogism, which Benedict calls delusive, i. e. fallacious and sophistical, to demonstrate that the persons in the Godhead were substances; a captious syllogism this, as we may see from what follows, and also every way proper to throw the ignorant into the greatest perplexity) "quatenus si adsenserit illectus auditor, Trinitatem esse trium substantiarum Deum, trium derogetur cul-

The Greeks were not so destitute of systematical divines as the Latins. John Damascenus composed a complete body of the Christian doctrine in a scientific method, under the title of Four Books concerning the Orthodox Faith. The two kinds of theology, which the Latins termed scholastic and didactic, were united in this laborious performance, in which the author not only explains the doctrines he delivers by subtle and profound reasoning, but also confirms his explications by the authority of the ancient doctors. This book was received among the Greeks with the highest applause, and was so excessively admired, that at length it came to be acknowledged among that people as the only rule of divine truth. Many, however, complain of this applauded writer, as having consulted more, in his theological system, the conjectures of human reason and the opinions of the ancients, than the genuine dictates of the sacred oracles, and of having, in consequence of this method, deviated from the true source and the essential principles of theology.\* To the work of Damascenus now mentioned, we may add his Sacred Parallels, in which he has collected, with uncommon care and industry, the opinions of the ancient doctors concerning various points of the Christian religion. We may, therefore, look upon this writer as the Thomas and Lombard of the Greeks.

VII. None of the moral writers of this century attempted to form a complete system of the duties and virtues of the Christian life. John, surnamed Carpathius, a Greek writer, composed some exhortatory discourses, in which there are scarcely any marks of judgment or genius. Among the monastic orders nothing was relished but the enthusiastic strains of the Mystics, and the doctrines of Dionysius the Areopagite, their pretended chief, whose supposititious writings were interpreted and explained by Johannes Darenensis out of complaisance to the monks.† The Latin writers confined their labours in morality to some general precepts concerning virtue and vice, which seemed rather intended to regulate the external actions of Christians, than to purify their inward principles, or to fix duty upon its proper foundations. Their precepts also, such

tor Deorum: si autem abnuerit, personarum denegatur culpator." It was with such miserable sophistry, that these subtle divines puzzled and tormented their disciples and hearers, accusing those of Tritheism who admitted their argument, and casting the reproach of Sabellianism upon those who rejected it. For thus they reasoned, or rather quibbled; "You must either affirm or deny that the three Persons in the Deity are three substances. If you affirm it, you are undoubtedly a Tritheist, and worship three Gods: if you deny it, this denial implies that they are not three distinct persons, and thus you fall into Sabellianism." Benedict condemns this Hibernian subtilty, and severely animadverts upon the introduction of it into theology; he also recommends in its place that amiable simplicity which is so conformable to the nature and genius of the Gospel:—"Sed hæc de fide (says he) et omnis calliditatis versuta, simplicitate fidei catholicæ et puritate, vitanda, non captiosa interjectione linguarum, scævæ impactione interpolanda." Hence it appears, that the philosophical or scholastic theology, among the Latins, is of more ancient date than is commonly imagined.

\* Jo. Henr. Hottinger. Bibliothecar. Quadripart. lib. iii. cap. ii. sect. iii. p. 372.—Mart. Chemnitius, de Usu et Utilitate Locor. Commun. p. 26.

† Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 120.



as they were, and their manner of explaining them, had now imbibed a strong tincture of the Peripatetic philosophy, as appears from certain tracts of Bede, and the treatise of Alcuin concerning virtue and vice.\* That the people, however, might be animated to the pursuit of virtue by the commanding power of example, Bede, Florus, Alcuin, Marcellinus, Ambrose, Authpert, and others, employed their pious industry in writing the lives of such as had been eminent for their piety and worthy deeds.

VIII. The controversies that turned upon the main and essential points of religion were, during this century, few in number; and scarcely any of them were managed with tolerable sagacity or judgment. The greatest part of the Greeks were involved in the dispute concerning images, in which their reasonings were utterly destitute of precision and perspicuity, while the Latins employed their chief zeal and industry in confuting and extirpating the doctrine of Élipand concerning the person of Christ. John Damascenus exposed the errors of all the different sects in a short but useful and interesting treatise; he also attacked the Manichæans and Nestorians with a particular vehemence, and even went so far in his polemic labours, as to combat the erroneous doctrines of the Saracens. In these compositions we find several proofs of subtlety and genius, but very little of that clearness and simplicity that constitute the chief merit of polemical writings. The Jews were left almost unmolested, as the Christians were sufficiently employed by the controversies that had arisen among themselves: Anastasius, abbot of Palestine, however, made some attempts to subdue the infidelity of that obstinate people.

IX. Of all the controversies which agitated and perplexed the Christian church during this century, that which arose concerning the worship of images in Greece, and was thence carried into both the eastern and western provinces, was the most unhappy and pernicious in its consequences. The first sparks of this terrible flame, which threatened ruin both to the interests of religion and government, had already appeared under the reign of Philipippus Bardanes, who was created emperor of the Greeks soon after the commencement of this century. This prince, with the consent of John patriarch of Constantinople, ordered a picture, which represented the sixth general council, to be pulled down from its place in the church of Sophia, in 726, because this council had condemned the Monothelites, whose cause the emperor espoused with the greatest ardour and vehemence. Nor did Bardanes stop here; but sent immediately an order to Rome to remove all representations of that nature from the churches and other places of worship. His orders, however, were far from being received with submission, or producing their designed effect: on the contrary, Constantine, the Roman pontiff, not only rejected, by a formal protest, the imperial edict, but resolved to express his contempt of it by his actions as well as his

words. He ordered six pictures, representing the six general councils, to be placed in the porch of St. Peter's church; and that no act of rebellion or arrogance might be left unemployed, he assembled a council at Rome, in which he caused the emperor himself to be condemned as an apostate from the true religion. These first tumults were quelled by a revolution, which, in the following year, deprived Bardanes of the imperial throne.\*

X. The dispute, however, broke out with redoubled fury under Leo the Isaurian, a prince of the greatest resolution and intrepidity; and the new tumults which it excited were both violent and durable. Leo, unable to bear any longer the excessive height to which the Greeks carried their superstitious attachment to the worship of images, and the sharp raileries and serious reproaches which this idolatrous service drew upon the Christians from the Jews and Saracens, resolved, by the most vigorous proceedings, to root out at once this growing evil. For this purpose he issued an edict in 726, by which it was ordered, not only that the worship of images should be abrogated and relinquished, but also that all the images, except that of Christ's crucifixion, should be removed out of the churches.† In this proceeding the emperor acted more from the impulse of his natural character, which was warm and vehement, than from the dictates of prudence, which avoids precipitancy where prejudices are to be combated, and destroys and undermines inveterate superstitions rather by slow and imperceptible attacks, than by open and violent assaults. The imperial edict produced such effects as might have been expected from the frantic enthusiasm of a superstitious people. A civil war broke out in the islands of the Archipelago, ravaged a part of Asia, and afterwards reached Italy. The people, partly from their own ignorance, but principally in consequence of the perfidious suggestions of the priests and monks, who had artfully rendered the worship of images a source of opulence to their churches and cloisters, were led to regard the emperor as an apostate; and hence they considered themselves as freed from their oath of allegiance, and from all the obligations which attach subjects to their lawful sovereign.

XI. The Roman pontiffs, Gregory II. and III., were the authors and ringleaders of these civil commotions and insurrections in Italy. The former, on the emperor's refusing to revoke his edict against images, declared him,

\* See Fred. Spauhemii *Historia Imaginum restituta*; also the *Annales Italici* by Muratori, vol. iv.—Maimbourg's history of this controversy is full of the most absurd and malignant fictions.

† In this account of the imperial edict, Dr. Mosheim follows the opinions of Baronius, Fleury, and Le Sneur. Others affirm, with greater probability, that this famous edict did not enjoin the pulling down images every where, and casting them out of the churches, but only prohibited the paying to them any kind of adoration or worship. It would seem as if Leo was not, at first, averse to the use of images, as ornaments, or even as helps to devotion and memory; for, at the same time that he forbade them to be worshipped, he ordered them to be placed higher in the churches, some say, to avoid this adoration; but afterwards finding that they were the occasion of idolatry, he caused them to be removed from the churches and broken.

\* This treatise is extant in the works of Alcuin, published by Quereetanus, tom. ii. p. 1218.

without hesitation, unworthy of the name and privileges of a Christian, and thus excluded him from the communion of the church; and no sooner was this formidable sentence made public, than the Romans, and other Italian communities, that were subject to the Grecian empire, violated their allegiance, and, rising in arms, either massacred or banished all the emperor's deputies and officers. Leo, exasperated by these insolent proceedings, resolved to chastise the Italian rebels, and to make the haughty pontiff feel in a particular manner the effects of his resentment; but he failed in the attempt. Doubly irritated by this disappointment, he vented his fury against images, and their worshippers, in 730, in a much more terrible manner than he had hitherto done; for, in a council assembled at Constantinople, he degraded from his office Germanus, the bishop of that imperial city, who was a patron of images, put Anastasius in his place, ordered all the images to be publicly burned, and inflicted a variety of severe punishments upon such as were attached to that idolatrous worship. These rigorous measures divided the Christian church into two violent factions, whose contests were carried on with an ungoverned rage, and produced nothing but mutual invectives, crimes, and assassinations. Of these factions, one adopted the adoration and worship of images, and were on that account called *Iconoduli* or *Iconolatæ*; while the other maintained that such worship was unlawful, and that nothing was more worthy of the zeal of Christians, than to demolish and destroy the statues and pictures that were the occasions and objects of this gross idolatry; and hence they were distinguished by the titles of *Iconomachi* and *Iconoclastæ*. The furious zeal which Gregory II. had shewn in defending the odious superstition of image-worship, was not only imitated, but even surpassed by his successor, who was the third pontiff of that name; and though, at this distance of time, we are not acquainted with all the criminal circumstances that attended the intemperate zeal of these insolent prelates, we know with certainty that it was their extravagant attachment to image-worship that chiefly occasioned the separation of the Italian provinces from the Grecian empire.\*

\* The Greek writers tell us, that both the Gregories carried their insolence so far as to excommunicate Leo and his son Constantine, to dissolve the obligation of the oath of allegiance, which the people of Italy had taken to these princes, and to prohibit their paying tribute to them, or showing them any marks of submission and obedience. These facts are also acknowledged by many of the partisans of the Roman pontiffs, such as Baronius, Sigonius, and their numerous followers. On the other hand, some learned writers, particularly among the French, alleviate considerably the crime of the Gregories, and positively deny that they either excommunicated the emperors above-mentioned, or called off the people from their duty and allegiance. See Launois, *Epist. lib. vii. Ep. vii. p. 456. tom. v. op. par. ii.*—*Nat. Alexander, Select. Histor. Ecclesiast. Capit. Sæc. viii. dissert. i. p. 456. De Marca, Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii, lib. iii. cap. xi.*—*Bossuet, Defens. Declarationis Cleri Gallic. de Potestate Eccles. par. i. lib. vi. cap. xii. p. 197.*—*Gianuone, Historia di Napoli, vol. i.* All these found their opinions, concerning the conduct of the Gregories, chiefly upon the authority of the Latin writers, such as Anastasius, Paul the Deacon, and others, who seem to have known nothing of that audacious insolence, with which these pontiffs are said to have opposed the emperors, and even represent

XII. Constantine, to whom the furious tribe of the image-worshippers had given by way of derision the name of *Copronymus*,\* succeeded his father Leo in the empire, in 741, and, animated with an equal zeal and ardour against the new idolatry, employed all his influence for the abolition of the worship of images, in opposition to the vigorous efforts of the Roman pontiffs and the superstitious monks. His manner of proceeding was attended with greater marks of equity and moderation, than had appeared in the measures pursued by Leo: for, knowing the respect which the Greeks had for the decisions of general councils, whose authority they considered as supreme and unlimited in religious matters, he assembled at Constantinople, in 754, a council composed of the eastern bishops, in order to have this important question examined with the utmost care, and decided with wisdom, seconded by a just and lawful authority. This assembly, which the Greeks regard as the seventh œcumenical council, gave judgment, as was the custom of those times, in favour of the opinion embraced by the emperor, and solemnly condemned the worship and also the use of images.† But this decision was not sufficient to vanquish the blind obstinacy of superstition: many adhered still to their idolatrous worship, and none made a more turbulent resistance to the wise decree of this council than the monks, who still continued to excite commotions in the state, and to blow the flames of sedition and rebellion among the people. Their malignity was, however, chastised by Constantine, who, filled with a just indignation at their seditious practices, punished several of them in an exemplary manner, and by new laws set bounds to the violence of monastic rage. Leo IV., who, after the death of Constantine, was declared emperor, in 775, adopted the sentiments of his father and grandfather, and pursued the measures which they had concerted for the extirpation of idolatry out of the Christian church; for, having perceived that the worshippers of images could not be engaged by mild and gentle proceedings to abandon this superstitious practice, he had recourse to the coercive influence of penal laws.

XIII. A cup of poison, administered by the impious counsel of a perfidious wife, deprived Leo IV. of his life, in 780, and rendered the idolatrous cause of images triumphant. The profligate Irene, after having thus dismissed her husband from the world, held the reins of empire during the minority of her son Con-

them as having given several marks of their submission and obedience to the imperial authority. Such are the contrary accounts of the Greek and Latin writers; and the most prudent use we can make of them is, to suspend our judgment with respect to a matter, which the obscurity that covers the history of this period renders it impossible to clear up. All that we can know with certainty is, that the zeal of the two pontiffs above-mentioned for the worship of images, furnished to the people of Italy the occasion of falling from their allegiance to the Grecian emperors.

† This nickname was given to Constantine, when his having defiled the sacred font at his baptism.

‡ The authority of this council is not acknowledged by the Roman catholics, who also disregard the obligation of the second commandment, which they have prudently struck out of the decalogue.

stantine; and, to establish her authority on more solid foundations, entered into an alliance with Adrian, bishop of Rome, in 786, and summoned a council at Nice in Bithynia, which is known by the title of the second Nicene council. In this assembly the imperial laws concerning the new idolatry were abrogated, the decrees of the council of Constantinople reversed, the worship of images and of the cross restored, and severe punishments denounced against such as maintained that God was the only object of religious adoration. It is impossible to imagine any thing more ridiculous and trifling than the arguments upon which the bishops, assembled in this council, founded their decrees.\* The Romans, however, held sacred the authority of these decrees; and the Greeks considered in the light of parricides and traitors all such as refused to submit to them. The other enormities of the flagitious Irene, and her deserved fate, cannot, with propriety, be treated of here.

XIV. In these violent contests, the greater part of the Latins, such as the Britons, Germans, and Gauls, seemed to steer a middle way between the opposite tenets of the contending parties. They were of opinion that images might be lawfully preserved, and even placed in the churches; but, at the same time, they looked upon all worship of them as highly injurious and offensive to the Supreme Being.† Such, particularly, were the sentiments of Charlemagne, who distinguished himself in this important controversy. By the advice of the French bishops, who were no friends to this second council of Nice, he ordered some learned and judicious divine to compose Four Books concerning Images, which he sent, in 790, to Adrian, the Roman pontiff, with a view of engaging him to withdraw his approbation of the decrees of that council. In this performance the reasons alleged by the Nicene bishops to justify the worship of images, are refuted with great accuracy and spirit.‡ They were not, however, left without defence:—

Adrian, who was afraid of acknowledging even an emperor for his master, composed an answer to the four books mentioned above; but neither his arguments, nor his authority, were sufficient to support the superstition he endeavoured to maintain; for, in 794, Charlemagne

assembled, at Frankfort on the Maine, a council of three hundred bishops, in order to re-examine this important question; in which the opinions contained in the four books were solemnly confirmed, and the worship of images unanimously condemned.\* Hence we may conclude, that in this century the Latins deemed it neither impious, nor unlawful, to dissent from the opinion of the Roman pontiff, and even to charge that prelate with error.

XV. While the controversy concerning images was at its height, a new contest arose among the Latins and Greeks about the source whence the Holy Ghost proceeded. The Latins affirmed, that this divine Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son: the Greeks, on the contrary, asserted, that it proceeded from the Father only. The origin of this controversy is covered with perplexity and doubt. It is, however, certain, that it was agitated in the council of Gentilli, near Paris, in 767, in presence of the emperor's legates;† and from this we may conclude, with a high degree of probability, that it arose in Greece at that time when the contest about images was carried on with the greatest vehemence. In this controversy the Latins alleged, in favour of their opinions, the creed of Constantinople, which the Spaniards and French had successively corrupted (upon what occasion is not well known,) by adding the words *filio-que* to that part of it which contained the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost. The Greeks, on the other hand, made loud complaints of this criminal attempt of the Latins to corrupt by a manifest interpolation a creed, which served as a rule of doctrine for the church universal, and declared this attempt impudent and sacrilegious. Thus, the dispute changed at length its object, and was transferred from the matter to the interpolated words above mentioned.‡ In the following century it was carried on with still greater vehemence, and added new fuel to the dissensions which already portended a

\* This event is treated with a degree of candour, not more laudable than surprising, by Mabillon, in Pref. ad Seeulum. iv. Actorum SS. Ord. Benedict. part. v. See also Jo. Georg. Dorseheus, Collat. ad Concilium Francofordiense.

† See Le Cointe, Annales Eccles. Francorum, tom. v. p. 698.

‡ Learned men generally imagine that this controversy began about the words *filio-que*, which some of the Latins had added to the creed that had been drawn up by the council of Constantinople, and that from the words the dispute proceeded to the doctrine itself; see Mabillon (Act. Sanctor. Ord. Bened. Sæc. iv. part. i. Præf. p. iv.) who is followed by many in this particular. But this opinion is certainly erroneous. The doctrine was the first subject of controversy, which afterwards extended to the words *filio-que*, considered by the Greeks as a manifest interpolation. Among other proofs of this, the council of Gentilli shows evidently, that the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit had been, for a considerable time, the subject of controversy when the dispute arose about the words now mentioned. Pagi, in his Critica in Baronium, tom. iii. p. 323, is of opinion, that this controversy had both its date and its occasion from the dispute concerning images; for, when the Latins treated the Greeks as heretics, on account of their opposition to image-worship, the Greeks in their turn charged the Latins also with heresy, on account of their maintaining that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son. The learned critic has, however, advanced this opinion without sufficient proof; and we must therefore consider it as no more than a probable conjecture.

\* Mart. Chemnitius, Examen Concilii Tridentini, par. iv. lib. ii. cap. v. p. 52.—L'Enfant, Préservatif contre la Réunion avec le Siège de Rome, par. iii. lettre xvii. p. 446.

† The aversion the Britons had to the worship of images, may be seen in Spelman, Concil. Magne Britannicæ, tom. i. p. 73.

‡ The books of Charlemagne concerning Images, which deserve an attentive perusal, are yet extant; and, when they were extremely scarce, were republished at Hanover, in 1731, by the celebrated Christopher Aog. Heuman, who enriched this edition with a learned preface. These books are adorned with the venerable name of Charlemagne; but it is easy to perceive that they are the productions of a scholastic divine, and not of an emperor. Several learned men have conjectured, that Charlemagne composed these books with the assistance of his preceptor Alcuin; see Heuman's Pref. p. 51; and Bunsen's Historia Imperii German. tom. i. p. 490. This conjecture, though far from being contemptible, cannot be admitted without hesitation, since Alcuin was in England when these books were composed. We learn from the history of his life, that he went into England in 789, and did not thence return before 792.

schism between the eastern and western churches.\*

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### *Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. THE religion of this century consisted almost entirely in a motley round of external rites and ceremonies. We are not, therefore, to wonder that more zeal and diligence were employed in multiplying and regulating these outward marks of a superstitious devotion, than in correcting the vices and follies of men, in enlightening their understandings, and forming their hearts. The administration of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, which was deemed the most solemn and important branch of divine worship, was now every where embellished, or rather deformed, with a variety of senseless fopperies, which destroyed the beautiful simplicity of that affecting and salutary institution. We also find manifest traces, in this century, of that superstitious custom of celebrating what were called *solitary masses*,† though it be difficult to decide whether they were instituted by a public law, or introduced by the authority of private persons.‡ Be that as it may, this single custom is sufficient to give us an idea of the superstition and darkness that sat brooding over the Christian church in this ignorant age, and renders it unnecessary to enter into a farther detail of the absurd rites with which a designing priesthood continued to disfigure the religion of Jesus.

II. Charlemagne seemed disposed to stem this torrent of superstition, which gathered force from day to day; for, not to mention the zeal with which he opposed the worship of images, there are other circumstances that bear testimony to his intentions in this matter, such as his preventing the multiplication of festivals, by reducing them to a fixed and limited number, his prohibiting the ceremony of consecrating the church bells by the rite of holy aspersion, and his enactment of other ecclesiastical laws, which redound to his honour. Several circumstances, however, concurred to render his designs abortive, and to blast the success of his worthy purposes; and none more than his excessive attachment to the Roman pontiffs, who were the patrons and protectors of those who exerted themselves in the cause of ceremonies. This vehement passion for the lordly pontiff was inherited by the great prince of whom we are now speaking, from his father Pepin, who had already commanded the manner of singing, and the kind of church-music

in use at Rome, to be observed in all Christian churches. It was in conformity with his example, and in compliance with the repeated and importunate solicitation of the pontiff Adrian, that Charlemagne laboured to bring all the Latin churches to follow, as their model, the church of Rome, not only in the article now mentioned, but also in the whole form of their worship, in every circumstance of their religious service.\* Several churches, however, among which those of Milan and Corbeta distinguished themselves eminently, absolutely rejected this proposal, and could neither be brought, by persuasion or by violence, to change their usual method of worship.

#### CHAPTER V.

##### *Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. THE Arians, Manicheans, and Marcionites, though often depressed by the force of penal laws and the power of the secular arm, gathered strength in the east, amidst the tumults and divisions with which the Grecian empire was perpetually agitated, and drew great numbers into the profession of their opinions.† The Monothelites, to whose cause the emperor Philippicus, and many others of the first rank and dignity, were most zealous well-wishers, regained their credit in various countries. The condition also both of the Nestorians and Monophysites was easy and agreeable under the dominion of the Arabians; their power and influence were considerable; nor were they destitute of means of weakening the Greeks, their irreconcilable adversaries, of spreading their doctrines, and extensively multiplying the number of their adherents.

II. In the church which Boniface had newly erected in Germany, he himself tells us, that there were many perverse and erroneous reprobrates, who had no true notion of religion; and his friends and adherents confirm this assertion. But the testimony is undoubtedly partial, and unworthy of credit, since it appears from the most evident proofs, that the persons here accused of errors and heresies were Irish and French divines, who refused that blind submission to the church of Rome, which Boniface was so zealous to propagate every where. Adalbert, a Gaul, and Clement, a native of Ireland, were the persons whose opposition gave the most trouble to the ambitious legate. The former procured himself to be consecrated bishop, without the consent of Boniface; excited seditions and tumults among the eastern Franks; and appears, indeed, to have been both flagitious in his conduct, and erroneous in his opinions. Among other irregularities, he was the forger of a letter to the human race, which was said to have been written by Jesus Christ, and to have been brought from heaven by the arch-angel Michael.§ As to Clement,

\* See Pithæi Hist. Controv. de Processione Spiritus S. at the end of his Cod. Canon. Eccles. Roman. p. 355.—Le Quien, Oriens Christian. tom. iii. p. 254.—Ger. J. Vossius, de Tribus Symbolis, Diss. iii. p. 63; and, above all, Jo. Georg. Walchius, Histor. Controv. de Processione Spiritus S. published at Jena in 1751.

† Solitary or private masses were such as were celebrated by the priest alone in behalf of souls detained in purgatory, as well as on some other particular occasions. These masses were prohibited by the laws of the church; but they were a rich source of profit to the clergy. They were condemned by the canons of a synod assembled at Mentz under Charlemagne, as criminal innovations, and as the fruits of avarice and sloth.

‡ See the Treatise concerning Images, attributed to Charlemagne, p. 245; as also George Calixtus, de Missis Solitariis, sect. 12.

\* See the Treatise concerning Images, p. 52; and Eginhard, de Vita Caroli Magni, cap. 26.

† In Europe also Arianism prevailed greatly among the barbarous nations that embraced the Christian faith.

‡ See the Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. iv. p. 82.

§ There is an edition of this letter published by the learned Baluze in the Capitularia Regum Francorum, tom. ii. p. 139E.

his character and sentiments were maliciously misrepresented, since it appears, by the best and most authentic accounts, that he was much better acquainted with the true principles and doctrines of Christianity than Boniface himself; and hence he is considered by many as a confessor and sufferer for the truth in this barbarous age.\* Be that as it will, both Adalbert and Clement were condemned, at the instigation of Boniface, by the pontiff Zachary, in a council assembled at Rome, in 748,† and were committed to prison, where, in all probability, they concluded their days.

III. Religious discord ran still higher in Spain, France, and Germany, toward the conclusion of this century; and the most unhappy tumults and commotions were occasioned by a question proposed to Felix bishop of Urgel, by Elipand, archbishop of Toledo, who desired to know in what sense Christ was the son of God. The answer given to this question, was, that Christ, considered in his divine nature, was truly and essentially the Son of God; but that, considered as a man, he was only so, nominally and by adoption. This doctrine was spread abroad by the two prelates; Elipand propagated it in the different provinces of Spain, and Felix throughout Septimania, while the pontiff Adrian, and the greatest

part of the Latin doctors, looked upon this opinion as a renovation of the Nestorian heresy, by its representing Christ as divided into two distinct persons. In consequence of this, Felix was successively condemned by the councils of Narbonne, Ratisbon, Frankfort on the Maine, and Rome, and was finally obliged, by the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, to retract his error, and to change his opinion.\* The change he made was, however, rather nominal than real, the common shift of temporising divines; for he still retained his doctrine, and died in the firm belief of it at Lyons, to which city he had been banished by Charlemagne.† Elipand, on the contrary, lived secure in Spain under the dominion of the Saracens, far removed from the thunder of synods and councils, and out of the reach of that coercive power in religious matters, whose utmost efforts can go no farther than to make the erroneous, hypocrites or martyrs. Many are of opinion, that the disciples of Felix, who were called Adoptians, departed much less from the doctrine generally received among Christians, than is commonly imagined; and that what chiefly distinguished their tenets were the terms they used, and their manner of expression, rather than a real diversity of sentiments.‡ But, as this sect and their chief thought proper to make use of singular and sometimes of contradictory expressions, this furnished such as accused them of Nestorianism, with plausible reasons to support their charge.

\* We find an enumeration of the erroneous opinions of Clement in the letters of Boniface, *Epistol. cxxxv.* p. 139. See also *Usserii Sylloge Epistolarum Hibernicarum*, p. 12. *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Critique*, tom. i. p. 133. ¶ The zealous Boniface was too ignorant to be a proper judge of heresy, as appears by his condemning Vigilus for believing that there were *antipodes*. The great heresy of Clement seems to have been his preferring the decisions of Scripture to the decrees of councils and the opinions of the fathers, which he took the liberty to reject when they were not conformable to the word of God.

¶ This is the true date of the council assembled by Zachary for the condemnation of Adalbert and Clement, and not the year 745, as Fleury and Mabillon have pretended; in which error they are followed by Mr. Bower, in his *History of the Popes*. The truth is, that the letter of Boniface, in consequence of which this council was assembled, must have been written in 748, since he declares in that letter, that he had been near thirty years legate of the holy see, into which commission he entered, as all authors agree, about the year 719.

¶ \* The council of Narbonne, which condemned Felix, was holden in 788, that of Ratisbon in 792, that of Frankfort in 794, that of Rome in 799.

† The authors, who have written of the sect of Felix, are mentioned by Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat. mediæ ævi*, tom. ii. p. 482. Add to these Petrus de Marca, in his *Marca Hispanica*, lib. iii. cap. xii. p. 388.—Jo. de Ferreras, *Historia de Espana*, tom. ii.—Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Actor. SS. Ord. Benedicti*, part. ii. There are also very particular accounts given of Felix by Dom. Colonia, in his *Histoire Littéraire de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. and by the Benedictine monks in their *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv.

‡ Jo. G. Dorscheus, *Collat. ad Concilium Francofurti*, p. 101.—Werenfels, *de Logomachiis Eruditorum*, p. 459. Basnagius, *Præf. ad Etherium in Canisii Lection. antiquis*, tom. ii. part. i. p. 284.—G. Calixtus, *Singul. Diss.*

# THE NINTH CENTURY.

## PART I.

### THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the Prosperous Events which happened to the Church in this Century.*

I. THE reign of Charlemagne had been singularly auspicious to the Christian cause; the life of that great prince was principally employed in the most zealous efforts to propagate and establish the religion of Jesus among the Huns, Saxons, Friselanders, and other unenlightened nations; but his piety was mixed with violence, his spiritual conquests were generally made by the force of arms, and this impure mixture tarnishes the lustre of his noblest exploits. His son Louis, undeservedly surnamed the Debonnaire, or the Meek, inherited the defects of his father without his virtues, and was his equal in violence and cruelty, but greatly his inferior in all worthy and valuable accomplishments. Under his reign a very favourable opportunity was offered of propagating the Gospel among the northern nations, and particularly among the inhabitants of Sweden and Denmark. A petty king of Jutland, named Harald Klack, being driven from his kingdom and country, in 826, by Regner Lodbrock, threw himself at the emperor's feet, and implored his succours against the usurper. Louis granted his request, and promised the exiled prince his protection and assistance, on condition, however, that he would embrace Christianity, and admit the ministers of that religion to preach in his dominions. Harald submitted to these conditions, was baptised with his brother at Mentz, in 826, and returned into his country attended by two eminent divines, Ansgar or Anschaire, and Authbert; the former a monk of Corbey in Westphalia, and the latter belonging to a monastery of the same name in France.—These venerable missionaries preached the Gospel with remarkable success, during the course of two years, to the inhabitants of Cimbria and Jutland.

II. After the death of his learned and pious companion Authbert, the zealous and indefatigable Ansgar made a voyage into Sweden, in 828, where his ministerial labours were also crowned with distinguished success. Returning into Germany, in 831, he was loaded by Louis with ecclesiastical honours, being created archbishop of the new church at Hamburg, and also of the whole north, to which dignity, in 844, the superintendance of the church at Bremen was added. The profits attached to this high and honourable charge were very inconsiderable, while the perils and labours, in which it involved the pious prelate, were truly formidable. Accordingly he travelled fre-

quently among the Danes, Cimbrians, and Swedes, in order to promote the cause of Christ, to form new churches, and to confirm and establish those which he had already incorporated; in all which arduous enterprises he passed his life in the most imminent dangers, until, in 865, he concluded his glorious course.\*

III. About the middle of this century the Mœsians,† Bulgarians, and Gazarians, and after them the Bohemians and Moravians, were converted to Christianity by Methodius and Cyril, two Greek monks, whom the empress Theodora had sent to dispel the darkness of those idolatrous nations.‡ The zeal of Charlemagne, and of his pious missionaries, had been formerly exerted in the same cause, and among the same people,§ but with so little success, that any faint notions which they had received of the Christian doctrine were entirely effaced. The instructions of the Grecian doctors had a much better, and also a more permanent effect; but, as they recommended to their new disciples the forms of worship, and the various rites and ceremonies used among the Greeks,|| this was the occasion of much religious animosity and contention in after-times, when the lordly pontiffs exerted all their vehemence, and employed all the means which they could devise, though with imperfect success, for reducing these nations under the discipline and jurisdiction of the Latin church.

IV. Under the reign of Basilus, the Macedonian, who ascended the imperial throne of the Greeks in 867, the Slavonians, Arentani, and certain communities of Dalmatia, sent a solemn embassy to Constantinople to declare their resolution of submitting to the jurisdiction of the Grecian empire, and of embracing, at the same time, the Christian religion. This

\* The writers to whom we are indebted for accounts of this pious and illustrious prelate, the founder of the Cimbrian, Danish, and Swedish churches, are mentioned by Fabricius in his *Biblioth. Latin. mediæ ævi*, tom. i. p. 292, as also in his *Lux Evangelii Orbi Terrarum exorientis*, p. 425. Add to these the Benedictine monks, in their *Histoire Lit. de la France*, tom. v. p. 277.—*Acta Sactor. Mens. Februar.* tom. i. p. 391.—*Erici Pontoppidani Annales Eccles. Danicæ Diplomat.* tom. i. p. 18.—*Mølleri Cimbria Literata*, tom. iii. These writers give us also circumstantial accounts of Ebbo, Withmar, Rembert, and others, who were either the fellow-labourers or successors of Ansgar.

† We have translated thus the term *Mysi*, which is an error in the original. Dr. Mosheim, like many others, has confounded the Mysians with the inhabitants of Mœsia, by giving to the latter, who were Europeans, the title of the former, who dwelt in Asia.

‡ Jo. George Stredowsky, *Sacra Moravia: Historia*, lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 94, compared with Pet. Kohlii *Introduct. in Historiam et Rem liter. Slavorum*, p. 124.

§ Stredowsky, lib. i. cap. ix. p. 55.

|| L'Enfant, *Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites*, livr. i.

proposal was received with admiration and joy; and it was also answered by a suitable ardour and zeal for the conversion of a people that seemed so ingenuously disposed to embrace the truth: accordingly, a competent number of Grecian doctors were sent among them to instruct them in the knowledge of the Gospel, and to admit them by baptism into the Christian church.\* The warlike nation of the Russians were converted under the same emperor, but not in the same manner, or from the same noble and rational motives. Having entered into a treaty of peace with that prince, they were engaged by various presents and promises to embrace the Gospel, in consequence of which they received not only the Christian ministers that were appointed to instruct them, but also an archbishop, whom the Grecian patriarch Ignatius had sent among them, to perfect their conversion and establish their church.† Such were the beginnings of Christianity among the bold and warlike Russians, who were inhabitants of the Ukraine, and who, before their conversion, had fitted out a formidable fleet, and, setting sail from Kiow for Constantinople, had spread terror and dismay through the whole empire.‡

V. It is proper to observe, with respect to the various conversions which we have now been relating, that they were undertaken upon much better principles, and executed in a more pious and rational manner, than those of the preceding ages. The ministers, who were now sent to instruct and convert the barbarous nations, did not, like many of their predecessors, employ the terror of penal laws, to alight men into the profession of Christianity; nor, in establishing churches upon the ruins of idolatry, were they principally attentive to promote the grandeur and extend the authority of the Roman pontiffs; their views were more noble, and their conduct more suitable to the genius of the religion they professed. They had

chiefly in view the happiness of mankind, endeavoured to promote the gospel of truth and peace by rational persuasion, and seconded their arguments by the victorious power of exemplary lives. It must, however, be confessed, that the doctrine they taught was far from being conformable to the pure and excellent rules of faith and practice laid down by our divine Saviour and his holy apostles; for their religious system was corrupted by a variety of superstitious rites, and a multitude of absurd inventions. It is farther certain, that there remained among these converted nations too many traces of the idolatrous religion of their ancestors, notwithstanding the zealous labours of their Christian guides: and it appears also, that these pious missionaries were content with introducing an external profession of the true religion among their new proselytes. It would be, however, unjust to accuse them on this account of negligence or corruption in the discharge of their ministry, since in order to gain over these fierce and savage nations to the church, it may have been absolutely necessary to indulge them in some of their infirmities and prejudices, and to connive at many things, which pious missionaries could not approve, and which, in other circumstances, they would have been careful to correct.

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THE Saracens had now extended their usurpations with amazing success. Masters of Asia, a few provinces excepted, they pushed their conquests to the extremities of India, and obliged a great part of Africa to receive their yoke; nor were their enterprises in the west without effect, since Spain and Sardinia submitted to their arms, and fell under their dominion. But their conquests did not end here; for, in 827, by the treason of Euphemius, they made themselves masters of the rich and fertile island of Sicily; and, toward the conclusion of this century, an army of those barbarians, proceeding from Asia, seized several cities of Calabria, and spread the terror of their victorious arms even to the very walls of Rome, while Crete, Corsica, and other islands, were either joined to their possessions, or ravaged by their incursions. It is easy to comprehend that this overgrown prosperity of a nation accustomed to bloodshed and rapine, and which also beheld the Christians with the utmost aversion, must have been every where detrimental to the progress of the Gospel, and to the tranquility of the church. In the east, more especially, a prodigious number of Christian families embraced the religion of their conquerors, that they might live in the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions. Many, indeed, refused this base and criminal compliance, and with a pious magnanimity adhered to their principles in the face of persecution: but such were gradually reduced to a miserable condition, and were not only robbed of the best part of their wealth, and deprived of their worldly advantages, but, what was still more deplorable, they fell by degrees into such incredible ignorance and stu-

\* We are indebted for this account of the conversion of the Slavonians to the treatise de *administrando Imperio*, composed by the learned emperor Constantine Porphyrogeneta, and published by Baudurius in his *Imper. Orient.* tom. i. Constantine gives the same account of this event in the life of his grandfather Basilus, the Macedonian, sect. 54, published in the *Corpus Scriptorum Byzantinorum*, tom. xvi.

† Constantinus Porph. in *Vita Basilii Macedonis*, sect. 96. p. 157. *Corp. Byzant.* See also the *Narratio de Ruthenorum Conversione*, published both in Greek and Latin by Bandurius, in his *Imper. Orient.*

‡ The learned Lequien in his *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 1257, gives a very inaccurate account of those Russians who were converted to Christianity under the reign of Basilus the Macedonian; and in this he does no more than adopt the errors of many who wrote before him upon the same subject. Nor is he consistent with himself; for in one place he affirms, that the people here spoken of were the Russians who lived in the neighbourhood of the Bulgarians, while in another he maintains, that by these Russians we are to understand the Gazarians. The only reason he alleges to support the latter opinion is, that, among the Christian doctors sent to instruct the Russians, mention is made of Cyril, who converted the Gazari to Christianity. This reason shows, that the learned writer had a most imperfect knowledge both of these Russians and the Gazari. He is also guilty of other mistakes upon the same subject. There is a much better explanation of this matter given by the very learned Theoph. Sigifred Bayer, *Dissert. de Russorum prima Expeditione Constantinopolitana*, which is published in the sixth volume of the *Commentaria Acad. Scientiar. Petropolitane*.

pidity, that, in process of time, there were scarcely any remains of Christianity to be found among them, beside the mere name, and a few external rites and ceremonies. The Saracens who had fixed themselves in Europe, particularly those who were settled in Spain, were of a much milder disposition, and seemed to have put off the greatest part of their native ferocity; so that the Christians, generally speaking, lived peaceably under their dominion, and were permitted to observe the laws, and to enjoy the privileges of their holy profession. It must, however, be confessed, that this mild and tolerating conduct of the Saracens was not without some few exceptions of cruelty.\*

II. The European Christians had the most cruel sufferings to undergo from another quarter,—even from the insatiable fury of a swarm of barbarians that issued out from the northern provinces. The Normans, under which general term are comprehended the Danes, Norwegians, and Swedes, whose habitations lay along the coasts of the Baltic sea, were a people accustomed to carnage and rapine. Their petty kings and chiefs, who subsisted by piracy and plunder, had already, during the reign of Charlemagne, infested with their fleets the coasts of the German ocean, but were restrained by the opposition they met with from the vigilance and activity of that warlike prince. In this century, however, they became more bold and enterprising, made frequent irruptions into Germany, Britain, Friseland, and Gaul, and carried along with them, wherever they went, fire and sword, desolation and horror. The impetuous fury of these savage barbarians not only spread desolation through the Spanish provinces,† but even penetrated into the very

\* See, for example, the account that is given of Eulogius, who suffered martyrdom at Cordova, in the *Acta Sanctorum* ad d. xi. Martii, tom. ii. p. 88; as also of Roderic and Solomon, two Spanish martyrs of this century. *Ibid.* ad d. xiii. Martii, p. 328.

† *Jo. de Ferreras, Historia de Espana*, vol. ii. Piracy was esteemed among the northern nations a very honourable and noble profession; and hence the sons of kings, and the young nobility, were trained up to this species of robbery, and made it their principal business to perfect them-

heart of Italy; for, in 857, they ravaged and plundered the city of Luna in the most cruel manner; and, about three years after, Pisa, and several other towns of Italy, met with the same fate.\* The ancient histories of the Franks abound with the most dismal accounts of their horrid exploits.

III. The first views of these savage invaders extended no farther than plunder; but, charmed at length with the beauty and fertility of the provinces which they were so cruelly depopulating, they began to form settlements in them; nor were the European princes in a condition to oppose their usurpations. On the contrary, Charles the Bald was obliged, in 850, to resign a considerable part of his dominions to the powerful banditti; and a few years after, under the reign of Charles the Gross, emperor and king of France, the famous Norman chief Godofred entered with an army into Friseland, and obstinately refused to sheath his sword before he was master of the whole province.‡ Such, however, of the Normans as settled among the Christians, contracted a more gentle turn of mind, and gradually departed from their primitive brutality. Their marriages with the Christians contributed, no doubt, to civilize them; and engaged them to abandon the superstition of their ancestors with more facility, and to embrace the Gospel with more readiness than they would have otherwise done. Thus the proud conqueror of Friseland solemnly embraced the Christian religion after he had received in marriage, from Charles the Gross, Gisela, the daughter of Lothaire the younger.

self in it. Nor will this appear very surprising to such as consider the religion of these nations, and the barbarism of the times. See *Jo. Lud. Holberg, Historia Danorum et Norvegorum Navalis*, in *Scriptis Societatis Scientiar. Hafniensis*, tom. iii. p. 349, in which there are a multitude of curious and interesting relations concerning the ancient piracies, drawn from the Danish and Norwegian annals.

\* See the *Scriptores Rerum Italianarum*, published by Muratori.

† *Annales incerti Auctoris*, in *Pithæi Scriptor. Francic.* p. 46.

‡ *Reginonis Prumiensis Annal.* lib. ii.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.*

I. THE Grecian empire, in this century, was in circumstances seemingly calculated to distinguish all taste for letters and philosophy, and all zeal for the cultivation of the sciences. The liberality, however, of the emperors, some of whom were men of learning and taste, and the wise precautions taken by the patriarchs of Constantinople, among whom Photius deserves the first rank in point of erudition, contributed to attach a certain number of learned men to that imperial city, and thus prevented the total decline of letters. Accordingly, we

find in Constantinople, at this time, several persons who excelled in eloquence and poetry; some who displayed, in their writings against the Latins, a considerable knowledge of the art of reasoning, and a high degree of dexterity in the management of controversy; and others who composed the history of their own times with accuracy and elegance. The controversy with the Latins, when it grew more keen and animated, contributed, in a particular manner, to excite the literary emulation of the disputants; rendered them studious to acquire new ideas, and a rich and copious elocution, adorned with the graces of elegance and wit; and thus roused and invigorated talents that were ready to perish in indolence and sloth.



II. We learn from Zonaras, that the study of philosophy lay for a long time neglected in this age; but it was revived, with a zeal for the sciences in general, under the emperor Theophilus, and his son Michael III. This revival of letters may principally be ascribed\* to the encouragement and protection which the learned received from Bardas, who had been declared by Cæsar, himself an illiterate man, but a warm friend of the celebrated Photius, the great patron of science, by whose counsel he was, undoubtedly, directed in this matter. At the head of all the learned men to whom Bardas committed the culture of the sciences, he placed Leo, surnamed the Wise, a man of the most profound and uncommon erudition, and who afterwards was consecrated bishop of Thessalonica. Photius explained the Categories of Aristotle, while Michael Psellus gave a brief exposition of the better works of that great philosopher.

III. The Arabians, who, instead of cultivating the arts and sciences, had thought of nothing hitherto, but of extending their territories, were now excited to literary pursuits by Almamoun, otherwise called Abu Giafar Abdallah, whose zeal for the advancement of letters was great, and whose munificence toward men of learning and genius was truly royal. Under the auspicious protection of this celebrated khalif of Syria and Egypt, the Arabians made a rapid and astonishing progress in various kinds of learning. This excellent prince began to reign about the time of the death of Charlemagne, and died in 833. He erected the famous schools of Bagdad, Cufa, and Basra, and established seminaries of learning in several other cities; he drew to his court men of eminent parts by his extraordinary liberality, set up noble libraries in various places, caused translations to be made of the best Grecian productions into the Arabic language at a vast expense, and employed every method of promoting the cause of learning, that became a great and generous prince, whose zeal for the sciences was attended with knowledge.‡ It was under the reign of this celebrated khalif, that the Arabians began to take pleasure in the Grecian learning, and to propagate it, by degrees, not only in Syria and Africa, but also in Spain and Italy; and from this period they give us a long catalogue of celebrated philosophers, physicians, astronomers, and mathematicians, who were ornaments to their nation through several succeeding ages;‡ and in this certainly they do not boast without reason, though we are not to consider, as literally true, all the wonderful and pompous things which the more modern writers of the Saracen history tell us of these illustrious philosophers.

After this period the European Christians profited much by the Arabian learning, and were highly indebted to the Saracens for improvement in the various sciences; for the

mathematics, astronomy, physic, and philosophy, that were taught in Europe from the tenth century, were, for the most part, drawn from the Arabian schools that were established in Spain and Italy, or from the writings of the Arabian sages. Hence the Saracens may, in one respect, be justly considered as the restorers of learning in Europe.

IV. In that part of Europe which was subject to the dominion of the Franks, Charlemagne laboured with incredible zeal and ardour for the advancement of useful learning, and animated his subjects to the culture of the sciences in all their various branches: so that, had his successors been disposed to follow his example, and capable of acting upon the noble plan which he formed, the empire, in a little time, would have been entirely delivered from barbarism and ignorance. It is true, this great prince left in his family a certain spirit of emulation, which animated his immediate successors to imitate, in some measure, his zeal for the prosperity of the republic of letters. Louis the Debonnaire both formed and executed several designs that were extremely conducive to the progress of the arts and sciences;§ and his zeal, in this respect, was surpassed by the ardour with which his son Charles the Bald exerted himself in the propagation of letters, and in exciting the emulation of the learned by the most alluring marks of his protection and favour. This great patron of the sciences drew the *literati* to his court from all parts, took a particular delight in their conversation, multiplied and embellished the seminaries of learning, and protected, in a more especial manner, the Aulic school, of which mention has already been made, and which was first erected in the seventh century, for the education of the royal family and the first nobility.¶ His brother Lothaire endeavoured to revive in Italy the drooping sciences, and to rescue them from that state of languor and decay into which the corruption and indolence of the clergy had permitted them to fall. For this purpose he erected schools in the eight principal cities of Italy, in 823,‡ but with little success, since that country appears to have been entirely destitute of men of learning and genius during the ninth century.§

In England learning had a better fate under the auspicious protection of king Alfred, who acquired an immortal name, not only by the admirable progress he made in all kinds of elegant and useful knowledge,|| but also by the care he took to multiply men of letters and genius in his dominions, and to restore to the

\* See the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 583.

‡ Herman. *Conringii Antiquit. Academicæ*. p. 320.—*Cæs. Eg. du Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 178.—*Launoy, de Scholis Caroli M.* cap. xi, xii. p. 47.—*Histoire Litt. de la France*, tom. v. p. 483.

‡ See the edict for that purpose among the *Capitularia*, published by Muratori in the first volume of his compilation de *Rebus Italicis*.

§ See Muratori's *Antiq. Ital. mediæ Ævi*, tom. iii. p. 829.

|| See *Ant. Wood, Hist. et Antiquit. Academiæ Oxoniensis*. lib. i. p. 13.—*Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 211.—*General Dictionary*, at the article *Alfred*. (This prince, among other pious and learned labours, translated the *Pastoral* of Gregory I., *Boetius* de *Consolatione*, and *Bede's Ecclesiastical History*.)

\* Zonar. *Annal.* tom. ii. lib. xvi.

‡ *Abulpharajius, Historia Dynastiæ*. p. 246.—*Georg. Elmæcin. Histor. Saracen.* lib. ii. p. 139.—*Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient.* article *Mamun*, p. 545.

‡ See the treatise of *Leo Africanus, de Medicis et Philosophis Arabibus*, published by Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Græca*, tom. xii. p. 259.

sciences, sacred and profane, the credit and lustre which they so eminently deserve.\*

V. But the infelicity of the times rendered the effects of all this zeal and all these projects for the advancement of learning much less considerable than might have otherwise been expected. The protectors and patrons of the learned were themselves learned; their authority was respectable, and their munificence was boundless; and yet the progress of science toward perfection was but slow, because the interruptions arising from the troubled state of Europe were frequent. The discords that arose between Louis and his sons, which were succeeded by a rupture between the latter, retarded considerably the progress of letters in the empire; and the incursions and victories of the Normans, which afflicted Europe during the whole course of this century, were so inimical to the culture of the arts and sciences, that, in most of the regions of this part of the world, and even in France, there remained but a small number who truly deserved the title of learned men.† The wretched and incoherent fragments of erudition that yet remained among the clergy were confined to the monasteries, and to the episcopal schools; but the zeal of the monkish and priestly orders for the improvement of the mind, and the culture of the sciences, diminished in proportion as their revenues increased, so that their indolence and ignorance grew with their possessions.

VI. It must, however, be confessed, that several examples of learned men, whose zeal for science was kindled by the encouragement and munificence of Charlemagne, shone forth with a distinguished lustre through the darkness of this barbarous age. Among these, the first rank is due to Rabanus Maurus, whose fame was great through all Germany and France, and to whom the youth resorted, in prodigious numbers, from all parts, to receive his instructions in the liberal arts and sciences. The writers of history, whose works have deservedly preserved their names from oblivion, are Eginhard, Freculph, Thegan, Haymo, Anastasius, Ado, and others of less note. Florus, Walafridus Strabo, Bertharius, and Rabanus, excelled in poetry. Smaragdus and Bertharius were eminent for their skill in grammar and languages, as was also the celebrated Rabanus already mentioned, who acquired a very high degree of reputation by a learned and subtle treatise concerning the causes and the rise of languages. The Greek and Hebrew erudition was cultivated with considerable success by

William, Servatus Lupus, Scotus, and others. Eginhard, Agobard, Hincmar, and Servatus Lupus, were famed for the eloquence which appeared both in their discourses and in their writings.\*

VII. The philosophy and logic that were taught in the European schools during this century, scarcely deserved such honourable titles, and were little better than an empty jargon. There were, however, to be found in various countries, particularly among the Irish, men of acute parts and extensive knowledge, who were perfectly well entitled to the appellation of philosophers. Of these, the chief was Johannes Scotus Erigena,‡ a native of Ireland, the friend and companion of Charles the Bald, who delighted so much in his conversation as to honour him with a place at his table. Scotus was endowed with an excellent and truly superior genius, and was considerably versed both in Greek and Latin erudition. He explained to his disciples the philosophy of Aristotle, for which he was singularly well qualified by his thorough knowledge of the Greek language; but, as his genius was too bold and aspiring to confine itself to the authority and decisions of the Stagirite, he pushed his philosophical researches yet farther, dared to think for himself, and ventured to pursue truth without any other guide than his own reason. We have yet extant of his composition, five Books concerning the Division of Nature; an intricate and subtle production, in which the causes and principles of all things are investigated with a considerable degree of sagacity, and in which also the precepts of Christianity are allegorically explained, yet in such a manner as to show, that their ultimate end is the union of the soul with the Supreme Being. He was the first who blended the scholastic theology with the mystic, and formed both into one system. It has also been imagined, that he was far from rejecting the opinions of those who consider the union of God and nature, as similar to the union that subsists between the soul and the body,—a notion much the same with that of many ancient philosophers, who looked upon the Deity as the soul of the world. But it may, perhaps, be alleged, and not without reason, that what Scotus said upon this subject amounted to no more than what the *Realists*,‡ as they are called

\* Such as are desirous of a more circumstantial account of these writers, and of their various productions, may consult the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. iv. p. 251 to 371; or the more ample account given of them by the celebrated Le Bœuf, in his *Etat des Sciences en France depuis Charlemagne, jusqu'au Roi Robert*, which is published in his *Recueil de divers Ecrits pour servir d'Eclaircissement à l'Histoire de France*, tom. ii.

‡ Erigena signifies properly a native of Ireland, as Erin was the ancient name of that kingdom.

‡ The *Realists*, who followed the doctrine of Aristotle with respect to universal ideas, were so called in opposition to the *Nominalists*, who embraced the hypothesis of Zeno and the Stoics upon that perplexed and intricate subject. Aristotle held, against Plato, that previous to, and independent of matter, there were no universal ideas or essences; and that the ideas, or exemplars, which the latter supposed to have existed in the divine mind, and to have been the *models* of all created things, had been eternally impressed upon matter, and were coeval with, and inherent in, their objects. Zeno and his followers, departing both from the Platonic and Aristotelian systems, maintained that these pretended universals had neither

† This excellent prince not only encouraged by his protection and liberality such of his own subjects as made any progress in the liberal arts and sciences, but invited over from foreign countries men of distinguished talents, whom he fixed in a seminary at Oxford, and, in consequence, may be looked upon as the founder of that noble university. Johannes Scotus Erigena, who had been in the service of Charles the Bald, and Grimbold, a monk of St. Bertin in France, were the most famous of those learned men who came from abroad: Asserius, Werefrid, Plegmund, Dunwuf, Wulfsig, and the abbot of St. Neot's, deserve the first rank among the English literati who adorned the age of Alfred. See Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i. book iii., and Rapin's *History of England*.

‡ Servati Lupi Op. Epist. xxiv. p. 69.—Conringii *Antiq. Acad.* p. 322.—*Histoire Liter. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 251.

ed, maintained afterwards, though it must be allowed that he has expressed himself in a very perplexed and obscure manner.\* This celebrated philosopher formed no particular sect, at least as far as we know; and this will be considered, by those who are acquainted with the spirit of the times in which he lived, as a proof that his immense learning was accompanied with meekness and modesty.

About this time a certain person named Macarius, a native of Ireland, propagated in France that enormous error, which was afterwards adopted and professed by Averroes, that one individual intelligence, one soul, performed the spiritual and rational functions in all the human race. This error was confuted by Ratram, a famous monk of Corbey.† Before these writers flourished, Dungal, a native of Ireland also, who left his country, and retired into a French monastery, where he lived during the reigns of Charlemagne and his son Louis, and taught philosophy and astronomy with the greatest reputation.‡ Heric, a monk of Auxerre, made likewise an eminent figure among the learned of this age; he was a man of uncommon sagacity, was endowed with a great and aspiring genius, and is said, in many things, to have anticipated the famous Descartes in the manner of investigating truth.§

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government during this Century.*

I. THE impiety and licentiousness of the greatest part of the clergy arose, at this time, to an enormous height, and stand upon record, in the unanimous complaints of the most candid and impartial writers of this century.¶ In the east, tumult, discord, conspiracies, and treason, reigned uncontrolled, and all things were carried by violence and force. These abuses appeared in many things, but particularly in the election of the patriarchs of Constantinople. The favour of the court was now the only step to that high and important office; and, as the patriarch's continuance in that eminent post depended upon such an uncertain and precarious foundation, nothing was more usual than to see a prelate pulled down from his episcopal throne by an imperial decree. In the

form nor essence, and were no more than mere terms and nominal representations of their particular objects. The doctrine of Aristotle prevailed until the eleventh century, when Roscellinus embraced the Stoical system, and founded the sect of the Nominalists, whose sentiments were propagated with great success by the famous Abelard. These two sects differed considerably among themselves, and explained, or rather obscured, their respective tenets in a variety of ways.

\* The work here alluded to was published by Mr. Thomas Gale, in 1681. The learned Heuman has made several extracts from it, and has given also an ample account of Scotus, in his Acts of the Philosophers, written in German, tom. iii. p. 858.

† Mabillon, Præf. part. ii. Act. SS. Ord. Beuedicti, sect. 156. p. 53.

‡ Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. iv. p. 493.

§ Le Bœuf, Mémoires pour l'Histoire d'Auxerre, tom. ii. p. 481.—Acta Sanctorum, tom. iv. M. Junii ad J. xxiv. p. 629, et ad d. xxxi. Jul. p. 249; for this philosopher has obtained a place among the saintly order.

¶ See Agobardus, de Privilegiis et Jure Sacerdotii, sect. 13.

western provinces, the bishops were voluptuous and effeminate in a very high degree. They passed their lives amidst the splendour of courts and the pleasures of a luxurious indolence, which corrupted their taste, extinguished their zeal, and rendered them incapable of performing the solemn duties of their functions;\* while the inferior clergy were sunk in licentiousness, minded nothing but sensual gratifications, and infected with the most heinous vices the flock, whom it was the very business of their ministry to preserve, or to deliver from the contagion of iniquity. Besides, the ignorance of the sacred order was, in many places, so deplorable, that few of them could either read or write; and still fewer were capable of expressing their wretched notions with any degree of method or perspicuity. Hence it happened, that, when letters were to be penned, or any matter of consequence was to be committed to writing, they commonly had recourse to some person who was supposed to be endowed with superior abilities, as appears in the case of Servatus Lupus.†

II. Many circumstances concurred, particularly in the European nations, to produce and augment this corruption and licentiousness, so shameful in an order of men, who were set apart to exhibit examples of piety to the rest of the world. Among these we may reckon, as the chief sources of the evil under consideration, the calamities of the times, the bloody and perpetual wars that were carried on between Louis the Debonnaire and his family, the incursions and conquests of the barbarous nations, the gross and incredible ignorance of the nobility, and the riches that flowed in upon the churches and religious seminaries from all quarters. Many other causes also contributed to dishonour the church, by introducing into it a corrupt ministry. A nobleman, who, through want of talents, of activity, or courage, was rendered incapable of appearing with dignity in the cabinet, or with honour in the field, immediately turned his views toward the church, aimed at a distinguished place among its chiefs and rulers, and became, in consequence, a contagious example of stupidity and vice to the inferior clergy.‡ The patrons of churches, in whom resided the right of election, unwilling to submit their disorderly conduct to the keen censure of zealous and upright pastors, industriously looked for the most abject, ignorant, and worthless ecclesiastics, to whom they committed the care of souls.§ But one of the circumstances, which contributed in a particular manner to render, at least, the higher clergy wicked and depraved, and to take off their minds from the duties of their

\* The reader will be convinced of this by consulting Agobard, *passim*, and by looking over the laws enacted in the Latin councils for restraining the disorders of the clergy. See also Servatus Lupus, Epist. xxxv. p. 73, 281, and Steph. Baluze, in Adnot. p. 378.

† See the works of Servatus Lupus, Epist. xviii. xcix. p. 126, 142, 148; as also his *Lit.* See also Rodolph Bituricensis *Capitula ad Clerum suum*, in Baluzii *Miscellaneis*, tom. vi. p. 139, 148.

‡ Hincmarus, in *Opere Posteriori contra Godeschalcum*, cap. xxxvi. tom. i. op. p. 318.—Servatus Lupus, Epist. lxxix. p. 120.

§ Agobardus, de *Privilegiis et Jure Sacerdotii*, cap. xi p. 341. tom. i. op.

station, was the obligation of performing certain services to their sovereigns, in consequence of the possessions they derived from the royal bounty. The bishops and heads of monasteries held many lands and castles by a feudal tenure; and, being thereby bound to furnish their princes with a certain number of soldiers in time of war, were obliged also to take the field themselves at the head of these troops,\* and thus to act in a sphere that was utterly inconsistent with the nature and duties of their sacred character. Beside all this, it often happened that rapacious princes, in order to satisfy the craving wants of their soldiers and domestics, boldly invaded the possessions of the church, which they distributed among their armies; in consequence of which the priests and monks, in order to avoid perishing through hunger, abandoned themselves to the practice of violence, fraud, and all sorts of crimes, considering these acts as the only remaining means by which they could procure a subsistence.†

III. The Roman pontiffs were raised to that high dignity by the suffrages of the sacerdotal order, accompanied by the voice of the people; but, after their election, the approbation of the emperor was necessary, in order to their consecration.‡ An edict, indeed, is yet extant, supposed to have been published, in 817, by Louis the Debonnaire, in which he abolishes this imperial right, and grants to the Romans, not only the power of electing their pontiff, but also the privilege of installing and consecrating him when elected, without waiting for the consent of the emperor.§ But this grant will not deceive those who inquire into the affair with any degree of attention and diligence, since several learned men have proved it spurious by the most irresistible arguments.|| It must, however, be confessed, that, after the time of Charles the Bald, a new scene of things arose; and the important change above-mentioned was really introduced. That prince, having obtained the imperial dignity by the good offices of the bishop of Rome, returned this eminent service by delivering the succeeding pontiffs from the obligation of waiting for the consent of the emperors, in order to their being installed in their office; and thus we find, that from the time of Eugenius III. who was raised

to the pontificate in 884, the election of the pope was carried on without the least regard to law, order, and decency, and was generally attended with civil tumults and dissensions, until the reign of Otho the Great, who put a stop to these disorderly proceedings.

IV. Among the pontiffs of this century, there were very few who distinguished themselves by their learning, prudence, and virtue, or who were studious of those particular qualities which are essential to the character of a Christian bishop. On the contrary, the greatest part of them are only known by the flagitious actions that have transmitted their names with infamy to our times; and all seem to have vied with each other in their ambitious efforts to extend their authority, and render their dominion unlimited and universal. It is here that we may place, with propriety, an event which is said to have interrupted the much-vaunted succession of regular bishops in the see of Rome, from the first foundation of that church to the present times. Between the pontificate of Leo IV., who died in 855, and that of Benedict III., a certain woman, who artfully disguised her sex for a considerable time, is said, by learning, genius, and dexterity, to have made good her way to the papal chair, and to have governed the church with the title and dignity of pontiff about two years. This extraordinary person is yet known by the title of Pope Joan. During the five succeeding centuries this event was generally believed, and a vast number of writers bore testimony to its truth; nor, before the reformation undertaken by Luther, was it considered by any, either as incredible in itself, or as disgraceful to the church.\* But, in the last century, the elevation, and indeed the existence of this female pontiff, became the subject of a keen and learned controversy; and several men of distinguished abilities, both among the Roman catholics and protestants, employed all the force of their genius and erudition to destroy the credit of this story, by invalidating, on the one hand, the weight of the testimonies on which it was founded, and by showing, on the other, that it was inconsistent with the most accurate chronological computations.† Between the contending parties,

\* Steph. Baluzii Appendix Actor. ad Servatum, p. 508.—Muratori Antiq. Ital. mediæ ævi, tom. ii. p. 446. Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 587.—Du-Fresne, ad Joivillii Hist. Ludovici S. p. 75, 76.

† Agobardus, de Dispens. Serum Ecclesiast. sect. iv.—Flodoardus, Histor. Eccles. Rhenensis, lib. iii. cap. iv.—Servatus Lupus, Epist. xlv. p. 87, 437, &c.—Muratori, tom. vi. Antiq. Ital. p. 302.—Lud. Thomassin, Dis. ciplina Ecclesie vet. et novæ circa Beneficia, par. ii. lib. iii. cap. xi. These corrupt measures prevailed also among the Greeks and Lombards, as may be seen in the Oriens Christianus of Lequien, tom. i. p. 142.

‡ See De Bunan, Hist. Imper. German. tom. iii.

§ Hardeuini Concilia, tom. iv. p. 1236.—Le Cointe, Annales Eccles. Francor. tom. vii. ad An. 817. sect. 6. Baluzii Capitular. Regum Francor. tom. i. p. 591.

|| Muratori, Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiast. p. 54, and Antiq. Ital. tom. iii. p. 29, 30, in which that learned man conjectures, that this edict was forged in the eleventh century. Bunan, Hist. Imper. German. tom. iii. p. 34. The partisans, however, of the papal authority, such as Fontanini and others, plead strenuously, though ineffectually, for the authenticity of the edict in question.

\* The arguments of those who maintained the truth of this extraordinary event are collected in one striking point of view, with great learning and industry, by Fred. Spanheim, in his Exercitiatio de Papa Fœmina, tom. ii. op. p. 577. This dissertation was translated into French by the celebrated L'Enfant, who digested it into a better method, and enriched it with several additions.

† The arguments of those who reject the story of Pope Joan as a fable, have been collected by David Blondel, and after him with still more art and erudition by Bayle, in the third volume of his Dictionary, at the article *Papesse*. Add to these Jo. Georg. Eccard. (Hist. Francie Oriental. tom. ii. lib. xxx. sect. 119. p. 436.) who has adopted and appropriated the sentiments of the great Leibnitz, upon the matter in question. See also Lequien's Oriens Christianus. tom. ii. p. 777, and Heuman's Sylloge Dissert. Sacr. tom. i. part ii. p. 352. The very learned Jo. Christoph. Wagenseil has given a just and accurate view of the arguments on both sides, which may be seen in the Amœnitates Literariæ of Schellhornius, part i. p. 146; and the same has been done by Basnage in his Histoire de l'Eglise, tom. i. p. 408. A list of the other writers, who have employed their labours upon this intricate question, may be seen in Casp. Sagittarius' Introd. in Hist. Eccles. tom. i. cap. xxv. p. 676, and in the Biblioth. Bræmens tom. viii. part v. p. 935.

some of the wisest and most learned writers have judiciously steered a middle course; they grant that many fictitious and fabulous circumstances have been interwoven with this story; but they deny that it is entirely destitute of foundation, or that the controversy is yet ended, in a satisfactory manner, in favour of those who dispute the truth; and, indeed, upon a deliberate and impartial view of this whole matter, it will appear more than probable, that some unusual event must have happened at Rome, from which this story derived its origin, because it is not at all credible, from any principles of moral evidence, that an event should be universally believed and related in the same manner by a multitude of historians, during five centuries immediately succeeding its supposed date, if that event had been absolutely destitute of all foundation. But what it was that gave rise to this story is yet to be discovered, and is likely to remain uncertain.\*

V. The enormous vices, that must have covered so many pontiffs with infamy in the judgment of the wise, formed not the least obstacle to their ambition in these miserable times, nor hindered them from extending their influence, and augmenting their authority, both in church and state. It does not, indeed, appear from any authentic records, that their possessions increased in proportion to the progress of their authority, or that any new grants of land were added to what they had already obtained from the liberality of the kings of France.—The donations, which Louis the Debonnaire is reported to have made to them, are mere inventions, equally destitute of truth and probability; and nothing is more groundless than the accounts of those writers who affirm that Charles the Bald divested himself, in 875, of his right to the city of Rome and its territory, in favour of the pontiffs, whom he at the same time enriched with a variety of noble and costly presents, in return for the good services of John VIII., by whose assistance he had been raised to the empire. Be that as it may, it is certain, that the authority and affluence of the bishops of Rome increased greatly from the time of Louis, but more especially from the accession of Charles the Bald to the imperial throne, as all the historical records of that period abundantly testify.†

VI. After the death of Louis II. a fierce and dreadful war broke out between the posterity of Charlemagne, among which there were several competitors for the empire. This furnished the Italian princes and pope John VIII. with

an opportunity of assuming the right of nominating to the imperial throne, and of excluding from all concern in this election the nations who had formerly the right of suffrage; and, as the occasion was favourable, it was seized with avidity, and improved with the utmost dexterity and zeal. Their favour and interest were earnestly solicited by Charles the Bald, whose intreaties were rendered effectual by rich presents, prodigious sums of money, and most pompous promises, in consequence of which he was proclaimed, in 876, by the pope and the Italian princes assembled at Pavia, king of Italy and emperor of the Romans. Carloman and Charles the Gross, who succeeded him in the kingdom of Italy, and in the Roman empire, were also elected by the Roman pontiff and the princes of Italy. After the reigns of those potentates, the empire was torn in pieces: the most deplorable tumults and commotions arose in Italy, France, and Germany, which were governed or rather subdued and usurped by various chiefs; and, in this confused scene, the highest bidder was, by the aid of the greedy pontiffs, generally raised to the government of Italy, and to the imperial throne.\*

VII. Thus the power and influence of the pontiffs, in civil affairs, rose in a short time to an enormous height, through the favour and protection of the princes, in whose cause they had employed the influence which superstition had given them over the minds of the people. The increase of their authority, in religious matters, was not less rapid or less considerable; and it arose from the same causes. The wisest and most impartial among the Roman catholic writers, not only acknowledge, but have even taken pains to demonstrate, that, from the time of Louis the Debonnaire, the ancient rules of ecclesiastical government were gradually changed in Europe by the counsels and instigation of the court of Rome, and new laws substituted in their place. The European princes suffered themselves to be divested of the supreme authority in religious matters, which they had derived from Charlemagne; the episcopal power was greatly diminished, and even the authority of both provincial and general councils began to decline. The Roman pontiffs, elate with their overgrown prosperity and the daily accessions that were made to their authority, were eagerly bent upon persuading all, and had, indeed, the good fortune to persuade many, that the bishop of Rome was constituted, by Jesus Christ, supreme legislator and judge of the church universal; and that, therefore, the bishops derived all their authority from the pope, nor could the councils determine any thing without his permission and consent.‡ This opinion, which was inculcated

\* Such is the opinion of Paul Sarpi, in his *Lettere Italiane*, Lett. lxxvii. p. 452; of L'Enfant, *Biblioth. Germanique*, tom. x. p. 27; of Theod. Haecus, *Biblioth. Bremens.* tom. viii. part v. p. 935; and of the celebrated Pfaff, *Instit. Histor. Eccles.* p. 402; to whom we might add Wernsdorf, Boecler, Holberg, and many others, were such an enumeration necessary. Without assuming the character of a judge in this intricate controversy, concerning which so many decisions have been confidently pronounced, I shall only take the liberty to observe, that the matter in debate is yet dubious, and has not, on either side, been represented in such a light as to bring conviction.

† See above, sect. 3.

‡ Bunau *Histor. Imperii Rom. German.* tom. ii. p. 482.—Jo. George Ercard, *Histor. Franciæ Orient.* tom. ii. lib. xxxi. p. 606.

\* This matter is amply illustrated by Sigonius, in his famous book *de Regno Italiae*, and by the other writers of German and Italian history.

‡ See the excellent work of an anonymous and unknown author, who signs himself D. B. and whose book is entitled, *Histoire du Droit Ecclesiastique public Francoise*, published first at London, in 1737, and lately republished in a more splendid edition. The author of this performance shows, in a judicious and concise manner, the various steps by which the papal authority rose to such a monstrous height. His account of the ninth century may be seen in the first volume of his work, at the 160th page.

with the utmost zeal and ardour, was opposed by such as were acquainted with the ancient ecclesiastical constitutions, and the government of the church in the earlier ages; but it was opposed in vain.

VIII. In order to gain credit to this new ecclesiastical system, so different from the ancient rules of church government, and to support the haughty pretensions of the pontiffs to supremacy and independence, it was necessary to produce the authority of ancient deeds, to stop the mouths of such as were disposed to set bounds to their usurpations. The bishops of Rome were aware of this; and as those means were deemed the most lawful that tended best to the accomplishment of their purposes, they employed some of their most ingenious and zealous partisans in forging conventions, acts of councils, epistles, and the like records, by which it might appear, that, in the first ages of the church, the Roman pontiffs were clothed with the same spiritual majesty and supreme authority which they now assumed.\* Among these fictitious supports of the papal dignity, the famous *Decretal Epistles*, as they are called, said to have been written by the pontiffs of the primitive time, deserve chiefly to be stigmatised. They were the productions of an obscure writer, who fraudulently prefixed to them the name of Isidore, bishop of Seville,† to make the world believe that they had been collected by this illustrious and learned prelate. Some of them had appeared in the eighth century,‡ but they were now entirely drawn from their obscurity, and produced, with an air of ostentation and triumph, to demonstrate the supremacy of the Roman pontiffs.§ The decisions of a cer-

\* There is just reason to imagine, that these decretals, and various other acts, such as the grants of Charlemagne and his son Louis, were forged with the knowledge and consent of the Roman pontiffs, since it is utterly incredible, that these pontiffs should, for many ages, have constantly appealed, in support of their pretended rights and privileges, to acts and records that were only the fictions of private persons, and should with such weak arms have stood out against kings, princes, councils, and bishops, who were unwilling to receive their yoke. Acts of a private nature would have been useless here, and public deeds were necessary to accomplish the views of papal ambition. Such forgeries were in this century deemed lawful, on account of their supposed tendency to promote the glory of God, and to advance the prosperity of the church: and, therefore, it is not surprising, that the good pontiffs should feel no remorse in imposing upon the world frauds and forgeries, that were designed to enrich the patrimony of St. Peter, and to aggrandise his successors in the apostolic see.

† It is certain that the forger of the decretals was extremely desirous of persuading the world, that they were collected by Isidore, the celebrated bishop of Seville, who lived in the sixth century. See Fabricii Biblioth. Latin. mediæ ævi, tom. v. p. 561. It was a custom among the bishops to add, from a principle of humility, the epithet *peccator*, i. e. *sinner*, to their titles; and, accordingly, this forger has added the word *peccator* after the name of Isidore: but this some ignorant transcribers have absurdly changed into the word *mercator*; and hence it happens that one Isidorus Mercator passes for the fraudulent collector, or forger of the decretals.

‡ See Calmet, Histoire de Lorraine, tom. i. p. 528.—B. Just. Hen. Bohmer, Præf. ad novam Edit. Juris Cauou. tom. i. p. x. xix. Not.

§ Beside the authors of the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses* and other writers, the learned Blondel has demonstrated, in an ample and satisfactory manner, the spuriousness of the decretals, in his *Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes*; and in our time the imposition is acknowledged even by the Roman catholics, at least by such of them as possess some degree of judgment and impartiality. See

tain Roman council, which is said to have been holden during the pontificate of Sylvester, were likewise alleged in behalf of the same cause; but this council had not been heard of before the present century, and the accounts now given of it proceeded from the same source with the decretals, and were equally authentic. Be that as it may, the decrees of this pretended council contributed much to enrich and aggrandise the Roman pontiffs, and exalt them above all human authority and jurisdiction.\*

IX. There were, however, among the Latin bishops, some men of prudence and sagacity, who saw through these impious frauds, and perceived the chains that were forging both for them and for the church. The French bishops distinguished themselves, in a particular and glorious manner, by the zeal and vehemence with which they opposed the spurious decretals, and other fictitious monuments and records, and protested against their being received among the laws of the church. But the obstinacy of the pontiffs, and particularly of Nicolas I., conquered this opposition, and reduced it to silence. And as the empire, in the periods that succeeded this contest, fell back into the grossest ignorance and darkness, there scarcely remained any who were capable of detecting these odious impositions, or disposed to support the expiring liberty of the church. The history of the following ages shows, in a multitude of deplorable examples, the disorders and calamities that sprang from the ambition of the aspiring pontiffs; it represents these despotic lords of the church, labouring, by the aid of their impious frauds, to overturn its ancient government, to undermine the authority of its bishops, to engross its riches and revenues into their own hands; and, what is still more horrible, it represents them aiming perfidious blows at the thrones of princes, and endeavouring to lessen their power, and to set bounds to their dominion. All this is unanimously acknowledged by such as have looked, with attention and impartiality, into the history of the times of which we now write, and is ingenuously confessed by men of learning and probity, who are well affected to the Romish church and its sovereign pontiff.†

X. The monastic life was now universally in the highest esteem; and nothing could equal the veneration that was paid to such as devoted themselves to the sacred gloom and indolence of a convent. The Greeks and Orientals had been long accustomed to regard the monkish orders and discipline with the greatest admiration; but it was only from the beginning of the eighth century, that this holy passion was indulged among the Latins to such an extravagant length. In the present age it went beyond all bounds: kings, dukes, and counts, forgot their true dignity, even the zealous discharge

Buddens' Isagoge in Theologiam, tom. ii. p. 726; as also Petr. Constantius' Prolegom. ad Epistolas Pontificum, tom. i. p. 30; and a dissertation of Fleury, prefixed to the sixteenth volume of his Ecclesiastical History.

\* See J. Launoy, de cura Ecclesie erga pauperes et miseros, cap. i. Observat. i. p. 576. tom. ii. part. ii. op.

† See the above-mentioned author's treatise entitled, *Regia Potestas in Causis Matrimonial.* tom. i. part. ii. op. p. 764; as also Petr. Constantius, Præf. ad Epist. Romanor. Pontif. tom. i. p. 127.

of the duties of their high stations, and affected that contempt of the world and its grandeur, which they took for magnanimity, though it was really the result of a narrow and superstitious spirit. They abandoned their thrones, their honours, and their treasures, and shut themselves up in monasteries with a view of devoting themselves entirely to God. Several examples of this fanatical extravagance were exhibited in Italy, France, Germany, and Spain, both in this and in the preceding century; and if the allurements of worldly pleasures and honours had too much power over the minds of many, to permit their separating themselves from human society during their lives, such endeavoured to make amends for this in their last hours; for, when they perceived death approaching, they demanded the monastic habit, and actually put it on before their departure, that they might be regarded as of the fraternity, and be in consequence entitled to the fervent prayers and other spiritual succours of their ghostly brethren.

But nothing affords such a striking and remarkable proof of the excessive and fanatical veneration that was paid to the monastic order, as the conduct of several kings and emperors, who drew numbers of monks and abbots from their cloisters, and placed them in stations entirely foreign to their vows and their character, even amidst the splendour of a court, and at the head of affairs. The transition, indeed, was violent, from the obscurity of a convent, and the study of a liturgy, to sit at the helm of an empire, and manage the political interests of nations. But such was the case; and pious princes alleged, as a reason for this singular choice, that the government of a state could never be better placed than in the hands of such holy men, who had subdued all irregular appetites and passions, and were so divested of the lusts of pleasure and ambition, as to be incapable of any unworthy designs, or any low, sordid, or selfish views. Hence we find, in the history of these times, frequent examples of monks and abbots performing the functions of ambassadors, envoys, and ministers of state, and displaying their talents with various success in these high and eminent stations.

XI. The morals, however, of the monks, were far from being so pure as to justify the reason alleged for their promotion. Their patrons and protectors, who loaded them with honours and preferment, were sensible of the irregular and licentious lives that many of them led, and used their utmost efforts to correct their vices, and to reform their manners. Louis the Debonnaire distinguished his zeal in the execution of this virtuous and noble design; and, to render it more effectual, he employed the pious labours of Benedict, abbot of Aniane, in reforming the monasteries, first in Aquitaine, and afterwards throughout the whole kingdom of France, and in restoring, by new and salutary laws, the monastic discipline, which had been so neglected as to fall into decay. This worthy ecclesiastic presided, in 817, in the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, where several wise measures were taken for removing the disorders that reigned in the cloisters; and, in consequence of the unlimited authority he had

received from the emperor, he subjected all the monks, without exception, to the rule of the famous Benedict abbot of Mont-Cassin, annulled the variety of rites and customs that had prevailed in the different monasteries, prescribed to them all one uniform method of living, and thus united, as it were, into one general body or society, the various orders which had hitherto been connected by no common bond.\* This admirable discipline, which acquired to Benedict of Aniane the highest reputation, and occasioned him to be revered as the second father of the western monks, flourished during a certain time, but afterwards declined through various causes, until the conclusion of this century, when, under the calamities that oppressed both the church and the empire, it almost entirely disappeared.

XII. The same emperor, who had appeared with such zeal, both in protecting and reforming the monks, gave also distinguished marks of his favour to the order of canons, which Chrodegangus had introduced in several places during the last century. He distributed them through all the provinces of the empire, and instituted also an order of canonesses, the first female convent known in the Christian world.† For each of these orders the zealous emperor had a rule drawn up, in 817, in the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, substituting it for that which had been appointed by Chrodegangus; and this new rule was observed in most of the monasteries and convents of the canons and canonesses in the west until the twelfth century, although it was disapproved by the court of Rome.‡ The author of the rule, framed for the canons, was undoubtedly Amalarius, a presbyter of Metz; but it is not so certain whether that which was drawn up for the canonesses, was composed by the same hand.§ Be that as it may, the canonical order grew into high repute; and from this time a great number of convents were erected for its members in all the western provinces, and were

\* Jo. Mabillon, Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict. Sæc. iv. par. i. Pref. p. xxvii. and Pref. ad. Sæc. v. p. xxv. et ejusdem Annales Ordin. S. Benedicti. tom. ii. p. 430.—Calmet, Hist. de Lorraine, tom. i. p. 596. For a particular account of Benedict of Aniane, and his illustrious virtues, see the Acta Sanctor. tom. ii. Febr. 606; and the Histoire Lit. de la France, tom. iv. p. 417.

† See Mabillon, Annal. Ordin. S. Benedicti, tom. ii. p. 428.

‡ This rule was condemned in a council held at Rome, A. D. 1059, under the pontiff Nicolas II. The pretexs used by the pontiff and the assembled prelates, to justify their disapprobation of this rule, were, that it permitted the canons to enjoy the possessions they had before their vows, and allowed to each of them too large a portion of bread and wine; but the true reason was, that this order had been instituted by an emperor without either the consent or knowledge of the Roman pontiff. For an account of the rule and discipline of these canons, see Fleury's Hist. Eccles. tom. x. p. 163, 164, &c. Brussels edition in 12mo.

§ Lud. Thomassin, Discipulin. Eccles. Vet. et Novæ, part. i. lib. iii. cap. xlii, xliii.—Muratori, Antiq. Ital. medii ævi, tom. v. p. 186, 540. No accounts of the Canons are less worthy of credit, than those which are given by writers, who have been themselves members of that order, such as Raymond Chappone's Histoire des Chanoines, published at Paris in 1699; for these writers, from fond prejudices in favour of their institution, and an ambitious desire of enhancing its merit and rendering it respectable, derive the origin of the canonical order from Christ and his apostles, or trace it up, at least, to the first ages of the Christian church.

richly endowed by the liberality of pious and opulent Christians. But this institution degenerated in a short time, like all others, from its primitive purity, and ceased to answer the laudable intention and design of its worthy founders.\*

XIII. Of the theological writers who flourished among the Greeks, the following are the most remarkable:

Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, a man of most profound and universal erudition, whose *Bibliotheca*,† Epistles, and other writings, are yet valuable on many accounts.

Nicephorus, also a patriarch of the above-mentioned city, who, among other productions, published a warm defence of the worship of images against the enemies of that idolatrous service.‡

Theodorus Studites, who acquired a name chiefly by his warm opposition to the Iconoclasts, and by the zeal with which he wrote in favour of image worship.§

The same cause has principally contributed to transmit to after-ages the names of Theodorus Graptus, Methodius, who obtained the title of Confessor for his adherence to image-worship in the very face of persecution, Theodorus Abucara,|| Petrus Siculus, Nicetas David, and others, who would probably have been long since buried in oblivion, had not the various contests between the Greek and Latin churches, and the divisions of the former among themselves upon the question concerning images, excited the vehemence of these inconsiderable writers, and furnished them with an occasion of making some noise in the world.

Moses Barcephala, a Syrian bishop, far surpassed all whom we have now been mentioning, and deserved the shining reputation which he has obtained in the republic of letters, as what we have yet extant of his works discover marks of true genius, and an uncommon acquaintance with the art of writing.¶

XIV. Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mentz, is deservedly placed at the head of the Latin writers of this age; the force of his genius, the extent of his knowledge, and the multitude of productions that flowed from his pen, entitle him to this distinguished rank, and render improper all comparison between him and his contemporaries. He may be called the great light of Germany and France, since it was from the prodigious fund of knowledge he possessed, that those nations derived principally their religious instruction. His writings were every where in the hands of the learned,\*\* and were

held in such veneration, that, during four centuries, the most eminent of the Latin divines appealed to them as authority in religious matters, and adopted almost universally the sentiments they contained. After this illustrious prelate, the writers who are most worthy of mention are,

Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, a man of wisdom and prudence, and far from being destitute of literary merit; but whose reputation has deservedly suffered by his vindicating, and even fomenting the rebellion of Lothaire and Pepin against Louis the Debonnaire, their father and their sovereign.\*

Hilduin, abbot of St. Denis, who acquired no small reputation by a work entitled *Areopagitica*.†

Eginhard, abbot of Selingstadt, the celebrated author of the *Life of Charlemagne*, remarkable for the beauty of his diction, the perspicuity and elegance of his style, and a variety of other literary accomplishments.‡

Claudius, bishop of Turin, whose exposition of several books of Scripture,§ as also his *Chronology*, gained him an eminent and lasting reputation.||

Freculph, bishop of Lisieux, whose *Chronicle*, which is no more than a heavy compilation, is yet extant.

Servatus Lupus, of whose composition we have several epistles and treatises: and who, though a copious and subtle writer, is yet defective in point of elegance and erudition.¶

Drepanius Florus, who left behind him several poems, an exposition of certain books of Scripture, and other performances less worthy of attention.\*\*

Christian Druthmar, the author of a *Commentary upon St. Matthew's Gospel*.††

Godeschale, a monk of Orbais, who rendered his name immortal by the controversy which he commenced concerning predestination and free grace.

Paschasius Radbert,‡‡ a name famous in the contests concerning the real presence of Christ's body in the eucharist; and who, to pass in silence his other writings, composed a book upon

tom. v. p. 151; as also the *Acta Sauctor.* tom. i. Febr. p. 500.

\* See Colonia, *Hist. Liter. de la ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 93.—*General Dictionary*, at the article Agobard.—*Hist. Lit. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 567. [Agobard opposed with great zeal both the worship and the use of images, in his famous book, de *Picturis et Imaginibus*, a work which has greatly embarrassed the doctors of the Romish church.]

† *Hist. Lit. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 607.

‡ *Hist. Lit. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 550. [This is the *Life of Charlemagne*, the best edition of which is that published by Schminckius, at Utrecht, in 1711.]

§ This prelate, who was famous for his knowledge of the holy Scriptures, composed 111 books of commentaries upon *Genesis*, 4 upon *Exodus*, and several upon *Leviticus*. He wrote also a commentary upon the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, in which there are many excellent things, and an exposition of all the *Epistles of St. Paul*. His commentary on the *Epistle to the Galatians* is printed, but all the rest are in manuscript.

¶ See *Simon, Critique de la Biblioth. Eccles. de M. Dupin*, tom. i. p. 284.

¶ *Histoire Lit. de la France*, tom. v. p. 255.

\*\* Colonia, *Histoire Liter. de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 135.—*Hist. Lit. de la France*, tom. v. p. 213.

†† *Hist. Lit. de la France*, tom. v. p. 84.

‡‡ For an account of Radbert, see the work last quoted, tom. v. p. 267.

\* Calmet, *Hist. de Lorraine*, tom. i. p. 591.—*Hist. Lit. de la France*, tom. iv. p. 536.

† See Camusat, *Histoire des Journaux*, tom. i. p. 87.

‡ *Acta Sauctor.* tom. ii. Martii ad d. xiii. p. 293.—Oudin, *Scriptor. Eccles.* tom. ii. p. 2.

§ Theodore Studites was one of the most voluminous writers of this century, and would certainly have been known as a man of genius and learning in after-ages, even if the controversy concerning images had never existed. There are of his writings, yet extant, 265 letters, several treatises against the Iconoclasts, 124 epigrams in iambics, and a large manuscript, which contains a course of catechetical instruction concerning the duties of the monastic life.

¶ See Bayle's *Dictionary*, vol. i.

¶ *Assenani Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. ii. p. 127.

\*\* See, for a particular account of the life and writings of Rabanus Maurus, the *Histoire Literaire de la France*,



this very subject, which furnished abundant matter of dispute throughout this century.

Bertram, or Rratram, a monk of Corby, who deserves the first rank among the writers that refuted the doctrine of Radbert; and whose book concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper, composed by the order of Charles the Bald, gave occasion to many contests among learned divines.\*

Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt, the laborious author of several treatises upon various subjects, and who is more to be esteemed for his industry and diligence, than for his genius and learning.†

Walafridus Strabo, who acquired no mean reputation by his Poems, his Lives of the Saints, and his explications of many of the more difficult passages of Scripture.‡

Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, a man of an imperious and turbulent spirit, but who deserves a distinguished place among the Latin writers of this century, since his works discover an aspiring genius, and an ardent zeal in the pursuit of truth, and tend, in a singular manner, to throw light, both upon the civil and ecclesiastical history of the age in which he lived.§

Johannes Scotus Erigena, the friend and companion of Charles the Bald, an eminent philosopher, and a learned divine, whose erudition was accompanied with uncommon marks of sagacity and genius, and whose various performances, as well as his translations from the Greek, gained him a shining and lasting reputation.||

It is sufficient barely to name Remigius Bertharius, Ado, Aimoin, Heric, Regino, abbot of Prun, and others, of whom the most common writers of ecclesiastical history give ample accounts.

### CHAPTER III.

*Concerning the doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.*

I. THE zeal of Charlemagne for the interests of Christianity, and his liberality to the learned, encouraged many to apply themselves diligently to the study of the Scriptures, and to the pursuit of religious truth: and, as long as this eminent set of divines remained, the western provinces were happily preserved from many errors, and from a variety of superstitious practices. Thus we find among the writers of this age several men of eminent talents, whose productions show that the lustre of true erudition and theology was not yet totally eclipsed. But these illustrious luminaries of the church disappeared one after another; and barbarism and ignorance, encouraged by their departure, re-

sumed their ancient seats, and brought, in their train, a prodigious multitude of devout follies, odious superstitions, and abominable errors. Nor did any encourage and propagate with more zeal and ardour these superstitious innovations, than the sacerdotal orders, the spiritual guides of a deluded people; and if we inquire how it came to pass, that the clergy were so zealous in such an inglorious cause, we shall find that this zeal was, in some, the effect of ignorance, and, in others, the fruit of avarice and ambition, since much was to be gained, both in point of authority and opulence, from the progress of superstition. Among the Greeks and Orientals, Christianity was almost in the same declining and deplorable state, though there arose, from time to time, in the eastern provinces, men of superior abilities, who endeavoured to support the cause of true religion, and to raise it from the pressures under which it laboured.

II. The causes of this unhappy revolution, that covered the Christian church with superstition and darkness, will appear evident to such as are at all acquainted with the history of these times. The Oriental doctors, miserably divided among themselves, and involved in the bitterest contentions and quarrels with the western churches, lost all notion of the true spirit and genius of Christianity, and, corrupted and biased by the prejudices and passions that are generally excited and nourished by ill-managed controversy, became incapable of promoting the true and essential interests of religion. Intent also upon defending the excellence and divine authority of their doctrine, and discipline against the Latin doctors, and in maintaining among themselves the worship of images, which began to be warmly opposed, they advanced, in the course of these disputes, many things that were highly erroneous; and, as one error follows another, their number increased from day to day. The savage and unnatural lives of the monks and hermits, whose number was prodigious, and whose authority was considerable,—who haunted the woods and deserts, the gloomy scenes of their extravagant devotion,—contributed much, among other causes, to the decay of solid and rational piety. Add, to all this, the irruptions of the barbarous nations into the west, the atrocious exploits of usurping princes, the drooping and neglected condition of the various branches of learning, the ambitious phrensy of the Roman pontiffs, (who were incessantly gaping after new accessions of authority and dominion,) the frauds and tricks of the monastic orders carried on under the specious mask of religion; and then we shall see the true causes that founded the empire of superstition and error, upon the ruin of virtue, piety, and reason.

III. The ignorance and corruption that dishonoured the Christian church, in this century, were great beyond measure; and if there were no other examples of their enormity upon record, than the single instance of the stupid veneration that was paid to the bones and carcases of departed saints, this would be sufficient to convince us of the deplorable progress of superstition. This idolatrous devotion was now considered as the most sacred and momentous

\* We shall have occasion to speak more particularly of Bertram, and his book, in the following chapter.

† It is proper to observe, that a great part of the writings that are attributed to Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt, were composed by Remi, or Remigius, of Auxerre. See Casimir Oudinus, *Comment. de Scriptor. Eccles. tom. ii. p. 330.*—*Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. v. p. 111, tom. vi. p. 106.*—*Le Bœuf, Recueil de Diss. sur l'Histoire de la France, tom. i. p. 278.*

‡ See the *Histoire de la France, tom. v. p. 544.*

§ The same work, *tom. v. p. 416.*

|| See *Herm. Conringius, Antiq. Academicæ, p. 309,* and the *Hist. Lit. de la France, tom. v. p. 416.*

branch of religion; nor did any dare to entertain the smallest hopes of finding the Deity propitious, before they had assured themselves of the protection and intercession of some one or other of the saintly order. Hence it was that every church, and indeed every private Christian, had their particular patron among the saints, from an apprehension that their spiritual interests would be but indifferently managed by those, who were already employed about the souls of others; for they judged, in this respect, of the saints as they did of mortals, whose capacity is too limited to comprehend a vast variety of objects. This notion rendered it necessary to multiply prodigiously the number of the saints, and to create daily new patrons for the deluded people; and this was done with the utmost zeal. The priests and monks set their invention at work, and peopled, at discretion, the invisible world with imaginary protectors. They dispelled the thick darkness which covered the pretended spiritual exploits of many holy men; and invented both names and histories of saints\* that never existed, that they might not be at a loss to furnish the credulous and wretched multitude with objects proper to perpetuate their superstition, and to nourish their confidence. Many chose their own guides, and committed their spiritual interests either to phantoms of their own creation, or to distracted fanatics, whom they esteemed as saints, for no other reason than their having lived like madmen.

IV. The ecclesiastical councils found it necessary, at length, to set limits to the licentious superstition of those ignorant wretches, who, with a view to have still more friends at court, (for such were their gross notions of things,) were daily adding new saints to the list of their celestial mediators. They, accordingly, declared by a solemn decree, that no departed Christian should be considered as a member of the saintly order before the bishop, in a provincial council, and in the presence of the people, had pronounced him worthy of that distinguished honour.† This remedy, feeble and illusory as it was, contributed, in some measure, to restrain the fanatical temerity of the saint-makers: but, in its consequences, it was the occasion of a new accession of power to the Roman pontiff. Even so early as this century, many were of opinion, that it was proper and expedient, though not absolutely necessary, that the decisions of bishops and councils should be confirmed by the consent and authority of the pope, whom they considered as the supreme and universal bishop; and this will not appear surprising to any who reflect upon the enormous strides which the bishops of Rome made toward unbounded dominion in this barbarous and superstitious age, whose corruption and darkness were peculiarly favourable to their ambitious pretensions. It is true, we have no example of any person solemnly sainted by the bishop of Rome alone, before the tenth century,‡ when

Udalric, bishop of Augsburg, received this dignity in a formal manner from John XV. It is, however, certain, that before that time the pontiffs were consulted in matters of that nature, and their judgment respected in the choice of those who were to be honoured with saintship;\* and it was by such steps as these, that the church of Rome engrossed to itself the creation of these tutelary divinities, which at length was distinguished by the title of *canonization*.

V. This preposterous multiplication of saints was a new source of abuses and frauds. It was thought necessary to write the lives of these celestial patrons, in order to procure for them the veneration and confidence of a deluded multitude; and here lying wonders were invented, and all the resources of forgery and fable exhausted, to celebrate exploits which had never been performed, and to perpetuate the memory of holy persons who had never existed. We have yet extant a prodigious quantity of these trifling legends, the greatest part of which were, undoubtedly, forged after the time of Charlemagne, by the monastic writers, who had both the inclination and leisure to edify the church by these *pious* frauds. The same impostors, who peopled the celestial regions with fictitious saints, employed also their fruitful inventions in embellishing, with false miracles and various other impertinent forgeries, the histories of those who had been really martyrs or confessors in the cause of Christ; these fictions, however, did not pass without animadversion, but were severely censured by some of the most eminent writers of the times.‡ Various were the motives that engaged different persons to propagate these impositions, and countenance their authors. Some were incited to this by the seductions of a false devotion, which reigned in this perverse and ignorant age, and made them imagine, that departed saints were highly delighted with the applause and veneration of mortals, and never failed to crown, with peculiar marks of their favour and protection, such as were zealous in honouring their memories, and in celebrating their exploits. The prospect of gain, and the ambitious desire of being revered by the multitude, engaged others to multiply the number, and to maintain the credit of the legends, or saintly registers. The churches, that were dedicated to the saints, were perpetually crowded

Initiis et Progress. in Propylæo Actor. SS. mens. Maii, p. 171; and the other authors who have written upon this subject, of which there is an ample list in the Bibliographia Antiquar. of Fabricius, cap. vii. sect. 25.

\* See the candid and impartial account that is given of this matter by the late pope Benedict XIV. in his laborious work, de Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Beatorum Canonizatione, lib. i. cap. 7. p. 50, tom. i. op. It is to be wished, that historians of the church of Rome would learn to imitate the prudence, moderation, and equity of that illustrious pontiff.

† See Serratus Lupus' Vita Maximini, p. 275, and the candid and learned observations upon this subject that are to be found in various places of the works of the celebrated Launoy: e. g. in his Disputatio Epistolæ Petri de Marca, de Tempore quo in Gallia Christi Fides recepta, cap. xiv. p. 110, in his Dissertationes de primis Christianæ Relig. in Gallia Initiis, diss. ii. 142, 144, 145, 147, 168, 169, 181.—De Lazari, Magdal. et Marthæ, in Galliam Appulsu, p. 340.—De duobus Dionysiis, p. 527, 529, 530, tom. ii. part. i. op.—See also Martenne, Thesaurus Anecdotor. tom. i. p. 151.—Histoire Lit. de la France, tom. iv. p. 273.

\* See Dr. Middleton's Letter from Rome, in which we find the names of St. Bacheo, St. Viar. St. Amphibolus, Euodia, &c.]

† Mabillon, Act. Sanctor. Ord. Benedicti, Sæc. v. Præf. p. 44.—Launoy, de Lazari, Magdalena, et Marthæ in Provinciam Appulsu, cap. i. sect. xii.—Frauc. Pagi Brevarium Pontif. Romanor. tom. ii. p. 259, tom. iii. p. 30.

‡ See Dan. Papebrochius, de solemnium Caucouzionum

with supplicants, who flocked to them with rich presents, in order to obtain succour under the afflictions they sufered, or deliverance from the dangers which they had reason to apprehend; and it was regarded also as a very great honour to be the more immediate ministers of these mediators, who, as it is likewise proper to observe, were esteemed and frequented in proportion to their antiquity, and to the number and importance of the pretended miracles that had rendered their lives illustrious. The latter circumstance offered a strong temptation to such as were employed by the various churches in writing the lives of their tutelary saints, to supply by invention the defects of truth, and to embellish their legends with fictitious prodigies; indeed, they were not only tempted to this imposture, but were even obliged to make use of it in order to swell the fame of their respective patrons.\*

VI. But even all this was insufficient to satisfy the demands of superstition, nourished by the stratagems of a corrupt and designing priesthood, and fomented by the zeal of the more ignorant and stupid sons of the church. It was not enough to reverence departed saints, and to confide in their intercession and succours; it was not enough to clothe them with an imaginary power of healing diseases, working miracles, and delvering from all sorts of calamities and dangers; their bones, their clothes, the apparel and furniture they had possessed during their lives, the very ground which they had touched, or in which their putrified carcases were laid, were treated with a stupid veneration, and supposed to retain the power of healing all disorders both of body and mind, and of defending such as possessed them against all the assaults and devices of Satan. The consequence of this absurd notion was, that every one was eager to provide himself with these salutary remedies; for which purpose great numbers undertook fatiguing and perilous voyages, and subjected themselves to all sorts of hardships, while others made use of this delusion to accumulate riches, and to impose upon the miserable multitude by the most impious and shocking inventions. As the demand for relics was prodigious and universal, the clergy employed all their dexterity to satisfy these demands, and were far from being scrupulous in the methods they used for that end. The bodies of the saints were sought by fasting and prayer, instituted by the priest in order to obtain a divine answer and an infallible direction, and this pretended direction never failed to accomplish their desires; the holy body was always found, in consequence, as they impiously gave out, of the suggestion and inspiration of God himself. Each discovery of this kind was attended with excessive demonstrations of joy, and animated the zeal of these devout seekers to enrich the church still more and more with this new kind of treasure. Many travelled with this view into the eastern provinces, and frequented the places which Christ and his disciples had honoured with their presence, that,

\* Of all the lives of the saints written in this century, those which were drawn up by the monks of Great Britain, and of Bretagne in France, seem to be the most liable to suspicion. Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sæc. i. Benedictin.*

with the bones and other secret remains of the first heralds of the Gospel, they might comfort dejected minds, calm trembling consciences, save sinking states, and defend their inhabitants from all sorts of calamities. Nor did these pious pilgrims return home with empty hands; for the craft, dexterity, and knavery of the Greeks found a rich prey in the stupid credulity of the Latin relie-hunters, and made profitable commerce of this new devotion. The latter paid considerable sums for legs and arms, skulls and jaw-bones (several of which were pagan, and some not human,) and other things that were supposed to have belonged to the primitive worthies of the Christian church; and thus the Latin churches came to the possession of those celebrated relics of St. Mark, St. James, St. Bartholomew, Cyprian, Pantaleon, and others, which they show at this day with so much ostentation. But there were many, who, unable to procure for themselves these spiritual treasures by voyages and prayers, had recourse to violence and theft; for all sorts of means, and all sorts of attempts in a cause of this nature, were considered, when successful, as pious and acceptable to the Supreme Being.\*

VII. The study of the Scriptures languished much among the Greeks in this century. Photius, who composed a book of Questions, † relating to various passages of Scripture, an exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul, and other productions of the same nature ‡, was one of the few who employed their talents in the illustration of the sacred writings. He was a man of great sagacity and genius, who preferred the dictates of reason to the decisions of authority; notwithstanding all which, he cannot be recommended as a model to other commentators.—The other Greek writers, who attempted to explain the Scriptures, did little more than compile and accumulate various passages from the commentators of the preceding ages; and this method was the origin of those *Catenæ*, or chains of commentaries, so much in vogue among the Greeks during this century, of which a considerable number have come down to our times, and which consisted entirely in a collection of the explications of Scripture that were scattered up and down in the ancient authors. The greatest part of the theological writers, finding themselves incapable of more arduous undertakings, confined their labours to this compilatory practice, to the great detriment of sacred criticism.

VIII. The Latin commentators were greatly superior in number to those among the Greeks,

\* See Muratori (*Antiq. Ital. tom. v.*) who gives examples of the truth of this assertion.

† This work, which is entitled *Amphilochia*, from its having been addressed to Amphilochius, bishop of Cyzicum, consists of 308 questions, and answers to them; a sixth part of which, at least, are to be found in the Epistles of Photius, published in 1651 by bishop Montagne. The greater part of these questions relate to different texts of the Old and New Testament; but these are interspersed with others of a philosophical and literary kind. This work is still extant in manuscript in the Vatican, Barberinian, and Bavarian libraries.

‡ Such as a *catena* (a chain) of commentaries on the book of Psalms, compiled from the writings of Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, &c., and a commentary upon the Prophets, both of which are yet extant in manuscript, the former in the Bibliotheca Saceriana or Cosimiana, and the latter in the Vatican library.

in consequence of the zeal and munificence of Charlemagne, who, both by his liberality and by his example, had excited and encouraged the doctors of the preceding age to the study of the Scriptures. Of these expositors there are two, at least, who are worthy of esteem,—Christian Druthmar, whose Commentary on St. Matthew has reached our times;\* and the abbot Bertharius, whose Two Books concerning Fundamentals are also said to be yet extant. The rest seem to have been unequal to the important office of sacred critics, and may be divided into two classes, which we have already had occasion to mention in the course of this history; the class of those who merely collected and reduced into a mass the opinions and explications of the ancients, and that of a fantastic set of expositors, who were always hunting after mysteries in the plainest expressions, and labouring to deduce a variety of abstruse and hidden significations from every passage of Scripture, all which they did, for the most part, in a very clumsy and uncouth manner. At the head of the first class was Rabanus Maurus, who acknowledges that he borrowed from the ancient doctors the materials of which he made use in illustrating the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Epistles of St. Paul. To this class also belonged Walaffrid Strabo, who borrowed his explications chiefly from Rabanus; Claudius of Turin, who trod in the footsteps of Augustin and Origen; Hincmar, whose Exposition of the four Books of Kings, compiled from the fathers, we still possess; Remigius of Auxerre, who derived from the same source his illustrations of the Psalms and other books of sacred writ; Sedulius, who explained in the same manner the Epistles of St. Paul; Florus, Haymo bishop of Halberstadt, and others, whom for the sake of brevity, we pass in silence.

IX. Rabanus Maurus, whom we introduced above at the head of the compilers from the fathers, deserves also an eminent place among the allegorical commentators, on account of his diffuse and tedious work, entitled Scripture Allegories. To this class also belong Smaragdus, Haymo, Scotus, Paschasius Radbert, and many others, whom it is not necessary to particularize. The fundamental and general principle, in which all the writers of this class agree, is, that, beside the literal signification of each passage in Scripture, there are hidden and deep senses which escape the vulgar eye; but they are not agreed about the number of these mysterious significations. Some attribute to every phrase three senses, others four, and some five; and the number is carried to seven by Angelone, a monk of Lisioux, an acute, though fantastic writer, who is far from deserving the meanest rank among the expositors of this century.†

\* See R. Simon, *Histoire critique des principaux Commentateurs du Nouv. Testament*, chap. xxv. p. 348; as also his *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclesiastique de M. Du-Pin*, tom. i. p. 293.

† See the preface to his Commentary on the Book of Kings, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima*, tom. xv. p. 308. The commentary of Angelone upon the book of Genesis was published by Bernard Pezirus, in his *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. i. part i.; but, indeed, the loss would not have been great, if it had never seen the light.

X. The teachers of theology were still more contemptible than the commentators; and the Greeks, as well as the Latins, were extremely negligent both in unfolding the nature, and proving the truth of the doctrines of Christianity. Their method of inculcating divine truth was dry and unsatisfactory, and more adapted to fill the memory with sentences, than to enlighten the understanding, or to improve the judgment. The Greeks, for the most part, followed implicitly Damascenus, while the Latins submitted their hoodwinked intellects to the authority of Augustine. Authority became the test of truth, and supplied in arrogance what it wanted in argument. That magisterial decisions were employed in the place of reason, appears manifestly from the *Collectaneum de tribus Questionibus* of Servatus Lupus; and also from a treatise of Remigius, concerning the necessity of holding fast the truths of the Gospel, and of maintaining inviolable the sacred authority of the holy and orthodox fathers.—If any deigned to appeal to the authority of the Scriptures in defence of their systems, they either explained them in an allegorical manner, or understood them in the sense that had been given to them by the decrees of councils, or in the writings of the fathers; from which senses they thought it both unlawful and impious to depart. The Irish doctors alone, and particularly Johannes Scotus, had the courage to spurn the ignominious fetters of authority, and to explain the sublime doctrines of Christianity in a manner conformable to the dictates of reason, and the principles of true philosophy. But this noble attempt drew upon them the malignant fury of a superstitious age, and exposed them to the hatred of the Latin theologians, who would not permit either reason or philosophy to interfere in religious matters.\*

XI. The important science of morals suffered, like all others, in the hands of ignorant and unskilful writers. The labours of some were wholly employed in collecting from the fathers an indigested heap of maxims and sentences concerning religious and moral duties; and such, among others, was the work of Alvarus, intitled *Scintille Patrum*. Others wrote of virtue and vice, in a more systematic manner; such as Halitgarius, Rabanus Maurus, and Jonas, bishop of Orleans; but the representations they gave of one and the other were very different from those which we find in the Gospel. Some deviated into that most absurd and delusive method of instructing the ignorant in the will of God by a fantastic combination of figures and allegories; and several of the Greeks began to turn their studies towards the solution of cases of conscience,† in order to remove the difficulties that arose in scrupulous and timorous minds. We pass in silence the writers of homilies and books of penance, of which a considerable number appeared in this century.

XII. The doctrine of the mystics, whose origin is falsely attributed to Dionysius the Arc-

\* For an account of the persecution and hatred that Johannes Scotus suffered in the cause of reason and liberty, see Du Boulay, *Hist. Academiæ Paris.* tom. i. p. 182; as also Mabilou, *Acta Sanctior. Ord. Bened. sæc. v.* p. 392.

† See Nicophori Chartophylac. *Epistolæ Duæ*, in the *Bibliotheca Magna Patrum*, tom. iii. p. 413.

opagagite, and whose precepts were designed to elevate the soul above all sensible and terrestrial objects, and to unite it to the Deity in an ineffable manner, had been now for a long time in vogue among the Greeks, and more especially among the monastic orders; and to augment the credit of this fanatical sect, and multiply its followers, Michael Syn-celcus and Methodius composed the most pompous and eloquent panegyrics upon the memory of Dionysius, in which his virtues were celebrated with the utmost exaggeration. The Latins were not yet bewitched with the specious appearance, and the illusory charms of the mystic devotion, which was equally adapted to affect persons of a lively fancy and those of a more gloomy turn of mind. They lived in a happy ignorance of this contagious doctrine, when the Grecian emperor Michael Balbus sent to Louis the Debonnaire, in 824, a copy of the pretended works\* of Dionysius the Areopagite, which fatal present immediately kindled the holy flame of mysticism in the western provinces, and filled the Latins with the most enthusiastic admiration of this new religion. The translation of these spurious works into Latin by the express order of the emperor,† who could not be easy while his subjects were deprived of such a valuable treasure, contributed much to the progress of mysticism. By the order of the same emperor, Hilduin, abbot of St. Denys, composed an account of the life, actions, and writings of Dionysius, under the title of *Aereopagitica*, in which work, among other impudent fictions, usual in those times of superstition and imposture, he maintained, in order to exalt the honour of his nation, that Dionysius the Areopagite, and Dionysius the bishop of Paris, were one and the same person.‡ This fable, which was invented with unparalleled assurance, was received with the most perfect and unthinking credulity, and

\* *Usseri Sythogæ Ep. Hibernicæ. p. 51. 55.* The spuriousness of these works is now admitted by the most learned and impartial of the Roman Catholic writers, as they contain accounts of many events that happened several ages after the time of Dionysius, and were not at all mentioned until after the fifth century. See Fleury, *Hist. Eccles. liv. 54. tom. xi. p. 528. edit. Bruxelles.*

† That these books were translated by the order of Louis, appears manifestly from the Epistle to that emperor, which Hilduin prefixed to his *Aereopagitica*, and in which we find the following passage: "de notitia librorum, quos (Dionysius) patri sermone conscripsit, et quibus petentibus illos composuit, lecto nobis per Dei gratiam et Vestram ordinationem, cuius dispensatione interpretatos, sermone nostra eos petentibus reserat, satisfacti." From this passage, it is evident that they are in an error, who affirm that the Latin translation of the works of Dionysius was not executed before the time of Charles the Bald. And they err also, who, with Mabillon, (*Annal. Benedict. tom. ii. lib. xxix. secl. 59. p. 488.*) and the authors of the *Hist. Lit. de la France* (tom. v. p. 425.) inform us, that Michael Balbus sent these works already translated into Latin to the emperor Louis. It is amazing how men of learning could fall into the latter error, after reading the following passage in the Epistle above quoted: "Authenticos namque eosdem (Dionysii) libros Græca lingua conscriptos, cum œconomus ecclesie Constantinopolitane et ceteri missi Michaelis legatione—functi sunt—pro munere magno suscepimus."

‡ *Launoy, Diss. de Discrimine Dionysii Areopag. et Parisiensis, cap. iv. p. 38. tom. ii. p. i. op.*; as also the writings of this great man concerning both those

made such a deep and permanent impression upon the minds of the French, that the repeated demonstrations of its falsehood have not yet been sufficient entirely to ruin its credit. As the first translation of the works of Dionysius that had been executed by order of Louis, was probably in a barbarous and obscure style, a new and more elegant one was given by the famous Johannes Scotus Erigena, at the request of Charles the Bald, the publication of which increased considerably the partisans of the mystic theology among the French, Italians, and Germans. Scotus himself was so enchanted with this new doctrine, that he incorporated it into his philosophical system, and upon all occasions either accommodated his philosophy to it, or explained it according to the principles of his philosophy.

XIII. The defence of Christianity, against the Jews and Pagans, was greatly neglected in this century, in which the intestine disputes and dissensions that divided the church, gave sufficient employment to such as had an inclination to controversy, or a talent of managing it with dexterity and knowledge. Agobard, however, as also Amulo and Rabanus Maurus, chastised the insolence and malignity of the Jews, and exposed their various absurdities and errors, while the emperor Leo, Theodoros Abu-cara, and other writers, whose performances are lost, employed their polemic labors against the progress of the Saracens, and refuted their impious and extravagant system. But it may be observed in general of those who wrote against the Saracens, that they reported many things, both concerning Mohammed and his religion, which were far from being true; and if, as there is too much reason to imagine, they did this designedly, knowing the falsehood, or at least the uncertainty of their allegations against these infidels, we must look upon their writings rather as intended to deter the Christians from apostasy, than to give a rational refutation of the Saracen doctrine.

XIV. The contests of the Christians among themselves were carried on with greater eagerness and animosity than the disputes in which they were engaged with the common enemies of their faith; and these contests were daily productive of new calamities and disorders, which dishonoured their profession, and threw a heavy, though undeserved reproach upon the cause of true religion. After the banishment of Irene, the controversy, concerning Images broke out anew among the Greeks, and was carried on by the contending parties, during the half of this century, with various and uncertain success. The emperor Nicephorus, though he did not abrogate the decrees of the council of Nice, or order the images to be taken out of the churches, deprived the patrons of image-worship of all power to molest or injure their adversaries, and seems upon the whole to have been an enemy to that idolatrous service. But his successor Michael Curropalates, surnamed Rhangebe, acted in a very different manner. Feeble and timorous, and dreading the rage of the priests and monks who maintained the cause of images, he favoured that cause during his short reign, and persecuted its adversaries with the greatest bit-

terness and cruelty. The scene changed again, upon the accession of Leo the Armenian to the empire, who abolished the decrees of the Nicene council relating to the use and worship of images, in a council assembled at Constantinople, in 814;\* without however enacting any penal laws against their idolatrous worshippers. This moderation, far from satisfying the patriarch Nicephorus, and the other partisans of image-worship, only served to encourage their obstinacy, and to increase their insolence; upon which the emperor removed the haughty prelate from his office, and chastised the fury of several of his adherents with a deserved punishment. His successor Michael, surnamed Balbus, or the Stanmerer, was obliged to observe the same conduct, and to depart from the clemency and indulgence which, in the beginning of his reign, he had discovered toward the worshippers of images, whose idolatry, however, he was far from approving. The monks more especially provoked his indignation by their fanatical rage, and forced him to treat them with particular severity. But the zeal of his son and successor Theophilus, in discouraging this new idolatry, was still more vehement; for he opposed the adorers of images with great violence, and went so far as to put to death some of the more obstinate ringleaders of that impetuous faction.

XV. On the death of Theophilus, which happened in 842, the regency was entrusted to the empress Theodora during her son's minority. This superstitious princess, fatigued with the importunate solicitations of the monks, deluded by their forged miracles, and not a little influenced also by their insolent threats, assembled, in the year above-mentioned, a council at Constantinople, in which the decrees of the second Nicene council were reinstated in their lost authority, and the Greeks were indulged in their corrupt propensity to image-worship by a law which encouraged that wretched idolatry;† so that, after a controversy, which had been carried on during the space of a hundred and ten years, the cause of idolatry triumphed over the dictates of reason and Christianity; the whole east, the Armenians excepted, bowed down before the victorious images; nor did any of the succeeding emperors attempt to cure the Greeks of this superstitious phrensy, or restrain them in the performance of this puerile worship. The council that was holden at Constantinople under Photius, in 879, and which is reckoned by the Greeks the eighth general council, gave a farther degree of force and vigor to idolatry, by maintaining the sanctity of images, and approving, confirming, and renewing the Nicene decrees. The superstitious Greeks, who were blind-led by the monks in the most ignominious manner, esteemed this council as a most signal blessing derived to them from the immediate interposition of Heaven, and accordingly instituted, in commemoration there-

of, an anniversary festival, which was called the Feast of Orthodoxy.\*

XVI. The triumph of images, notwithstanding the zealous efforts of the Roman pontiffs in their favour, was obtained with much more difficulty among the Latins, than it had been among the Greeks; for the former yet maintained the inalienable privilege of judging for themselves in religious matters, and were far from being disposed to submit their reason implicitly to the decisions of the pontiff, or to regard any thing as infallible and true, which had authority for its only foundation. The greater part of the European Christians, as we have seen already, steered a middle course between the idolaters and the Iconoclasts, between those who were zealous for the worship of images on the one hand, and those who were averse to all use of them on the other. They were of opinion, that images might be suffered as the means of aiding the memory of the faithful, and of calling to their remembrance the pious exploits and the virtuous actions of the persons they represented; but they detested all thoughts of paying them the least marks of religious homage or adoration. Michael Balbus, when he sent, in 824, a solemn embassy to Louis the Debonnaire, to renew and confirm the treaties of peace and friendship which had been concluded between his predecessors in the empire and Charlemagne, charged his ministers, in a particular manner, to bring over the king of the Franks to the party of the Iconoclasts, that they might gradually suppress, by their united influence, the worship of images, and thus restore concord and tranquillity to the church. Louis, on this occasion, assembled a council at Paris, in 824,‡ in order to examine the proposal of the Grecian emperor; in which it was resolved to adhere to the decrees of the council of Frankfort, which allowed the use of images in the churches, but severely prohibited the treating of them with the smallest marks of religious worship. But in process of time the European Christians departed gradually from the observance of this injunction, and fell imperceptibly into a blind submission to the decisions of the pope, whose influence and authority daily became more formidable; so that, toward the conclusion of

\* See Gretser's *Observat. in Codinum de Officiis Antæ et Eccles. Constantinopolitane*, lib. iii. cap. viii.; as also the *Ceremoniale Byzantinum*, published by Reisk, lib. i. c. xxviii. p. 92.

† † So Michael and his son Theophilus style Louis in their letter to him, refusing him the title of emperor, to which, however, he had an undoubted right in consequence of the treaties which they now desired to renew.

‡ † Fleury, Le Sueur, and other historians, unanimously place this council in 825. It may be proper to observe, that the proceedings of this council evidently show, that the decisions of the Roman pontiff were by no means looked upon at this time either as obligatory or infallible; for, when the letter of pope Adrian, in favour of images, was read in the council, it was almost unanimously rejected, as containing absurd and erroneous opinions. The decrees of the second council of Nice, relating to image-worship, were also censured by the Gallican bishops; and the authority of that council, though received by several popes as an œcumenical one, absolutely rejected; and what is remarkable is, that the pope did not, on this account, declare the Gallican bishops heretics, or exclude them from the communion of the apostolic see. See Fleury, liv. xlvii.

† † \* Fleury and some other writers place the meeting of this council in 815.

† † See Fred. Spanheim, *Historia Imaginum*, sect. viii. p. 845, tom. ii. op.—L'Enfant, *Preservatif contre la Reunion avec le Siege de Rome*, tom. iii. lett. xiv. p. 147; lett. xviii. xix. p. 509.

this century, the Gallican clergy began to pay a certain kind of religious homage to the saintly images, in which their example was followed by the Germans and other nations.\*

XVII. Notwithstanding this apostasy, the Iconoclasts were not destitute of adherents among the Latins. Of these, the most eminent was Claudius, bishop of Turin, by birth a Spaniard, and also a disciple of Felix, bishop of Urgel. This zealous prelate, as soon as he had obtained the episcopal dignity through the favour of Louis the Debonnaire, began to exercise the duties of his function in 823, by ordering all images, and even the cross, to be cast out of the churches, and committed to the flames. The year following he composed a treatise, in which he not only defended these vehement proceedings, and declared against the use, as well as the worship, of images, but also broached several other opinions, that were quite contrary to the notions of the multitude, and to the prejudices of the times. He denied, among other things, in opposition to the Greeks, that the cross was to be honoured with any kind of worship; he treated relics with the utmost contempt, as absolutely destitute of the virtues that were attributed to them, and censured with great freedom and severity those pilgrimages to the holy land, and those journeys to the tombs of the saints, which, in this century, were looked upon as extremely salutary, and particularly meritorious. This noble stand, in the defence of true religion, drew upon Claudius a multitude of adversaries; the sons of superstition rushed upon him from all quarters; Theodemir, Dungalus, Jonas of Orleans, and Walafrid Strabo,† combined to overwhelm him with their voluminous answers. But the learned and venerable prelate maintained his ground,‡ and supported his cause with such dexterity and force, that it remained triumphant, and gained new credit; and hence it happened, that the city of Turin and the adjacent country were, for a long time after the death of Claudius, much less infected with superstition than the other parts of Europe.

XVIII. The controversy that had been carried on in the preceding century concerning the *procession* (if we may be allowed to use that term) of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, and also concerning the words *filio-que*, foisted by the Latins into the creed of Constantinople, broke out now with redoubled vehemence, and from a private dispute became a flaming contest between the Greek and Latin churches. The monks of Jerusalem distinguished themselves in this controversy, and complained particularly of the interpolation of the words *filio-que*, i. e. *and from the*

son, in the above mentioned symbol; nor did they stop here, but despatched to Charlemagne, in 809, a certain ecclesiastic of their order, whose name was John, to obtain satisfaction in this matter.\* The affair was debated in due form, in a council assembled in that year at Aix-la-Chapelle, and also at Rome, in the presence of pope Leo III., to whom the emperor had sent ambassadors for that purpose. Leo adopted the doctrine which represented the Holy Ghost as proceeding from the Father and the Son, but he condemned the addition that had been made to the symbol,† and declared it as his opinion, that *filio-que*, being evidently an interpolation, ought to be omitted in reading the symbol, and at length stricken out of it entirely, not every where at once, but in such a prudent manner as to prevent disturbance. His successors were of the same opinion; the word, however, being once admitted, not only kept its place in opposition to the Roman pontiffs, but was by degrees added to the symbol in all the Latin churches.‡

XIX. To these disputes of ancient origin were added controversies entirely new, and particularly that famous one concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist. It had been hitherto the unanimous opinion of the church that the body and blood of Christ were administered to those who received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that they were consequently present at that holy institution; but the sentiments of Christians concerning the nature and manner of this presence were various and contradictory, nor had any council determined with precision that important point, or prescribed the manner in which this pretended presence was to be understood. Both reason and folly were hitherto left free in this matter; nor had any imperious mode of faith suspended the exercise of the one, or restrained the extravagance of the other. But, in this century, Paschasius Radbert, a monk, and afterwards abbot of Corbey, pretended to explain with precision, and to determine with certainty, the doctrine of the church on this head; for which purpose he composed, in 831, a treatise concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.§ A second edition of this treatise, revised with care, and considerably augmented, was presented in 845 to Charles the Bald; and it principally gave occasion to the warm and important controversy that ensued. The doctrine of Paschasius

\* See Steph. Baluzii Miscellanea, tom. vii. p. 14.

† This addition of *filio-que* to the symbol of Nice and Constantinople, was made in the fifth and sixth centuries by the churches of Spain; and their example was followed by most of the Gallican churches where the symbol was read and sung with this addition.

‡ See Le Coigneux, Annal. Eccles. Francor. tom. iv. ad a. 809.—Longueval, Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. v. p. 151.

§ See Mabillon, Annales Benedict. ii. p. 539. An accurate edition of Radbert's book was published by Martene, in the sixth volume of his Amplius. Collect. veter. Scriptor. p. 378. The life and actions of this wrong-headed divine are treated of at large by Mabillon, in his Acta Sanctorum Ord. Benedict. Sæc. iv. part. II. 126. and by the Jesuits, in the Acta SS. Antwerp. ad. d. xxvi. Aprilis.

\* Mabillon, Annal. Benedictin. tom. ii. p. 488. et Act. Sanctorum Ord. Bened. sæc. iv.—Le Coigneux, Annal. Eccles. Francor. tom. iv. ad Annum 824.

† In order to do justice to the adversaries of Claudius here mentioned, it is necessary to observe, that they only maintained the innocence and usefulness of images, without pretending to represent them as objects of religious worship.

‡ Mabillon, Annal. Benedictin. tom. ii. p. 488.—Præf. ad sæc. iv. Actor. SS. Ord. Benedict. p. 8.—Histoire Liter. de la France, tom. iv. p. 491. and tom. v. p. 27. 64.—Basnage, Histoire des Eglises Reformées, tom. i.

amounted, in general, to the two following propositions: first, that, after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, nothing remained of these symbols but the outward figure, under which the body and blood of Christ were really and locally present; and, secondly, that the body of Christ thus present in the eucharist was the same body that was born of the Virgin, that suffered upon the cross, and was raised from the dead. This new doctrine, and more especially the second proposition now mentioned, excited, as might well be expected, the astonishment of many. Accordingly it was opposed by Rabanus Maurus, Heribald, and others, though they did not all refute it in the same method, or on the same principles. Charles the Bald, on this occasion, ordered the famous Ratram and Johannes Scotus to draw up a clear and rational explication of that important doctrine which Radbert seemed to have so egregiously corrupted.\* These learned divines executed with zeal and diligence the orders of the emperor. The treatise of Scotus perished in the ruins of time; but that of Ratram is still extant,† which furnished ample matter of dispute, both in the last and present century.‡

XX. It is remarkable that in this controversy each of the contending parties were almost as much divided among themselves as they were at variance with their adversaries. Radbert, who began the dispute, contradicts himself in many places, departs from his own principles, and maintains, in one part of his book, conclusions that he had disavowed in another. His principal adversary Bertram, or Ratram, seems in some respects liable to the same charge; he appears to follow in general the doctrine of those, who deny that the body and blood of Christ are really present in the holy sacrament, and to affirm on the contrary that they are only represented by the bread and wine as their signs or symbols. There are, however, several passages in his book which seem inconsistent with this just and rational notion of the eucharist, or at least are susceptible of different interpretations, and have therefore given rise to various disputes. Johannes Scotus, whose philosophical genius rendered him more accurate, and shed through his writings that logical precision so much wanted, and so highly desirable in polemical productions, was the only disputant in this contest who expressed his sentiments with perspicuity, method, and consistency, and declared plainly that the bread and wine were

the signs and symbols of the absent body and blood of Christ. All the other theologians of his time fluctuate and waver in their opinions, express themselves with ambiguity, and embrace and reject the same tenets at different times, as if they had no fixed or permanent principles on this subject. Hence it evidently appears, that there was not yet in the Latin church any fixed or universally received opinion concerning the manner in which the body and blood of Christ are present in the eucharist.

XXI. The disputants in this controversy charged each other reciprocally with the most odious doctrines, which each party drew by way of consequences from the tenets they opposed,—a method of proceeding as unjust, as it is common in all kinds of debate. Hence arose the imaginary heresy, that, on the triumphant progress of the doctrine of transubstantiation in the eleventh century, was branded with the title of *Stercoranism*, and of which the true origin was as follows: They who, embracing the opinion of Paschasius Radbert, believed that the bread and wine in the sacrament were substantially changed after the consecration, and preserved only their external figure, drew a most unjust conclusion from the opinion of their adversaries, who maintained on the contrary, that the bread and wine preserved their substance, and that Christ's body and blood were only figuratively, and not really, present in the eucharist. They alleged that the doctrine of the latter implied, that the body of Christ was digested in the stomach, and was thrown out with the other excrements. But this consequence was quickly retorted upon those that imagined it; for they who denied the conversion of the bread and wine into the real body and blood of Christ, charged the same enormous consequence upon their antagonists who believed this transmutation; and the charge certainly was much more applicable to the latter than to the former. The truth is, that it was neither truly applicable to one nor to the other; and their mutual reproaches, most wretchedly founded, show rather a spirit of invective, than a zeal for the truth. The charge of *Stercoranism* is but a malignant invention; it can never, without the most absurd impudence, be brought against those who deny the transmutation of the bread into the body of Christ; it may indeed be charged upon such as allow this transmutation, though it be a consequence that none of them, except those whose intellects were unsound, perhaps ever avowed.\*

XXII. While this controversy was at its greatest height, another of a quite different kind, and of much greater importance, arose, whose unhappy consequences are yet felt in the reformed churches. The subject of this new contest was the doctrine of predestination and divine grace, and its rise is universally attributed to Godeschalcus, an illustrious Saxon, who had entered involuntarily into the mo-

\* For an account of Ratram, or Bertram, and his famous book which made so much noise in the world, see the Biblioth. Lat. of Fabricius, tom. i. p. 1061.

† A new English translation of the book of Bertram, (who was a priest and monk of Corbey) concerning the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, was published at Dublin in 1752: to which is prefixed a very learned and judicious historical dissertation respecting this famous author and his works, in which both are ably defended against the calumnies and fictions of the Roman Catholic writers.

‡ There is an account, but a partial one, of this controversy in Mabillon's *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. part. ii. Benedict.* p. viii. which the curious reader will therefore do well to compare with Basnage's *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. 909.

\* For an account of the *Stercoranists*, see Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Benedict. part. ii. p. 21.*—J. Basnage, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 926, and a Treatise of the learned Dr. Pfaff, published at Tubingen in 1750.



nastic order in the convent of Fulda, whence he removed to the monastery of Orbais, in the diocese of Soissons, where he prosecuted his theological studies, not only with great assiduity, but also with an insatiable desire of sounding the deepest mysteries, and of being "wise above what is written." This eminent ecclesiastic, upon his return from Rome in 847, took up his lodging for some time with count Eberald, one of the principal noblemen at the court of the emperor Lothaire, where he discoursed largely of the intricate doctrine of predestination in the presence of Nothings, bishop of Verona, and maintained that God, from all eternity, had pre-ordained some to everlasting life, and others to everlasting punishment and misery. Rabanus Maurus, who was by no means his friend, being informed of the propagation of this doctrine, opposed him with great vigor. To render his opposition more successful, he began by representing Godeschalus as a corrupter of the true religion, and a forger of monstrous heresies, in some letters addressed to count Eberald and to the bishop of Verona; and when the accused monk came from Italy into Germany to justify himself against these clamours, and for that purpose appeared at Mentz, of which Rabanus his accuser was archbishop, he was condemned in a council assembled by the latter in that city, in 848, and sent thence to Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, in whose diocese he had received the order of priesthood. Hincmar, who was devoted to the interests of Rabanus, assembled a council at Quiercy in 849, in which Godeschalus was condemned a second time, and was also treated in a manner equally repugnant to the principles of religion and the dictates of humanity. Because he was firm in maintaining his doctrine, which he affirmed, and indeed with truth, to be the doctrine of St. Augustine, the imperious Hincmar degraded him from the priesthood, and was so barbarous as to order him to be scourged with the utmost severity, until the force of his pain overpowering his constancy obliged him, according to the commands of his reverend executors, to burn with his own hands that justification of his opinions which he had presented to the council of Mentz. After these barbarous proceedings, the unfortunate monk was cast into prison in the monastery of Hautvilliers, where he ended his misery and his days in 868, or the following year, maintaining with his last breath the doctrine for which he had suffered.

XXIII. While Godeschalus lay in prison, his doctrine gained him followers; his sufferings excited compassion; and both together produced a considerable schism in the Latin church. Ratram, monk of Corbey, Prudentius, bishop of Troyes, Loup, or Lupus, abbot of Ferrieres, Florus, deacon of Lyons, Remi, archbishop of the same city, with his whole church, and many other ecclesiastics, whom it would be tedious to mention, pleaded with the utmost zeal and vehemence, both in their writings and in their discourse, the cause of this unhappy monk, and of his condemned opinions. Some, indeed, confined themselves principally to the defence of his person and con-

duct, while others went farther, and employed all their zeal, and all their labour, in the vindication of his doctrine. On the opposite side of the question were Hincmar, his unrighteous judge, Ansalarius, the celebrated Johannes Scotus, and others, who all maintained, that Godeschalus and his opinions had received the treatment they deserved. As the spirit of controversy ran high between these contending parties, and grew more vehement from day to day, Charles the Bald summoned a new council, or synod, which met at Quiercy in 853, in which, by the credit and influence of Hincmar, the decrees of the former council were confirmed, and in consequence Godeschalus was again condemned. But the decrees of this council were declared null; and decisions of a different kind, by which he and his doctrine were vindicated and defended, were enacted in a council assembled at Valence in Dauphine, in 855. This council was composed of the clergy of Lyons, Vienne, and Arles, with Remi, archbishop of Lyons at their head; and its decrees were confirmed, in 859, by the council of Langres, in which the same clergy were assembled, and in 860, by the council of Toul, in which the bishops of fourteen provinces supported the cause of the persecuted monk, whose death allayed the heat of this intricate controversy.\*

XXIV. If we attend to the merits of this cause, we shall find that the debate still subsists in all its force, and that the doctrine of Godeschalus has in our days both able defenders and powerful adversaries. He undoubtedly maintained a two-fold predestination, one to everlasting life, and the other to eternal death. He held also, "that God did not desire or will the salvation of all mankind, but that of the elect only; and that Christ did not suffer death for the whole human race, but for those persons only whom God has predestinated to eternal salvation." These decisions, which carry a severe and rigorous aspect, are softly and favourably interpreted by the followers of Godeschalus. They deny, for example, that their leader represents God as predestinating, to a necessary course of iniquity, those whom he has previously predestinated to eternal misery; and, according to them, the doctrine of Godeschalus amounts to no more than this: "That God has, from all eternity, doomed to everlasting misery such as he foresaw would go on unrepentent in a sinful course, and has decreed their ruin in consequence of their sins freely committed and eternally foreseen: that the salutary effects of the mercy of God, and the sufferings of Christ, extend indeed only to the elect, and are made good to them alone; though this mercy and these sufferings, considered in themselves, belong equally to all mankind." But this contradictory jargon

\* Beside the common writers, who speak of this controversy, the curious reader will do well to consult the more learned and impartial accounts he will find of it in Boulay's *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 178.—Mabillon's *Præf. ad Sæc. iv. Benedict.* part. ii. p. xlvii.—*Hist. Littéraire de la France,* tom. v. p. 352.—*Usserii Historia Godeschalci—Gerard, Joh. Vossii Historia Pelagiana,* lib. vii. cap. iv.—*Fabricii Biblioth. Latin. mediæ Ævi.* tom. iii. p. 210.

did not satisfy the adversaries of the predestinarian monk; they maintained, on the contrary, that, under ambiguous terms and perplexed sentences, Godeschalvus had concealed the most enormous errors, propagating it assiduously as an article of faith, "That God had not only by an original decree predestinated one part of mankind to eternal damnation, but had also pushed them on by an irresistible necessity, by a propellent force, to those crimes and transgressions which were proper to render that damnation just.\*" Without determining any thing upon such an intricate and incomprehensible subject, with respect to which silence is the truest wisdom, we shall only observe, that the private quarrels, and mutual hatred, that prevailed between Rabanus Maurus and Godeschalvus, were the real source of the predestinarian controversy, and of all the calamities in which it involved the unfortunate monk.†

XXV. Another, though less important, controversy arose about this time, concerning the concluding words of a very ancient hymn, which runs thus: *te, trina Deitas unaque, poscimus*, which may be thus translated, "O God, who art three, and at the same time but one, we beseech thee," &c. Hincmar wisely prohibited the singing of these words in the churches that were under his jurisdiction, from a persuasion that they tended to introduce into the minds of the multitude notions inconsistent with the unity and simplicity of the Supreme Being, and might lead them to imagine that there were three Gods. But the Benedictine monks refused to obey this mandate, and Bertram, who was one of the most eminent of that order, wrote a copious work to prove the expression *trina Deitas*, or threefold Deity, ortho-

dox, from the authority of fathers, esteemed the only criterion of truth in those miserable times. Godeschalvus, who now lay in prison, heard of this dispute, entered warmly into it, and in a laboured dissertation supported the cause of his Benedictine brethren; on which account Hincmar accused him of tritheism, and drew up a treatise to prove the charge, and to refute that impious and enormous heresy. This controversy, however, was but of a short duration; and the exceptionable passage of the hymn in question maintained its credit, notwithstanding all the efforts of Hincmar, and continued, as before, to be sung in the churches.\*

XXVI. A vain curiosity, and not any design of promoting useful knowledge and true piety, was the main source of the greatest part of the controversies that were carried on in this century; and it was more especially this idle curiosity, carried to an indecent and most extravagant length, that gave rise to the controversy concerning the manner in which Christ was born of the Virgin, which began in Germany, and made its way from that country into France. Certain Germans maintained, that Jesus proceeded from his mother's womb in a manner quite different from those general and uniform laws of nature that regulate the birth of the human species; which opinion was no sooner known in France, than it was warmly opposed by the famous Ratram, who wrote a book expressly to prove that Christ entered into the world in the very same way with other mortals, that his Virgin mother bore him, as other women bring forth their offspring. Paschasius Radbert, who was constantly employed, either in inventing or patronising the most extravagant fancies adopted the opinion of the German doctors, and composed an elaborate treatise to prove that Christ was born, without his mother's womb being opened, in the same manner as he came into the chamber where his disciples were assembled after his resurrection, though the door was shut. He also charged those who held the opinion of Ratram with denying the virginity of Mary. This fruitless dispute was soon hushed and gave place to controversies of superior moment.†

XXVII. Of all the controversies that divided Christians in this century, the most interesting, though at the same time the most lamentable, was that which occasioned the fatal schism between the Greek and Latin churches. A vindictive and jealous spirit of animosity and contention had long prevailed between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, and had sometimes broken out into acts of violence and rage. The ambition and fury of these contending prelates became still more keen and vehement about the time of Leo the Isaurian, when the bishops of Constantinople, seconded by the power and authority of the emperors, withdrew from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiffs many provinces, over which they had

\* The cause of Godeschalvus has been very learnedly defended by the celebrated Maguin, who published also a valuable edition of all the treatises that were composed on both sides of this intricate controversy. This interesting collection, which was printed at Paris in 1650, bears the following title: 'veterum Auctorum qui Nono Sæculo de Prædestinatione et Gratia scripserunt, Opera et Fragmenta, cum Historia et gemina Præfatione.' Cardinal Norris maintained also the cause of the predestinarian monk with more brevity, but less moderation than Maguin. This brief vindication may be seen in the Synopsis Historiæ Godeschalvanæ, which is inserted in the 4th volume of the works of that cardinal, p. 677. All the Benedictines, Jansenists, and Augustin monks maintain, almost without exception, that Godeschalvus was most unjustly persecuted and oppressed by Rabanus Maurus. The Jesuits are of a different opinion; they assert in general, and Louis Cellot, one of their order, has in a more particular manner laboured to demonstrate, in his *Historia Godeschalci Prædestinationis*, published at Paris in 1655, that the monk in question was justly condemned, and deservedly punished.

† The parents of Godeschalvus consecrated him to God, by devoting him from his infancy, as was the custom of the times, to the monastic life in the monastery of Fulda. The young monk, however, having arrived at a certain age, seemed much disposed to abandon his retreat, to shake off his religious fetters, and to return into society; but he was prevented from the execution of this purpose by Rabanus Maurus, who kept him against his will in his monastic bonds. Hence a violent contest arose between these ecclesiastics, in which Louis the Debonaire was obliged to interpose; and hence proceeded the furious disputes concerning predestination and grace. See *Centuria Magdeb. Cent. ix. c. 10.*—Mabillon, *Annal. Bened. tom. ii. ad annum 829.* p. 523.

\* An account of this controversy is given by the writers of the life, actions, and doctrines of Godeschalvus.

† See the *Spicilegium veterum Scriptorum*, published by M. d'Acheri, tom. i. p. 396.—Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sec. iv. Benedict. part. ii. p. 51.*

hitherto exercised a spiritual dominion.\* In this century the contest rose to an enormous height, and broke forth into a most dreadful flame, in 558,† when the learned Photius was chosen patriarch of Constantinople, by the emperor Michael, in the place of Ignatius, whom that prince had driven from his see and sent into exile. This violent proceeding, though it was vindicated and even applauded by a council assembled at Constantinople in 861, was far from being attended with a general approbation. Ignatius appealed from this council to pope Nicolas I., who espoused his interests, and, in a council assembled at Rome in 862, excommunicated Photius as unlawfully elected, and his abettors for having been concerned in such an unrighteous cause. The new patriarch, however, was so far from being terrified or dejected by this excommunication, that he returned the compliment to the pope, and, in a council assembled at Constantinople, in 866, he declared Nicolas unworthy of the place he held in the church, and also of being admitted to the communion of Christians.

XXVIII. The Roman pontiff alleged a specious pretext for his acting with such violence, and exciting such unhappy commotions in the church. This pretence was the innocence of Ignatius, whom, upon an accusation of treason, whether true or false, the emperor had degraded from his patriarchal dignity. This, however, was not the true reason; ambition and interest were the real though secret springs that directed the motions of Nicolas, who would have borne with patience, and viewed with indifference, the unjust sufferings of Ignatius, if he could have recovered from the Greeks, the provinces of Illyricum, Macedonia, Epirus, Achaia, Thessaly, and Sicily, which the emperor and Photius had removed from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff. Before he engaged in the cause of Ignatius, he sent a solemn embassy to Constantinople, to demand the restitution of the provinces; but his demand was rejected with contempt.—Hence, under pretence of avenging the injuries committed against Ignatius, he indulged without restraint his own private resentment, and thus covered with the mask of justice the fury of disappointed ambition and avarice.

XXIX. While affairs were in this troubled state and the flame of controversy was growing more violent from day to day, Basilus the Macedonian, who, by the murder of his predecessor, had paved his way to the imperial throne, calmed at once these tumults, and restored peace to the church, by recalling Ignatius from exile to the high station from which he had been degraded, and by confining Photius in a monastery. This act of authority was solemnly approved and confirmed by a council assembled at Constantinople, in 869, in which the legates of pope Adrian II. had great influence, and were treated with the highest marks

of distinction.\* The Latins acknowledge this assembly as the eighth œcumenical council; and in it the religious contests between them and the Greeks were concluded, or at least hushed and suspended. But the controversy concerning the authority of the pontiff, the limits of their just power, and particularly their jurisdiction in Bulgaria, still subsisted; nor could all the efforts of papal ambition engage either Ignatius or the emperor to give up Bulgaria, or any other province, to the see of Rome.

XXX. The contest that had arisen between the Greeks and Latins concerning the elevation of Photius, was of such a nature as to admit an easy and effectual remedy. But the haughty and ambitious spirit of this learned and ingenious patriarch fed the flame of discord instead of extinguishing it, and unhappily prolonged the troubles and divisions of the Christian church. In the year 866, he added to the see of Constantinople the province of Bulgaria, with which Nicolas had formed the design of augmenting his spiritual dominion. While the pope was most bitterly provoked at missing his aim, Photius went yet farther, and entered into measures every way unworthy of his character and station: for he not only sent a circular letter to the oriental patriarchs to engage them to espouse his private cause, as the public and momentous cause of the church, but drew up a most violent charge of heresy against the Roman bishops, who had been sent among the newly converted Bulgarians, and against the church of Rome in general. The articles of corrupt doctrine, or heresy, which this imperious and exasperated prelate brought against the votaries of the Romish system, were as follow: first, that they fasted on the Sabbath, or seventh day of the week: secondly, that in the first week of Lent they permitted the use of milk and cheese: thirdly, that they prohibited their priests from marrying, and separated from their wives such as had been married when they entered into orders:‡ fourthly, that they represented the bishops alone as authorised to anoint with the holy chrism baptized persons, and, in consequence, obliged those who had been anointed by presbyters, to receive that unction a second time from the hand of a bishop: lastly, that they had adulterated the symbol or creed of Constantinople, by adding to it the words *filio-que*, i. e. *and from the son*, and were therefore of opinion that the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Father only, but also from the Son.† Nicolas I. finding the

\* The writers on both sides of this controversy are enumerated by Fabricius, in his *Biblioth. Græca*, vol. iv. c. xxxviii. p. 372.

† Photius attributes to this forced and unnatural celibacy of the clergy, that multitude of children whose fathers were unknown. Remarkable to this purpose is the following passage from a book of Alvaro Pelagio, bishop of Sylva in Portugal, *de Planctu Ecclesie*: "It is to be wished," says he, "that the clergy had never vowed chastity, especially the clergy of Spain, where the sons of the laity are not much more numerous than the sons of the clergy."

‡ See the letter of Photius in the collection published by bishop Montague, N. n. p. 47. Other writers mention ten heads of accusation brought against Photius; but such do not distinguish between the first and second controversy that arose between the Greeks and Latins, and they add to the articles, with which this patriarch was charged, those that

\* See Giannone, *Historia di Napoli*, tom. i.—Petr. de Marca, *de Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii*, lib. i. cap. i. p. 6.—Lequien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 506.

† In the original, we find the date of 852; but, as this is probably an error of the press, the translator has taken the liberty to correct it in the text.

Roman church thus attacked, sent the articles of this accusation to Hincmar and the other Gallican bishops in 867, desiring them to assemble their respective suffragans in order to examine and answer the reproach of Photius. In pursuance of this exhortation of the pontiff, Odo, Æneas, and Ado, bishops of Beauvais, Paris, and Vienne, as also the celebrated Ratram, stepped forth gallantly into the field of controversy against the Greeks, answered one by one the accusations of Photius, and employed the whole force of their erudition and zeal in maintaining the cause of the Latin church.\*

XXXI. On the death of Ignatius, which happened in 878, the emperor took Photius into favour, and placed him again at the head of the Greek church. This restoration of the degraded patriarch was agreed to by the Roman pontiff John VIII. on condition, however, that Photius would permit the Bulgarians to come under the jurisdiction of the see of Rome. The latter promised to satisfy in this the demands of the pontiff, to which the emperor also seemed to consent; and hence it was that John VIII. sent legates to the council holden in 889 at Constantinople, by whom he declared his approbation of the acts of that assembly, and acknowledged Photius as his brother in Christ. The promises, however, of the emperor and the patriarch, were far from being accomplished; for after this council the former, most probably by the advice, or at least with the consent of the latter, refused to transfer the province of Bulgaria to the Roman pontiff; and it must be confessed that this refusal was founded upon most weighty and important reasons. The pope was highly irritated at this disappointment, and sent Marinus to Constantinople in the character of legate, to declare that he had changed his mind with reference to Photius, and that he entirely approved the sentence of excommunication that had been formerly given against him. The legate, upon delivering this disagreeable message, was cast into prison by the emperor, but was afterwards liberated; and, being raised to the pontificate upon the death of John VIII., recalled the remembrance of this injurious treatment, and levelled a new sentence of condemnation against Photius.

XXXII. This sentence was treated with contempt by the haughty patriarch; but, about six years after this period, he experienced anew the fragility of sublunary grandeur and elevation, by a fall which concluded his prosperous days; for, in 886, Leo, surnamed the philosopher, the son and successor of Basilus, deposed him from the patriarchal see, and confined him in an Armenian monastery, where he died in 891. The death of Photius, who was the only author of the schisms that divided the Greeks and Latins, might have been an occasion of removing these unhappy contests,

were drawn up in the time of Michael Cerularius. Certain it is, that in the epistle of Photius, which relates only to the first controversy, and is the only criterion by which we ought to judge of it, there are no more heads of accusation than the five which we have enumerated in the text.

\* Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sac. iv. Bened. part. ii. p. 55.*  
† Mich. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus, tom. i. p. 103.*

and of restoring peace and concord in the church, if the Roman pontiffs had not been regardless of the demands of equity as well as of the duty of Christian moderation. But these imperious lords of the church indulged their vindictive zeal beyond all measure, and would be satisfied with nothing of less moment than the degradation of all the priests and bishops, who had been ordained by Photius. The Greeks, on the other hand, were shocked at the arrogance of these unjust pretensions, and would not submit to them on any conditions. Hence a spirit of resentment and irritation renewed the rage of dispute, which had been happily declining; religious as well as civil contests were again set on foot; new controversies were added to the old, until the fatal schism took place, which produced a lasting and total separation between the Greek and Latin churches.

## CHAPTER IV.

### *Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. THAT religious rites and ceremonies were progressively multiplied, evidently appears from the labours of those writers, who began in this century to explain to the ignorant multitude their origin, their nature, and the purposes they served; for the multiplicity alone of these religious rites could render the explanation of them necessary. Johannes Scotus, Angelome, Remi or Remigius, bishop of Auxerre, and Walafrid Strabo, were the principal authors who distinguished themselves in this species of sacred literature, to whom we may add Amalarius, many of whose explanations were, however, refuted by Agobard and Florus. Their works are generally entitled *De Officiis Divinis*; for in the style of this age religious ceremonies were called by that name. The labours of these pious and learned men in illustrating the ritual were undoubtedly undertaken with good intentions; but their utility may be well called into question; and it would be bold to affirm that they were not as prejudicial to the church in some respects, as they might be advantageous to it in others. Their books afforded, indeed, a certain sort of spiritual nourishment to the minds of Christians in their attendance upon public worship; but this nourishment was both coarse and unwholesome. The reasons alleged for the ceremonies in vogue at this time in the church, and the purposes they were supposed to answer, were, for the most part, not only far-fetched, childish, and ridiculous, but also bore the strongest marks of forgery and fiction. It is also farther observable, that these illustrations not only encouraged, but augmented prodigiously, to the detriment of real piety, the veneration and zeal of the multitude for external rites and ceremonies; for who would dare to refuse their admiration and reverence to institutions, which they were taught to consider as full of the most mysterious wisdom, and founded upon the most pious and affecting reasons?

II. It would be endless to enter into an exact enumeration of the various rites and cere-

monies, which were now introduced, for the first time, and of which some were adopted by the whole body of Christians, and others only by certain churches. We shall therefore dismiss this matter with the general account which follows, and point out in the notes the sources from which the curious reader may derive a more particular knowledge of the absurdities of this superstitious age. The carcases of the saints transported from foreign countries, or discovered at home by the industry and diligence of pious or designing priests, not only obliged the rulers of the church to augment the number of festivals or holidays already established, but also to diversify the ceremonies in such a manner, that each saint might have his peculiar worship; and, as the authority and credit of the clergy depended much upon the high notion which was generally entertained of the virtue and merit of the saints whom they had canonised, and presented to the multitude as objects of religious veneration, it was necessary to amuse and surprise the people by a variety of pompous and striking ceremonies, by images and the like inventions, in order to keep up and nourish their stupid admiration for the saintly tribe. Hence arose the splendor and magnificence that were lavished upon the churches in this century, and the prodigious number of costly pictures and images with which they were adorned; hence the stately altars, which were enriched with the noblest inventions of painting and sculpture, and illuminated with innumerable tapers at noon-day; hence the multitude of processions, the gorgeous and splendid garments of the priests, and the masses that were celebrated in honor of the saints.\* Among other novelties, the feast of All-Saints was added, in this century, by Gregory IV. to the Latin calendar;† and the festival of St. Michael, which had been long kept with the greatest marks of devotion and respect by the Orientals and Italians, began now to be observed more zealously and universally among the Latin Christians.‡

III. Nor was it only in the solemn acts of religious worship that superstition reigned with an unlimited sway; its influence extended even to the affairs of private life, and was observable in the civil transactions of men, particularly among the Latin Christians, who retained with more obstinacy than the Greeks a multitude of customs, which derived their origin from the sacred rites of paganism. The barbarous nations, which were converted to Christianity, could not support the thoughts of abandoning altogether the laws and manners of their ancestors, however inconsistent they might be with the indispensable demands of the Gospel: on the contrary, they persuaded the Christians among whom they lived to imitate their extravagant superstition in this respect; and this was the true and original

source of the barbarous institutions that prevailed among the Latins, during this and the following century; such as the various methods by which it was usual for persons accused to prove their innocence in doubtful cases, either by the trial of cold water,\* by single combat,† by the fire ordeal,‡ and by the cross.§ It is no

§- \* All these were presumptuous attempts to force the divine providence to declare itself miraculously in favor of the truth. In the trial of cold water, the person accused had the right foot and left hand bound together, and was, in this posture, thrown naked into the water. If he sunk, he was acquitted; but, if he floated upon the surface, this was considered as an evidence of guilt. The most respectable authors, ancient and modern, attribute the invention of this superstitious trial to pope Eugenius II., and it is somewhat surprising that Mr. Bower has taken no notice of it in his history of that pontiff. Baluze has inserted, in the second volume of his *Capitulare*, the solemn form of prayer and protestation, which Eugenius had caused to be drawn up as an introduction to this superstitious practice; and both Fleury and Spanheim look upon that pontiff as its inventor. On the other hand, father Le Brun, a priest of the oratory, maintains in his *Histoire Critique des Pratiques Superstitieuses*, tom. ii., that this custom was much more ancient than Eugenius, and his reasons are not unworthy of attention. Be that as it may, this custom was condemned and abrogated at the request, or rather by the authority of Louis the Debonnaire, about the year 829. It was, however, revived afterwards, and was practised in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, as we shall see in the progress of this history. For an account of this mode of trial, Dr. Mosheim refers us, in a note, to Mabillon's *Analecta veteris Ævi*, tom. i. p. 47, and Roye's work *de Missis Dominicis*, p. 152.

† The trial by duel, or single combat, was introduced toward the conclusion of the fifth century by Gondobald, king of the Burgundians, when the abuse of oaths had occasioned the most horrible perjuries, and opened a door to all sorts of injustice. The duel was then added to the oath by Gondobald; the successful combatant was supposed to be in the right, and this barbarous test of truth and justice was, in spite of humanity and common sense, adopted by the Lombards, French, and Germans, and borrowed from them by other nations. It was first prohibited in 855, in the third council of Valence.

‡ The fire ordeal was practised in various ways. The accused either held a burning ball of iron in his hand, or was obliged to walk barefooted upon heated ploughshares, whose number was increased in proportion to the number or enormity of the crimes imputed to him; and sometimes a glove of red-hot iron was used on this occasion, as we see in the tenth book of the history of Denmark, by Saxo the Grammatician. If in these trials the person impeached remained unhurt, and discovered no signs of pain, he was discharged as innocent; otherwise he was punished as guilty. The first account we have of Christians appealing to this kind of trial as a proof of their innocence, is that of Simplicius, bishop of Autun, who lived in the fourth century. This prelate, as the story goes, before his promotion to the episcopal order, had entered into the matrimonial state; and his fond wife, unwilling to quit him after his advancement, continued to sleep in the same chamber with her spouse. The sanctity of Simplicius suffered, at least in the voice of fame, by the constancy of his wife's affection; and it was rumored that the holy man, though a bishop, persisted in opposition to the ecclesiastical canons to taste the sweets of matrimony; upon which the dame, in the presence of a great concourse of people, took up a considerable quantity of burning coals, which she held in her clothes, and applied to her breasts, without the least hurt to her person or damage to her garments, as the legend says, and her example being followed by her husband with like success, the silly multitude admired the miracle, and proclaimed the innocence of the loving pair. Bricius, or St. Brice, (whom Mr. Collier, in his *Ecclesiastical History of England*, represents by mistake as the first Christian who endeavoured to clear himself in this way)

\* See the work of J. Fecht, de Missis in Honorem Sanctorum.

† See Mabillon, de Re Diplomatica, p. 537.

‡ The holidays or festivals of the saints were yet but few in number among the Latins, as appears from a poem of Florus, published by Martenne in the fifth volume of his *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*.

longer a question in our days, from what source these methods of deciding dubious cases and accusations derived their origin; all agree that they were mere delusions, drawn from the barbarous rites of paganism,\* and not only opposite to the precepts of the Gospel, but absolutely destructive of the spirit of true religion. The pontiffs, however, and the inferior clergy, encouraged these odious superstitions, and went so far as to accompany the practice of them with the celebration of the Lord's Supper and other rites, in order to give them a Christian aspect, and to recommend them to the veneration and confidence of the multitude.

#### CHAPTER V.

##### *Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I THE sects, that had sprung up in the earlier ages of the church, subsisted still, with little change in their situations or circumstances. Such of them as were considerably numerous, fixed their settlements beyond the limits both of the Greek and Latin empires, and thus out of the reach of their enemies. The Nestorians more especially, and the Monophysites, secure under the protection of the Arabians, were extremely industrious in maintaining their credit, and also discovered a warm and active zeal in the propagation of Christianity among those who were yet unacquainted with that divine religion. Some learned men are of opinion, that it was only in this century that the Abyssinians or Ethiopians embraced the sentiments of the Monophysites, in consequence of the exhortations addressed to them by the doctors of that sect who resided in Egypt. But this is undoubtedly an erroneous account of the matter; for it is certain, that the Abyssinians, who were accustomed to receive their spiritual guides from the bishop of Alexandria, commenced Monophysites in the seventh century, if not sooner; for in that period the Arabians made

played a trick of much the same nature in the fifth century.

The trial by the cross was made by obliging the contending parties to stretch out their arms, and he that continued the longest in this posture gained his cause.

Jo. Lorcenii Antiquit. Sueo-Gothicæ, lib. ii. cap. vii. viii. p. 144. This barbarous method of deciding controversies by duel was practised even by the clergy. See Just. Hen. Bohneri Jus Eccles. Protestantium, tom. v. p. 88.

Petr. Lambecius, Res Hamburg. lib. ii. p. 39.—Usserii Sylloge Epistol. Hibernic. p. 81.—Johnson, Leges Eccles. Britannicæ.—Michael de la Roche, Mémoires Liter. de la Grande Bretagne, tom. viii. p. 391.

§ See Agobardus, contra Judicium Dei, tom. i. op. et contra Legem Gundobaldi, cap. ix. p. 114.—Hier. Bignonius, ad Formulæ Marculphi, cap. xii.—Baluzius, ad Agobardum, p. 104.

\* Strabo tells us, in the fifth book of his Geography, that, while the sacred rites of the goddess Ferona were celebrated in a grove not far from mount Soracte, several persons, transported with the imaginary presence of this pretended divinity, fell into fits of enthusiasm, and walked bare-footed over heaps of burning coals without receiving the least damage. The historian adds, that a spectacle so extraordinary drew a prodigious concourse of people to this annual solemnity. Pliny relates something of the same nature concerning the Hirpii. See his Nat. Hist. book vii. chap. ii.

themselves masters of Egypt, oppressed the Greeks, and granted to the Monophysites such a powerful protection, as enabled them to reduce under their jurisdiction almost all the churches that had been established in Egypt.\*

II. The Greeks, during the greatest part of this century, were engaged in a most bitter controversy, or, to speak more properly, in a bloody and barbarous war with the Paulicians, a sect that may be considered as a branch of the Manichæans, and which resided principally in Armenia. This pernicious sect is said to have been formed by two brothers, Paul and John, sons of Callinices, and inhabitants of Samosata, from the former of whom it derived its name; though others are of opinion that the Paulicians were so called from another Paul, an Armenian by birth, who lived under the reign of Justinian II.† Be that as it may, a certain zealot called Constantine revived, in the seventh century, under the government of Constans, this drooping faction, which had suffered deeply from the violence of its adversaries, and was ready to expire under the severity of the imperial edicts, and of those penal laws which were executed against its adherents with the utmost rigor. Constans, Justinian II., and Leo the Isaurian, exerted their zeal against the Paulicians with a peculiar degree of bitterness and fury, left no method of oppression unemploy'd, and neglected no means of accomplishing their ruin; but their efforts were ineffectual, nor could all their power, or all their barbarity, exhaust the patience or conquer the obstinacy of that inflexible people, who, with a fortitude worthy of a better cause, seemed to despise the calamities to which their erroneous doctrine exposed them. The face of things changed, however, to their advantage toward the commencement of this century; and their affairs wore a more prosperous aspect under the protection of the emperor Nicephorus, who favoured them in a particular manner, and restored to them their civil privileges, as well as their religious liberty.‡

III. Their tranquillity, however, was but of short duration; it was a transient scene that was soon to be succeeded by yet more dreadful sufferings than they had hitherto experienced. The cruel rage of persecution, which had for some years been suspended, broke forth with redoubled violence under the reigns of Michael Cæropalates, and Leo the Armenian, who caused the strictest search to be made after the Paulicians in all the provinces of the Grecian empire, and inflicted capital punishment upon such of them as refused to return to the bosom of the church. This rigorous decree turned the afflictions of the Paulicians, who dwelt in Armenia, into vengeance, and drove them into the most desperate measures. They massacred Thomas, bishop of New Cæsarea, and also the magistrates and judges whom the emperors had established in Armenia: and,

\* Nouveaux Mémoires de la Compagnie de Jesus dans le Levant, tom. iv. p. 283, 284.—Le Grand, Dissert. iv.—Lobo, Voyage Historique de l'Abyssinie, tom. ii. p. 18.

† Photius, lib. i. contra Manichæos, p. 74, in B. Wolfii Anecdoticis Græcis, tom. i.

‡ See Georg. Cedrenus, Compend. Historiar. tom. ii.

after avenging themselves thus cruelly, they took refuge in the countries that were governed by the Saracens, and thence infested the neighbouring states of Greece with perpetual incursions.\* After these reciprocal acts of cruelty and vengeance, the Paulicians, as it would seem, enjoyed an interval of tranquillity, and returned to their habitations in the Grecian provinces.

IV. But the most dreadful scene of persecution that was exhibited against these wretched heretics, arose from the furious and inconsiderate zeal of the empress Theodora. This impetuous woman, who was regent of the empire during the minority of her son, issued out a decree, which placed the Paulicians in the perplexing alternative either of abandoning their principles, or of perishing by fire and sword. The decree was severe; but the cruelty with which it was put in execution by those who were sent into Armenia for that purpose, was horrible beyond expression; for these ministers of wrath, after confiscating the goods of above a hundred thousand of that miserable people, put their possessors to death in the most barbarous manner, and made them expire slowly in a variety of the most exquisite tortures. Such as escaped destruction fled for protection and refuge to the Saracens, who received them with compassion and humanity, and permitted them to build a city for their residence, which was called Tibrica. Upon this they entered into a league with the Saracens; and, choosing for their chief an officer of the greatest resolution and valour, whose name was Carbas, they declared against the Greeks a war which was carried on with the utmost vehemence and fury. This war continued during the whole century; the victory seemed often doubtful, but the slaughter was terrible, and the numbers that perished on both sides prodigious. Many of the Grecian provinces felt, in a more particular manner, the dire effects of this cruel contest, and exhibited the most affecting scenes of desolation and misery.† During these commotions, some Paulicians, toward the conclusion of the century, spread abroad among the

Bulgarians their pestilential doctrines, which were received with docility, and took root speedily, as might naturally be expected, among a barbarous people, recently converted to the Christian faith.\*

V. The Greeks treated the Paulicians, of whom we have now been speaking, as Manichæans; though, if we may credit the testimony of Photius, the Paulicians expressed the utmost abhorrence of Manes and his doctrine.‡ Most evident it is, that they were not altogether Manichæans, though they embraced some opinions that resembled certain tenets of that abominable sect. They had not, like the Manichæans, an ecclesiastical government administered by bishops, priests, and deacons: they had no sacred order of men distinguished by their manner of life, their habit, or any other circumstance from the rest of the assembly; nor had councils, synods, or the like institutions, any place in their religious polity. They had certain doctors whom they called *Synecdemi*, i. e. companions in the journey of life, and also *Notarii*. Among these, there reigned a perfect equality; and they had no peculiar rites or privileges, nor any external mark of dignity to distinguish them from the people.‡ The only singularity that attended their promotion to the doctoral rank was, that they changed their lay-names for Scripture ones, as if there had been something peculiarly venerable in the names of the holy men, whose lives and actions are recorded in the sacred writings. They received all the books of the New Testament, except the two Epistles of St. Peter, which they rejected for reasons unknown to us; and their copies of the Gospel were exactly the same with those used by all other Christians, without the least interpolation of the sacred text; in which respect also they differed considerably from the Manichæans.§ They moreover recommended to the people without exception, with the most affecting and ardent zeal, the constant and assiduous perusal of the Scriptures, and expressed the utmost indignation against the Greeks, who allowed to priests alone an access to these sacred fountains of divine knowledge.¶ In explaining, however, the doctrines of the Gospel, they often departed from the literal sense and the natural signification of the words, and interpreted them in a forced and allegorical manner, when they opposed their favourite opinions and tenets;¶ and such more especially were the delusive and erroneous explanations which they gave of what is said con-

\* Photius, lib. i. contra Manichæos, p. 125.—Petr. Siculi Historia Manichæorum, p. 71.

† Georg. Cedrenus, Compend. Hist. p. 541, edit. Paris.—Zonaras, Annal. lib. xvi. The principal authors who have given accounts of the Paulicians are Photius, lib. i. contra Manichæos, and Petrus Siculus, whose history of the Manichæans Matth. Raderus published in Greek and Latin in 1601. By the account of Petrus Siculus that is given by himself, we learn that, in 870, under the reign of Basilus the Macedonian, he was sent ambassador to the Paulicians at Tibrica, to treat with them for the exchange of prisoners, and lived among them during the space of nine months; this is sufficient to give us a high idea of the power and prosperity of the Paulicians at that time. It is from this eminent writer that Cedrenus seems to have taken what he has advanced in his Compend. Histor. p. 431. What we learn concerning the Paulicians from the more modern writers, (such as Bayle, in his Dictionary, and B. Jo. Christ. Wolfius, in his Manichæismus ante Manichæos, p. 217.) seems to be derived from Bossuet's Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes, tom. ii. p. 129. But this authority is highly exceptionable; for Bossuet did not consult the true sources of knowledge upon this point; and, what is still worse, the spirit of party seems to have led him into voluntary errors.

\* It is not improbable that there are yet, in Thrace and Bulgaria, Paulicians, or Paulians as they are called by some. It appears at least certain, that in the seventeenth century some of that sect still subsisted, and dwelt at Nicopolis, as we learn from the testimony of Urb. Cerni, who tells us, in his Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine, that Peter Doodati, archbishop of Sophia, caused them to abandon their errors, and return to the Catholic faith; but whether the latter part of the account be true or false, is more than we shall pretend to determine.

† Photius, lib. i. contra Manichæos, p. 17, 56, 65. Petr. Siculus, Hist. Manich. p. 43.

‡ Photius, l. c. p. 31, 32.—Petr. Sicul. p. 44.—Cedrenus, l. c. p. 431.

§ Photius, p. 11.—Petr. Sicul. p. 19.

¶ Photius, p. 101.—Petr. Sicul. p. 57.

¶ Photius p. 12.

cerning the institutions of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the divine authority of the Old Testament, all which they obstinately rejected. Beside the books of the New Testament, they treated with a particular veneration certain epistles of Sergius, the most eminent and illustrious doctor of their sect.

VI. The Greek writers, instead of giving a complete view of the Paulician system, which was undoubtedly composed of a great variety of tenets, content themselves with mentioning six monstrous errors, which, in their estimation, rendered the Paulicians unworthy of enjoying either the comforts of this world, or the happiness of the next. These errors are as follow: 1. "They denied that this inferior and visible world was the production of the Supreme Being, and they distinguished the Creator of this world, and of human bodies, from the most high God, who dwells in the heavens." It was principally on account of this odious doctrine, which was, however, adopted by all the Gnostic sects, that the Paulicians were deemed Manicheans by the Greeks. But what their sentiments were concerning the creator of this world, and whether they considered him as a being distinct from the evil principle, are matters that no writer has hitherto explained in a satisfactory manner. We learn only from Photius, that, according to the Paulician doctrine, the evil principle was engendered by darkness and fire; whence it plainly follows that he was neither self-originated, nor eternal.\* 2. "They treated contemptuously the Virgin Mary;" that is to say, according to the manner of speaking usual among the Greeks, they refused to adore and worship her. They maintained, indeed, that Christ was the son of Mary, and was born of her (although they maintained, as appears from the express testimony of their adversaries, that the divine Saviour brought with him from heaven his human nature, and that Mary, after the birth of Christ, had other children by Joseph;) they

\* Photius, lib. ii. contra Manicheos, p. 147. It is evident, beyond all contradiction, that the Paulicians, in imitation of the oriental philosophers from whom the Gnostic and Manicheans derived their origin, considered eternal matter as the seat and source of all evil; but they believed, at the same time, like many of the Gnostics, that this matter, endued from all eternity with life and motion, had produced an active principle, which was the fountain of vice, misery, and disorder. This principle, according to them, is the author of all material substances, while God is the Creator and Father of spirits. These tenets resemble, no doubt, the Manichean doctrine; yet they differ from it in several points. The Paulicians seem to have emanated from one of the old Gnostic sects, and to have been very numerous and diversified; and, though persecuted and oppressed from age to age in the most rigorous manner by many emperors, they could never be entirely suppressed, or extirpated.

only fell into the sentiments of the Valentini-ans, and held, that Christ passed through the womb of the Virgin, as the pure stream of limpid water passes through a conduit, and that Mary did not preserve her virginity to the end of her days; all which assertions the Greeks rejected with the utmost antipathy and abhorrence. 3. "They refused to celebrate the holy institution of the Lord's Supper;" for, as they imagined many precepts and injunctions of the Gospel to be of a merely figurative and parabolical nature, so they understood, by the bread and wine which Christ is said to have administered to his disciples at his last supper, the divine discourses and exhortations of the Saviour, which are a spiritual food and nourishment to the soul, and fill it with repose, satisfaction, and delight.\* 4. "They loaded the cross of Christ with contempt and reproach;" by which we are only to understand, that they refused to follow the absurd and superstitious practice of the Greeks, who paid to the pretended wood of the cross a certain sort of religious homage. As the Paulicians believed that Christ was clothed with an ethereal, impassable, and celestial body, they could by no means grant that he was really nailed to the cross, or that he expired, in effect, upon that ignominious tree: and hence naturally arose that treatment of the cross, of which the Greeks accused them. 5. "They rejected, after the example of the greatest part of the Gnostics, the books of the Old Testament, and looked upon the writers of that sacred history as inspired by the Creator of this world, and not by the Supreme God." 6. "They entirely excluded presbyters and lay-elders from the administration of the church." By this, however, no more can be meant, than that they refused to call their doctors by the name of *presbyters*, a name which had its origin among the Jews, and was peculiar to that odious people, who persecuted Jesus Christ, and attempted, as the Paulicians speak, to put him to death.†

\* The Greeks do not charge the Paulicians with any error concerning baptism; it is, however, certain, that the accounts of that sacred institution, which are given in Scripture, were allegorically explained by this extravagant sect; and Photius, in his first book against the Manicheans, expressly asserts that the Paulicians treated baptism as a mere allegorical ceremony, and by the baptismal water understood the Gospel.

† These six famous errors of the Paulicians I have taken from the Manichean history of Petrus Siculus, with whom Photius and Cedrenus agree, although their accounts of these opinions be less perspicuous and distinct. The explanatory remarks that I have added, are the result of my own reflections upon the Paulician system, and the doctrine of the Greeks.



# THE TENTH CENTURY.

## PART I.

### THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the Prosperous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THE deplorable state of Christianity in this century, arising partly from that astonishing ignorance that gave a loose rein both to superstition and immorality, and partly from an unhappy concurrence of causes of another kind, is unanimously lamented by the various writers, who have transmitted to us the history of these miserable times. Yet, amidst all this darkness, some gleams of light were perceived from time to time, and several occurrences happened, which deserve a place in the prosperous annals of the church. The Nestorians in Chaldæa extended their spiritual conquests beyond mount Imaus, and introduced the Christian religion into Tartary, (properly so called,) whose inhabitants had hitherto lived in their natural state of ignorance and ferocity, uncivilized and savage. The same successful missionaries spread, by degrees, the knowledge of the Gospel among that most powerful nation of the Turks, or Tartars, which went by the name of Karit, and bordered on Kathay, or the northern part of China.\* The laborious industry of this sect, and their zeal for the propagation of the Christian faith, deserve, no doubt, the highest encomiums; it must, however, be acknowledged, that the doctrine and worship, which they introduced among these barbarians, were far from being, in all respects, conformable to the true spirit and genius of the Christian religion.

II. The prince of that country, whom the Nestorians converted to the Christian faith, assumed, if we may give credit to the vulgar tradition, the name of John after his baptism, to which he added the surname of Presbyter, from a principle of modesty. Hence it was, as some learned men imagine, that the successors of this monarch retained these names until the time of Genghiz-Khan, who flourished in the fourteenth century,† and were each of them called Prester John.‡ But all this has a very fabulous air; at least it is advanced without any solid proof; it even appears evident, on the contrary, that the famous Prester John, who made so much noise in the world, did not begin to reign in that part of Asia before the conclusion of the eleventh century. It is, however, certain beyond all contradiction, that

the monarchs of the nation called Karit (which makes a large part of the empire of the Mogul, and is by some denominated a tribe of the Turks, and, by others, of the Tartars,) embraced Christianity in this century; and that a considerable part of Tartary, or Asiatic Seythia, lived under the spiritual jurisdiction of bishops who were sent among them by the Nestorian pontiff.\*

III. If we turn our eyes to the western world, we shall find the Gospel making its way with more or less rapidity among the most rude and uncivilized nations. The famous arch-pirate Rollo, son of a Norwegian count, being banished from his native land,‡ had, in the preceding century, put himself at the head of a resolute band of Normans, and seized one of the maritime provinces of France, whence he infested the neighbouring country with perpetual incursions and depredations. In 912, this valiant chief, with his whole army, embraced the Christian faith, on the following occasion. Charles the Simple, who wanted both resolution and power to drive this warlike and intrepid invader out of his dominions, was obliged to have recourse to negotiation. He accordingly offered to make over to Rollo a considerable part of his territories, on condition that the latter would consent to a peace, espouse his daughter Gisela,‡ and embrace Christianity. These terms were accepted by Rollo without the least hesitation; and his army, following the example of their leader, professed a religion of which they were totally ignorant.§ These Norman pirates, as appears from many authentic records, were absolutely without religion of any kind, and therefore were not restrained, by the power of prejudice, from embracing a religion which presented to them the most advantageous prospects. They knew no distinction between interest and duty, and they estimated truth and virtue only by the profits with which they were attended. It

\* The late learned Sigefred Bayer, in his Preface to the *Museum Sinicum*, p. 145, informed us of his design to give the world an accurate account of the Nestorian churches established in Tartary and China, drawn from some curious ancient records and monuments, that have not been as yet made public. His work was to have been entitled *Historia Ecclesiarum Sinicarum, et Septentrionalis Asiae*; but death prevented the execution of this interesting plan, and also of several others, which this great man had formed, and which would undoubtedly have thrown a new light upon the history of the Asiatic Christians.

† Holbergi *Historia Danorum Navalis in Scriptis Societatis Scient. Hafniens.* part iii. p. 357.

‡ Other writers more politely represent the offer of Gisela as one of the methods that Charles employed to obtain a peace with Rollo.

§ Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom i. p. 296 — Daniel, *Hist. de France*, tom. ii. p. 587.

\* *Assemani Bibliotheca Oriental.* Vatic. tom. iii. part ii. p. 482.—Herbelot, *Bibliothèque Orientale*, p. 256.

† Dr. Mosheim, and his translator, ought to have said, the thirteenth century. Eort.

‡ See *Assemani Biblioth.* tom. iii. part ii. p. 289.

was from this Rollo, who received at his baptism the name of Robert, that the famous line of Norman dukes derived its origin; for the province of Bretagne, and a part of Neustria, which Charles the Simple conveyed to his son-in-law by a solemn grant, were from this time known by the name of Normandy,\* which they derived from their new possessors.

IV. The Christian religion was introduced into Poland by the zealous efforts of female piety. Dambrowska, daughter of Boleslaus, duke of Bohemia, persuaded, by the force of repeated exhortations, her husband Miecslaus, duke of Poland, to abandon paganism; and, in 965, he embraced the Gospel. The account of this agreeable event was no sooner brought to Rome, than the pontiff, John XIII., sent into Poland Ægidius, bishop of Tusculum, attended with a numerous train of ecclesiastics, in order to second the pious efforts of the duke and duchess, who desired, with impatience, the conversion of their subjects. The exhortations and endeavours of these devout missionaries, who were unacquainted with the language of the people they came to instruct, would have been entirely without effect, had they not been accompanied with the edicts and penal laws, the promises and threats of Miecslaus, which dejected the courage, and conquered the obstinacy of the reluctant Poles. When therefore the fear of punishment, and the hope of reward, had laid the foundations of Christianity in Poland, two national archbishops and seven bishops were consecrated to the ministry, whose zeal and labours were followed with such success, that the whole body of the people abandoned, by degrees, their ancient superstitions, and made public profession of the religion of Jesus.† It was, indeed, no more than an external profession; for that inward change of affections and principles, which the Gospel requires, was far from being an object of attention in this barbarous age.

V. The Christian religion was established in Russia by means similar to those that had occasioned its propagation in Poland; for we must not lay any stress upon the proselytes that were made to Christianity among the Russians in the preceding century, since those conversions were neither permanent nor solid, and since it appears evidently, that such of that nation, as, under the reign of Basilus the Macedonian, had embraced the doctrine of the Greek church, relapsed soon after into the superstition of their ancestors. Wlodomir, duke of Russia and Moseovy, married, in 961, Anne, sister of Basilus, the second Grecian emperor of that name; and this zealous princess, by her repeated entreaties and her pious importunity, at length persuaded her reluctant spouse to receive the Christian faith, and he was accordingly baptized, in 987, assuming on that occasion the name of Basilus. The Russians spontaneously followed the example of their prince;

\* It was Neustria, and not Bretagne, that received the name of Normandy, from the Normans who chose Rollo for their chief.

† Duglossi Historia Polonica, lib. ii. p. 91, lib. iii. p. 95, 239.—Regenvolschii Historia Eccles. Slavon. lib. ii. cap. i. p. 8.—Henr. Canisii Lectiones Antiqua: tom. iii. part. i. p. 41.—Solignac, Hist. de Fologne, tom. i. p. 71.

we have, at least, no account of any compulsion or violence being employed in their conversion;\* and this is the true date of the entire establishment of Christianity among that people. Wlodomir and his duchess were placed in the highest order of the Russian saints, and are still worshipped at Kiow (where they were interred) with the greatest devotion. The Latins, however, paid no such respect to the memory of Wlodomir, whom they represented as absolutely unworthy of saintly honours.†

VI. The Hungarians and Avari had received some faint notions of Christianity under the reign of Charlemagne, in consequence of the measures that had been taken by that zealous prince for the propagation of the Gospel.—These notions, however, were soon and easily extinguished by various circumstances, which took their rise from the death of Charlemagne: and it was not before the century of which we now write that the Christian religion obtained a fixed settlement among these warlike nations.‡ Toward the middle of this century, Bulosudes and Gyula or Gylas, two Turkish chiefs, whose governments lay upon the banks of the Danube,§ made public profession of Christianity, and were baptized at Constantinople. The former apostatized soon after to the religion of his ancestors, while the latter not only persevered steadfastly in his new profession, but also showed the most zealous concern for the conversion of his subjects, who, in consequence of his express order, were instructed in the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel by Hierotheus, a learned prelate, by whom he had been accompanied in his journey to Constantinople. Sarolta, the daughter of Gylas, was afterwards given in marriage to Geysa, the chief of the Hungarian nation, whom she persuaded to embrace the divine religion in which she had been educated. The faith, however, of this new convert was feeble and unsteady, and he retained a strong propensity to the superstition which he had been engaged to forsake; but his apostasy was prevented by the pious remonstrances of Adalbert, archbishop of Prague, who went into Hungary toward the conclusion of this century, and by whom also Stephen, the son of Geysa, was baptized with great pomp and solemnity. It was to this young prince that the Gospel was principally indebted for its propagation and establishment among the Hungarians, whose general conversion was the fruit of his zeal for the cause of Christ; for he perfected what his father and grandfather had only begun; fixed bishops, with large revenues, in various places; erected magnificent temples for divine worship; and, by the influence of instructions, threatenings, rewards, and punishments, brought his subjects, almost without exception, to abandon the wretched superstition of their idola-

\* See Anton. Pagi Critica in Baron. tom. iv. ad annum 987, p. 55, et. ad an. 1015, p. 110.—Car. du Fresnoy, Famil. Byzant. p. 143.

† Dittmar. Mersch. Episcopi. Chronic. lib. vii. Caronic. p. 417. tom. i. Scriptor. Brunsvic. Leibnitzii.

‡ Pauli Dobrezensii Historia Eccles. Reformatior. in Ungaria, part. i. cap. iii. p. 19.

§ The Hungarians and Transylvanians were, at this time, known to the Grecians by the name of Turks.

trous ancestors. These vigorous proceedings, by which Stephen introduced the religion of Jesus among the Hungarians, procured him the most distinguished honours of saintship in succeeding ages.\*

VII. The Christian religion was in a very unsettled state among the Danes under the reign of Gormon; and, notwithstanding the protection it received from his queen, who professed it publicly, it was obliged to struggle with many difficulties, and to encounter much opposition. The face of things changed, indeed, after the death of Gormon. His son Harald, surnamed Blaataud, being defeated by Otho the Great, in 949, embraced the Gospel, and was baptized, together with his consort and his son Sueno or Swein, by Adaldagus, archbishop of Hamburg, or, as others allege, by Poppon a pious ecclesiastic, who attended the emperor in this expedition. It is probable that Harald, educated by his mother Tyra, who was a Christian, was not extremely averse to the religion of Jesus; it appears, however, certain, that his conversion was less the effect of his own choice, than of the irresistible commands of his victorious enemy; for Otho, persuaded that the Danes would never desist from their hostile incursions and rapines, while they persevered in the religion of their ancestors, which was calculated to nourish a ferocity of temper, and to animate to military exploits, made it the principal condition of the treaty of peace, which he concluded with Harald, that he and his subjects should receive the Christian faith.† On the conversion of this prince, Adaldagus and Poppon employed their ministerial labours among the Cimbrians and Danes, in order to engage them to imitate such an illustrious example; and their exhortations were crowned with remarkable success, to which the stupendous miracles performed by Poppon are said to have contributed in a particular manner. These miracles, indeed, were of such a kind, as manifestly shows that

they derived their origin from human art, and not from a divine interposition.\* As long as Harald lived, he used every wise and probable method of confirming his subjects in the religion they had embraced. For this purpose he established bishops in several parts of his dominions, enacted excellent laws, abrogated superstitious customs, and imposed severe restraints upon all vicious and immoral practices. But, after all these pious efforts, and salutary measures, which promised such fair prospects to the rising church, his son Sueno, or Swein, apostatized from the truth, and, during a certain time, involved the Christians in the deepest calamity and distress, and treated them with the greatest cruelty and injustice. This persecuting tyrant felt, however, in his turn, the heavy strokes of adversity, which produced a salutary change in his conduct, and happily brought him to a better mind; for, being driven from his kingdom, and obliged to seek his safety in a state of exile among the Scots, he embraced anew the religion he had abandoned, and, on his restoration to his dominions, exerted the most ardent and exemplary zeal in the cause of Christianity, which he endeavoured to promote to the utmost of his power.‡

VIII. It was in this century, that the first dawn of the Gospel arose upon the Norwegians, as we learn from the most authentic records. The conversion of that people was attempted, in 933, by their monarch, Hagan Adalsteen, who had been educated among the English, and who employed certain ecclesiastics of that nation to instruct his subjects in the doctrines of Christianity. But his pious efforts were rendered fruitless by the brutal obstinacy, with which the Norwegians persevered in their ancient prejudices; and the assiduity and zeal with which his successor Harald Graufeldt pursued the same plan of reformation, were also without effect.§ The succeeding princes, far from being discouraged by these obstacles, persisted firmly in their worthy purpose; and Haro, among others, yielding to the intreaties of Harald, king of Denmark, to whom he was indebted for the Norwegian crown, embraced, himself, the Christian religion, and recommended it with the greatest fervour to his subjects, in an assembly of the people, holden in 945.¶ This recommendation, notwithstanding the solemnity and zeal with which it was accompanied, made little impression upon the minds of this fierce and barbarous people; nor were they entirely gained over by the zealous endeavours of Olmus to convert them to Christianity, though the pious diligence of that prince, which procured him the honour of saintship, was not altogether without effect.|| But that which gave the finishing stroke to the conversion of the Norwe-

\* The Greeks, Germans, Bohemians, and Poles, severally claim the honour of having been the founders of the Christian religion in Hungary; and their respective pretensions have introduced not a little obscurity into this matter. The Germans allege, that the Christian religion was brought into Hungary by Gisela, sister to their emperor Henry II., who, being given in marriage to Stephen, the king of that nation, persuaded that prince to embrace the Gospel. The Bohemians tell us, on the other hand, that it was by the ministry of Adalbert, archbishop of Prague, that Stephen was converted. The Poles affirm, that Geysa, having married a Christian princess of their nation, viz. Adalbert, sister to Meislaus, duke of Poland, was induced by her remonstrances and exhortations to make profession of Christianity. In consequence of a careful examination of all these pretensions we have followed the sentiments and decisions of the Greek writers, after having diligently compared them with the Hungarian historians; and we are encouraged in this by the authority of the learned Gabriel de Juxta Hornad, who, in his *Initia Religionis Christiane inter Hungaros Ecclesie orientalis adserta*, published in 1740, decides this question in favour of the Greeks. All other accounts of the matter are extremely imperfect, and subject to many doubts and difficulties.

† Adami Brem. Hist. lib. ii. cap. ii. iii. p. 16, cap. xv. p. 20, in Lindenbergii *Scriptoribus rerum Septentrionalium*.—Alb. Kranzius Wandalia, lib. iv. cap. xv.—Ludwigii *Reliquie Manuscriptorum*, tom. ix. p. 10.—Pontoppidani *Annales Ecclesie Diplomatici*, tom. i. p. 59.

\* Jo. Adolphi, *Cypravi Annales Episcoporum Slesvic.* cap. viii. p. 78.—Adam. Bremens. lib. ii. cap. xxxi. p. 22, cap. xlv. p. 283.—Jo. Stephan. ad Saxoniæ Grammat. p. 207.—Molleri *Introduct. ad Historiam Chersones.* Cimbricæ, part. ii. cap. iii. sect. 14.

† Saxon. Grammat. *Histor. Dan.* lib. x. p. 186.—Pontoppidan. *de Gestis et Vestigijs Danorum extra Daniam*, tom. ii. cap. i. sect. 1. 2.

‡ Eric. Pontoppidan. *Annales Eccles. Danicæ diplomat.* tom. i. p. 66.

§ Torfæi *Historia Norvegiæ*, tom. ii. p. 183, 214.

|| Torfæus p. 457.

gians was their subjection to Sueno, or Swein, king of Sweden, who, having defeated their monarch Olaus Tryg-gueson, became master of Norway, and obliged its inhabitants to abandon the gods of their ancestors, and to embrace universally the religion of Jesus.\* Among the various doctors who were sent to instruct this barbarous people, the most eminent, both in merit and authority, was Guthebal, an English priest.† From Norway, Christianity spread its salutary light through the adjacent countries, and was preached, with success, in the Orkney islands, which were, at that time, subject to the Norwegian kings, and also in Iceland and Old Greenland; for it is evident, from many circumstances and records of undoubted authority, that the greatest part of the inhabitants of these countries received the Gospel in this century.‡

IX. In Germany the pious exploits of Otho the Great contributed, in a signal manner, to promote the interest of Christianity, and to fix it upon solid foundations throughout the empire. This truly great prince, whose pious magnanimity clothed him with a lustre infinitely superior to that which he derived from his imperial dignity, was constantly employed in extirpating the remains of the ancient superstitions, and in supporting and confirming the infant church, which in several provinces had not yet attained any considerable degree of consistence and vigor. That there might be rulers and pastors to govern the church, and to contribute both by their doctrine and example to the reformation and improvement of an unpolished and illiterate people, he established

bishops in several places, and generously erected and endowed the bishoprics of Brandenburg, Havelberg, Meissen, Magdeburg, and Naumburg; by which excellent establishments the church was furnished with eminent doctors from various parts, whose instructions were the occasion of raising up new laborers in the spiritual harvest, and of thus multiplying the ministers of Christ from time to time. It was also through the munificence of the same prince, that many convents were erected for those who, in conformity with the false piety of the times, chose to finish their Christian course in the indolent sanctity of a solitary life; and it was by his express order that schools were established in almost every city for the education of the youth. All this may serve to show us the generosity and zeal of this illustrious emperor, whose merit would have surpassed the highest encomiums, had his prudence and moderation been equal to the fervor of his piety and the uprightness of his intentions. But the superstition of his empress,\* and the deplorable ignorance of the times, deduced this good prince into the notion, that he obliged the Deity in proportion as he loaded the clergy with riches and honors, and that nothing was more proper to draw down upon him the divine protection, than the exercise of a boundless liberality to his ministers. In consequence of this idle and extravagant fancy, Otho opened the sources of his opulence, which flowed into the church like an overgrown torrent, so that the bishops, monks, and the religious fraternities in general, wallowed in wealth and abundance. But succeeding ages perceived the unhappy effects of this excessive and ill-judged munificence, when the sacred orders employed this opulence, which they had acquired without either merit or labor, in gratifying their passions, in waging war against all who opposed their ambitious pretensions, and in purchasing the various pleasures of a luxurious and effeminate life.

X. It was no doubtful mark of the progress and strength of the Christian cause, that the European kings and princes began so early as this century to form the project of a holy war against the Mohammedans, who were masters of Palestine. They considered it as an intolerable reproach upon Christians, that the very land in which the divine author of their religion had received his birth, had exercised his ministry, and made expiation for the sins of mortals, should be abandoned to the enemies of the Christian name. They also looked upon it as highly just, and suitable to the majesty of the Christian religion, to avenge the calamities and injuries, the persecution and reproach, which its professors had suffered under the Mohammedan yoke. The bloody signal was accordingly given toward the conclusion of this century, by Sylvester II. in the first year of his pontificate; and this signal was an epistle, written in the name of the church of Jerusalem, to the church universal throughout the world,‡ in which the European powers were

† \* Dr. Mosheim attributes here to Swein the honor which is due to his predecessor Olaus Tryg-gueson; if it can be deemed an honour to have promoted a rational and divine religion by compulsion and violence, by fire and sword. Olaus, who had abjured Paganism in England during his youth, in consequence of a warm and pathetic discourse which he had heard from a British priest, returned to Norway with a firm resolution to propagate Christianity throughout his dominions. For this purpose he traveled from one province to another, attended by a chosen band of soldiers, and, sword in hand, performed the functions of missionary and apostle.—His ministry, thus enforced, was followed with the desired success throughout all the provinces, except that of Drontheim, which rose in rebellion against him, and attacked Christianity with the same kind of arguments that Olaus employed in establishing it. This opposition occasioned several bloody battles, which ended, however, in the defeat of the rebels, and of the god Thor, their tutelar deity, whose statue Olaus dragged from its place, and burned publicly in the sight of his worshippers. This event detected the courage of the inhabitants of Drontheim who submitted to the religion and laws of their conqueror. And thus, before the reign of Sueno, at least before the defeat of Olaus by that prince, Norway was Christian. See the History of Denmark, published in French by M. Mallet, vol. i. p. 52, 53.

† Chron. Danicum a Ludewigio editum in Reliquiis Manuscriptorum, tom. ix. p. 11, 16, 17.

‡ On the subject of the conversion of the inhabitants of the Orkneys, see Torfæi Historia Rerum Orcadens, lib. i. p. 22, and, for an account of the Icelanders, the reader may consult Aringrum Jonas' Crymogæa, lib. i. and Arius' Multis, in Schedis Islandicæ; as also Torfæus, Histor. Norveg. tom. ii. p. 378, 379, 417; and Gabriel Laron's Singularitates Historiques et Litteraires, tom. i. p. 138.—The same Torfæus gives a full account of the introduction of Christianity into Greenland, in his Histor. Norveg. tom. ii. p. 374, and also in his Greenlandia Antiqua, c. xvii. p. 127.

\* See the life of the empress, whose name was Adelaide, in the Lectiones Antiquæ of Henry Canisius, tom. iii.

† This is the twenty-eighth Epistle in the first part

solemnly exhorted and entreated to succour and deliver the Christians in Palestine. The pope's exhortations, however, were without effect, except upon the inhabitants of Pisa, who are said to have obeyed the summons with the utmost alacrity, and to have prepared themselves immediately for a holy campaign.\*

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THE Christian religion suffered less in this century from the cruelty of its enemies, than from the defection of its friends. Of all the pagan monarchs, under whose government the Christians lived, none behaved to them in a hostile manner, or tormented them with the execution of compulsive edicts or penal laws, except Gormon and Swein, kings of Denmark. Notwithstanding this, their affairs were far from being either in a fixed or flourishing state; and their situation was full of uncertainty and peril, both in the eastern and western provinces. The Saracens in Asia and Africa, amidst the intestine divisions under which they groaned, and the calamities that overwhelmed them from different quarters, were extremely assiduous in propagating the doctrines of Mohammed; nor were their efforts unsuccessful. Multitudes of Christians fell into their snares; and the Turks, a valiant and fierce nation, who inhabited the northern coast of the Caspian sea, received their doctrine. The uniformity of religion did not, however, produce a solid union of interest between the Turks and Saracens; on the contrary, their dissensions and quarrels were never more violent than from the time that Mohammed became their common chief in religious matters. The Persians, whose country was a prey to the ambitious usurpations of the latter, implored the aid of the former, by whom succours were granted with the utmost alacrity and readiness. The Turks accordingly fell upon the Saracens in a furious manner, drove them out of the whole extent of the Persian territories, and afterwards, with incredible rapidity and success, invaded, seized, and plundered the other provinces that belonged to that people, whose desolation, in reality, came on like a whirlwind. Thus the powerful empire of the Saracens, which its enemies had for so many years attempted in vain to overturn, fell at last by the hands of its allies and friends. The Turks accomplished what the Greeks and Romans ineffectually aimed at; they struck suddenly that dreadful blow, which ruined at once the affairs of the Saracens in Persia, and then deprived them by degrees of their other dominions; and thus the Ottoman empire, which is still an object of terror to the Christians, was established upon the ruins of the Saracen dominion.†

II. In the western provinces, the Christians

of the collection of the letters of Sylvester II. published by Du-Chesne, in the third volume of his *Scriptor. Histor. Franc.*

\* See Muratori, *Scriptores Rerum Italianarum*, tom. iii. p. 400.

† For a more ample account of these revolutions,

had much to suffer from the hatred and cruelty of those who remained under the darkness of paganism. The Normans, during a great part of this century, committed, in several parts of France, the most barbarous hostilities, and involved the Christians, wherever they carried their victorious arms, in numberless calamities. The Sarmatians, Slavonians, Bohemians, and others, who had either conceived an aversion for the Gospel, or were sunk in a stupid ignorance of its intrinsic excellence and its immortal blessings, not only endeavoured to extirpate Christianity out of their own territories by the most barbarous efforts of cruelty and violence, but infested the adjacent countries, where it was professed, with fire and sword, and left, wherever they went, the most dreadful marks of their unrelenting fury. The Danes, moreover, did not cease to molest the Christians, until they were subdued by Otho the Great, and thus, from being the enemies, became the friends of the Christian cause. The Hungarians also contributed their part to the sufferings of the church, by their incursions into several parts of Germany, which they turned into scenes of desolation and misery; while the fierce Arabs, by their tyranny in Spain, and their depredations in Italy and the neighbouring islands, spread calamity and oppression all around them, of which, no doubt, the Christians established in those parts had the heaviest portion.

III. Whoever considers the endless vexations, persecutions, and calamities, which the Christians suffered from the nations that continued in their ancient superstitions, will easily perceive the reason of that fervent and inextinguishable zeal, which Christian princes discovered for the conversion of those nations, whose impetuous and savage fury they experienced from time to time. A principle of self-preservation, and a prudent regard to their own safety, as well as a pious zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, engaged them to put in practice every method that might open the eyes of their barbarous adversaries, from a rational and well-grounded hope that the precepts of Christianity would mitigate, by degrees, the ferocity of these nations, and soften their rugged and intractable tempers. Hence it was, that Christian kings and emperors left no means unemployed to draw these infidels within the pale of the church. For this purpose, they proposed to their chiefs alliances of marriage, and offered them certain districts and territories, with auxiliary troops to maintain them against their enemies, upon condition that they would abandon the superstition of their ancestors, which tended to nourish their ferocity, and to increase their passion for blood and carnage. These offers were attended with the desired success, as they induced the infidel chiefs not only to lend an ear themselves to the instructions and exhortations of the Christian missionaries; but also to oblige their subjects and armies to follow their examples in this important respect.

see the *Annales Turcici* of Leunclavius and *Elmacini Historia Saracenicæ*.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.*

I. THE deplorable ignorance of this barbarous age, in which the drooping arts were totally neglected, and the sciences seemed to be on the point of expiring for want of encouragement, is unanimously confessed and lamented by all the writers who have transmitted to us any accounts of this period. Nor, indeed, will this fatal revolution, in the republic of letters, appear astonishing to such as consider, on one hand, the terrible vicissitudes, tumults, and wars, that threw all things into confusion both in the eastern and western world, and, on the other, the ignominious stupidity and dissoluteness of those sacred orders which had been appointed as the guardians of truth and learning. Leo, surnamed the Philosopher, who ascended the imperial throne of the Greeks toward the commencement of this century, was himself an eminent lover of learning, and an auspicious and zealous protector of such as distinguished themselves in the culture of the sciences.\* This noble and generous disposition appeared with still greater lustre in his son Constantine Porphyrogeneta, who evinced the greatest ardor for the revival of the arts and sciences in Greece,† and employed what he deemed the most effectual measures for the accomplishment of this excellent purpose. It was with this view that he spared no expense in drawing to his court, and supporting in his dominions, a variety of learned men, each of whom excelled in some of the different branches of literature, and in causing the most diligent search to be made for the writings of the ancients. With this view, also, he became himself an author,‡ and thus animated by his example, as well as by his protection, men of genius and abilities to enrich the sciences with their learned productions. He employed, moreover, a considerable number of able pens, in making valuable extracts from the commentaries and other compositions of the ancients; which extracts were preserved in certain places for the benefit and satisfaction of the curious; and thus, by various exertions of liberality and zeal, this learned prince restored the arts and sciences to a certain degree of life and vigor.§ But there were few of the Greeks who followed

\* See Jo. Alb. Fabricii Biblioth. Græc. lib. v. part. ii. cap. v. p. 363.

† Fabricius. lib. v. part. ii. cap. v. p. 486.

‡ We have yet remaining the following productions of this prince: The Life of the Emperor Basilus;—a Treatise upon the Art of Governing, in which he investigates the origin of several nations, treats of their power, their progress, their revolutions, and their decline, and gives a series of their princes and rulers;—a Discourse concerning the Manner of forming a Land Army and Naval Force in Order of Battle;—Two Books concerning the eastern and western Provinces, which may be considered as an account of the state of the empire in the time of this prince.

§ All this appears evident from the accounts left upon record by Zonaras, in his Annales, tom. iii.

this great and illustrious example; nor did any of the succeeding emperors equal these two excellent princes in zeal for the advancement of learning, or in lending, by protection and encouragement, an auspicious hand to raise, out of obscurity and dejection, neglected and depressed genius. But (what is still more remarkable) Constantine Porphyrogeneta, whom we have now been representing as the restorer of letters, and whom the Greeks unanimously admire in this character, is supposed by some to have done considerable prejudice to the cause of learning by the very means he employed to promote its advancement; for, by employing learned men to extract from the writers of antiquity what they thought might contribute to the improvement of the various arts and sciences, he gave too much occasion to neglect the sources, and flattered the indolence of the effeminate Greeks, who confined their studies to these extracts, and neglected, in effect, the perusal of the writers from whom they were drawn. Hence it unfortunately happened, that many of the most celebrated authors of antiquity were lost, at this time, through the sloth and negligence of the Greeks.

II. This method, as the event manifestly showed, was really detrimental to the progress of true learning and genius. And accordingly we find among the Greek writers of this century only a small number, who acquired a distinguished and shining reputation in the republic of letters; so that the fair and engaging prospects which seemed to arise in the cause of learning from the munificence and zeal of its imperial patrons, vanished in a short time; and though the seeds of science were richly sown, the natural expectations of an abundant harvest were unhappily disappointed. Nor did the cause of philosophy succeed better than that of literature. Philosophers indeed there were; and some of them were not destitute of genius and abilities; but not one of them rendered his name immortal by productions that were worthy of being transmitted to posterity. A certain number of rhetoricians and grammarians, a few poets who were above contempt, and several historians who, without deserving the highest encomiums, were not totally destitute of merit, were the members that composed, at this time, the republic of letters in Greece, whose inhabitants seemed to take pleasure in those kinds of literature alone, in which industry, imagination, and memory are concerned.

III. Egypt, though at this time it groaned under a heavy and exasperating yoke of oppression and bondage, produced writers, who, in genius and learning, were no-wise inferior to the most eminent of the Grecian literati. Among the many examples we might mention to prove the truth of this assertion, we shall confine ourselves to that of Eutyechius, bishop of Alexandria, who cultivated the sciences of physic and theology with the greatest success, and cast a new light upon them both by his

excellent writings. The Arabians, during this whole century, preserved that noble passion for the arts and sciences, which had been kindled among them in the preceding age; and hence their country abounded with physicians, mathematicians, and philosophers, whose names and characters, together with an account of their respective abilities and talents, are given by Leo Africanus and other literary historians.

IV. The Latins present to us a spectacle of a very different kind. They were almost without exception sunk in the most brutish and barbarous ignorance; so that, according to the unanimous accounts of the most credible writers, nothing could be more melancholy and deplorable than the darkness that reigned in the western world during this century, which, with respect to learning and philosophy at least, may be called the *Iron Age* of the Latins.\* Some learned men of modern times have, we confess, ventured to call this in question: but their doubts are certainly without foundation, and the matter of fact is too firmly established by unquestionable authorities to lose any part of its credit in consequence of the objections they allege against it.† It is true, there were public schools founded in most of the European provinces, some of which were erected in the monasteries, and the rest in those cities where the bishops resided. It is also true, that through this dismal night of ignorance there shone forth from time to time, and more especially toward the conclusion of this century, some geniuses of a superior order, who eyed with ardour the paths of science, and cast some rays of light upon the darkness of a barbarous age. But they were very few in number, and their extreme rarity is a sufficient proof of the infelicity of the times in which they appeared. In the seminaries of learning, such as they were, the seven liberal arts were taught in the most unskilful and miserable manner by the monks, who esteemed the arts and sciences no farther than as they were subservient to the in-

terests of religion, or, to speak more properly, to the views of superstition.

V. They who were the most learned and judicious among the monastic orders, and who were desirous of employing usefully a part of their leisure, applied themselves to the composition of annals and histories, which savoured of the ignorance and barbarism of the times. Such were Abo, Luitprand, Wittekind, Fulcin, Johannes Capuanus, RATHERIUS, Floard, Notker, Ethelbert, and others, who, though very different from each other in their respective degrees of merit, were all ignorant of the true nature and rules of historical composition. Several of the poets of this age gave evident marks of true genius; but they were strangers to the poetic art, which was not indeed necessary to satisfy a people utterly destitute of elegance and taste. The grammarians and rhetoricians of these unhappy times are scarcely worthy of mention; their method of instructing was full of absurdities; and their rules were trivial, and, for the most part, injudicious. The same judgment may be formed in general of the geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music, which were more or less taught in the public schools, and of which a more particular account would be unstructive and insipid.

VI. The philosophy of the Latins extended no farther than the single science of logic or dialectics, which they looked upon as the sum and substance of all human wisdom. But this logic, which was so highly admired, was drawn without the least perspicuity or method from a book of Categories, which some have unjustly attributed to Augustin, and others to Porphyry. It is true, indeed, that the Timæus of Plato, the Topica of Cicero and Aristotle, and the book of the latter concerning interpretation, with other compositions of the Greeks and Romans, were in the hands of several of the doctors of this century, as we learn from credible accounts; but the same accounts inform us, that the true sense of these excellent authors was scarcely understood by any of those who daily perused them.\* It will appear, no doubt, surprising, that in such an ignorant age such a subtle question as that concerning universal ideas should ever have been thought of; true however it is, that the famous controversy, whether universal ideas belonged to the class of objects or of mere names (a controversy which perplexed and bewildered the Latin doctors in succeeding times, and gave rise to the opposite sects of the Nominalists and Realists,) was started for the first time in this century. Accordingly we find, in several passages of the writers of this period, the seeds and beginnings of this tedious and intricate dispute.†

\* The testimonies that prove the ignorance which prevailed in the tenth century, are collected by Du Boulay, in his *Historia Acad. Paris.* tom. i. p. 288; and also by Lud. Ant. Muratori, in his *Antiquitat. Ital. medii ævi.* tom. iii. p. 831, et tom. iv. p. 111, &c.

† The famous Leibnitz, in his preface to the *Cod. Juris Nat. et Gentium Diplomati.* affirms that more knowledge and learning existed in the tenth century, than in the succeeding ages, particularly in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. But this is washing the Ethiopian; it is an extravagant assertion, and borders upon paradox. We shall be better directed in our notions of this matter by Mabillon, in his *Præfat. ad Act. Bened. Quint. Sæc.* p. 2, by the authors of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France.* and by Le Bouff's *Dissertation de Statu Literarum in Francia.* a Carolo M. ad Regem Robertum; who all agree in acknowledging the gross ignorance of this century, though they would engage us to believe that its barbarism and darkness were not so hideous as they are commonly represented. There are, indeed, several considerations that render the reasons and testimonies even of these writers not a little defective; but we agree with them so far, as to grant that all learning and knowledge were not absolutely extinguished in Europe at this time, and that, in the records of this century, we shall find a few chosen spirits, who pierced through the cloud of ignorance that covered the multitude.

\* Gunzo. *Epistol. ad Monachos Augienses* in Martene's *Collect. Ampliss. Monumentor. Veter.* tom. iii. p. 304.

† This appears evident from the following remarkable passage, which the reader will find in the 304th page of the work cited in the preceding note, and in which the learned Gunzo expresses himself in the following manner: "Aristoteles, genus, speciem, differentiam, proprium et accidens, subsistere denegavit, quæ Platon; subsistentia persuasit. Aristoteles in Platoni magis credendum putatis? Magna est utriusque auctoritas, quatenus vix audeat quis

VII. The drooping sciences found an eminent and illustrious patron, toward the conclusion of this century, in the learned Gerbert, a native of France, who, upon his elevation to the pontificate, assumed the title of Sylvester II. The genius of this famous pontiff was extensive and sublime, embracing all the branches of literature; but its more peculiar bent was turned toward mathematical studies. Mechanics, geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and every other kind of knowledge that had the least affinity to these important sciences, were cultivated by this restorer of learning with the most ardent zeal, and not without success, as his writings abundantly testify; nor did he stop here, but employed every method that was proper to encourage and animate others to the culture of the liberal arts and sciences. The effects of this noble zeal were visible in Germany, France, and Italy, both in this and in the following century; as by the writings, example, and exhortations of Gerbert, many were incited to the study of physic, mathematics, and philosophy, and in general to the pursuit of science in all its branches. If, indeed, we compare this learned pontiff with the mathematicians of modern times, his merit, in that point of view, will almost totally disappear under such a disadvantageous comparison; for his geometry, though it be easy and perspicuous, is merely elementary and superficial.\* Yet, such as it was, it was marvellous in an age of barbarism and darkness, and surpassed the apprehension of those pygmy philosophers, whose eyes, under the auspicious direction of Gerbert, were just beginning to open upon the light. Hence it was, that the geometrical figures, described by this mathematical pontiff, were regarded by the monks as magical operations, and the pontiff himself was treated as a magician and a disciple of Satan.†

VIII. It was not however to the fecundity of his genius alone, that Gerbert was indebted for the knowledge with which he now began to enlighten the European provinces; he had derived a part of his erudition, particularly in physic, mathematics, and philosophy, from the writings and instructions of the Arabians, who were settled in Spain. Thither he had repaired in pursuit of knowledge, and had spent some time in the seminaries of learning at Cordova and Seville, with a view of hearing the Arabian doctors;‡ and it was, perhaps, by his example, that the Europeans were directed and engaged to have recourse to this source of instruction in after times; for it is undeniably certain, that from the time of Gerbert,

\* *alterum alteri dignitate præferre.* Here we see plainly the seeds of discord sown, and the foundation laid for that knotty dispute which puzzled the metaphysical brains of the Latin doctors in after-times. Gunzo was not adventurous enough to attempt a solution of this intricate question, which he leaves undecided; others were less modest, without being more successful.

† This work was published by Pezsius, in his *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. iii. part. ii. p. 7.

‡ See the *Hist. Liter. de la France*, tom. vi. p. 558.—Du Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. i. p. 314, 319.—Naude, *Apologie pour les Français Hommes fausement accusés de la Magie*, chap. xix. sect. 1. Du Boulay, tom. i. p. 314.

such of the Europeans as were ambitious of making any considerable progress in physic, arithmetic, geometry, or philosophy, entertained the most eager and impatient desire of receiving instruction either from the academical lessons, or from the writings of the Arabian philosophers, who had founded schools in several parts of Spain and Italy. Hence it was, that the most celebrated productions of these doctors were translated into Latin; their tenets and systems were adopted with zeal in the European schools; and numbers went over to Spain and Italy to receive instruction from the mouths of these famous teachers, which were supposed to utter nothing but the deepest mysteries of wisdom and knowledge. However excessive this veneration for the learned Arabians may have been, it must be owned, that all the knowledge, whether of physic, astronomy, philosophy, or mathematics, which flourished in Europe from the tenth century, was originally derived from them: and that the Spanish Saracens, in a more particular manner, may be looked upon as the fathers of European philosophy.

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government during this Century.*

I. To those who consider the primitive dignity and the solemn nature of the ministerial character, the corruptions of the clergy must appear deplorable beyond all expression. These corruptions had risen to the most enormous height in that dismal period of the church which we have now before us. Both in the eastern and western provinces, the clergy were, for the most part, a most worthless set of men, shamefully illiterate and stupid, ignorant more especially in religious matters, equally enslaved to sensuality and superstition, and capable of the most abominable and flagitious deeds. This dismal degeneracy of the sacred order, according to the most credible accounts, principally arose from the scandalous examples of those who ought to have presented models of good conduct,—namely, the pretended chiefs and rulers of the universal church, who indulged themselves in the commission of odious crimes, and abandoned themselves to the lawless impulse of the most licentious passions without reluctance or remorse; who confounded, in short, all difference between just and unjust acts, to satisfy their impious ambition; and whose spiritual empire was such a diversified scene of iniquity and violence, as never was exhibited under any of those temporal tyrants, who have been the scourges of mankind. We may form some notion of the Grecian patriarchs from the single example of Theophylact, who, according to the testimonies of the most respectable writers, made the most impious traffic of ecclesiastical promotions, and expressed no sort of care about any thing but his dogs and horses.\* Degenerate, however, and licentious

\* This *exemplary* prelate, who sold every ecclesiastical benefice as soon as it became vacant



as these patriarchs might be, they were, in general, less profligate and indecent than the Roman pontiffs.

II. The history of the popes, who lived in this century, is a history of so many monsters, and not of men, and exhibits a horrible series of the most flagitious, tremendous, and complicated crimes, as all writers, even those of the Romish communion, unanimously confess. The source of these disorders must be sought principally in the calamities that fell upon the greatest part of Europe, and which afflicted Italy in a particular manner, after the extinction of the race of Charlemagne. On the death of Benedict IV., in 903, Leo V. was raised to the pontificate, which he enjoyed no longer than forty days, being dethroned by Christopher, and cast into prison. Christopher, in his turn, was deprived of the pontifical dignity in the following year by Sergius III., a Roman presbyter, seconded by the protection and influence of Adalbert, a most powerful Tuscan prince, who had a supreme and unlimited direction in all the affairs that were transacted at Rome. Anastasius III., and Lando, who, on the death of Sergius, in 914, were raised successively to the papal dignity, enjoyed it but for a short time, and did nothing that could contribute to render their names illustrious.

III. After the death of Lando, which happened 914, Alberic,\* marquis or count of Tuscany, whose opulence was prodigious, and whose authority in Rome was despotic and unlimited, obtained the pontificate for John X., archbishop of Ravenna, in compliance with the solicitation of Theodora, his mother-in-law, whose lewdness was the principle that interested her in this promotion.† This infamous election will not surprise such as know that the laws of Rome were at this time absolutely silent; that the dictates of justice and equity were overpowered and suspended; and that all things were carried on in that great city by interest or corruption, by violence or fraud. John X., though in other respects a scandalous example of iniquity and lewdness in the papal chair, acquired a certain degree of reputation by his glorious campaign against the Saracens, whom he drove from the settlement which they had made upon the banks of the Garigli-

had in his stable above 2000 hunting horses, which he fed with pig-nuts, pistachios, dates, dried grapes, and figs steeped in the most exquisite wines, to all which he added the richest perfumes. On Holy Thursday, as he was celebrating high-mass, his groom brought him the joyful news that one of his favourite mares had foaled upon which he threw down the liturgy, left the church, and ran in raptures to the stable, where having expressed his joy at that grand event, he returned to the altar to finish the divine service, which he had left interrupted during his absence. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. livre IV.

§ \* It was Albert or Adalbert, of whom Dr. Mosheim here speaks. Alberic was grandson to the elder Theodora, by her daughter Marozia, who was married to Albert. See Spanheim, Eccles. Hist. Secul. x. p. 1432.—Fleury, Hist. eccles. livre 54. The latter historian is of opinion, that it was the younger Theodora, the sister of Marozia, who, from an amorous principle, raised John to the pontificate.

§ † Theodora, mistress of Rome, procured the elevation of John, that she might continue the licentious commerce in which she had lived with that canal ecclesiastic for many years before.

ano.\* He did not, however, long enjoy his glory; for the enmity of Marozia, daughter of Theodora and wife of Alberic, proved fatal to him; for this infamous female, having espoused Wido, or Guy, marquis of Tuscany, after the death of her first consort, engaged him to seize the wanton pontiff, who was her mother's lover, and to put him to death in the prison where he lay confined. This licentious pontiff was succeeded by Leo VI., who sat but seven months in the apostolic chair, which was filled after him by Stephen VII. The death of the latter, which happened in 931, presented to the ambition of Marozia an object worthy of its grasp; and accordingly she raised to the papal dignity John XI., who was the fruit of her lawless amours with one of the pretended successors of St. Peter, Sergius III., whose adulterous commerce with that infamous woman gave an *infallible* guide to the Romish church.‡

IV. John XI., who was placed at the head of the church by the credit and influence of his mother, was pulled down from this summit of spiritual grandeur, in 933, by Alberic his half-brother, who had conceived the utmost aversion against him. His mother Marozia had, after the death of Wido, entered anew into the bonds of matrimony with Hugo, king of Italy, who, having offended his step-son Alberic, felt severely the weight of his resentment, which vented its fury upon the whole family; for Alberic drove out of Rome not only Hugo, but also Marozia and her son the pontiff, and confined them in prison, where the latter ended his days in 936. The four pontiffs, who, in their turns, succeeded John XI., and filled the papal chair until the year 956, were Leo VII., Stephen VIII., Marinus II., and Agapet, whose characters were much better than that of their predecessor, and whose government, at least, was not attended with those tumults and revolutions that had so often shaken the pontifical throne, and banished from Rome the inestimable blessings of peace and concord. On the death of Agapet, which happened in 956; Alberic II., who to the dignity of Roman consul joined a degree of authority and opulence which nothing could resist, raised to the pontificate his son Octavian, who was yet in the early bloom of youth, and destitute, besides, of every quality that was requisite for discharging the duties of that high and important office. This unworthy pontiff assumed the name of John XII., and thus introduced the custom that has since been adopted by all his successors in the see of

§ \* In the original we have *Montem Garilianum*, which is, undoubtedly, a mistake, as the Garigliano is a river in the Kingdom of Naples, and not a mountain.

† The character and conduct of Marozia are acknowledged to have been most infamous by the general testimony both of ancient and modern historians, who affirm, with one voice, that John XI. was the fruit of her carnal commerce with Sergius III. Eccard alone (in his *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. iii.) has ventured to clear her from this reproach, and to assert, that Sergius, before his elevation to the pontificate, was her lawful and first husband. The attempt, however, is highly extravagant, if not imprudent, to pretend to acquit, without the least testimony or proof of her innocence, a woman who is known to have been entirely destitute of every principle of virtue.

Rome, of assuming another name upon the acquisition of the pontificate.

V. The fate of John XII, was as unhappy as his promotion had been scandalous. Unable to bear the oppressive yoke of Berenger II., king of Italy, he sent ambassadors, in 960, to Otho the Great, urging him to march into Italy at the head of a powerful army, to deliver the church and the people from the tyranny under which they groaned. To these entreaties the perplexed pontiff added a solemn promise, that, if the German monarch would come to his assistance, he would array him with the purple and the other ensigns of sovereignty, and proclaim him emperor of the Romans. Otho received this embassy with pleasure, marched into Italy at the head of a large body of troops, and was accordingly saluted by John with the promised title. The pontiff, however, soon perceiving that he had acted with too much precipitation, repented of the step he had taken; and, though he had sworn allegiance to the emperor, as his lawful sovereign, in the most solemn manner, he broke his oath, and joined with Adalbert, the son of Berenger, against Otho. This revolt was not left unpunished. The emperor returned to Rome in 963; called a council, before which he accused and convicted the pope of many crimes; and, after having degraded him in the most ignominious manner from his high office, he appointed Leo VIII. to fill his place. On Otho's departure from Rome, John returned to that city, and in a council, which he assembled in 964, condemned the pontiff whom the emperor had elected, and soon after died in a miserable and violent manner. After his death the Romans chose Benedict V., bishop of Rome, in opposition to Leo; but the emperor annulled this election, restored Leo to the papal chair, and carried Benedict to Hamburg, where he died in exile.\*

VI. The prelates who governed the see of Rome from Leo VIII., who died in 956, to Gerbert, or Sylvester II., who was raised to the pontificate toward the conclusion of this century, were more happy in their administration, as well as more decent in their conduct, than their infamous predecessors; yet none of them acted in so exemplary a manner as to deserve the applause that is due to eminent virtue. John XIII., who was raised to the pontificate in 965, by the authority of Otho the Great, was driven out of Rome in the beginning of his administration; but in the following year, on the emperor's return to Italy, he was restored to his high dignity, in the

calm possession of which he ended his days in 972. His successor Benedict VI. was not so happy. Thrown into prison by Crescentius, son of the famous Theodora, in consequence of the hatred which the Romans had conceived both against his person and government, he was loaded with all sorts of ignominy, and was strangled in 974, in the apartment where he lay confined. Unfortunately for him, Otho the Great, whose power and severity had kept the Romans in awe, died in 973; and with him expired that order and discipline which he had restored in Rome by salutary laws executed with impartiality and vigor. That event changed the aspect of affairs. Licentiousness and disorder, seditions and assassinations, resumed their former sway, and diffused their horrors through that miserable city. After the death of Benedict, the papal chair was filled by Franco, who assumed the name of Boniface VII., but enjoyed his dignity only for a short time; for scarcely a month had passed after his promotion, when he was deposed from his office, expelled from the city, and succeeded by Donus II.,\* who is known by no other circumstance than his name. Upon his death, which happened in 975, Benedict VII. was created pontiff; and, during the space of nine years, ruled the church without much opposition, and ended his days in peace. This peculiar happiness, without doubt, principally resulted from the opulence and credit of the family to which he belonged; for he was nearly related to the famous Alberic, whose power, or rather despotism, had been unlimited in Rome.

VII. His successor John XIV., who from the bishopric of Pavia was raised to the pontificate, derived no support from his birth, which was obscure; nor did he continue to enjoy the protection of Otho III., to whom he owed his promotion. Unsupported as he thus was, calamities fell upon him with fury, and misery concluded his transitory grandeur; for Boniface VII., who had usurped the papal throne in 974, and in a little time after had been banished from Rome, returned from Constantinople (whither he had fled for refuge,) seized the unhappy pontiff, threw him into prison, and afterwards put him to death. Thus Boniface resumed the government of the church; but his reign was also transitory; for he died about six months after his restoration.† He was succeeded by John XV., whom some writers call John XVI., because, as they allege, there was another John, who ruled the church during a period of four months, and whom they consequently call John XV.‡ Leaving it to the reader's choice to call that John of whom we speak, the XVth or the XVIth of that name,

\* In the account I have here given of the pontiffs of this century, I have consulted Muratori's *Scriptores Rerum Italicarum*, as also Baronius, Peter de Marca, Sigonius de Regno Italiae (with the learned annotations of Ant. Saxius,) the same Muratori in his *Annales Italiae*, Pagi, and other writers, all of whom had access to the fountain-head, and to several ancient manuscripts, not yet published. The narrations I have here given, are certainly true upon the whole. It must, however, be confessed, that many parts of the papal history lie yet in great obscurity, and, therefore, require farther illustration; nor will I deny that a spirit of partiality has been extremely detrimental to the history of the pontiffs, by corrupting it, and rendering it uncertain in a multitude of places.

† \* Some writers place Donus II. before Benedict VI. See the *Tabulae Synopticae Hist. Eccles.* by the learned Pfaff.

‡ † Fleury says, eleven months.  
§ ‡ Among these authors, is the learned Pfaff: but the Roman Catholic writers, whom Dr. Mosheim follows with good reason, do not reckon, among the number of the pontiffs, that John who governed the church of Rome, during the space of four months after the death of Boniface VII., because he was never duly invested, by consecration, with the papal dignity.

we shall only observe that he possessed the papal dignity from the year 985 to 996; that his administration was as happy as the troubled state of the Roman affairs would permit; and that the tranquillity he enjoyed was not so much the effect of his wisdom and prudence, as of his being a Roman by birth, and a descendant from noble and illustrious ancestors. It is certain, at least, that his successor Gregory V., who was a German, and who was elected pontiff by the order of Otho III. in 996, met with a quite different treatment; for Crescens, the Roman consul, drove him out of the city, and conferred his dignity upon John XVI., formerly known by the name of Philagathus. This revolution was not, however, permanent in its effects; for Otho III., alarmed by these disturbances at Rome, marched into Italy in 998, at the head of a powerful army; and, imprisoning the new pontiff, whom the soldiers, in the first moment of their fury, had maimed and abused in a most barbarous manner, he re-instated Gregory in his former honors. It was on the death of the latter pontiff, which happened soon after his restoration, that the same emperor raised to the papal dignity his preceptor and friend, the famous and learned Gerbert or Sylvester II., whose promotion was attended with the universal approbation of the Roman people.\*

VIII. Amidst these frequent commotions, and even amidst the repeated enormities and flagitious crimes of those who gave themselves out for Christ's vicegerents upon earth, the power and authority of the Roman pontiff gradually and imperceptibly increased; such were the effects of that ignorance and superstition which reigned without control in these miserable times. Otho the Great had indeed published a solemn edict, prohibiting the election of any pontiff without the previous knowledge and consent of the emperor; which decree, as all writers unanimously agree, remained in force from the time of its publication to the conclusion of this century. It is also to be observed, that the same emperor (and likewise his son and grandson, who succeeded him in the empire) maintained, without interruption, the right of supremacy over the city of Rome, its territory, and its pontiff, as may be clearly proved by a multitude of examples. It is, moreover, equally certain that the German, French, and Italian bishops, who were not ignorant of the nature of their privileges and the extent of their jurisdiction, were, during this whole century, perpetually upon their guard against every eventual attempt of the pope for the exclusive assumption of a legislative authority in the church. But, notwithstanding all this, the bishops of Rome found the means of augmenting their influence, and partly by open violence, partly by secret and fraudulent stratagems, encroached, not only upon the privileges of the bishops, but also upon the ju-

risdiction and rights of kings and emperors.\* Their ambitious attempts were seconded and vindicated by the scandalous adulation of certain mercenary prelates, who exalted the dignity and prerogatives of, what they called, the apostolic see, in the most pompous and extravagant terms. Several learned writers have observed, that in this century certain bishops maintained publicly that the popes were not only bishops of Rome, but of the whole world, an assertion which hitherto none had ventured to make;† and that even among the French clergy it had been affirmed by some, that the authority of the bishops, though divine in its origin, was conveyed to them by St. Peter, the prince of the apostles.‡

IX. The adventurous ambition of the bishops of Rome, who left no means unemployed to extend their jurisdiction, exhibited an example which the inferior prelates followed with the most zealous and indefatigable emulation. Several bishops and abbots had begun, even from the time that the descendants of Charlemagne sat on the imperial throne, to enlarge their prerogatives, and had actually obtained, for their tenants and their possessions, an immunity from the jurisdiction of the counts and other magistrates, as also from taxes and imposts of all kinds. But in this century they carried their pretensions still farther; aimed at the civil jurisdiction over the cities and territories in which they exercised a spiritual dominion, and even aspired to the honors and authority of dukes, marquises, and counts of the empire. Among the principal circumstances that animated their zeal in the pursuit of these dignities, we may reckon the perpetual and bitter contests concerning jurisdiction and other matters, that reigned between the dukes and counts, who were governors of cities, and the bishops and abbots, who were their spiritual rulers. The latter, therefore, seizing the opportunity that was offered to them by the superstition of the times, used every method that might be effectual to obtain that high rank, which had hitherto stood in the way of their ambition; and the emperors and kings to whom they addressed their presumptuous requests, generally granted them, either from a desire of pacifying the contentions and quarrels that arose between civil and military magistrates, or from a devout reverence for the sacred order, or with a view to augment their own authority, and to confirm their dominion by the good services of the bishops, whose influence was very great over the minds of the people. Such were the different motives that engaged princes to enlarge the authority and jurisdiction of the clergy; and hence we see from this century downwards so many bishops and abbots invested with characters, employments, and titles so foreign to their spiritual offices and functions, and clothed with the honors of dukes, marquises, counts, and viscounts.§

\* The history of the pontiffs of this period is not only extremely barren of interesting events, but also obscure, and uncertain in many respects. In the accounts I have here given of them, I have followed principally Lud. Ant. Muratori's *Annales Italie*, and the *Comatus Chronologico-Historicus de Romanis Pontificibus*, which the learned Pap-brochius prefixed to his *Acta Sanctorum Mensis Maii*.

\* Several examples of these usurpations may be found in the *Histoire du Droit Eccles. Francois*, tom. i. p. 247, edit. in 8vo.

† *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. vi. p. 98.

‡ The same work, p. 186.

§ The learned Louis Thomassin, in his book, *de Disciplina Ecclesie veteri et nova*, tom. iii. lib. i.

X. Beside the reproach of the grossest ignorance, which the Latin clergy in this century so justly deserved,<sup>9</sup> they were also chargeable, in a heinous degree, with two other odious vices, even *concubinage* and *simony*, which the greatest part of the writers of these unhappy times acknowledge and deplore. As to the former of these vices, it was practised too openly to admit any doubt. The priests, and what is still more surprising, even the sanctimonious monks, fell victims to the triumphant charms of the sex, and to the imperious dominion of their carnal lusts; and, entering into the bonds of wedlock or concubinage, squandered away in a most luxurious manner, with their wives and mistresses, the revenues of the church.† The other vice reigned with an equal degree of impudence and licentiousness. Elections of bishops and abbots were no longer adjusted by the laws of the church; but kings and princes, or their ministers and favourites, either conferred these ecclesiastical dignities upon their friends and creatures, or sold them, without shame, to the highest bidder.‡ Hence it happened, that the most stupid and flagitious wretches were frequently advanced to the most important stations in the church; and that, upon several occasions, even soldiers, civil magistrates, and counts, were by a strange metamorphosis converted into bishops and abbots. Gregory VII. endeavoured, in the following century, to put a stop to these two growing evils.

XI. While the monastic orders, among the Greeks and Orientals, still maintained an external appearance of religion and decency, the Latin monks, toward the commencement of this century, had so entirely lost sight of all subordination and discipline, that the greatest part of them knew not even by name the rule of St. Benedict, which they were obliged to observe. A noble Frank, whose name was Odo, a man as learned and pious as the ignorance and superstition of the times would per-

cap. xviii., has collected a multitude of examples to prove that the titles and prerogatives of dukes and counts were conferred upon certain prelates so early as the ninth century; and some bishops trace *evcu* as far back as the eighth century the beginning of that princely dominion which they now enjoy. But notwithstanding all this, if I do not grossly err, there cannot be produced any evident and indisputable example of this princely dominion, previous to the tenth century.

\* Ratherius, speaking of the clergy of Verona in his *Itinerarium*, which is published in the *Spicilegium* of M. d'Acheri, tom. i. p. 281, says, that he found many among them who could not even repeat the Apostles' Creed. His words are, "Sciscitatus de fide illorum, inveni plurimos neque ipsum sapere." "Symbolum, qui fuisse creditur Apostolorum."

† That this custom was introduced toward the commencement of this century is manifest, from the testimony of Ordericus Vitalis and other writers, and also from a letter of Mancio, bishop of Chalons in Champagne, published by Mabillon, in his *Analecta veterum*. As to the charge brought against the Italian monks, of their spending the treasures of the church upon their wives or mistresses, see Hugo's narrative de *Monasterii Farfensium destructione*, in Muratori's *Antiq. Ital. mediæ ævi*, tom. vi. p. 278.

‡ Many infamous and striking examples and proofs of simoniacal practice may be found in the work entitled *Gallia Christiana*, tom. i. p. 23, 37; tom. ii. p. 173, 179. Add to this *Abbotis Apologotum*, published at the end of the *Codex Canon. Pithæi*, p. 398, as also Mabillon's *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v.

mit, endeavoured to remedy this disorder; nor were his attempts totally unsuccessful. This zealous ecclesiastic being created, in 927, abbot of Clugni, in the province of Burgundy, on the death of Berno, not only obliged the monks to live in a rigorous observance of their rules, but also added to their discipline a new set of ceremonies, which, notwithstanding the air of sanctity that attended them, were, in reality, insignificant and trifling, and yet, at the same time, severe and burthensome.\* This new rule of discipline covered its author with glory, and, in a short time, was adopted in all the European convents: for the greatest part of the ancient monasteries, which had been founded in France, Germany, Italy, Britain, and Spain, received the rule of the monks of Clugni, to which also the convents, newly established, were subjected by their founders; and thus it was, that the Order of Clugni, attained that high degree of eminence and authority, opulence and dignity, which it exhibited to the Christian world in the following century.‡

XII. The more eminent Greek writers of this century are easily numbered; among them we find Simeon, high treasurer of Constantinople, who, from his giving a new and more elegant style to the Lives of the Saints, which had been originally composed in a gross and barbarous language, was distinguished by the title of *Metaphrast*, or *Translator*.‡ He did not, however, content himself with digesting, polishing, and embellishing the saintly chronicle, but went so far as to augment it with a

\* See Mabillon, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. iii. p. 386, and *Pref. ad Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedict.* Sæc. v. p. 26. See also the *Acta Sanctior. Bened. Sæc. v.* p. 66, in which he speaks largely of Berno, the first abbot of Clugni, who laid the foundations of that order, and of Odo (p. 122.) who gave it a new degree of perfection. The learned Helyot, in his *Histoire des Ordres Religieux*, tom. v. p. 184, has given a complete and elegant history of the order of Clugni; and the subsequent state of that famous monastery is described by Martenne, in his *Voyage Liter. de deux Benedict.* part. i. p. 227.

† The majority of ecclesiastical historians do not appear to have perceived the true meaning and force of the word *order* in its application to the Cistercian monks, those of Clugni, and other convents. They imagine that this term signifies a new monastic institution, as if the Order of Clugni imported a new set of monks never before heard of. But this is apparently a great error, into which they fall by confounding the ancient meaning of that term with the sense in which it is used in modern times. The word *order*, when employed by the writers of the tenth century, signified no more at first than a certain form or rule of monastic discipline; but, from this primitive signification, another (a secondary one) was gradually derived: so that by the same word is also understood, an association or confederacy of several monasteries, subjected to the same rule of discipline under the jurisdiction and inspection of one common chief. Hence we conclude, that the Order of Clugni was not a new set of monks, such as were the Carthusian, Dominican, and Franciscan Orders; but signified, only, first, that new institution, or rule of discipline, which Odo had prescribed to the Benedictine monks, who were settled at Clugni, and, afterwards, that prodigious multitude of monasteries throughout Europe, which received the rule established at Clugni, and were formed by association into a sort of community, of which the abbot of Clugni was the chief.

‡ See Leo Allatius, de *Simeonum Scriptis*, p. 24.—Jo. Bollandus, *Pref. ad Acta Sanctorum Antwerp.* sect. iii. p. 6.

multitude of trifling fables drawn from the fecundity of his own imagination.

Nicon, an Armenian monk, composed a treatise concerning the Religion of the Armenians, which is not altogether contemptible.

Some place in this century Olympiodorus and Ecumenius,\* who distinguished themselves by those compilations which were known by the name of *Catena*, or *Chains*, and of which we have had occasion to speak more than once in the course of this history. But it is by no means certain, that these two writers belong to the tenth century, and they are placed there only by conjecture.

It is much more probable, that the learned Suidas, author of the celebrated Greek Lexicon, lived in the period now before us.

Among the Arabians, no author acquired a higher reputation than Eutychius, bishop of Alexandria, whose Annals, with several other productions of his learned pen, are still extant.†

XIII. The most eminent of the Latin writers of this century was Gerbert, or Sylvester II., who has already been mentioned with the applause due to his singular merit. The other writers of this age were not very eminent in any respect.

Odo, who laid the foundations of the celebrated Order of Clugni, left several productions in which the grossest superstition reigns, and in which it is difficult to perceive the smallest marks of true genius or solid judgment.‡

The learned reader will form a different opinion of Ratheir, bishop of Verona, whose works, yet extant, afford evident proofs of sagacity and judgment, and breathe throughout an ardent love of virtue.§

Atto, bishop of Vercelli, composed a treatise, *depressuris Ecclesiasticis*, i. e. concerning the Sufferings and Grievances of the Church, which shows in their true colours the spirit and complexion of the times.||

Dunstan, the famous abbot of Glastonbury, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, composed in favour of the monks a book *de Concordia Regularum*, i. e. concerning the Harmony of the Monastic Rules.¶

Elfric, archbishop of Canterbury, acquired a considerable reputation, among the Anglo-Saxons established in Britain, by various productions.\*\*

Burchard, bishop of Worms, is highly esteemed among the canonists on account of his celebrated *Decreta*, divided into twenty books, though a part of the merit of this collection of canons may be considered as due to Obert, with whose assistance it was composed.††

Odilo, archbishop of Lyons,\* was the author of some insipid discourses, and other productions, whose mediocrity has almost sunk them in a total oblivion.

As to the historical writers and annalists who lived in this century, their works and abilities have been already considered in their proper place.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.*

I. THE state of religion in this century was such as might be expected in times of prevailing ignorance and corruption. The most important doctrines of Christianity were disfigured and perverted in the most wretched manner; and such as had preserved, in unskillful hands, their primitive purity, were nevertheless obscured with a multitude of vain opinions and idle fancies, so that their intrinsic excellence and lustre were little attended to. This will appear evident to those who look with the smallest degree of attention into the writers of this age. Both Greeks and Latins placed the essence and life of religion in the worship of images and departed saints; in seeking with zeal, and preserving with a devout care and veneration, the sacred relics of holy men and women, and in accumulating riches upon the priests and monks, whose opulence increased with the progress of superstition. Scarcely did any Christian dare to approach the throne of God, without rendering first the saints and images propitious by a solemn round of expiatory rites and lustrations. The ardour with which relics were sought almost surpasses credibility; it had seized all ranks and orders among the people, and had become a sort of fanaticism and phrensy; and, if the monks are to be believed, the Supreme Being interposed, in a special and extraordinary manner, to discover, to doting old women and bareheaded friars, the places where the bones or carcases of the saints lay dispersed or interred. The fears of purgatory, of that fire which was to destroy the remaining impurities of departed souls, were now carried to the greatest height, and far exceeded the terrifying apprehension of infernal torments; for they hoped to avoid the latter easily, by dying enriched with the prayers of the clergy, or covered with the merits and mediation of the saints, while from the pains of purgatory they thought there was no exemption. The clergy, therefore, finding these superstitious terrors admirably adapted to increase their authority and to promote their interest, used every method to augment them; and by the most pathetic discourses, accompanied with monstrous fables and fictitious miracles, they laboured to establish the doctrine of purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region.

Reliquie Manuscriptorum, tom. ii. p. 43.—Histoire Liter. de la France, tom. vii. p. 295.

†† \* Odilo was abbot of Clugni, and not archbishop of Lyons: for he obstinately refused the latter station, notwithstanding the urgent entreaties employed both by pontiffs and emperors to engage him to accept it. See Fleury Hist. Eccl. livre lix.

\* For an account of Ecumenius, see Montfaucon's Biblioth. Coisliniana, p. 271.

† See Jo. Albert. Fabricii Bibliographia Antiquaria, p. 179,—as also Ensebi Renaudot's Historia Patriarch. Alexandr. p. 347.

‡ Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. vi. p. 229.

§ Id. ibid. p. 339.

|| Id. ibid. p. 281.

¶ See the ample account that is given of this eminent prelate in Collier's Ecclesiastical History of England, vol. i. cent. x. p. 181, 183, &c.

\*\* We have a Grammar and a Dictionary composed by this learned prelate; as also an Anglo-Saxon translation of the first books of the Holy Scripture, a History of the Church, and 180 sermons. See Fleury, Hist. Eccl. livre lviii.

†† See the Chronicon Wormatiense in Ludwig's

II. The contests concerning predestination and grace, as also concerning the eucharist, that had agitated the church in the preceding century, were in this happily reduced to silence. This was the result of the mutual toleration that was practised by the contending parties, who, as we learn from writers of undoubted credit, left it to each other's free choice to retain, or to change their former opinions. Besides, the ignorance and stupidity of this degenerate age were ill suited to such deep inquiries as these contests demanded; nor was there any great degree of curiosity among an illiterate multitude to know the opinions of the ancient doctors concerning these and other knotty points of theology. Thus it happened, that the followers of Augustin and Pelagius flourished equally in this century; and that, if there were many who maintained the corporal presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy sacrament, there were still more who either came to no fixed determination upon this point, or declared it publicly as their opinion, that the divine Saviour was really absent from the eucharistical sacrament, and was received only by a certain inward impulse of faith, in a manner wholly spiritual.\* This mutual toleration, as it is easy to conclude from what has been already observed, must not be attributed either to the wisdom or virtue of an age, which was almost totally destitute of both. The truth of the matter is, that the divines of this century wanted both the capacity and the inclination to attack or defend any doctrine, whose refutation or defence required the smallest portion of learning or logic.

III. That the whole Christian world was covered, at this time, with a thick and gloomy veil of superstition, is evident from a prodigious number of testimonies and examples, which it is needless to mention. This horrible cloud, which hid almost every ray of truth from the eyes of the multitude, furnished the priests and monks with many opportunities of propagating absurd and ridiculous opinions, which contributed not a little to confirm their credit. Among these opinions, which so frequently dishonoured the Latin church, and produced from time to time such violent agitations, none occasioned such a general panic, or such dreadful impressions of terror or dismay, as a notion that now prevailed of the immediate approach of the day of judgment. This notion, which took its rise from a remarkable passage in the Revelations of St.

John,\* and had been entertained by some doctors in the preceding century, was advanced publicly by many at this time; and, spreading itself with an amazing rapidity through the European provinces, it threw them into the deepest consternation and anguish: for they imagined that St. John had clearly foretold that, after a thousand years from the birth of Christ, Satan was to be let loose from his prison; that Antichrist was to come, and the conflagration and destruction of the world were to follow these great and terrible events. Hence prodigious numbers of people abandoned all their civil connexions and their parental relations, and, giving over to the churches or monasteries all their lands, treasures, and worldly effects, repaired with the utmost precipitation to Palestine, where they imagined that Christ would descend from heaven to judge the world. Others devoted themselves by a solemn and voluntary oath to the service of the churches, convents, and priesthood, whose slaves they became, in the most rigorous sense of that word, performing daily their heavy tasks; and all this from a notion that the Supreme Judge would diminish the severity of their sentence, and look upon them with a more favourable and propitious eye, on account of their having made themselves the slaves of his ministers. When an eclipse of the sun or moon happened to be visible, the cities were deserted, and their miserable inhabitants fled for refuge to deep caverns, and hid themselves among the craggy rocks, and under the bending summits of steep mountains. The opulent attempted to bribe the Deity, and the saintly tribe, by rich donations conferred upon the sacerdotal and monastic orders, who were regarded as the immediate vicegerents of heaven. In many places, temples, palaces, and noble edifices, both public and private, were suffered to decay, and were even deliberately pulled down, from a notion that they were no longer of any use, since the final dissolution of all things approached. In a word, no language is sufficient to express the confusion and despair that tormented the minds of miserable mortals upon this occasion. This general delusion was, indeed, opposed and combated by the discerning few, who endeavoured to dispel these groundless terrors, and to efface the notion from which they arose, in the minds of the people. But their attempts were ineffectual; nor could the dreadful apprehensions of the superstitious multitude be entirely removed before the conclusion of this century. Then, when they saw that the

\* It is certain, that the Latin theologians of this century differed much in their sentiments about the manner in which the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist: this is granted by such of the Roman Catholic writers as have been ingenuous enough to sacrifice the spirit of party to the love of truth. That the doctrine of transubstantiation, as it is commonly called, was unknown to the English in this century, has been abundantly proved from the public homilies, by Rapin de Thoyras, in his History of England, vol. i. It is, however, to be confessed, on the other hand, that this absurd doctrine was already adopted by several French and German divines. ¶ For a more judicious account of the opinions of the Anglo-Saxon church concerning the eucharist, see Collier's Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, vol. i. cent. x.

¶ \* The passage here referred to, is in the twentieth chapter of the Book of Revelations, at the 2d, 3d, and 4th verses: "And he took hold of the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years;—and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled;—and after that he must be loosed a little season.—" And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

dreaped period had passed without the arrival of any great calamity, they began to understand that St. John had not really foretold what they so much feared.\*

IV. The number of the saints, who were looked upon as ministers of the kingdom of heaven, and whose patronage was esteemed such an unspeakable blessing, had now an extraordinary increase; and the celestial courts were filled with new legions of this species of beings, some of which, as we have had formerly occasion to observe, had no existence but in the imagination of their deluded clients and worshippers. This multiplication of saints may be easily accounted for, when we consider that superstition, the source of fear, had risen to such an enormous height in this age, as rendered the creation of new patrons necessary to calm the anxiety of trembling mortals. Besides, the corruption and impiety that now reigned with a horrid sway, and the licentiousness and dissolution that had so generally infected all ranks and orders of men, rendered the reputation of sanctity very easy to be acquired; for, amidst such a perverse generation, it demanded no great efforts of virtue to be esteemed holy, and this, no doubt, contributed to increase considerably the number of the celestial advocates. All those, to whom nature had given an austere complexion, a gloomy temper, or enthusiastic imagination, were, in consequence of an advantageous comparison with the profligate multitude, revered as the favorites of heaven and the friends of God.

The Roman pontiff, who before this period had pretended to the right of creating saints by his sole authority, gave, in this century, the first specimen of this spiritual power; for in the preceding ages there is no example of his having exercised this privilege alone. This specimen was given in 993, by John XV., who, with all the formalities of a solemn canonization, enrolled Udalric, bishop of Augsburg, in the number of the saints, and thus conferred upon him a title to the worship and veneration of Christians.† We must not, how-

\* Almost all the donations that were made to the church during this century, bear evident marks of this groundless panic that had seized all the European nations, as the reasons of these donations are generally expressed in the following words: "Appro-  
"pinqnante mundi termino," &c. i. e. "The end of  
"the world being now at hand," &c. Among the many undeniable testimonies that we have from ancient records of this universal delusion, that was so profitable to the sacerdotal order, we shall confine ourselves to the quotation of one very remarkable passage in the Apologeticum of Abbo, abbot of Fleury, adversus Arnulphum, i. e. Arnout bishop of Orleans, which apology is published by the learned Francis Pithou, in the Codex Canonum Ecclesie Romanæ, p. 401. The words of Abbo are as follow: "De fine quoque mundi coram populo sermonem in ecclesia Parisiorum adolescentulus audivi, quod statim finito mille annorum numero Antichristus adveniret, et non longo post tempore univærsale judicium succederet; cui prædicationi ex evangelicis, ac apocalypsi, et libro Danielis, qua potui virtute restiti. Denique et errorem, qui de fine mundi molevit, abbas meus beate memorie Richardus sagaci animo propulit, postquam literas a Lectariensibus accepit, quibus me respondere jussit. Nam fama pene totum mundum impleverat, quod, quando Annunceratio Domini in Parasceve contigisset, absque ullo scrupulo finis sæculi esset.

† Franc. Pagi Breviar. Pontif. Roman. tom. ii. p. 259.

ever, hence conclude, that after this period the privilege of canonizing new saints was vested solely in the pontiffs;\* for there are several examples upon record, which prove, that not only provincial councils, but also several of the first order among the bishops, advanced to the rank of saints such as they thought worthy of that high dignity, and continued thus to augment the celestial patrons of the church, without consulting the pope, until the twelfth century.† Then Alexander III. abrogated this privilege of the bishops and councils, and placed *canonization* in the number of the more important acts of authority,‡ which the sovereign pontiff alone, by a peculiar prerogative, was entitled to exercise.

V. The expositors and commentators, who attempted in this century to illustrate and explain the sacred writings, were too mean in their abilities, and too unsuccessful in their undertakings, to deserve more than a slight and transient notice; for it is extremely uncertain, whether or no the works of Olympiodorus and Eutimius are to be considered as the productions of this age. Among the Latins, Remi, or Remigius, bishop of Auxerre, continued the exposition of the Scriptures, which he had begun in the preceding century; but his work is highly defective in various respects; for he took very little pains in explaining the literal sense of the words, and employed the whole force of his fantastic genius in unfolding their pretended mystical signification, which he looked upon as infinitely more interesting than their plain and literal meaning. Besides, his explications are rarely the fruit of his own genius and invention, but are, generally speaking, mere compilations from ancient commentators. As to the Moral Observations of Odo upon the book of Job,§ they are transcribed from a work of Gregory the Great, which bears the same title. We mention no more; if, however, any are desirous of an ample account of those who were esteemed the principal commentators in this century, they will find it in a book written professedly upon this subject by Notkerus Balbulus.

VI. The science of theology was absolutely abandoned in this century; nor did either the Greek or Latin church furnish any writer who attempted to explain in a regular method the doctrines of Christianity. The Greeks were contented with the works of Damascenus, and the Latins with those of Augustin and Gregory, who were now considered as the greatest doctors that had adorned the church. Some added to these the writings of the venerable Bede and Rabanus Maurus. The moral science was still more neglected than that of theology in this wretched age, and was reduced to a certain number of dry and insipid homilies, and to the lives of the saints, which Smeon among the Greeks and Hubald, Odo, and

\* This absurd opinion has been maintained with warmth by Phd. Bonanni, in *Ins Numismata Pontif. Romanorum*, tom. i. p. 41.

† See Franc. Pagi Breviar. tom. ii. p. 260; tom. iii. p. 30.—Arm. de la Chapelle, *Biblioth. Anglois.*, tom. v. p. 105.—Mabillon, *Præfat. ad Sæc. v. Benedicti* p. 53.

‡ These were called the *Causæ Majores*.  
§ *Moralia in Jobum*.

Stephen,\* among the Latins, had drawn up with a seducing eloquence that covered the most impertinent fictions. Such was the miserable state of morals and theology in this century; in which, we may add, there did not appear any defence of the Christian religion against its professed enemies.

VII. The controversies between the Greek and Latin churches, were now carried on with less noise and impetuosity than in the preceding century, on account of the troubles and calamities of the times; yet they were not entirely reduced to silence.† The writers therefore who affirm, that this unlaiply schism was healed, and that the contending parties were really reconciled to each other for a certain space of time, have grossly mistaken the matter;‡ though it be, indeed, true, that the tumults of the times produced now and then a cessation of these contests, and occasioned several truces, which insidiously concealed the bitterest enmity, and served often as a cover to the most treacherous designs. The Greeks were, moreover, divided among themselves, and disputed with great warmth concerning the lawfulness of repeated§ marriages, to which violent contest the cause of Leo, surnamed the Philosopher, gave rise. This emperor, having buried successively three wives without having had by them any male issue, espoused a fourth, whose name was Zoe Carbinopsina, and who was born in the obscurity of a mean condition. As marriages contracted for the fourth time were pronounced impure and unlawful by the Greek canons, Nicolas, the patriarch of Constantinople, suspended the emperor, on this occasion, from the communion of the church. Leo, incensed at this rigorous proceeding, deprived Nicolas of the patriarchal dignity, and raised Euthymius to that high office, who, though he re-admitted the emperor to the bosom of the church, opposed the law which he had resolved to enact in order to render fourth marriages lawful. Upon this a schism, attended with the bitterest animosities, divided the clergy; one part of which declared for Nicolas, the other for Euthymius. Some time after this, Leo died, and was succeeded in the empire by Alexander, who deposed Euthymius, and restored Nicolas to his eminent rank in the church. No sooner was this zealous patriarch re-instated in his office, than he began to load the memory of the late emperor with the bitterest execrations and the most opprobrious invectives, and to maintain the unlawfulness of fourth marriages with the utmost obstinacy. In order to appease these tumults, which portended numberless calamities to the state, Constantine Porphyrogeneta, convoked an assembly of the clergy of Constantinople, in 920, in which

\* Bishop of Liege.

† Mich. Lequien, Dissert. i. Damascenica de Professione Spiritus Sancti. sect. xiii.—p. 12.—Fred. Spanheim, de perpetua Dissensione Ecclesie Oriental. et Occidental. part. iv. sect. vii. p. 523, tom. ii. op.

‡ Leo Allatus, de perpetua Consensione Ecclesie Orient. et Occident. lib. ii. cap. vii. p. 600.

§ Fourth marriages our author undoubtedly means, since second and third nuptials were allowed on certain conditions.

fourth marriages were absolutely prohibited, and marriages for the third time were permitted on certain conditions; and thus the public tranquillity was restored.\*

Several other contests of like moment arose among the Greeks during this century; and they serve to convince us of the ignorance that prevailed among that people, and of their blind veneration and zeal for the opinions of their ancestors.

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### *Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. In order to have some notion of the load of ceremonies under which the Christian religion groaned during this superstitious age, we have only to cast an eye upon the acts of the various councils which were assembled in England, Germany, France, and Italy. The number of ceremonies increased in proportion to that of the saints, which multiplied from day to day; for each new saintly patron had appropriated to his service a new festival, a new form of worship, a new round of religious rites; and the clergy, notwithstanding their gross stupidity in other matters, discovered, in the creation of new ceremonies, a marvellous fertility of invention, attended with the utmost dexterity and artifice. It is also to be observed, that a great part of these new rites derived their origin from the various errors which the barbarous nations had received from their ancestors, and still retained, even after their conversion to Christianity. The clergy, instead of extirpating these errors, either gave them a Christian aspect by inventing certain religious rites to cover their deformity, or by explaining them in a forced allegorical manner; and thus they were perpetuated in the church, and devoutly transmitted from age to age. We may also attribute a considerable number of the rites and institutions, that dishonored religion in this century, to absurd notions both concerning the Supreme Being and departed saints; for it was imagined that God was like the princes and great ones of the earth, who are rendered propitious by costly presents, and are delighted with those cringing salutations, and other marks of veneration and homage, which they receive from their subjects; and it was believed likewise, that departed spirits were agreeably affected with the same kind of services.

II. The famous yearly festival that was celebrated in remembrance of all departed souls, was instituted by the authority of Odilo, abbot of Clugni, and added to the Latin calendar toward the conclusion of this century.† Before this time, a custom had been introduced in many places of offering up prayers on certain days, for the souls that were confined in purgatory; but these prayers were made by each religious society, only for its own members, friends, and patrons. The pious zeal of

\* These facts are faithfully collected from Cedrenus, Leunclavius de Jure Græco-Rom. tom. i. p. 104, from Leo the Grammarian, Simeon the Treasurer, and other writers of the Byzantine history.

† In the year 998.



Odilo could not be confined within such narrow limits; and he therefore extended the benefit of these prayers to all the souls that labored under the pains and trials of purgatory.\* To this proceeding Odilo was prompted by the exhortations of a Sicilian hermit, who pretended to have learned, by an immediate revelation from heaven, that the prayers of the monks of Clugni would be effectual for the deliverance of departed spirits from the expiatory flames of a middle state.† Accordingly this festival was, at first, celebrated only by the congregation of Clugni; but, having afterwards received the approbation of one of the popes, it was, by his order, kept with particular devotion in all the Latin churches.

III. The worship of the Virgin Mary, which, before this century, had been carried to a very high degree of idolatry, now received new accessions of solemnity and superstition. Near the close of this century, a custom was introduced among the Latins of celebrating masses, and abstaining from flesh, in honor of the blessed Virgin, every Sabbath day. After this, what the Latins called the *minor office* was instituted in honor of St. Mary, which was, in the following century, confirmed by Urban II. in the council of Clermont. There are also to be found in this age manifest indications of the institution of the *rosary* and *crown* of the Virgin, by which her worshippers were to reckon the number of prayers that they were to offer to this new divinity; for, though some place the invention of the rosary in the thirteenth century, and attribute it to St. Dominic, yet this supposition is made without any foundation.‡ The rosary consists in fifteen repetitions of the Lord's prayer, and a hundred and fifty salutations of the blessed Virgin; while the crown, according to the different opinions of the learned concerning the age of the blessed Virgin, consists in six or seven recitations of the Lord's prayer, and six or seven times ten salutations.§

## CHAPTER V.

*Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. THE profound ignorance and stupidity, that were productive of so many evils in this century, had at least this advantage attending them, that they contributed much to the tranquillity of the church, and prevented the rise of new sects and new commotions of a religious kind. But, though no new inventions were broached, the ancient errors still remained.

\* See Mabillon, Acta. SS. Ord. Bened. Sac. vi part. 1. p. 54, where the reader will find the Life of Odilo, with his decree for the institution of this festival.

† Benedict XIV. was artful enough to observe a profound silence with respect to the superstitious and dishonorable origin of this anniversary festival in his treatise de Festis A. Christi, Mariæ, et Sanctorum, lib. iii. cap. xxi. p. 171, tom. x. oper. and by his silence he has plainly shown to the world what he thought of this absurd festival. This is not the only mark of prudence that is to be found in the works of that famous pontiff.

‡ This is demonstrated by Mabillon, Prefat. ad Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sac. x. p. 58.

§ In these words: Ave, Maria!

The Nestorians and Monophysites still lived under the Arabian government: they were, however, much more rigorously treated than in former times, and were often persecuted with the utmost injustice and violence. But, as some of them excelled in medical knowledge, which was highly esteemed among the Arabians, while others rendered themselves acceptable to the great, by the dexterous management of their domestic affairs, as overseers and stewards, all this contributed to diminish the violence of the storms which arose against them from time to time.

II. The Manichæans or Paulicians, whose errors have been already pointed out, gathered considerable strength in Thrace under the reign of John Tzimisceas. A great part of this restless and turbulent sect had been transported into that province, by the order of Constantine Copronymus, so early as the eighth century, to put an end to the commotions which they had excited in the east; but a still greater number of them were left behind, especially in Syria and the adjacent countries. Hence it was, that Theodore, bishop of Antioch, from a pious apprehension of the danger to which his flock lay exposed from the neighborhood of such pernicious heretics, engaged the emperor, by his ardent and importunate solicitations, to send a new colony of these Manichæans from Syria to Philippi.\* From Thrace they passed into Bulgaria and Scythia, where they long resided under the jurisdiction of their own pontiff, or patriarch. After the council of Basil had commenced its deliberations, these sectaries removed into Italy, and thence spreading themselves through the other provinces of Europe, they became extremely troublesome to the popes on many occasions.†

III. In the last year of this century arose a certain teacher, whose name was Lentard, who lived at Vertus, in the diocese of Chalons, and, in a short time, drew after him a considerable number of disciples. This new doctor could not bear the superstitious worship of images, which he is said to have opposed with the utmost vehemence, and even to have broken in pieces an image of Christ, which he found in a church where he went to perform his devotions. He, moreover, exclaimed with the greatest warmth against the payment of tithes to the priests, and in several other respects showed that he was no cordial friend to the sacerdotal order. But that which showed evidently that he was a dangerous fanatic, was his affirming that in the prophecies of the Old Testament there was a manifest mixture of truth and falsehood. Gehouin, bishop of Chalons, examined the pretensions which this man made to divine inspiration, and exposed his extravagance to the view of the public, whom he had so artfully seduced; upon which he threw himself into a well, and ended his days like many other fanatics.‡ It is highly probable, that this upstart doctor taught many

\* Jo. Zonaras, Annal. lib. xvii.

† It is extremely probable, as we have already had occasion to observe, that the remains of this sect are still to be found in Bulgaria.

‡ All this is related by Glaber Radulphus, Hist. lib. iii. cap. xi.

other absurd notions beside those which we have now mentioned, and that, after his death, his disciples formed a part of the sect that was afterwards known in France under the name of the Albigenses, and which is said to have adopted the Manichæan errors.

IV. There were yet subsisting some remains of the sect of the Arians in several parts of Italy, and particularly in the territory of Padua; but RATHERIUS, bishop of Verona, had a still more enormous heresy to combat in the system of the Anthropomorphites, which was revived in 939. In the district of Vicenza, a considerable number, not only of the illiterate multitude, but also of the sacerdotal order, adopted that most absurd and extravagant notion, that the Deity was clothed with a human form, and seated, like an earthly monarch, upon a throne of gold, and that his angelic ministers were men arrayed in white garments, and furnished with wings, to render them more expeditious in executing their sovereign's orders. This monstrous error will appear less astonishing, when we consider that the stupid and illiterate multitude had constantly before

their eyes, in all the churches, the Supreme Being and his angels represented in pictures and images with the human figure.

The superstition of another set of blinded wretches, mentioned also by RATHERIUS, was yet more unaccountable and absurd than that of the Anthropomorphites; for they imagined that, every Monday, mass was performed in heaven by St. Michael in the presence of God; and hence, on that day, they resorted in crowds to all the churches which were dedicated to that highly honoured saint.\* It is more than probable that the avarice of the priests, who officiated in the church of St. Michael, was the real source of this extravagant fancy; and that in this, as in many other cases, the rapacity of the clergy took advantage of the credulity of the people, and made them believe whatever they thought would contribute to augment the opulence of the church.

\* RATHERII Epist. Synodica in Dacherii Spicilegio Script. Veter. tom. ii. p. 294.—SIGEBERTI Gemblacens. Chron. ad annum 939.

## THE ELEVENTH CENTURY.

### PART I.

#### EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

##### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the Prosperous Events which happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. IN the preceding century some faint notions of the Christian religion, some scattered rays of that divine light which it administers to mortals, had been received among the Hungarians, Danes, Poles, and Russians; but the rude and savage spirit of those nations, together with their deplorable ignorance and their violent attachment to the superstitions of their ancestors, rendered their total conversion to Christianity a work of great difficulty, which could not be very rapidly accomplished. The zeal, however, with which this important work was carried on, did great honour to the piety of the princes and governors of these unpollished countries, who united their influence with the labours of the learned men whom they had invited into their dominions, to open the eyes of their subjects upon the truth.\* In Tartary,† and the adjacent countries, the zeal and diligence of the Nestorians gained over considerable numbers, almost daily, to the profession of Christianity. It appears also evident

from a multitude of unexceptionable testimonies, that Metropolitan prelates, with a greater number of inferior bishops under their jurisdiction, were established at this time in the provinces of Casgar, Nuacheta, Turkestan, Genda, and Tangut;‡ from which we may conclude, that, in this and the following century, a prodigious number of Christians lived in those very countries which are at present overrun with idolatry, or with the Mohammedan errors. All these Christians were undoubtedly Nestorians, and lived under the jurisdiction of

\* Marcus Paul. Venetus de Regionibus Orientalibus, lib. i. cap. 38, 40, 45, 47, 48, 49, 62, 63, 64, lib. ii. cap. 39.—Euseb. Renaudot, Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine, p. 420.—Assemani Biblioth. Orient. Vaticanæ, tom. iii. part. ii. p. 502, &c. The successful propagation of the Gospel, by the ministry of the Nestorians, in Tartary, China, and the neighbouring provinces, is a most important event, and every way worthy to employ the researches and the pen of some able writer, well acquainted with oriental history. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that, if this subject be important, it is also difficult on many accounts. It was attempted, however, notwithstanding its difficulty, by the most learned Theoph. Siegfred Bayer, who had collected a great quantity of materials relative to this interesting branch of the history of Christianity, both from the works that have been published upon this subject, and from manuscripts that lie yet concealed in the cabinets of the curious. But, unhappily for the republic of letters, the death of that excellent man interrupted his labours, and prevented him from executing a design, which was worthy of his superior abilities, and his well known zeal for the interests of religion.

\* For an account of the Poles, Russians, and Hungarians, see Romualdi Vita in Actis Sanctior. tom. ii. Februar.

† Tartary is taken here in its most comprehensive sense: the inhabitants of Tartary, properly so called, and the Calmaes, Mogols, and the inhabitants of Tangut, there is a manifest difference.

the patriarch of that sect, who resided in Chaldea.

II. Among the European nations that lay yet grovelling in their native darkness and superstition, were the Slavonians, the Obotriti,\* the Venedi,† and the Prussians, whose conversion had been attempted, but with little or no success, by certain missionaries, from whose piety and zeal better fruits might have been expected. Toward the conclusion of the preceding century, Adalbert, bishop of Prague, had endeavoured to instil, into the minds of the fierce and savage Prussians, the salutary doctrines of the Gospel; but he perished in the fruitless attempt, and received, in 996, from the murdering lance of Siggo, a pagan priest, the crown of martyrdom.‡ Boleslaus, king of Poland, revenged the death of this pious apostle by entering into a bloody war with the Prussians; and he obtained, by the force of penal laws and of a victorious army, what Adalbert could not effect by exhortation and argument.§ He dragooned this savage people into the Christian church; yet, beside this violent method of conversion, others of a more gentle kind were certainly practised by the attendants of Boleslaus, who seconded the military arguments of their prince by the more persuasive influence of admonition and instruction. A certain ecclesiastic of illustrious birth, whose name was Boniface, and who was one of the disciples of St. Romuald, undertook the conversion of the Prussians, and succeeded in this pious enterprize by Bruno,|| who set out from Germany with a company of eighteen persons, who had entered with zeal into the same laudable design. These were, however, all barbarously massacred by the fierce and cruel Prussians; and neither the vigorous efforts of Boleslaus, nor of the succeeding kings of Poland, could engage this rude and inflexible nation to abandon totally the idolatry of their ancestors.¶

III. Sicily had been groaning under the dominion of the Saracens from the ninth century; nor had the repeated attempts of the Greeks and Latins to dispossess them of that rich and fertile country, been hitherto crowned with the desired success. But in this century the face of affairs changed entirely in that island; for, in 1059, Robert Guiscard, who had formed a settlement in Italy, at the head of a Norman

colony, and was afterwards created duke of Apulia, encouraged by the exhortations of pope Nicolas II., and seconded by the assistance of his brother Roger, attacked with the greatest vigour and intrepidity the Saracens in Sicily; nor did the latter chieftain sheath the victorious sword before he had rendered himself master of that island, and cleared it absolutely of its former tyrants. As soon as this great work was accomplished, which was not before the year 1090, count Roger not only restored to its former glory and lustre the Christian religion, which had been almost totally extinguished under the Saracen yoke, but also established bishoprics, founded monasteries, erected magnificent churches throughout that province, and bestowed upon the clergy those distinguished honours which they still enjoy.\* It is in the privileges conferred upon this valiant chief, that we find the origin of that supreme authority in matters of religion, which is still vested in the kings of Sicily, within the limits of their own territories, and which is known by the name of the Sicilian monarchy; for pope Urban II. is said to have granted, in 1097, by a special diploma, to Roger and his successors, the title, authority, and prerogatives, of hereditary legates of the apostolic see. The court of Rome affirms, that this diploma is not authentic; and hence warm contentions, about the spiritual supremacy, have arisen even in our times between the popes and the kings of Sicily. The successors of Roger governed that island, under the title of dukes, until the twelfth century, when it was erected into a kingdom.†

IV. The pontiffs, from the time of Sylvester II., had been forming plans for extending the limits of the church in Asia, and especially for driving the Moslems out of Palestine; but the troubles in which Europe was so long involved, prevented the execution of these arduous designs. Gregory VII., the most enterprizing and audacious priest that ever sat in the apostolic chair, animated and inflamed by the repeated complaints which the Asiatic Christians made of the cruelty of the Saracens, resolved to undertake in person a holy war for the deliverance of the church; and above fifty thousand men were speedily mustered to follow him in this bold expedition.‡ But his quarrel with the emperor Henry IV., of which we shall have occasion to speak hereafter, and other unforeseen occurrences, obliged him to relinquish a personal invasion of the holy land. The project, however, was renewed toward the conclusion of this century, by the enthusiastic zeal of an inhabitant of Amiens, who was known by the name of Peter the Hermit, and who suggested to Urban II. the means of accomplishing what had been unfortunately suspended. This famous hermit, in a journey, which he had made through Palestine in 1093, had observed, with inexpressible anguish, the vexations and persecutions which the Chris-

\* The Obotriti were a great and powerful branch of the Vandals, whose kings resided in the country of Mecklenburg, extending their dominion along the coasts of the Baltic from the river Pene in Pomerania to the duchy of Holstein.

† The Venedi dwelt upon the banks of the Weissel, or Vistula, in what is at present called, the Palatinate of Maronburg.

‡ See the Acta Sanctior. ad d. xvii. Aprilis, p. 174.

§ Solignac's Hist. de Pologne, tom. i. p. 433.

¶ Fleury differs from Dr. Mosheim in his account of Bruno, in two points. First, he maintains, that Boniface and Bruno were one and the same person, and here he is manifestly in the right; but he maintains farther, that he suffered martyrdom in Russia, which is an evident mistake. It is proper farther to admonish the reader to distinguish carefully the Bruno here mentioned, from a monk of the same name, who founded the order of the Carthusians.

¶ Ant. Pagi Critica in Baronium, tom. iv. ad annum 1008, p. 97. — Christ. Hartknoch's Ecclesiastical History of Prussia, book i. chap. 1.

\* See Burigni's Histoire Generale de la Sicile, tom. i. p. 286.

† See Baronii Liber de Monarchia Siciliae, tom. xi. Annal.; as also the Traite de la Monarchie Sicilienne, by M. Du-Pin.

‡ Gregori VII. Epist. lib. ii. 3, in Harduino Concil. tom. vi.

tians, who visited the holy places, suffered from the barbarous and tyrannic Saracens. Inflamed therefore with a holy indignation and a furious zeal, which he looked upon as the effects of a divine impulse, he implored the assistance of Simeon, patriarch of Constantinople, and also of the pope, but without effect. Far from being discouraged by this, he renewed his efforts with the utmost vigour, went through all the countries of Europe sounding the alarm of the holy war against the infidel nations, and exhorting all Christian princes to draw the sword against the tyrants of Palestine; nor did he stop here; but, with a view to engage the superstitious and ignorant multitude in his cause, he carried about with him a letter, which he said was written in heaven, and addressed to all true Christians, to animate their zeal for the deliverance of their brethren, who groaned under the oppressive burthen of a Mohammedan yoke.\*

V. When Urban saw the way prepared by the exhortations of the hermit, who had put the spirits of the people every where in a ferment, and had kindled in their breasts a vehement zeal for that holy carnage which the church had been so long meditating, he assembled a grand and numerous council at Placentia, in 1095, and recommended warmly, for the first time, the sacred expedition against the Saracens.† This arduous enterprize was far from being approved by the greatest part of this numerous assembly, notwithstanding the presence of the emperor's legates, who, in their master's name, represented most pathetically how necessary it was to set limits to the power of the victorious infidels, whose authority and dominion increased from day to day. The pontiff's proposal was, however, renewed with the same zeal, and with the desired success, some time after this, in the council assembled at Clermont, where Urban was present. The pompous and pathetic speech which he delivered on this occasion, made a deep and powerful impression upon the minds of the French, whose natural character renders them much superior to the Italians in encountering difficulties, facing danger, and attempting the execution of the most perilous designs: so that an innumerable multitude, composed of all ranks and orders in the nation, offered themselves as volunteers in this sacred expedition.‡ This numerous host was looked upon as formidable in the highest degree, and equal to the most glorious enterprizes and exploits, while, in reality, it was no more than an unwieldy body without life and vigour, and was weak and contemptible in every respect. This will appear sufficiently evident when we con-

sider that this army was a motley assemblage of monks, prostitutes, artists, labourers, lazy tradesmen, merchants, boys, girls, slaves, malefactors, and profligate debauchees, and that it was principally composed of the lowest dregs of the multitude, who were animated solely by the prospect of spoil and plunder, and hoped to make their fortunes by this holy campaign. Every one will perceive how little discipline, counsel, or fortitude, were to be expected from such a miserable rabble. This expedition was distinguished, in the French language, by the name of *croisade*, and all who embarked in it were called *croisés*, *croisards*, or cross-bearers, not only because the end of this holy war was to wrest the cross of Christ out of the hands of the infidels, but also on account of the consecrated cross of various colours, which every soldier wore upon his right shoulder.\*

VI. In consequence of these grand preparations, eight hundred thousand men, in separate bodies, and under different commanders, set out for Constantinople, in 1096, that, after receiving both assistance and direction from Alexis Comnenus the Grecian emperor, they might pursue their march into Asia. One of the principal divisions of this great body marched under the guidance of Peter the Hermit, the author and fomentor of the war, who was girded with a rope, and continued to appear with all the marks of an austere solitary. The adventurers who composed this first division committed the most flagitious crimes, which so incensed the inhabitants of the countries through which they passed, particularly those of Hungary and Bulgaria, that they rose up in arms and massacred the greatest part of them. A like fate attended several other divisions of the same army, who, under the conduct of weak and unskilful chiefs, wandered about like an undisciplined band of robbers, plundering the cities that lay in their way, and spreading misery and desolation wherever they came. The armies that were headed by illustrious commanders, distinguished by their birth and their military endowments, arrived more happily at the capital of the Grecian empire. That which was commanded by Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Lorraine, who deserves a place among the greatest heroes, whether of ancient or modern times,† and by his brother Baldwin, which was composed of eighty thousand well chosen troops, horse and foot,‡ and di-

\* See Abrah. Bzovius, *Continuat. Annal. Baroni.* tom. xv. ad annum 1410, n. ix. p. 322, edit. Colon.—L'Enfant, *Histoire du Concile de Pise*, tom. ii. lib. v. p. 60.—The writers who have treated of this holy war are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his *Lux Evangelii* into Orbe exortens, cap. xxx. p. 518.

† The Benedictine monks have given an ample account of this magnanimous chief, whose character was a bright assemblage of all Christian, civil, and heroic virtues, in their *histoire Literaire de la France*, tom. viii. p. 508.

‡ The engaging and illustrious virtues of Godfrey had drawn from all parts a prodigious number of volunteers, who were ambitious to fight under his standard. The magnitude of this host, however, perplexed the valiant chief, who, on that account, divided it into several bodies, and, finding in Peter the Hermit the same ambitious and military spirit that had prevailed in him before his retreat from the world, declared him the general of the first division, which was detached from the rest, and ordered to march immediately to Constantinople. By this mea-

\* This circumstance is mentioned by the abbot Dodechinius, in his *Continuat. Chronici Mariani Scotti*, apud *Scriptores Germanicos*, Jo. Pistorii, tom. i. p. 402. For an account of Peter, see Du Fresnoy's notes upon the *Alexias* of Anna Comnena.

† This council was the most numerous of any that had been hitherto assembled, and was, on that account, holden in the open fields. There were present at it two hundred bishops, four thousand ecclesiastics, and three hundred thousand laymen.

‡ Theod. Ruhnart, in *Vit. Urbani II.* sect. cccv. p. 224, 229, 240, 272, &c. tom. ii. op. posthum. Maillou et Ruhnart.—Jo. Harduin, *Concilia*, tom. xi. part. ii. p. 1726.—Baron. *Annal. Eccles.* tom. xi. ad annum 1095, n. xxxii. p. 648.

rected its march through Germany and Hungary. Another host, which was headed by Raymond, earl of Toulouse, passed through the Slavonian territories. Robert, earl of Flanders, Robert, duke of Normandy,\* Hugh, brother to Philip I. king of France, embarked their respective forces in a fleet which was assembled at Brundisi and Tarento, whence they were transported to Durazzo, or Dyrrhachium, as it was anciently called. These armies were followed by Boemond, duke of Apulia and Calabria, at the head of a chosen and numerous body of valiant Normans.

VII. This army was the greatest, and, in outward appearance, the most formidable, that had been known in the memory of man; and though, before its arrival at Constantinople, it was diminished considerably by the difficulties and oppositions it had met with on the way, yet, such as it was, it made the Grecian emperor tremble, and filled his mind with the most anxious and terrible apprehensions of some secret design against his dominions. His fears, however, were dispelled, when he saw these legions pass the straits of Gallipolis, and direct their march toward Bithynia.†

The first successful enterprize,‡ that was formed against the infidels, was the siege of Nice, the capital of Bithynia, which was taken in 1097; thence the victorious army proceeded into Syria, and in the following year subdued Antioch, which, with its fertile territory, was granted, by the assembled chiefs, to Boemond, duke of Apulia. Edessa fell next into the hands of the victors, and became the property of Baldwin, brother to Godfrey of Bouillon. The conquest of Jerusalem, which, after a siege of five weeks, submitted to their arms in

sure Godfrey freed himself from the dregs of that astonishing multitude which flocked to his camp. Father Maimbourg, notwithstanding his immoderate zeal for the holy war, and that fabulous turn which enabled him to represent it in the most favourable points of view, acknowledges frankly, that the first divisions of this prodigious army committed the most abominable enormities in the countries through which they passed, and that there was no kind of insolence, injustice, impurity, barbarity, and violence, of which they were not guilty. Nothing perhaps in the annals of history can equal the flagitious deeds of this infernal rabble. See particularly Maimbourg, *Histoire des Croisades*, tom. i. liv. i. p. 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, second edit. in 12mo.

☞ \* Eldest son of William the Conqueror.

☞ † Our author, for the sake of brevity, passes over the contests and jealousies, that subsisted between the chief of the crusade and the Grecian emperor. The character of the latter is differently painted by different historians. The warm defenders of the crusade represent him as a most perfidious prince, who, under the show of friendship and zeal, aimed at the destruction of Godfrey's army. Others consider him as a wise, prudent politician, who, by artifice and stratagem, warded off the danger he had reason to apprehend from the formidable legions that passed through his dominions; and part of which, particularly the army commanded by Peter the Hermit, ravaged his most fruitful territories in the most barbarous manner, and pillaged even the suburbs of the capital of the empire. The truth of the matter is, that, if Alexis cannot be vindicated from the charge of perfidy, the holy warriors are, on the other hand, chargeable with many acts of brutality and injustice. See Maimbourg, *Histoire des Croisades*, livre i. et ii.

☞ ‡ Before the arrival of Godfrey in Asia, the army, or rather rabble, commanded by Peter the Hermit in such a ridiculous manner as might be expected from a wrong-headed monk, received a ruinous defeat from the young Selman

1099, seemed to crown their expedition with the desired success. In this city were laid the foundations of a new kingdom, at the head of which was placed the famous Godfrey, whom the army saluted king of Jerusalem with an unanimous voice.

But this illustrious hero, whose other eminent qualities were adorned with the greatest modesty, refused that high title,\* though he governed Jerusalem with that valour, equity, and prudence, which have rendered his name immortal. Having chosen a small army to support him in his new dignity, he permitted the rest of the troops to return into Europe. He did not, however, long enjoy the fruits of a victory, in which his heroic valour had been so gloriously displayed, but died about a year after the conquest of Jerusalem, leaving his dominions to his brother Baldwin, prince of Edessa, who assumed the title of king without the least hesitation.

VIII. If we examine the motives that engaged the popes, more particularly Urban II., to kindle this holy war, which in its progress and issue was so detrimental to almost all the countries of Europe, we shall probably be persuaded that its origin is to be derived from the corrupt notions of religion, which prevailed in those barbarous times. It was thought inconsistent with the duty and character of Christians, to suffer that land which was blessed with the ministry, distinguished by the miracles, and consecrated by the blood of the Saviour of men, to remain under the dominion of his most inveterate enemies. It was also deemed a very important branch of true piety to visit the holy places in Palestine; but such peregrinations were extremely dangerous, while the despotic Saracens were in possession of that country. Nor is it to be denied, that these motives of a religious kind were accompanied and rendered more effectual by an anxious apprehension of the growing power of the Turks, who had already subdued the greatest part of the Grecian empire, and might soon carry into Europe, and more particularly into Italy, their victorious arms.

There are, it must be confessed, several learned men who have accounted otherwise for this pious, or rather fanatical, expedition. They imagine that the Roman pontiff recommended this sacred campaign with a view of augmenting their own authority, and weakening the power of the Latin emperors and princes; and that these princes countenanced and encouraged it in hopes of getting rid, by that measure, of their powerful and warlike vassals, and of becoming masters of their lands and possessions.† These conjectures,

☞ \* All the historians, who have written of this holy war, applaud the answer which Godfrey returned to the offer that was made him of a crown of gold, as a mark of his accession to the throne of Jerusalem; the answer was, that "he could not bear the thought of wearing a crown of gold in that city, where the King of kings had been crowned with thorns." This answer was sublime in the eleventh century.

† The part of this hypothesis, that relates to the views of the Roman pontiff, has been adopted as an undoubted truth, not only by many protestant historians, but also by several writers of the Romish communion. See Bened. Arcolus de bello Sacro in

however plausible in appearance, are still no more than conjectures. The truth seems to be this; that the pope and the European princes were engaged at first in these crusades by a principle of superstition only; but when,

Infidèles, lib. i. p. 16.—Basnage, Histoire des Eglises Reformées, tom. i. period. v. p. 235.—Vertot, Histoire des Chevaliers de Malthe, tom. i. liv. iii. p. 302, 308; liv. iv. p. 125.—Baillet, Histoire des Demeurs de Boniface VIII. avec Philippe le Bel, p. 76.—Histoire du Droit Ecclesiastique François, tom. i. p. 296, 298. To such, however, as consider matters attentively, this hypothesis will appear destitute of any solid foundation. Certain it is, that the pontiffs could never have either foreseen, or imagined, that so many European princes, and such prodigious multitudes of people, would take arms against the infidels, and march into Palestine; nor could they be assured before-hand, that this expedition would tend to the advancement of their opulence and authority; for all the accessions of influence and wealth, which the popes, and the clergy in general, derived from these holy wars, were of a much later date than their origin, and were acquired by degrees, rather by lucky hits, than by deep-laid schemes; and this alone is sufficient to show, that the pontiffs, in forming the plan, and exhorting to the prosecution of these wars, had no thoughts of extending thereby the limits of their authority. We may add, to this consideration, another of no less weight in the matter before us; and that is the general opinion which prevailed at this time, both among the clergy and the people, that the conquest of Palestine would be finished in a short time, in a single campaign; that the Divine Providence would interpose, in a miraculous manner, to accomplish the ruin of the infidels; and that, after the taking of Jerusalem, the greatest part of the European princes would return home with their troops, which last circumstance was by no means favourable to the views which the popes are supposed to have formed of increasing their opulence, and extending their dominion. Of all the conjectures that have been entertained upon this subject, the most improbable and groundless is that which supposes that Urban II. recommended, with such ardour, this expedition into Palestine, with a view of weakening the power of the emperor Henry IV. with whom he had a violent dispute concerning the investiture of bishops. They who adopt this conjecture, must be little acquainted with the history of these times; or at least they forget, that the first armies that marched into Palestine against the infidels, were chiefly composed of Franks and Normans, and that the Germans, who were the enemies of Urban II. were, in the beginning, extremely averse to this sacred expedition. Many other considerations might be added to illustrate this matter, which, for the sake of brevity, I pass in silence.

That part of the hypothesis, which relates to the kings and princes of Europe, and supposes that they countenanced the holy war to get rid of their powerful vassals, is as groundless as the other, which we have been now refuting. It is, indeed, adopted by several eminent writers, such as Vertot (Hist. de Malthe, liv. iii. p. 309.) Boulanvilliers, and others, who pretend to a superior and uncommon insight into the policy of these remote ages. The reasons, however, which these great men employed to support their opinion, may be all comprehended in this single argument, viz. "Many kings, especially among the Franks, became more opulent and powerful by the number of their vassals, who lost their lives and fortunes in this holy war; therefore, these princes not only permitted, but warmly countenanced the prosecution of this war from selfish and ambitious principles." The weakness of this conclusion must strike every one at first sight. We are wonderfully prone to attribute both to the Roman pontiffs, and to the princes of this barbarous age, much more sagacity and cunning than they really possessed; and we deduce from the events the principles and views of the actors, which is a defective and uncertain manner of reasoning. With respect to the pontiffs, it appears most probable that their immense opulence and authority were acquired, rather by their improving dexterously the opportunities that were offered to them, than by the schemes they had formed for extending their dominion, or filling their coffers.

in process of time, they learned by experience, that these holy wars contributed much to increase their opulence and to extend their authority, by sacrificing their wealthy and powerful rivals, new motives were presented to encourage these expeditions into Palestine, and ambition and avarice seconded and enforced the dictates of fanaticism and superstition.

IX. Without determining any thing concerning the justice or injustice\* of these wars,

\* I do not pretend to decide the question concerning the lawfulness of the crusades; a question which, when it is considered with attention and impartiality, will appear not only extremely difficult, but also highly doubtful. It is, however, proper to inform the reader, that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the justice of this holy war was called in question, and warmly disputed among Christians. The Waldenses and Albigenses, who were distinguished by the name of Cathari, or Puritans, considered these expeditions into Palestine as absolutely unlawful. The reasons they alleged were collected and combated by Francis Moneta, a Dominican friar of the thirteenth century, in a book entitled *Summa contra Catharos et Waldenses*, lib. v. cap. xiii. p. 531., which was published at Rome by Riccini. But neither the objections of the Waldenses, nor the answers of Moneta, were at all remarkable for their weight and solidity, as will appear evidently from the following examples. The former alleged, against the holy war, the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 32. "Give none offence; neither to the Jews nor the Gentiles." By the Gentiles, said they, are to be understood the Saracens. And therefore the European Christians are to abstain from making war upon the Saracens, lest they give offence to the Gentiles. We shall give Moneta's answer to this argument in his own words: "We read," says he, Gen. xii. 7. "that God said unto Abraham, Unto thy seed will I give this land." Now we (Christians who dwell in Europe) are the seed of Abraham, as the apostle admires, Galat. iii. 29. Therefore we are heirs of the promise, and the holy land is given to us by the covenant as our lawful possession. Hence it appears, that it is the duty of civil and temporal rulers to use their most zealous efforts to put us in possession of the promised land, while it is, at the same time, incumbent upon the church and its ministers to exhort these rulers in the most urgent manner to the performance of their duty. A rare argument this truly! but let us hear him out. "The church has no design to injure or slaughter the Saracens, nor is such the intention of the Christian princes engaged in this war. Yet the blood of the infidels must of necessity be shed, if they make resistance and oppose the victorious arms of the princes. The church of God therefore is entirely innocent and without reproach in this matter, and gives no offence to the Gentiles, because it does no more, in reality, than maintain its undoubted right." Such is the subtle reasoning of Moneta, on which it is not necessary to make any reflections.

Dr. Mosheim seems too modest, and even timorous in his manner of arraigning the justice of this holy war, which was so absurd in its principle, and so abominable in the odious circumstances that attended it. His respect, perhaps, for the Teutonic crosses which abound in Germany, and are the marks of an order that derives its origin from these fanatical expeditions into Palestine, may have occasioned that ambiguity and circumspection in his expressions, through which, however, it is easy to perceive his disapprobation of the crusades. The holy place profaned by the dominion of infidels, was the apparent pretext for this fanatical war. What holy place? Jerusalem, say the knights errant of Palestine. But they forget that Jerusalem was a city which, by the conduct of its inhabitants and the crucifixion of Christ, had become most odious in the eye of God; that it was visibly loaded with a divine malediction, and was the miserable theatre of the most tremendous judgments and calamities that ever were inflicted upon any nation. Had the case been otherwise, we know of no right which Christianity gives its professors to seize the territories, and invade the possessions of unbelievers. Had the Jews

we may boldly affirm, that they were highly prejudicial, both to the cause of religion, and to the civil interests of mankind; and that, in Europe more especially, they occasioned innumerable evils and calamities, the effects of which are yet perceptible in our times. The European nations were deprived of the greatest part of their inhabitants by these ill-judged expeditions; immense sums of money were exported into Asia for the support of the war; and numbers of the most powerful and opulent families either became extinct, or were involved in the deepest miseries of poverty and want. It could not easily be otherwise, since the heads of the most illustrious houses either mortgaged or sold their lands and possessions in order to pay the expenses of their voyage,<sup>2</sup> while others imposed such intolerable burthens upon their vassals and tenants, as obliged them to abandon their houses and all their domestic concerns, and to enlist themselves, rather through wild despair than religious zeal, under the sacred banner of the cross. Hence the face of Europe was totally changed, and all things were thrown into the utmost confusion. We pass in silence the various enormities that were occasioned by these crusades, the murders, rapes, and robberies of the most infernal nature, that were every where committed with impunity by these holy soldiers of God and of Christ, as they were impiously called; nor shall we enter into a detail of the new privileges and rights, to which these wars gave rise, and which were often attended with the greatest inconveniences.†

X. These holy wars were not less prejudicial to the cause of religion, and the true interests of the Christian church, than they were to the temporal concerns of men. One of their first

attempted the conquest of Palestine, they would have acted conformably with their apparent rights, because it was formerly their country; and consequently also with their religious principles, because they expected a Messiah who was to bind the kings of the Gentiles in chains, and to reduce the whole world under the Jewish yoke.

<sup>2</sup> We find many memorable examples of this in the ancient records. Robert, duke of Normandy, mortgaged his duchy to his brother William king of England to defray the expenses of his voyage to Palestine. See the *Histor. Major of Matthew Paris*, lib. i. p. 24.—Odo, viscount of Bourges, sold his territory to the king of France. *Galla Christiana Benedicti norum*, tom. ii. p. 45. See, for many examples of this kind, *Car. du Fresne, Adnot. ad Jonivilla Vitam Ludovici 8.* p. 52.—*Bonifacius sur l'Origine et les Droits de la Noblesse*, in *Mollet's Memoires de Literature et de l'Histoire*, tom. ix. part. i. p. 67.—*Jo. George Cramer, de Juribus et Prærogativis Nobilitatis*, tom. i. p. 81, 109. From the commencement therefore of these holy wars, a vast number of estates, belonging to the European nobility, were either mortgaged, or totally transferred, some to kings and princes, others to priests and monks, and not a few to persons of a private condition, who, by possessing considerable sums of ready money, were enabled to make advantageous purchases.

† Such persons as entered into these expeditions, and were distinguished by the badge of the military cross, acquired thereby certain remarkable rights, which were extremely prejudicial to the rest of their fellow citizens. Hence it happened, that when any of these holy soldiers contracted any civil obligations, or entered into conventions of sale, purchase, or any such transactions, they were previously required to renounce all privileges and immunities, which they had obtained, or might obtain in time to come, by assuming the cross. See *Le Beuf, Memoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre Append*, tom. ii. p. 232.

and most pernicious effects was the enormous augmentation of the influence and authority of the Roman pontiffs: they also contributed, in various ways, to enrich the churches and monasteries with daily accessions of wealth, and to open new sources of opulence to all the sacerdotal orders. For they, who assumed the cross, disposed of their possessions as if they were at the point of death, on account of the great and innumerable dangers to which they were to be exposed in their passage to the holy land, and the opposition they were to encounter there upon their arrival.<sup>3</sup> They therefore, for the most part, made their wills before their departure, and left a considerable part of their possessions to the priests and monks, in order to obtain, by these pious legacies, the favor and protection of the Deity.‡ Many examples of these donations are to be found in ancient records. Such of the holy soldiers, as had been engaged in suits of law with the priests or monks, renounced their pretensions, and submissively gave up whatever it was that had been the subject of debate; and others, who had seized any of the possessions of the churches or convents, or had heard of any injury that had been committed against the clergy by the remotest of their ancestors, made the most liberal restitution, both for their own usurpations and those of their forefathers, and made ample satisfaction, for the real or pretended injuries committed against the church, by rich and costly donations.‡

Nor were these the only unhappy effects of these holy expeditions, considered with respect to their influence upon the state of religion, and the affairs of the Christian church; for, while whole legions of bishops and abbots girded the sword to the thigh, and went as generals, volunteers, or chaplains into Palestine, the priests and monks, who had lived under their jurisdiction, and were more or less awed by their authority, threw off all restraint, led the most lawless and profligate lives, and abandoned themselves to all sorts of licentiousness, committing the most flagitious and extravagant excesses without reluctance or remorse. The monster superstition, which was already grown to an enormous size, received new accessions of strength and influence from this holy war, and exercised with greater vehemence than ever its despotic dominion over the minds of the Latins. To the crowd of saints and tutelar patrons, whose number was prodigious before this period, were now added many fictitious saints of Greek and Syrian origin,§

§ The translator has here inserted, in the text, the note (r) of the original, as it is purely historical, and makes an interesting part of the narration.

† See Plessis, *Hist. de Meaux*, tom. ii. p. 76, 79, 141.—*Galla Christiana*, tom. ii. p. 139.—*Le Beuf, Append.* p. 31.—*Du Fresne, Notæ ad Vitam Ludovici Sancti*, p. 52.

‡ *Du Fresne*, p. 52.

§ The Roman Catholic historians acknowledge, that, during the time of the crusades, many saints, unknown to the Latins before that period, were imported into Europe from Greece and the eastern provinces, and were treated with the utmost respect and the most devout veneration. Among these new patrons, there were some, whose exploits and even existence are called in question. Such, among others, was St. Catherine, whom Baronius and Cassander represent as having removed from Syria into Eu-

hitherto unknown in Europe; and an incredible quantity of relics, the greatest part of which were ridiculous in the highest degree, were imported into the European churches. The armies, that returned from Asia after the taking of Jerusalem, brought with them a vast number of these saintly relics, which they had bought at a high price from the crafty Greeks and Syrians, and which they considered as the noblest spoils that could crown their return from the holy land. These they committed to the custody of the clergy in the churches and monasteries, or ordered them to be most carefully preserved in their families from one generation to another.\*

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the Calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THE greatest opposition that Christians met with, in this century, was from the Saracens and Turks. To the latter the Christians and Saracens were equally odious, and felt equally the fatal consequences of their increasing dominion. The Saracens, notwithstanding their bloody contests with the Turks, which gave them constant occupation, and the vigorous, though ineffectual efforts they were continually making to set limits to the power of

repe. See Baronius, ad Mart; rol. Roman. p. 728.—George Cassander, Schol. ad Hymnos Ecclesiæ. It is extremely doubtful, whether this Catherine, who is honoured as the patroness of learned men, ever existed.

\* The sacred treasures of musty relics which the French, Germans, Britons, and other European nations, preserved formerly with so much care, and show even in our times with such pious ostentation, are certainly not more ancient than these holy wars, but were then purchased at a high rate from the Greeks and Syrians. These cunning traders in superstition, whose avarice and fraud were excessive, frequently imposed upon the credulity of the simple and ignorant Latins, by the sale of fictitious relics. Richard, king of England, bought in 1191, from the famous Saladin, all the relics that were to be found in Jerusalem, as appears from the testimony of Matthew Paris, who tells us also, that the Dominicans brought from Palestine a white stone, in which Jesus Christ had left the print of his feet. The Genoese pretended to have received from Baldwin, second king of Jerusalem, the very dish in which the paschal lamb was served up to Christ and his disciples at the last supper; though this famous dish excites the laughter of even father Labat, in his Voyages en Espagne et en Italie, tom. ii. For an account of the prodigious quantity of relics, which St. Louis brought from Palestine into France, we refer the reader to the life of that prince composed by Joinville, and published by Du Fresnoy; as also to Plessis, Histoire de l'Eglise de Meaux, tom. i. p. 120; and Lancelot, Memoires pour la Vie de l'Abbe de St. Cyran, tom. i. p. 175. Christ's handkerchief, which is worshipped at Besancon, was brought thither from the holy land. See J. Jaques Chiflet, Visontio, part ii. p. 108; and de Linteis Christi Sepulchralibus, c. ix. p. 50. Many other examples of this miserable superstition may be seen in Anton. Matthæi Analecta veteris Evi, tom. ii. p. 677.—Jo. Mabillon, Annal. Bened. tom. vi. p. 52; and principally Chiflet's Crisis Historica de Linteis Christi Sepulchralibus, c. ix. x. p. 50, and also 59, where we find the following passage: "Sciendum est, vidente 'immani et barbara Turcarum persecutione, et imminente Christiana religio in oriente naufragio, educta a sacerrimis et per Christianos quovis modo recondita ecclesiarum pignora.—Hæc plane divinis opibus illecti præ aliis, sacra Antiqua qua 'vi, qua pretio, a detinentibus hæc illic extorse 'runt."

that fierce nation, which was daily extending the bounds of its empire, persisted in their cruelty toward their Christian subjects, whom they robbed, plundered, maimed, or murdered in the most barbarous manner, and loaded with all sorts of injuries and calamities. The Turks, on the other hand, not only reduced the Saracen dominion to very narrow bounds, but also seized the richest provinces of the Grecian empire, the fertile countries situated upon the coasts of the Euxine sea, and subjected them to their yoke, while they impoverished and exhausted the rest by perpetual incursions, and by the most severe and unmerciful exactions. The Greeks were not able to oppose this impetuous torrent of prosperous ambition. Their force was weakened by intestine discords, and their treasures were exhausted to such a degree as rendered them incapable of raising new troops, or of paying the armies they had already in their service.

II. The Saracens in Spain opposed the progress of the Gospel in a different, yet still more pernicious way. They used all sorts of methods to allure the Christians into the profession of the Mohammedan faith. Alliances of marriage, advantageous contracts, flattering rewards, were employed to seduce them with too much success; for great numbers fell into these fatal snares, and apostatized from the truth; and these allurements would have, undoubtedly, still continued to seduce multitudes of Christians from the bosom of the church, had not the face of affairs been changed in Spain by the victorious arms of the kings of Arragon and Castile, and more especially Ferdinand I; for these princes, whose zeal for Christianity was equal to their military courage, defeated the Saracens in several battles, and deprived them of a great part of their territories and possessions.†

The number of those among the Danes, Hungarians, and other European nations, who retained their prejudices in favour of the idolatrous religion of their ancestors, was yet very considerable; and they persecuted, with the utmost cruelty, the neighbouring nations, and also such of their fellow-citizens as had embraced the Gospel. To put a stop to this barbarous persecution, Christian princes exerted their zeal in a terrible manner, proclaiming capital punishment against all who persisted in the worship of the Pagan deities. This dreadful severity contributed much more toward the extirpation of paganism, than the exhortations and instructions of ignorant missionaries, who were unacquainted with the true nature of the Gospel, and dishonoured its pure and holy doctrines by their licentious lives and superstitious practices.

The Prussians, Lithuanians, Sclavonians, Ohotriti, and several other nations, who dwell in the lower parts of Germany, and lay still grovelling in the darkness of paganism, con-

\* Jo. Henr. Hottingeri Histor. Ecclesiast. Sæc. xi. § ii. p. 452; and Michael Geddes' History of the Expulsion of the Moors out of Spain, which is to be found in the Miscellaneous Tracts of that Author, tom. i.

† For an account of these wars between the first Christian kings of Spain and the Moslems or Moors, see the Spanish histories of Mariana and Ferrera.



tinued to harass the Christians, who lived in their neighbourhood, by perpetual acts of hostility and violence, by frequent incursions into their territories, and by putting numbers of

them to death in the most inhuman manner.\*

\* Helmold Chron. Slavorum, lib. 1. cap. xvi. p. 52.—Adam Bremens. Histor. lib. ii. cap. xxvii.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.

I. THE declining condition of the Grecian empire was fatal to the progress of letters and philosophy. Its glory and power diminished from day to day under the insults and usurpations of the Turks and Saracens; and, while the empire suffered by these attacks from without, it was consumed gradually by the internal pestilence of civil discord, by frequent seditions and conspiracies, and by those violent revolutions which shook from time to time the imperial throne, and were attended with the sudden fall and elevation of those who held the reins of government. So many foreign invasions, so many internal troubles, so many emperors dethroned, deprived the political body of its strength and consistency, broke in upon the public order, rendered all things precarious, and, dejecting the spirits of the nation, damped the fire of genius, and discouraged the efforts of literary ambition.† There were, however, some emperors, such as Alexius Comnenus, who seemed to cherish and encourage the drooping sciences, and whose zeal was seconded by several prelates, who were willing to lend a supporting hand to the cause of letters. The controversies also that subsisted between the Greeks and Latins, impelled the former, amidst all their disadvantages to a certain degree of application to study, and prevented them from abandoning entirely the culture of the sciences. And hence it is, that we find among the Greeks of this century some writers, at least, who have deserved well of the republic of letters.

II. We pass in silence the poets, rhetoricians, and philologists of this century, who were neither highly eminent nor absolutely contemptible. Among the writers of history, Leo the *grammarian*, John Scylizes, Cedrenus, and a few others, deserve to be mentioned with some share of praise, notwithstanding the palpable partiality with which they are chargeable, and the zeal they discover for many of the fabulous records of their nation. But the greatest ornament of the republic of letters, at this time, was Michael Psellus, a man illustrious in every respect, and deeply versed in all the various kinds of erudition that were known in his age. This great man recommended warmly to his countrymen the study of phi-

losophy, and particularly the system of Aristotle, which he embellished and illustrated in several learned and ingenious productions.\* If we turn our eyes toward the Arabians, we shall find that they still retained a high degree of zeal for the culture of the sciences; as appears evidently from the number of physicians, mathematicians, and astronomers, who flourished among them in this century.†

III. The arts and sciences seemed, in some measure, to revive in the west, among the clergy, at least, and the monastic orders; they were not indeed cultivated by any other set of men; and the nobility, if we except such of them as were designed to fill certain ecclesiastical dignities, or had voluntarily devoted themselves to a religious solitude, treated all sorts of learning and erudition with indifference and contempt. The schools of learning flourished in several parts of Italy about the year 1050; and of the Italian doctors, who acquired a name by their writings or their academical lectures, several removed afterwards into France, and particularly into Normandy, where they instructed the youth, who had consecrated themselves to the service of the church.‡ The French also, though they acknowledge their obligations to the learned Italians who settled in their provinces, exhibit, at the same time, a considerable list of their countrymen, who, without any foreign succours, cultivated the sciences, and contributed not a little to the advancement of letters in this century; they mention also several schools erected in different parts of that kingdom, which were in the highest reputation, both on account of the fame of their masters, and the multitude of disciples that resorted to them.§ And, indeed, it is certain beyond all contradiction, that the liberal arts and sciences were cultivated in France, which abounded with learned men, while the greatest part of Italy lay as yet covered with a thick cloud of ignorance and darkness. For Robert, king of France, son and successor of Hugh Capet, disciple of the famous Gerbert (afterwards Sylvester II.) and the great protector of the sciences, and friend of the learned, reigned

\* Leo Allatius, Diarib. de Psellis, p. 14, edit. Fabricii.

† Elmacini Historia Saracen. p. 281.—Jo. Henr. Hottinger, Histor. Eccles. Sæc. xi. p. 449.

‡ See Muratori, Antiquitates Ital. medi ævi, tom. iii. p. 571.—Giammeo, Historia di Napoli, vol. ii.

§ Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. vii. at the Introduction.—Du Boulay, Hist. Académ. Paris, tom. i. p. 355.—Le Pœuf, Diss. sur l'Etat des Sciences en France depuis la Mort du Roi Robert, which is published among his Dissertations sur l'Histoire Ecclesiastique et Civile de Paris, tom. ii. part. i.

¶ \* The sentence which begins with the words *so many foreign*, and ends with the words *literary ambition*, is added by the translator to render the connexion with what follows more evident.

from the close of the preceding century to the year 1031,\* and exerted upon all occasions the most ardent zeal for the restoration of letters; nor were his noble efforts without success.† The provinces of Sicily, Apulia, Calabria, and other southern parts of Italy, were indebted, for the introduction of the sciences among them, to the Normans, who became their masters, and who brought with them from France the knowledge of letters to a people benighted in the darkest ignorance. To the Normans also was due the restoration of learning in England. William the Conqueror, a prince of uncommon sagacity and genius, and the great Mæcenas of his time, upon his accession to the throne of England in the year 1066, engaged, by the most alluring solicitations, a considerable number of learned men, from Normandy and other countries, to settle in his new dominions, and exerted his most zealous endeavours to dispel that savage ignorance, which is always a source of innumerable evils.‡ The reception of Christianity had polished and civilized, in an extraordinary manner, the rugged minds of the valiant Normans: for those fierce warriors, who, under the darkness of paganism, had manifested the utmost aversion to all branches of knowledge and every kind of instruction, distinguished themselves, after their conversion, by their ardent application to the study of religion and the pursuits of learning.

IV. This vehement desire of knowledge, that increased from day to day, and became at length, the predominant passion of the politest European nations, produced many happy effects. To it, more particularly, we must attribute the considerable number of public schools that were opened in various places, and the choice of more able and eminent masters than those who had formerly presided in the seminaries of learning. Toward the conclusion of the preceding age, there were no schools in Europe but those which belonged to monasteries, or episcopal residences: nor were there any other masters, except the Benedictine monks, to instruct the youth in the principles of sacred and profane erudition. But, not long after the commencement of this century, the face of things was totally changed, in a manner the most advantageous to the cause of letters. In many cities of France and Italy, learned men, both among the clergy and laity, undertook the weighty and important charge of instructing the youth, and succeeded much better in this worthy undertaking than the monks had done, not only by comprehending in their course of instruction more branches of knowledge than the monastic doctors were acquainted with, but also by teaching in a better method, and with more perspicuity and

precision, many of the same branches of science, which the others had taught before them. The most eminent of these new masters were such as had either travelled into Spain with a view to study in the schools of the Saracens (which was extremely customary in this age among those who were ambitious of a distinguished reputation for wisdom and knowledge,) or had improved their stock of erudition and philosophy by a diligent and attentive perusal of the writings of the Arabians, of which a great number were translated into Latin; for with these foreign succours they were enabled to teach philosophy, mathematics, physic, astronomy, and the other sciences that are connected with them, in a much more learned and solid manner than the monks or such as had received their education from them alone.—The school of Salerno, in the kingdom of Naples, was renowned above all others for the study of physic in this century, and vast numbers crowded thither from all the provinces of Europe to receive instruction in the art of healing: but the medical precepts which rendered the doctors of Salerno so famous, were all derived from the writings of the Arabians, or from the schools of the Saracens in Spain and Africa.\* It was also from the schools and writings of the Arabian sages, that the absurd and puerile tricks of divination, and the custom of foretelling future events from the position of the stars, the features of the face, and the lines of the hand, derived their origin. These ridiculous practices, proceeding from so respectable a source, and moreover adapted to satisfy the idle curiosity of impatient mortals, were carried on in all the European nations and in process of time the pretended sciences of astrology and divination acquired the highest reputation and authority.

V. The seven liberal arts, as they were now styled, were taught in the greatest part of the schools that were erected in this century for the education of youth. The first stage was grammar, which was followed by rhetoric and logic. When the disciple, having learned these three branches, which were generally known by the name of *trivium*, extended his ambition, and was desirous of new improvement in the sciences, he was conducted slowly through the *quadrivium*‡ to the very summit of literary fame. But this method of teaching, which had been received in all the western schools, was considerably changed toward the latter end of this century; for, as the science of logic, under which metaphysics were in part comprehended, received new degrees of perfection from the deep meditations and the assiduous industry of certain acute thinkers,

\* Robert succeeded Hugh Capet, and reigned thirty-five years.

† Daniel, *Histoire de la France*, tom. iii. p. 58.—Du Boulay, *Hist. Academ. Paris*, tom. i. p. 636 et passim.

‡ See *Hist. Liter. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 171.—“The English,” says Matthew Paris, “were so illiterate and ignorant before the time of William the Conqueror, that a man who understood the principles of grammar, was universally looked upon as a prodigy of learning.”

\* Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.* tom. ii. p. 935.—Giannone, *Hist. di Napoli*, tom. ii. p. 151. Freind's *History of Physic*.—It is well known, that the famous precepts of the school of Salerno, for the preservation of health, were composed in this century, at the request of the king of England.

‡ The *trivium* was a term invented in the times of barbarism to express the three sciences that were first learned in the schools, viz. grammar, rhetoric, and logic; and the schools in which these sciences alone were taught, were called *triviales*. The *quadrivium* comprehended the four mathematical sciences,—arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy.

and was taught with more detail and subtilty than in former times, the greatest part of the studious youth became so enamoured of this branch of philosophy, as to abandon grammar, rhetoric, and all the other liberal arts, that they might consecrate their whole time to the discussion of logical questions, and the pursuit of metaphysical speculations. Nor was this surprising, when we consider, that, according to the opinion which now prevailed in the republic of letters, a man who was well versed in *dialectics*, i. e. in logical and metaphysical knowledge, was reputed sufficiently learned, and was supposed to stand in need of no other branches of erudition.\* Hence arose that contempt of languages and eloquence, of the more elegant sciences, and the fine arts, which spread its baneful influence through the Latin provinces; and hence that barbarism and pedantic soplistry which dishonoured, in succeeding ages, the republic of letters, and deplorably corrupted the noble simplicity of true theology, and the purest systems of philosophical wisdom.

VI. The philosophy of the Latins, in this century, was absolutely confined within the circle of dialectics, while the other philosophical sciences were scarcely known by name.† This dialectic, indeed, was miserably dry and

\* See Boulay, tom. i. p. 408, 511.—This is too likely to become the prevailing taste even in our times, but it is an ancient taste, as we may easily perceive, by casting an eye upon the literary history of the eleventh century; and to confirm still farther the truth of the vulgar saying, that there is *nothing new under the sun*, we shall quote the following passage from the *Metalegion* of John of Salisbury, a writer of no mean abilities, lib. i. cap. iii. "Poeta, historiographi, habebantur infames, et si quis incumbebat laboribus antiquorum, notabatur ut non modo asello Arcadiorum tardior, sed obtusior plumbo vel lapide, omnibus erat in risum. Suis enim, aut magistri sui, quisque incumbebat iuventis.—Probat ergo summum repente philosophi; nam qui illiteratus accesserat, fere non morabatur in scholis ulterius quam eo curriculo temporis, quo avium puli plumescent. Sed quid docebat novi doctores, et qui plus somniorum quam vigiliarum in scrutinio philosophiæ consumserant? Ecce nova fiebant omnia: innovabatur grammatica, nominabatur dialectica, contumebantur rhetorica, et novas totius quadrivii vias, evanescit priorum regulis, de ipsis philosophiæ adytis proferebant. Solum *conventivium* sive *ratiorem* loquebantur, argumentum sonabat in ore omnium—ac incertum nimis aut rude et a philosopho alienum, impossibile credebatur *conventier* et ad rationis normam quicquam dicere aut facere, nisi *conventio* et *ratiomis* mentio expressim esset inserta." Many more passages of this nature are to be found in this author.

† We shall, indeed, find many, in the records of this century, honoured with the title of *Philosophers*. Thus we hear of Manegoldus the Philosopher, Adalardus the Philosopher, &c. But we must not attribute to that term, when applied to these grammarians, the sense which it bore among the ancient Greeks and Latins, and which it still bears in our times. In the style of what we call the middle ages, every man of learning, of whatever kind his erudition might be, was called a philosopher; and this title was also given to the interpreters of Scripture, though that set of men were, generally speaking, destitute of true philosophy. See the *Chronicon Sacerdotum* in Muratori's collection *Scriptor. Rerum Italicar.* tom. ii. part ii. cap. cxxv. p. 265, where we are told, that in the tenth century, in which the sciences were almost totally extinguished in Italy, there were thirty-two philosophers at Benevento. We learn, however, by what follows, that these philosophers were partly grammarians, and partly persons who were more or less versed in certain liberal arts.

barren, as long as it was drawn from no other source than the ten categories falsely attributed to St. Augustin, or from the explications of the Aristotelian philosophy, composed by Porphyry and Averroes. These, however, were the only guides which the schools had to follow in the beginning of this century; nor had the public teachers either genius or courage enough to enlarge the system, or to improve upon the principles of these dictators in philosophy, whose authority was treated as infallible, and whose productions, for a long time, were regarded as perfect, to the great detriment of true science. But, about the year 1050, the face of philosophy began to change, and the science of logic assumed a new aspect. This revolution began in France, where several of the books of Aristotle had been brought from the schools of the Saracens in Spain; and it was effected by a set of men highly renowned for their abilities and genius, such as Berenger, Roscellinus, Hildebert, and after them by Gilbert de la Porree, the famous Abelard, and others. These eminent logicians, though they followed the Stagirite as their guide, took the liberty to illustrate and model anew his philosophy, and to extend it far beyond its ancient limits.

VII. The philosophers of this age, who were most famous for their zealous and successful endeavours to improve the science of logic, and accommodate it to general use, were Lanfranc, an Italian by birth, (who was abbot of St. Stephen's at Caen, and was thence called by William the Conqueror to the see of Canterbury,) Anselm his successor, and Odo, whose last promotion was the bishopric of Cambrai. Lanfranc was so deeply versed in this science, that he was commonly called the Dialectician; and he employed with great dexterity the subtilties of logic in the controversy which was carried on between him and the learned Berenger, against whom he maintained the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the holy sacrament. Anselm, in a very learned dialogue, throws much light upon the darkness and perplexity in which the science of logic had been so long involved; and, among other things, he investigates, with no small sagacity, the nature of substance, and mode or quality, in order to convey more just notions of these metaphysical entities than had been hitherto entertained.\* This great prelate, who shone with a distinguished lustre in several branches of literature both sacred and profane, was the first of the Latin doctors who dispelled the clouds of ignorance and obscurity that hung over the important sciences of metaphysics and natural theology, as appears from two books of his composition, wherein the truths concerning the Deity, which are deducible from the mere light of nature, are enumerated and explained with a degree of sagacity which could not well be expected from a writer of this century. He was the inventor of that famous argument, vulgarly and erroneously attributed to Des-Cartes, which demonstrates the existence of God from the idea of an infi-

\* This dialogue, *de Grammatico*, is to be found in the works of Anselm, published by father Gerberon, tom. i. p. 143.

nity perfect Being naturally implanted in the mind of man, and which is to be found, without exception in the breast of every mortal. The solidity of this argument was, indeed, called into question, almost as soon as it was proposed, by Gamilo, a French monk, whose objections were answered by Anselm, in a treatise professedly written for that purpose.\* Odo, the third restorer of logic whom we mentioned above, taught that science with the greatest applause, and illustrated it in three learned productions, which have not survived the ruins of time.†

VIII. The restoration of logic was immediately followed by a vehement dispute between its restorers and patrons, concerning the *object* of that science; such was the term employed by the contending parties. This controversy, which was long agitated in the schools, was in its nature extremely trivial and unimportant: but, considered in its consequences, it became a very serious and weighty affair, since the disputants on both sides made use of their respective opinions in explaining the doctrines of religion, and reciprocally loaded each other with the most odious invectives and the most opprobrious accusations. In one point only they were unanimous, acknowledging that logic or dialectic had for its essential object the consideration of universals in their various relations and points of comparison, since particular and individual things, being liable to change, could not be the objects of a sure and immutable science. But the great question was, whether these universals, which came within the sphere of logical inquiries, belonged to the class of real things, or that of mere denominations. One set of these subtle disputants maintained, that universals were undoubted realities, and supported their hypothesis by the authority of Plato, Boetius, and other ancient sages; the other affirmed, that they were mere words and outward denominations, and

\* Gamilo's Treatise is to be found in the works of Anselm, with the answer of that learned prelate. † As Anselm makes such a shining figure in the literary history of England, it will not be improper to add here a more ample account of his character and writings than that which is given by Dr. Mosheim. His life and manners were without reproach, though his spiritual ambition justly exposed him to censure. His works are divided into three parts. The first contains his dogmatical tracts, and begins with a discourse concerning the Existence of God, the Divine Attributes, and the Trinity. This discourse is called Monologia, because it is drawn up in the form of a soliloquy. In this first part of the works of Anselm, there are many curious researches upon subjects of a very difficult and mysterious nature, such as the Fall of Satan, the Reason why God created Man, the doctrine of Original Sin, and the Manner of its Communication to Adam's Posterity, the Liberty of the Will, and the Consistency of Freedom with the Divine Providence. The second and third parts of the writings of this eminent prelate contain his practical and devotional performances, such as Homilies, Poems, Prayers, &c. and his Letters, which are divided into four books.

† The titles of these three treatises are as follow: de Sophista, de Complexionibus, de Reo et Ente. The learned Heriman, in his Narratio Restaurationis Abbatie Sti. Martini Tornacensis, which is published in M. D'Acheri's Spicillegium Scriptor. Veter. tom. ii. p. 889, speaks of Odo in the following honourable manner: "Cum Odo septem liberatum artium esset peritus, præcique tamen in dialectica eminens, et pro ipsa maxime clericorum frequentia cum expectat."

pleaded in behalf of their cause the respectable suffrages of Aristotle and Porphyry. The former were called Realists, on account of their doctrine, and the latter Nominalists, for the same reason. The contending parties were, in process of time, subdivided into various sects, on account of the different modes in which many explained the doctrine that was the badge and characteristic of their sect.\* This controversy made a prodigious noise in all the schools throughout Europe during many succeeding ages, and often produced unhappy contentions and animosities between philosophers and divines. Some are of opinion, that it derived its origin from the disputes between Berenger and his adversaries, concerning the eucharist;‡ a notion which, though it be advanced without authority, is by no means destitute of probability, since the hypothesis of the Nominalists might be very successfully employed in defending the doctrine of Berenger, concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

IX. The Nominalists had for their chief a person named John, who, on account of his logical subtlety, was surnamed the Sophist, which is the only circumstance we know of his history.† His principal disciples were Robert of Paris, Roscelin of Compiègne, and Arnoul of Laon, who propagated his doctrine with industry and success; to whom we may add, with some probability, Rainbert, the master of a famous school at Lisle, who is said, according to the quibbling humour of the times, 'to have read *nominal* logic to his disciples while Odo (whom we have already had occasion to mention) instructed his scholars in *reality*.§ The most renowned of all the *nominal*

\* The learned Brucker (in his *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*, tom. iii. p. 904) gives an ample account of the sect of the Nominalists, and enlarges upon the nature and circumstances of this logical contest: he also mentions the various writers, who have made this sect and its doctrine the object of their researches. Among these writers, the principal was John Salabert, presbyter in the diocese of Agen, who, in 1651, published a treatise entitled *Philosophia Nominalium Vindicta*. This book, which is extremely rare, has been seen by none of the authors who have written professedly concerning the sect of the Nominalists. A copy of it, taken from the manuscript in the French king's library, was communicated to me, from which it appears, that Salabert, who was certainly a very acute and ingenious logician, employed his labour rather in defending the doctrine of the Nominalists, than in giving an accurate account of their sect. There are, however, several things to be found in his book, which are far from being generally known, even among the learned.

† Du Boulay. *Histor. Acad. Paris*, tom. i. p. 443.—*Ger. du Bois. Histor. Ecclesiæ Paris*, tom. i. 770.

‡ This account we have from the unknown author of the *Fragmentum Historiæ Franciæ* a Roberto Rege ad Mortem Philippici I. which is published in Du Chesne's *Scriptores Historiæ Franciæ*, tom. iv. His words are as follow: "In dialectica hi potentes extiterunt sophista; Johannes, qui artem sophisticam vocalem esse dissevit," &c.—Du Boulay conjectures that this John the Sophist was the same person with John of Chartres, surnamed the Deaf, who was first physician to Henry I. king of France, and had acquired a great degree of renown by his genius and erudition. The same author tells us, that John had for his master Giraldus of Orleans, who was an incomparable poet, and an excellent rhetorician; but he advances this without any proof. Mabillon, on the other hand, in his *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v. supposes, that John the Nominalist was the same person who made known to Anselm the error of Roscelinus concerning the Three Persons in the Godhead.

§ The passage in the original is: "Qui dialecticam

philosophers of this age was Roscelin: hence many considered him as the chief and founder of that sect, and he is still regarded as such by several learned men.

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government, during this Century.*

I. ALL the records of this century loudly complain of the vices that reigned among the rulers of the church, and, in general, among all the sacerdotal orders; they also deplore that universal decay of piety and discipline, which was the consequence of this corruption in a set of men, who were bound to support, by their example, their authority, and their instructions, the sacred interests of religion and virtue. The western bishops were no sooner elevated to the rank of dukes, counts, and nobles, and enriched with ample territories, than they gave themselves up entirely to the dominion of pleasure and ambition, and, wholly employed in displaying the magnificence of their temporal stations, frequented the courts of princes, accompanied always with a splendid train of attendants and domestics.\* The inferior orders of the clergy were also licentious in their own way; few among them preserved any remains of piety and virtue, we might add, of decency and discretion. While their rulers were wallowing in luxury, and, basking in the beams of worldly pomp and splendour, they were indulging themselves, without the least sense of shame, in fraudulent practices, in impure and lascivious gratifications, and even in the commission of flagitious crimes. The Grecian clergy were less chargeable with these shocking irregularities, as the calamities under which their country groaned, imposed a restraint upon their passions, and gave a check to their licentiousness. Yet notwithstanding these salutary restraints, there were few examples of piety and virtue to be found among them.

II. The authority and lustre of the Latin church, or, to speak more properly, the power and dominion of the Roman pontiffs, rose in this century to the highest point, though they rose by degrees, and had much opposition and many difficulties to conquer. In the preceding age the pontiffs had acquired a great degree of authority in religious affairs, and in every thing that related to the government of the church; and their credit and influence increased prodigiously toward the commencement of this century. For then they received the pompous titles of 'masters of the world,' and 'popes, i. e. universal fathers;' they presided also every where in the councils by their le-

gencies suis in voce legabat, quum Odô in re discipulis legaret. See Hermanus, *Histor. Restaurations Monasterii S. Martini Tornacensis*, in D'Achern's *Spicil. Vet. Scriptorum*, vol. iii. p. 889.

\* See, among other examples of this episcopal grandeur that of Adalbert, in Adam. Bremensis, lib. iii. cap. xxxi. p. 34, lib. iv. cap. xxv. p. 52. that of Gunther, in the *Lectioes Antiquæ de Causis*, tom. iii. part. i. p. 185, and that of Mauasses, in *Museum Italicum de Mabillon*, tom. i. p. 111. Add to all these Muratori's *Antiq. Ital. mediæ Ævi*, tom. vi. p. 72.

gates; assumed the authority of supreme arbiters in all controversies that arose concerning religion or church discipline; and maintained the pretended rights of the church against the encroachments and usurpations of kings and princes. Their authority, however, was confined within certain limits; for, on one hand, it was restrained by sovereign princes, that it might not arrogantly aim at civil dominion; and, on the other it was opposed by the bishops themselves, that it might not rise to a spiritual despotism, and utterly destroy the liberty and privileges of synods and councils.\* From the time of Leo IX. the popes employed every method which the most artful ambition could suggest, to remove these limits, and to render their dominion both despotic and universal. They not only aspired to the character of supreme legislators in the church, to an unlimited jurisdiction over all synods and councils, whether general or provincial, to the sole distribution of all ecclesiastical honours and benefices, as being divinely authorized and appointed for that purpose; but they carried their insolent pretensions so far as to give themselves out for lords of the universe, arbiters of the fate of kingdoms and empires, and supreme rulers over the kings and princes of the earth. Before Leo. IX. no pope was so enormously impudent as to claim this unbounded authority, or to assume the power of transferring territories and provinces from their lawful possessors to new masters. This pontiff gave the example of such an amazing pretension to his holy successors, by granting to the Normans, who had settled in Italy, the lands and territories which they had already usurped, or were employed in forcing out of the hands of the Greeks and Saracens.† The ambitious views, however, of the aspiring popes were opposed by the emperors, the Kings of France, by William the Conqueror, who was now seated on the throne of England, and was the boldest assertor of the rights and privileges of royalty against the high claims of the apostolic see,‡

\* The very learned Lamoignon (in his *Assertio contra Privilegium S. Medardi*, part ii. cap. xxxi. op. tom. ii. has given us an accurate account of the ecclesiastical laws, and of the power of the hierarchy, during this century, which he collected from the letters of pope Gregory VII. from which account it appears, that Gregory, ambitious as he was, did not pretend to a supreme and despotic authority in the church.

† See Gaufr. Malaterra, *Hist. Sicula*, lib. i. cap. xiv. p. 553, tom. v. Scriptor. Ital. Muratori. (G) The translator has here incorporated the note (s) of the original into the text.

‡ See Eadmeri *Historia Novorum*, which is published at the end of the works of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury. It is proper to observe here, that, if it is true on one hand, that William the Conqueror opposed, on many occasions, with the utmost vehemence and zeal, the growing power of the Roman pontiffs, and of the aspiring bishops, it is no less certain, on the other, that, to accomplish his ambitious views, he, like many other European princes, had recourse to the influence of the pontiffs upon the minds of the multitude, and thereby nourished and encouraged the pride and ambition of the court of Rome. For, while he was preparing all things for his expedition into England, he sent ambassadors to pope Alexander II. "in order (as Matthew Paris says, *Hist. Major*, lib. i.) to have his undertaking approved and justified by apostolical authority; and the pope, having considered the claims of the contending parties, sent a standard to William as

and also by several other princes. Nor did the bishops, particularly those of France and Germany, sit tamely silent under the papal yoke; many of them endeavoured to maintain their rights and the privileges of the church; but others, seduced by the allurements of interest or the dictates of superstition, sacrificed their liberties, and yielded to the pontiffs. Hence it happened, that these imperious lords of the church, though they did not entirely gain their point, or satisfy to the full their raging ambition, yet obtained vast augmentations of power, and extended their authority from day to day.

III. The see of Rome, after the death of Sylvester II. which happened in 1003, was filled successively by John XVII., John XVIII. and Sergius IV., whose pontificates were not distinguished by any memorable events. It is, however, proper to observe, that these three popes were confirmed in the see of Rome by the approbation and authority of the emperors under whose reigns they were elected to that high dignity. Benedict VIII. who was raised to the pontificate in 1012, being obliged by his competitor Gregory to leave Rome, fled into Germany for succour, and threw himself at the feet of Henry II., by whom he was reinstated in the apostolic chair, which he possessed in peace until the year 1024. It was during his pontificate, that those Normans, who make such a shining figure in history, came into Italy, and reduced several of its richest provinces under their dominion. Benedict was succeeded by his brother John XIX. who ruled the church until the year 1033. The five pontiffs whom we have now been mentioning were not chargeable with dishonouring their high station by that licentiousness and immorality which rendered so many of their successors infamous; their lives were virtuous; at least their conduct was decent. But their examples had little effect upon Benedict IX., a most abandoned profligate, and a wretch capable of the most horrid crimes, whose flagitious conduct drew upon him the just resentment of the Romans, who in 1038 removed him from his station. He was afterwards indeed restored, by the emperor Conrad, to the papal chair; but, instead of learning circumspection and prudence from his former disgrace, he became still more scandalous in his life and manners, and so provoked the Roman people by his repeated crimes, that they deposed him a second time, in 1044, and elected in his place John, bishop of Sabina, who assumed the name of Sylvester III. About three months after this new revolution, the relatives and adherents of Benedict rose up in arms, drove Sylvester out of the city, and restored the degraded pontiff to his forfeited honours, which, however, he did not long enjoy; for, perceiving that there was no possi-

the omen of his approaching royalty." It is highly probable, that the Normans in Italy had made the same humble request to Leo IX., and demanded his confirmation both of the possessions they had acquired, and of those which they intended to usurp. And when we consider all this, it will not appear so surprising that the popes aimed at universal empire, since they were encouraged in their views by the mean submissions and servile homage of the European princes.

lity of appeasing the resentment of the Romans, he sold the pontificate to John Gratian, arch-presbyter of Rome, who took the name of Gregory VI. Thus the church had, at the same time, two chiefs, Sylvester and Gregory, whose rivalry was the occasion of much trouble and confusion. This contest was terminated in 1046, in the council holden at Sutri by the emperor Henry III., who so ordered matters, that Benedict, Gregory, and Sylvester, were declared unworthy of the pontificate, and Suidger, bishop of Bamberg, was raised to that dignity, which he enjoyed for a short time under the title of Clement II.\*

IV. After the death of Clement II., which happened in 1047, Benedict IX., though twice degraded, aimed anew at the papal dignity, and accordingly forced himself into St. Peter's chair for the third time. But, in the following year, he was obliged to surrender the pontificate to Poppo, bishop of Brixen, known by the name of Damasus II., whom Henry II. elected pope in Germany, and sent into Italy to take possession of that dignity. On the death of Damasus, who ruled the see of Rome only three and twenty days, the same emperor, in the diet holden at Worms in 1048, appointed Bruno, bishop of Toul, to succeed him in the pontificate. This prelate is known in the list of the popes by the name of Leo IX.; and his private virtues, as well as his public acts of zeal and piety in the government of the church, were deemed meritorious enough to entitle him to a place among the saintly order. But if we deduct from these pretended virtues his zeal for augmenting the opulence and authority of the church of Rome, and his laudable severity in correcting and punishing certain enormous vices, which were common among the clergy during his pontificate, there will remain little in the life and administration of this pontiff, that could give him any pretension to such a distinction. It is at least certain, that many, who industriously conceal or excuse the numerous infirmities and failings of the pontiffs, censure, with the utmost freedom, the temerity and injustice of the measures he took toward the conclusion of his days. Such, among others, was the war into which he inconsiderately entered, in 1053, with the Normans, whom he was grieved to see in the possession of Apulia. His temerity, indeed, was severely punished by the issue of this war, from which he derived the bitterest fruits, being taken prisoner by the enemy, and led captive to Benevento. Here dismal reflections upon his unhappy fate preyed upon his spirits, and threw him into a dangerous illness; so that, after a year's imprisonment, he

\* In this compendious account of the popes, I have followed the relations of Francis and Anthony Pagi, Papebrock, and also those of Muratori, in his *Annales Italie*, persuaded that the learned and judicious reader will justify my treating, with the utmost contempt, what Baronius and others have alleged in favour of Gregory VI.

† In several councils which he assembled in Italy, France, and Germany, he proposed rigorous laws against simony, sodomy, incestuous and adulterous marriages, the custom of carrying arms (which had become general among the clergy,) the apostasy of the monks, who abandoned their habit and renounced their profession, &c.

was sent to Rome, where he concluded his days on the 19th of April, 1054.\*

V. After the death of Leo the papal chair was filled, in 1055, by Gebhard, bishop of Eichstadt, who assumed the name of Victor II. and, after governing the church about three years, was succeeded by Stephen IX. brother to Godfrey, duke of Lorraine, who died a few months after his election. Nothing memorable happened under the administration of these two pontiffs. Gerard, bishop of Florence, who obtained the papacy in 1058, and took the name of Nicolas II., makes a greater figure in history than several of his predecessors.† We pass in silence John, bishop of Veltri, who usurped the pontificate, as also the title of Benedict X., after the death of Stephen, and who was deposed with ignominy, after having possessed about nine months the dignity to which he had no other title, than what he derived from lawless violence. Nicolas, on the removal of this usurper, assembled a council at Rome in 1059, in which, among many salutary laws for healing the inveterate disorders that had afflicted the church, one remarkable decree was passed for altering the ancient form of electing the pontiff. This alteration was intended to prevent the tumults and commotions which arose in Rome, and the factions which divided Italy, when a new pope was to be elected. The same pontiff received the homage of the Normans, and solemnly created Robert Guiscard duke of Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily, on condition that he should observe, as a faithful vassal, an inviolable allegiance to the Roman church, and pay an annual tribute in acknowledgment of his subjection to the apostolic see. By what authority Nicolas confirmed the Norman prince in the possession of these provinces, is more than we know; certain it is, that he had no sort of property in the lands which he granted so liberally to the Normans, who held them already by the odious right of conquest.‡ Perhaps the lordly pontiff founded this right of cession upon the fictitious donation of Constantine, which has been already noticed in the course of this history; or, probably, seduced by the artful and ambitious suggestions of Hildebrand, who had himself an eye upon the pontificate, and afterwards filled it under the adopted name of Gregory VII., he imagined, that as Christ's viceregent, the Roman pontiff was the king of kings, and had the whole universe for his domain. It is well known that Hildebrand had a supreme ascendancy over the mind of Nicolas, and that the latter neither undertook nor executed any thing without his direction. Be that as it may, it was the feudal grant made to Guiscard by this pope, that laid the foundation of the kingdom of Naples, or of the two Sicilies, and of

the sovereignty over that kingdom which the Roman pontiffs constantly claim, and which the Sicilian monarchs annually acknowledge.

VI. Before the pontificate of Nicholas II., the popes were chosen not only by the suffrages of the cardinals, but also by those of the whole Roman clergy, the nobility, the burgesses, and the assembly of the people. An election, in which such a confused and jarring multitude was concerned, could not but produce continual factions, animosities, and tumults. To prevent these, as far as was possible, this artful and provident pontiff had a law passed, by which the cardinals, as well presbyters as bishops, were empowered, on a vacancy in the see of Rome, to elect a new pope, without any prejudice to the ancient privileges of the Roman emperors in this important matter.\* Nor were the rest of the clergy, with the burgesses and people, excluded from all participation in this election, since their consent was solemnly demanded, and also esteemed of much weight.† In consequence, however, of this new regula-

† \* It does not appear, that Nicolas was at all solicitous about the privileges of the emperor, and his authority in the election of the bishop of Rome; for the words of the decree in all the various copies of it are to this import: "The cardinals shall first deliberate concerning the election of a pontiff, and the consent of the other clergy and of the people shall be required to confirm their choice. The pope shall be chosen out of the members that compose the church of Rome, if a proper person can be found among them; if not, he shall be elected elsewhere." "all this without any prejudice to the honour of our dear son Henry (who is now king, and shall be soon emperor, as we have already promised him,) or to the honor of his successors on whom the apostolic see shall confer personally and successively the same high privilege." Here we see the good pontiff manifestly taking advantage of the minority of Henry IV. to depreciate and diminish the ancient prerogatives of the imperial crown, and to magnify the authority of the papal mitre; for he declares, as a *personal right* granted by the Roman see to each emperor for himself, the privilege of confirming the pope's election; whereas it is well known that this privilege had been vested in the emperors of Germany during many preceding ages. See Fleury, Eccles. Hist. vol. xiii. liv. lx. It is proper to observe here, that the cringing and ignoble submission of Charles the Bald, who would not accept the title of emperor before it was conferred upon him by the pontiff, occasioned, in process of time, that absurd notion, that the papal consecration was requisite in order to qualify the kings of Germany to assume the title of Roman emperors, though, without that consecration, these kings had all Italy under their dominion, and exercised in every part of it various rights and prerogatives of sovereignty. Hence the kings of Germany were first styled kings of the Franks and Lombards, afterwards kings of the Romans until the year 1508, when Maximilian I. changed the title of king into that of emperor.

† The decree of Nicolas concerning the election of the pontiff is to be found in many authors, and particularly in the Concilia. But, upon comparing several copies of this famous decree, I found them in many respects very different from each other. In some copies the decree appears abridged; in others, it is long and prolix. In some it seems favourable to the rights and privileges of the emperors; in others it appears to have the contrary tendency. The most ample copy is that which we find in the *Chronicon Farsense in Muratori's Script. Rerum Italicarum*, tom. ii. part. ii. p. 645 which differs however, in various circumstances, from that which was published by Flugo-Florentinus, in his book de regia Potestate et sacerdotali Dignitate, in Baluzii Miscellaneis, tom. iv. p. 62. Notwithstanding the diversity that exists in the copies of this famous decree, they all agree in confirming the accounts we have given of the plans and pontificate of Nicolas

\* See the Acta Sanctorum ad d. xix. Aprilis, tom. iii. p. 642.—Hist. Littéraire de la France, tom. vii. p. 459.—Giannone, Historia di Napoli, tom. ii.

† Beside the accounts given of Nicolas II. by the writers of the papal history, there is a particular and accurate history of this pontiff drawn up by the Benedictine monks, in the Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. vii. p. 515.

‡ See Muratori's Annali d'Italia, tom. vi. p. 166.—Baron. Annal. ad an. 1060.

tion, the cardinals acted the principal part in the creation of the new pontiff, though they suffered for a long time much opposition both from the sacerdotal orders and the Roman citizens, who were constantly either reclaiming their ancient rights, or abusing the privilege they yet retained of confirming the election of every new pope by their approbation and consent. In the following century an end was put to all these disputes by Alexander III., who was so fortunate as to complete what Nicolas had only begun, and who transferred and confined to the college of cardinals the right of electing to the apostolic see, excluding the nobility, the people, and the rest of the clergy, from all concern in this important matter.\*

It may not be improper here to give some account of the origin of the cardinals,† and the nature of their privileges and functions. Many writers‡ have treated this subject in an ample manner, and have shed upon it a profusion of erudition, which deserves, no doubt, the highest applause; but they are, generally speaking, defective in perspicuity and precision; nor do I know of any, who have confined themselves to the true state of the question, and investigated, in a satisfactory manner, the origin of the office of cardinal, and the reasons that occasioned the institution of that order of ecclesiastics. Several learned men have employed much time and labour in fixing the sense of the word *cardinal*, and in illustrating its meaning from ancient monuments and records; but, however worthy of a curious philologist these researches may be, they contribute little to clear up the point in question, or to convey an accurate and satisfactory notion of the true origin of the college of cardinals, and the nature of that ecclesiastical dignity. It is certain, that the word in question, when applied to persons or things, and more especially to the sacred order, was, in the language of the middle ages, a term of dubious signification, and was susceptible of various senses. It is also well known, that, in former times, this title was by no means peculiar to the priests and ministers of the church of Rome, but was in use in all the Latin churches, and that not only the secular clergy, but also the regular, such as abbots, canons, and monks, were capable of this denomination, though in different senses. But, after the pontificate of Alexander III., the common use of the term was

gradually diminished, and it was confined to such only as were immediately concerned in the election of the pope, and had the right of suffrage in this weighty matter; so that, when we inquire into the origin of the sacred college at Rome, the question is not, who they were, that in the remoter periods of the church were distinguished, among the Latins in general, or at Rome in particular, from the rest of the clergy, by the name of cardinals; nor do we inquire into the proper signification of that term, or into the various senses in which it was formerly employed. The true state of the question is this: who the persons were that Nicolas II. comprehended under that denomination, when he vested in the Roman cardinals alone the right of electing the new pontiff, and excluded from that important privilege the rest of the clergy, the nobility, the burghesses, and the people? When this is known with certainty, we shall have a just notion of the college of cardinals in its rise, and shall also perceive the difference existing between the first cardinals and those of our times. Now this may easily be learned from the edict of Nicolas II. which sets the matter in the clearest light. "We have thought proper to enact (says the pontiff,) that, on the decease of the bishop of the Roman Catholic, or universal church, the affair of the election be treated principally, and previously to all other deliberations, among the *cardinal bishops* alone, who shall afterwards call in to their council the *cardinal clerks*, and require finally the consent of the rest of the clergy, and the people, to their election."‡ Here we see that the pontiff divides into two classes the persons who were to have the right of suffrage in the election of his successors. By the former we are manifestly to understand the seven prelates who belonged to the city and territory of Rome, whom Nicolas calls, in the same edict, *comprovinciales episcopi* (an epithet which had been used before by Leo I.,) and who had been distinguished by the title of cardinal bishops long before the century of which we are treating. The words of Nicolas confirmed this account of the matter, and place it beyond all possibility of contradiction; for he declares, that by cardinal bishops he understands those to whom it belonged to consecrate the pontiff elect; "Since the apostolic see," observes the papal legislator, "cannot be under the jurisdiction of any superior or metropolitan,† the cardinal bishops must necessarily supply the place of a metropolitan, and fix the elected pontiff on the summit of apostolic exaltation and empire."‡ Now

\* See Mabillon, *Comm. in Ord. Roman.* tom. ii. *Musei Italici*, p. 114.—Constant. *Cenni Pref. ad Concilium Lateran.* Stephani iii. p. 18.—Franc. *Pagi Breviarium Pontif. Romanor.* tom. ii. p. 374.

† The translator has here incorporated into the text the long and important note (c) of the original concerning the cardinals. The citations and references only are thrown into the notes.

‡ The authors who have written of the name, origin, and rights of the cardinals, are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his *Bibliogr. Antiquar.* p. 455.—Casp. Sagittarius, *Introd. ad Historiam Ecclesiast.* cap. xxix. p. 771, et Jo. And. Schmidius in *Supplement.* p. 644.—Christ. Gryphius, *Isagoge ad Historiam Saculæ* xvii. p. 430. Add to these Ludov. Thomassinus *Disciplina Ecclesiæ vetus et nova*, tom. i. lib. ii. cap. 115, 116, p. 616, and Lud. Ant. Muratori, whose learned dissertation, *de Origine Cardinalatus*, is published in his *Antiq. Ital. mediæ ævi*, tom. v.

§ \* The passage of the edict (which we have here translated from Hugo Floriacus, in *Baluzii Miscel.* tom. iv. p. 62.) runs thus in the original: "Constituimus ut, obeunte hujus Romanæ universalis ecclesiæ pontifice, inprimis, cardinales episcopi diligentissima simul consideratione tractantes, mox sibi clericos cardinales adhibeant, siquæ reliquus clerus et populus ad consensum novæ electionis accedant."

† Such as the swelling and bombastic terms of the edict: "Quia sedes apostolica super se metropo-



it is well known that the seven bishops of Rome, above-mentioned, had the privilege of consecrating the pontiff.

All these things being duly considered, we shall immediately perceive the true nature and meaning of the famous edict, according to which it is manifest, that, upon the death of a pontiff, the cardinal bishops were first to deliberate alone with regard to a proper successor, and to examine the respective merit of the candidates who might pretend to this high dignity, and afterwards to call in the cardinal clerks, not only to demand their counsel, but also to join with them in the election. The word *clerk* here bears the same sense with that of *presbyter*, and it is undeniably certain that the name of cardinal presbyter was given to the ministers of the eight and twenty Roman parishes, or principal churches. All the rest of the clergy, of whatever order or rank they might be, were, together with the people, expressly excluded from the right of voting in the election of the pontiff, though they were allowed what is called a *negative* suffrage, and their consent was required to what the others had done; from all which it appears that the college of electors, who chose the Roman pontiff, and who after this period were called cardinals in a new and unusual acceptation of that term, consisted, according to their original establishment by Nicolas II., of only two orders, namely, cardinal bishops and cardinal clerks or presbyters.\*

It is necessary to observe, before we finish this digression, that the famous decree of Nicolas could not obtain the force of a law. "It is evident (says Anselm, bishop of Lucca) that the edict of Nicolas is, and always has been, without the smallest degree of weight or authority. But, in affirming this, I have not the least design to cast any reflection upon the blessed memory of that pontiff, or to derogate from the applause that is due to his virtues. . . . As a man, however, he was fallible, and, through the weakness that is inseparable from humanity, was liable to be seduced into measures that were inconsistent with equity and justice." It is true, the

"litaniam habere non potest, cardinales episcopi metropolitani vice proculdubio fungantur, qui electionem antistitem ad apostolici culminis apicem provehant."

\* We must therefore take care that we be not misled by the error of Omphr. Panvinius, who affirms, [\*] that the cardinal bishops were not added to the college of cardinals before the pontificate of Alexander III. Nor are we to listen to the supposition of those writers, who imagine that certain deacons were, from the beginning, members of that college of cardinals by whom the popes were elected. There were indeed, in the Roman church, long before the edict of Nicolas, (and there still remain) cardinal deacons, i. e. superintendants of those churches which have hospitals annexed to them, and whose revenues are appropriated to the support of the poor; but they were evidently excluded from the election of the pope, which, by the edict of Nicolas, was to be made by the cardinal bishops and clerks alone. Hence we find the cardinals plainly distinguished from the deacons in the diploma that was drawn up for the election of Gregory VII.

† Anselm. Luceensis, lib. ii. contra Wibertum Antipapam et sequaces ejus, in Canisii Lectiomb. Antiquis. tom. iii. part. i. p. 383.

prelate has here principally in view that part of the edict in which Nicolas acknowledges and confirms the right of the emperors to ratify the election of the Roman pontiff; yet what he says is undoubtedly true of the whole edict in all its parts. For the seven Palatine judges,\* who were excluded by this decree from the important privilege they had formerly enjoyed of voting in the election to the apostolic see, complained loudly of the injury that was done them; and, seconded in their complaints by the various orders of the clergy, and by the clamours of the army, the citizens, and the multitude, they declared their opposition to the execution of this edict, and gave much trouble and uneasiness to the cardinals, who had been constituted electors by Nicolas. To appease these tumults, Alexander III. augmented the college of the electing cardinals, by conferring that dignity upon the prior, or arch presbyter, of St. John Lateran, the arch presbyter of St. Peter and St. Mary the Greater, the abbots of St. Paul and St. Laurence without the wall, and lastly, upon the seven Palatine judges.† By this dexterous stratagem, the higher order of the clergy was defeated, and ceased to oppose the measures of the cardinal electors; nor, indeed, could its opposition be of any significance, since its chiefs and leaders were become members of the sacred college instituted by Nicolas. The inferior clergy continued yet obstinate; but their opposition was vanquished in the same manner, and they were reduced to silence by the promotion of their chiefs, the cardinal deacons, to the dignity of electors. Who it was (whether Alexander III. or some other pontiff) that raised the principal Roman deacons to the rank of cardinals, is not certain; but nothing is more evident than that the design of this promotion was to put an end to the murmurs and complaints of the inferior clergy, who highly resented the violation of their privileges.

When the various orders of the clergy were drawn off from the opposition, it was no difficult matter to silence the people, and to exclude them from all part in the election of the pontiff. And accordingly, when, upon the death of Alexander III., it was proposed to choose Lucius III.‡ as his successor, the consent and approbation of the clergy and people, which had hitherto been always esteemed necessary to ratify the election, were not even demanded, and the affair was transacted by the college of cardinals alone, who have continued to maintain that exclusive and important privilege even to our times. Some writers affirm, that Innocent II. had been elected in the same manner, by the cardinals alone, without the consent of the clergy or the people, several years before the pontificate of Lucius;§ this

\* These judges were the *Primitivus, Secundarius, Arcarius, Sarcellarus, Proto-scriniarius, Primitivus Defensorum, et Admuniculator*: for a particular account of whose respective offices, services, and privileges, see Gravins, Du Cange, &c.

† Cenni Pref. ad Concil. Lateran. Stephan. p. 115, p. 19.—Mabillon, Comment. ad Ord. Roman. p. iii, ex Panvino.

‡ In the original, instead of Lucius III., we read Victor III. which was certainly a mistake of inadvertency in the learned author.

§ See Pag. Breviar. Pontif. Romanor. tom. ii. p. 615.

[\*] See Mabillon, Comment. in Ordinem Rom. p. 115, tom. ii. Musei Italici.

may be true, but it is nothing to the purpose; for, as the election of Innocent II. was irregular, it cannot properly be alleged in the case before us.

VII. From what has been observed in the preceding section, we may conclude, that the college of cardinals, and the extensive authority and important privileges they enjoy at this day, derive their origin from the edict published at the request and under the pontificate of Nicolas II.; that, under the title of cardinals, this pontiff comprehended the seven Roman bishops, who were considered as his suffragans, and of whom the bishop of Ostia was the chief, as also the eight and twenty ministers, who had inspection over the principal Roman churches; and that to these were added, in process of time, under Alexander III. and other pontiffs, new members, in order to appease the resentment of those who looked upon themselves as injured by the edict of Nicolas, and also to answer other purposes of ecclesiastical policy. We see, also, from an attentive view of this matter, that though the high order of purpled prelates, commonly called cardinals, had its rise in the eleventh century, yet it does not seem to have acquired the firm and undisputed authority of a legal council before the following age and the pontificate of Alexander III.

VIII. Though Nicolas II. had expressly acknowledged and confirmed in his edict the right of the emperor to ratify by his consent the election of the pontiff, his eyes were no sooner closed, than the Romans, at the instigation of Hildebrand, arch deacon and afterwards bishop of Rome, violated this imperial privilege in the most presumptuous manner; for they not only elected to the pontificate Anselm, bishop of Lucca, who assumed the name of Alexander II. but also solemnly installed him in that high office without consulting the emperor Henry IV. or giving him the least information of the matter. Agnes, the mother of the young emperor, no sooner received an account of this irregular transaction from the bishops of Lombardy, to whom the election of Anselm was extremely disagreeable, than she assembled a council at Basil, and, in order to maintain the authority of her son, who was yet a minor, caused Cadolaus, bishop of Parma, to be created pope, under the title of Honorius II. Hence arose a long and furious contest between the rival pontiffs, who maintained their respective pretensions by the force of arms, and presented a scene of bloodshed and horror in the church of Christ, which was designed to be the centre of charity and peace. In this violent contention Alexander triumphed, though he could never engage his obstinate adversary to desist from his pretensions.\*

IX. This contest, indeed, was of little consequence when viewed in comparison with the dreadful commotions which Hildebrand, who succeeded Alexander, and assumed the name

of Gregory VII., excited both in church and state, and nourished and fomented until the end of his days. This vehement pontiff, who was a Tuscan, born of mean parents, rose, by various steps, from the obscure station of a monk of Clugni, to the rank of arch deacon in the Roman church, and, from the time of Leo IX. who treated him with peculiar marks of distinction, was accustomed to govern the Roman pontiffs by his counsels, which had acquired the highest degree of influence and authority. In the year 1073, and on the same day that Alexander was interred, he was raised to the pontificate by the unanimous suffrages of the cardinals, bishops, abbots, monks, and people, without regard to the edict of Nicolas II.; and his election was confirmed by the approbation and consent of Henry IV. king of the Romans, to whom ambassadors had been sent for that purpose. This prince, indeed, had soon reason to repent of the consent he had given to an election, which became so prejudicial to his own authority and to the interests and liberties of the church, and so detrimental, in general, to the sovereignty and independence of kingdoms and empires.\* Hildebrand was a man of uncommon genius, whose ambition in forming the most arduous projects was equalled by his dexterity in bringing them into execution. Sagacious, crafty, and intrepid, he suffered nothing to escape his penetration, defeat his stratagems, or daunt his courage: haughty and arrogant beyond all measure, obstinate, impetuous, and intractable, he looked up to the summit of universal empire with a wishful eye, and laboured up the steep ascent with uninterrupted ardour and invincible perseverance: void of all principle, and destitute of every pious and virtuous feeling, he suffered little restraint in his audacious pursuits, from the dictates of religion or the remonstrances of conscience. Such was the character of Hildebrand, and his conduct was every way suitable to it; for no sooner did he find himself in the papal chair, than he displayed to the world the most odious marks of his tyrannic ambition. Not content to enlarge the jurisdiction, and to augment the opulence of the see of Rome, he laboured indefatigably to render the universal church subject to the despotic government and the arbitrary power of the pontiff alone, to dissolve the jurisdiction which kings and emperors had hitherto exercised over the various orders of the clergy, and to exclude them from the management or distribution of the revenues of the church. The outrageous pontiff even went farther, and impiously attempted to subject to his jurisdiction the emperors, kings, and princes of the earth, and to

\* The writers who have given the most ample accounts of the life and exploits of Gregory VII. are enumerated by Casp. Sagittarius, in his *Introductio ad Hist. Ecclesiasticam*, tom. i. p. 687, and by And. Schmidtus, in his *Supplementum*, tom. ii. p. 627.—See also the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. v. Maii ad d. xxv. p. 568, and Mabillon, *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Benedicti*, *Secl. vi.* p. 406. Add to these the *Life of Gregory VII.* published at Frankfurt in 1710, by Just. Christopher Dithmar, as also the authors who have written the history of the contests that arose between the empire and the hierarchy of Rome, and of the wars that were occasioned by the disputes concerning investitures.

\* Ferdin. Ughelli *Italia Sacra*, tom. ii. p. 166.—Jo. Jac. Mascoivius, *de Rebus Imperii sub Henrico IV.* et V. lib. i. p. 7.—Franc. Pagi *Breviar. Pontificum Romanorum*, tom. ii. p. 385.—Muratori, *Annali d'Italia*, tom. vi. p. 214

render their dominions tributary to the see of Rome. Such were the *pious* and *apostolic* exploits that employed the activity of Gregory VII. during his whole life, and which rendered his pontificate a continual scene of tumult and bloodshed. Were it necessary to bring farther proofs of his tyranny and arrogance, his fierce impetuosity and boundless ambition, we might appeal to those famous *sentences*, which are generally called, after him, the *dictates* of Hildebrand, and which show, in a lively manner, the spirit and character of this restless pontiff.\*

X. Under the pontificate of Hildebrand, the face of the Latin church was entirely changed, its government subverted, and the most important and valuable of those rights and privileges that had been formerly vested in its councils, bishops, and sacred colleges, were usurped by the greedy pontiff. It is, however,

\* *Dictatus Hildebrandini*. By these are understood twenty-seven apophthegms, or short sentences, relating to the supreme authority of the Roman pontiffs over the universal church and the kingdoms of the world, which are to be found in the second book of the Epistles of Gregory VII. between the fifty-fifth and the fifty-sixth Epistle under the title of *Dictatus Papæ*, i. e. Dictates of the Pope. See Harduini Concilia, tom. vi. part. i. p. 1304. and the various writers of Ecclesiastical History. Baronius, Lupus [\*] and other historians, who have signalized, upon all occasions, their vehement attachment to the Roman pontiffs, maintain, that these Dictates were drawn up by Gregory VII. and proposed as laws in a certain council; and hence the protestant writers have ventured to attribute them to Hildebrand. But the learned John Launoy, Natalis Alexander, Antony [†] and Francis Pagi, [‡] Elias Du-Pin, and other authors of note, affirm in the most positive manner that these sentences, or dictates, were a downright forgery imposed upon the world under the name of Gregory, by some perfidious impostor, who proposed thereby to flatter the Roman pontiffs in their ambitious pretensions. As a proof of this assertion, they observe, that while some of these sentences express indeed in a lively manner the ambitious spirit of Gregory, there are others which appear entirely opposite to the sentiments of that pontiff, as they are delivered in several parts of his Epistles. The French writers have important reasons (which it is not necessary to mention here) for affirming that no Roman pontiff ever presumed to speak of the papal power and jurisdiction in such arrogant terms as are here put into the mouth of Gregory. It may be easily granted, that these sentences, in their present form, are not the composition of this famous pontiff; for many of them are obscure, and they are all thrown together without the least order, method, or connexion, and it is not to be imagined, that a man of such genius, as Gregory discovered, would have neglected either perspicuity or precision in describing the authority, and fixing what he looked upon to be the rights and privileges of the bishops of Rome. But, notwithstanding all this, if we consider the *matter* of these sentences, we shall be entirely persuaded that they belonged originally to Hildebrand, since we find the greatest part of them repeated word for word in several places in his Epistles, and since such of them as appear inconsistent with some passages in these epistles, are not so in reality, but may be easily explained in perfect conformity with what they are said to contradict. The most probable account of the matter seems to be this: that some mean author extracted these sentences, partly from the extant epistles of Gregory, partly from those that have perished in the ruins of time, and published them in the form in which they now appear, without judgment or method.

[\*] Lupus, in his Note et Dissertationes in Concilia, tom. vi. op. p. 164, has given us an ample commentary on the Dictates of Hildebrand, which he looks upon as both authentic and sacred.

[†] See Anton. Pagi Critica in Baronium.

[‡] See Franc. Pagi Breviar. Pontif. Roman. tom. ii. p. 473.

to be observed, that the weight of this tyrannic usurpation did not fall equally upon all the European provinces, several of these provinces preserved some remains of their ancient liberty and independence, in the possession of which a variety of circumstances happily concurred to maintain them.

But, as we insinuated above, the views of Hildebrand were not confined to the erection of an absolute and universal monarchy in the church; they aimed also at the establishment of a civil monarchy equally extensive and despotic; and this aspiring pontiff, after having drawn up a system of ecclesiastical laws for the government of the church, would have introduced also a new code of political laws, had he been permitted to execute the plan he had formed. His purpose was to engage, in the bonds of fidelity and allegiance to St. Peter, i. e. to the Roman pontiff, all the kings and princes of the earth, and to establish at Rome an annual assembly of bishops, by whom the contests that might arise between kingdoms or sovereign states were to be decided, the rights and pretensions of princes to be examined, and the fate of nations and empires to be determined. This ambitious project met, however, with the warmest opposition, particularly from the vigilance and resolution of the emperors, and also from the British and French monarchs.\*

That Hildebrand had formed this audacious plan is undoubtedly evident, both from his own epistles, and also from other authentic records of antiquity. The nature of the oath which he drew up for the king or emperor of the Romans, from whom he demanded a profession of subjection and allegiance, † shows abundantly the arrogance of his pretensions. But his conduct toward the kingdom of France is worthy of particular notice. It is well known, that whatever dignity and dominion the popes enjoyed were originally derived from the French princes; and yet Hildebrand, or (as we shall hereafter entitle him) Gregory VII. pretended that the kingdom was tributary to the see of Rome, and commanded his legates to demand yearly, in the most solemn manner, the payment of that tribute; ‡ their demands, however, were treated with contempt, and the tribute was never either acknowledged or offered. Nothing can be more insolent than the

† \* The long note (g) in the original, which contains the ambitious exploits of Hildebrand, is inserted in the following paragraph, except the citations, which are thrown into notes.

† See the ninth book of his epistles, Epist. iii. The form of the oath runs thus: "Ab hac hora et deinceps fidelis ero per rectam fidem B. Petro Apostolo, ejusque vicario Papæ Gregorio . . . et quodcumque ipse Papa præceperit sub his videlicet verbis, per veram obedientiam, fideliter, sicut oportet Christianum, observabo. Et eo die, quando eum promittis videro, fideliter per manus meas miles Sancti Petri et illius elicitar." What is this but a formal oath of allegiance?

‡ Epist. lib. viii. ep. xxiii. in Harduini's Concilia, tom. vi. p. 1476. "Dicendum autem est omnibus Gallis et per veram obedientiam præcipiendum, ut unaquæque donus saltem unum denarium annuatim solvat Beato Petro, si eum recognoscant patrem et pastorem suum more antiquo." Every one knows that the demand made with the form, *per veram obedientiam*, was supposed to oblige indispensably

language in which he addressed himself to Philip I. king of France, to whom he recommended an humble and obliging carriage, from this consideration, that both his 'kingdom and his soul were under the dominion of St. Peter (i. e. his vicar the Roman pontiff,) who had the power to bind and to loose him, both 'in heaven and upon earth.\* Nothing escaped his all-grasping ambition; he pretended that Saxony was a fief holden in subjection to the see of Rome, to which it had been formerly yielded by Charlemagne as a pious offering to St. Peter. He also extended his pretensions to the kingdom of Spain, maintaining in one of his letters,† that it was the property of the apostolic see from the earliest times of the church, yet acknowledging in another,‡ that the transaction by which the successors of St. Peter had acquired this property, had been lost among other ancient records. His claims, however, were more respected in Spain than they had been in France; for it is proved most evidently by authentic records, that the king of Arragon, and Bernard, count of Bcsalu, gave a favourable answer to the demands of Gregory, and paid him regularly an annual tribute;§ and their example was followed by other Spanish princes, as we could show, were it necessary, by a variety of arguments. The despotic views of this lordly pontiff were attended with less success in England, than in any other country. William the Conqueror was a prince of great spirit and resolution, extremely jealous of his rights, and tenacious of the prerogatives he enjoyed as a sovereign and independent monarch; and accordingly, when Gregory wrote him a letter demanding the arrears of the *Peter-pence*,|| and at the same time summoning him to do homage for the kingdom of England, as a fief of the apostolic see, William granted the former, but refused the latter¶ with a noble obstinacy, declaring that

he held his kingdom of God only, and his own sword. Obligated to yield to the obstinacy of the English monarch, whose name struck terror into the boldest hearts, the restless pontiff addressed his imperious mandates where he imagined they would be received with more facility. He wrote circular letters to the most powerful of the German princes,\* to Geysa, king of Hungary,† and Swein, king of Denmark,‡ soliciting them to make a solemn grant of their kingdoms and territories to the prince of the apostles, and to hold them under the jurisdiction of his vicar at Rome, as fiefs of the apostolic see. What success attended his demands upon these princes, we cannot say; but certain it is, that in several countries his efforts were effectual, and his *modest* proposals were received with the utmost docility and zeal. The son of Demetrius, czar of the Russians, set out for Rome, in consequence of the pontiff's letter,§ in order to "obtain, as a gift "from St. Peter, by the hands of Gregory, "after professing his subjection and allegiance "to the prince of the apostles," the kingdom which was to devolve to him upon the death of his father; and his *pious request* was readily granted by the officious pope, who was extremely liberal of what did not belong to him. Demetrius Suinimer, duke of Croatia and Dalmatia, was raised to the rank and prerogatives of royalty by the same pontiff in 1076, and solemnly proclaimed king by his legate at Salona, on condition that he should pay an annual tribute of two hundred pieces of gold to St. Peter at every Easter festival.|| This bold step was injurious to the authority of the emperors of Constantinople, who, before this time, comprehended the province of Croatia within the limits of their sovereignty. The kingdom of Poland became also the object of Gregory's ambition, and a favourable occasion was offered for the execution of his iniquitous views: for, when Boleslaus II. had assassinated Stanislaus, bishop of Cracow, the pontiff not only excommunicated him with all the circumstances of infamy that he could invent, but also hurled him from his throne, dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken, and, by an express and imperious edict, prohibited the nobles and clergy of Poland from electing a new king without the pope's consent ¶ Many other examples might be alleged of the phrenetic ambition of Gregory; but those which have been already mentioned are sufficient to excite the indignation of every impartial reader. Had the success of that pontiff been equal to the extent of his insolent

\* Lib. vii. epist. xx. in Harduin's Concilia, tom. vi. p. 1468. "Maxime eniter ut B. Petrum, in cujus potestate est regnum tuum et anima tua, qui te potest in celo et in terra ligare et absolvere, tibi facias debitorem."

† Lib. x. ep. vii. "Regnum Hispaniæ ab antiquo proprii juris S. Petri fuisse et soli apostolicæ sedi æquo pertinere."

‡ Lib. x. epist. xxviii.

§ See Peter de Marca, Histoire de Bearn, liv. iv. p. 331.

|| The impost of *Peter-pence* (so called from its being collected on the festival of St. Peter in Vinculis) was an ancient tax of a penny on each house, first granted in 725, by Ina, king of the West Saxons, for the establishment and support of an English college at Rome, and afterwards extended, in 794, by Offa, over all Mercia and East Anglia. In process of time it became a standing and general tax throughout England; and, though it was for some time applied to the support of the English college according to its original design, the popes at length found means to appropriate it to themselves. It was confirmed by the laws of Canute, Edward the Confessor, William the Conqueror, &c. and was never totally abolished till the reign of Henry VIII.

¶ The letter of William is extant in the Miscellanea of Baluzius, tom. vii. p. 127; as also in Collier's Ecclesiastical History, in the Collection of Records, at the end of the first volume, p. 743, No. 12. "Hæbertus legatus tuus (says the resolute monarch to the audacious pontiff) admonuit me, quatenus tibi et successoribus tuis fidelitatem facerem, et de pecunia, quam antecessores mei ad ecclesiam mittere solebant, melius cogitare. Unum admisi, alterum non admisi. Fidelitatem facere nolui nec volo." &c.

\* See, in Harduin's Concilia, his famous letter (lib. ix. epist. iii.) to the bi-shop of Padua, exhorting him to engage Welfo, duke of Bavaria, and other German princes, to submit themselves and their dominions to the apostolic jurisdiction. "Admonere te volumus (says the pontiff) duces Welfonem, et fidelitatem B. Petro faciat. Illum enim totum in regno Beati Petri collocare desideramus, et ad ejus servitium specialiter provocare; quam voluntatem si in eo, vel etiam in aliis potentibus viris, amore B. Petri ductis, cognoveris, ut perficiant elabora."

† Lib. ii. ep. lxx.

‡ Lib. ii. ep. li.

§ Lib. ii. ep. lxxiv.

|| See Du Mont, Corps Diplomatique, tom. i. n. 88. p. 53.—Jo. Lucius, de Regno Dalmatiæ, lib. ii. p. 85. ¶ See Dlugossi Histor. Polon. tom. i. p. 295.

views, all the kingdoms of Europe would have been at this day tributary to the Roman see, and its princes the soldiers or vassals of St. Peter, in the person of his pretended vicar upon earth. But, though his most important projects were ineffectual, many of his attempts were crowned with a favourable issue; for, from the time of his pontificate, the face of Europe underwent a considerable change, and the prerogatives of the emperors and other sovereign princes were much diminished. It was, particularly under the administration of Gregory, that the emperors were deprived of the privilege of ratifying, by their consent, the election of the pope; a privilege of no small importance, which they have never recovered.

XI. The zeal and activity which Gregory employed in extending the jurisdiction of the Roman see, and enriching the patrimony of St. Peter, met, in no part of Europe, with such remarkable success as in Italy.—His intimate familiarity with Matilda, the daughter of Boniface, duke of Tuscany, and the most powerful and opulent princess in that country (who found by experience that neither ambition nor grace had extinguished the tender passions in the heart of Gregory,) contributed much to this success; for he engaged that princess, after the death of her husband Godfrey, duke of Lorraine, and her mother Beatrix, which happened in the years 1076 and 1077, to settle all her possessions in Italy and elsewhere upon the church of Rome, and thus to appoint St. Peter and his pretended vicar the heirs of her immense treasures. This rich donation was, indeed, considerably invalidated by the second marriage, which Matilda contracted, in 1089, with Welf, or Guelf, the son of the duke of Bavaria, not without the consent of pope Urban II. She, however, renewed it in a solemn manner in 1102, about seven years after her separation from her second husband, by which she became again sole mistress of her vast possessions.\* But, notwithstanding this new act, the popes did not remain in the peaceful possession of this splendid inheritance. It was warmly and powerfully disputed, first by the emperor Henry V. and afterwards by several other princes; nor were the pontiffs so successful in this contest as to preserve the whole inheritance, though, after various struggles and efforts, they re-

mained in the possession of a considerable part of it, which they still enjoy.\*

XII. The plan that Gregory had formed for raising the church above all human authority, to a state of perfect supremacy and independence, had many kinds of opposition to encounter, but none more difficult to surmount than that which arose from the two reigning vices of concubinage and simony, that had infected the whole body of the European clergy. The pontiffs, from the time of Stephen IX., had combated with zeal and vehemence those monstrous vices,† but without success, as they

\* Many learned men conclude from the very act by which this donation was confirmed to the see of Rome, that Matilda comprehended in the gift only her allodial possessions, and not the territories which she held as the fiefs of the empire, such as the marquisate of Tuscany, and the duchy of Spoleto. For the words of the act run thus: "Ego Matildis. . . dedi et obtuli ecclesie S. Petri. . . omnia mea bona jure proprietario, tam que tunc habueram, quam ea que in antea adquisitura eram, sive jure successionis, sive alio quocunque jure ad me pertineant." See the *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. iii. p. 448. But it is much to be questioned, whether this distinction is so evident as is pretended; for the words *jure proprietario*, from which it is inferred that Matilda disposed of only her allodial possessions in favour of St. Peter, do not, in my opinion, relate to the possessions of the testatrix, but to the nature of the gift, and must be interpreted in conjunction with the preceding verbs, "dedi et obtuli." The princess does not say, "dedi omnia bona que jure proprietario possideo et habeo," i. e. "I have granted that part of my property which I hold by a supreme and independent right," in which case the opinion of the learned men above-mentioned would be well founded; but she says, "dedi omnia bona mea ecclesie jure proprietario," i. e. "my will is, that the church shall possess as its own property the inheritance I have left to it." Besides, the following words manifestly show, that the opinion of these learned men is destitute of all foundation, since Matilda would not have added, "sive jure successionis, sive alio quocunque jure ad me pertineant," i. e. "I grant all my possessions, under whatever title I enjoy them, whether by right of succession, or by any other right," &c. had she intended to confine her donation to her allodial possessions. Certain it is, that in this ample grant she excepts no part of her property, but evidently comprehends in it her whole substance. If it be objected to this, that the pontiffs never affirmed that the fiefs of the empire, which Matilda possessed, were comprehended in this grant to their church, and that they only claimed her allodial and independent possessions, I answer, by questioning the fact, since many circumstances concur to prove, that they claimed the whole substance of Matilda, all her possessions without exception, as their undoubted right. But, suppose for a moment that the case was otherwise, and that the Roman church had never made such an universal claim, this would, by no means invalidate the opinion I here maintain, since the question under consideration is not, how far the pontiffs may have moderated their pretensions to the territories of Matilda, but what is the true and genuine sense of the words in which her donation is expressed.

† *Monstrous vices* we may justly call them; for, though it be true, that, in the methods Gregory took to extirpate these vices, he violated not only the laws of religion, but also the dictates of natural equity and justice, and, under the mask of a pious zeal, committed the most abominable enormities, yet it is certain, on the other hand, that these vices produced the most unhappy effects both in church and state, and that the suppression of them had now become absolutely necessary. There were, indeed, among the clergy several men of piety and virtue, who lived in the bonds of wedlock, and these Gregory ought to have spared. But there is no doubt that a prodigious number of ecclesiastics throughout Europe, not only of priests and canons, but also of monks, lived in the bonds of a criminal love; kept, under the titles of wives, mistresses

\* The life and exploits of this heroic princess (who was one of the strongest bulwarks of the Roman church against the power of the emperors, and the most tender and obedient of all the *spiritual* daughters of Gregory VII.) have been written by Bened. Luchinus, Domin. Mellinus, Felix Contelorus, and Julius de Puteo, but more amply by Francis Maria of Florence, in his Records concerning the Countess Matilda, written in Italian, and Bened. Bacchinus, in his *Historia Monasterii Podalironensis*. The famous Leibnitz, in his *Scriptores Brunsvici*, tom. i. p. 629, and Lud. Ant. Muratori, in his *Scriptores Rerum Italicæ*, tom. v. p. 335, have published, with annotations, the ancient histories of the life of Matilda, composed by Donizo, and another writer, whose name is unknown, together with the copy of the second act of cession by which that princess confirmed her former grant to the church of Rome. We may add here, that nothing relating to this extraordinary woman is more worthy of perusal than the accounts that we find of her and her second husband, in the *Origines Guelphicæ*, tom. i. lib. iii. cap. v. et tom. ii. lib. v.

had become too inveterate and too general to be extirpated without the greatest difficulty and the most extraordinary efforts. Accordingly Gregory, in the year 1074, which was the second of his pontificate, exerted himself with much more vigour than his predecessors had done in opposition to the vices already mentioned. For this purpose he assembled a council at Rome, in which all the laws of the former pontiffs against simony were renewed and confirmed, and the purchase or sale of ecclesiastical benefices prohibited in the strictest and severest manner. It was also decreed in the same council, that the sacerdotal order should abstain from marriage, and that such priests as already had wives or concubines, should immediately dismiss them, or quit their office. These decrees were accompanied with circular letters, written by the pontiff to all the European bishops, enjoining the strictest obedience to the decisions of this solemn council, under the severest penalties. Gregory did not stop here, but sent ambassadors into Germany to Henry VI. king of the Romans, in order to engage that prince to summon a council for the trial and punishment of such ecclesiastics as had been guilty of simoniacal practices.

whom they dismissed at pleasure, to enjoy the sweets of a licentious variety; and not only spent, in the most profuse and scandalous manner, the revenues and treasures of the churches and convents to which they belonged, but even distributed a great part of them among their bastards. As to the vice of simony, its general extent and its pernicious fruits appear evidently from those records, which the Benedictine monks have published in several parts of their Gallia Christiana, not to mention a multitude of other ancient papers to the same purpose. One or two examples will be sufficient to give the reader an idea of this matter. We find in the first volume of the admirable work now mentioned (in the Appendix. Document. p. 5.) a public act by which Bernard a viscount, and Froterius bishop of Albi, grant, or rather sell, openly to Bernard Aimard and his son, the bishopric of Albi, reserving to themselves a considerable part of its revenues. This act is followed by another, in which count Pontius bequeaths to his wife the same bishopric of Albi in the following terms: "Ego Pontius dono tibi dilectæ sponse meæ "episcopatum Albiensem—cum ipsa ecclesia et cum "omni adjacentia sua—et medietatem de episcopatu "Nemanso,—et medietatem de abbata St. Ægidii— "post obitum tuum remaneat ipsis alodis ad infan- "tes qui de me erunt creati."—In the second volume of the same learned work (in the Appendix. p. 173.) there is a letter of the clergy of Limoges, beseeching William, count of Aquitaine, not to sell the bishopric, but to give them a pastor, and not a devourer of the flock. "Rogamus tuam pietatem, ne propter "mundale lucrum vendas St. Stephani locum, quia, "si tu vendas episcopatum, ipse nostra manuabit "communia.—Mitte nobis ovium custodem, non de- "voratorem." Ademar, viscount of Limoges, laments, (tom. ii. p. 173.) that "he himself had formerly made traffic of the cure of souls by selling benefices to simoniacal abbots." The barefaced impudence of the sacerdotal orders, in buying and selling benefices, exceeded all measure, and almost all credibility; and they carried matters so far as to vindicate that abominable traffic, as may be seen in a remarkable passage in the Apologeticum of Abbo, which is added by Pithou to the Codex Can. Ecclesiæ Romanæ; thus passage, which deserves to be quoted, is as follows: "Nihil pene ad ecclesiam per- "tinere videtur, quod ad pretium non largiatur, scilicet "episcopatus, presbyteratus, diaconatus, et ali- "qua minores gradus, archidiaconatus quoque, decan- "nia, prepositura, thesauri custodia, baptisterium— "et hujusmodi negotiatorum subdola responsione so- "lent astruere, non se emere benedictionem, qua "percipitur gratia spiritus sancti, sed res ecclesia- "rum vel possessiones episcopi." An acute distinc- tion truly!

XIII. These decrees, which were in part equitable and just, and which were, in every respect, conformable with the notions of religion that prevailed in this age, were looked upon by the people as highly salutary, since they rendered a free election, and not a mercenary purchase, the way to ecclesiastical promotion, and obliged the priests to abstain from marriage, which was absurdly considered as inconsistent with the sanctity of their office. Yet both these decrees were attended with the most deplorable tumults and dissensions, and were fruitful, in their consequences, of innumerable calamities. No sooner was the law concerning the celibacy of the clergy published, than the priests, in the several provinces of Europe, who lived in the bonds of marriage with lawful wives, or of lasciviousness with hired concubines,\* complained loudly of the severity of this council, and excited dreadful tumults in the greatest part of the European provinces. Many of these ecclesiastics, especially the Milanese priests, chose rather to abandon their spiritual dignities than their sensual pleasures, and to quit their benefices that they might cleave to their wives. They went still farther: for they separated themselves entirely from the church of Rome, and branded with the infamous name of *Paterini*,† i. e.

\* All the historians who give an account of this century, mention the tumults excited by such priests as were resolved to continue with their wives or concubines. For an account of the seditions which arose in Germany, upon this occasion, see Sigonius de Regno Italie, lib. ix. p. 557. tom. ii. as also Tenguel's Collectio Veter. Monument. p. 45, 47, 54. Those which the priests excited in England, are mentioned by M. Paris, in his Hist. Maj. lib. i. The tumults occasioned by the same reason in the Belgic and Gallic provinces, are described in the Epistola Clericorum Cameracensium ad Remenses pro Uxoribus suis, published in Mabillon's Annal. Benedictin. tom. v. p. 634; and in the Epistola Novimagentium Clericorum ad Cameracenses, published in Mabillon's Museum Italicum, tom. i. p. 128. Great was the flame which the laws of Gregory excited in Italy, and particularly in the province of Milan, of which we have an ample relation, given by Arnulph and Landulph, two Milanese historians, whose works were published with annotations by Muratori's Scriptores Rerum Italicarum, tom. iv. p. 36. Both these historians maintain, against Gregory and his successors, the cause of the injured priests, and the lawfulness of their marriages.

† *Paterinus* is one of the names by which the Paulicians or Manichæans (who came during this century from Bulgaria into Italy, and were also known by the title of *Catharia*, or *Pure*) were distinguished among the Italians. But, in process of time, the term *Paterinus* became a common name for all kinds of heretics, as we might show by many examples taken from the writers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. There are various opinions concerning the origin of this word, the most probable of which is that which supposes it derived from a certain place called *Patara*, in which the heretics held their assemblies; and it is well known, that a part of the city of Milan is, to this very day, called *Patara*, or *Contrada de Patari*. See Annotat. ad Arnulphum Mediolanensem in Muratori's Scriptores Rerum Italicarum, tom. iv. p. 39; see also Saxius ad Sigonium de Regno Italie, lib. ix. p. 536. An opinion (of which, if I err not, Sigonius was the author) prevailed, that the name in question was given to the Milanese priests, who separated from the church of Rome, and retained their wives in opposition to the laws of the pontiffs. But this opinion is without foundation; and it appears evidently from the testimony of Arnulph and other historians, that not the married priests, but the faction of the pontiffs, who condemned their conjugal bonds, were branded with the opprobrious name of *Paterini*. See Arnulph. lib.

Manichæans, the pontiff and his adherents, who condemned so unjustly the conduct of such priests as entered into the bonds of a lawful and virtuous wedlock. The proceedings of Gregory appeared to the wiser part, even of those who approved the celibacy of the clergy, unjust and criminal in two respects: first, because his severity fell indiscriminately, and with equal fury, upon the virtuous husband and the licentious rake; and he dissolved, with a merciless hand, the chastest bonds of wedlock, and thus involved husbands and wives, with their tender offspring, in disgrace, perplexity, anguish, and want.\* The second thing criminal in the measures taken by this pontiff was, that, instead of chastising the married priests with wisdom and moderation, and according to the laws of the ecclesiastical discipline, whose nature is wholly spiritual, he gave them over to the civil magistrate, to be punished as disobedient and unworthy subjects, with the loss of their substance, and with the most shocking marks of undeserved infamy and disgrace.†

XIV. This vehement contest excited great tumults and divisions, which, however, were gradually calmed by length of time, and also by the perseverance of the obstinate pontiff;

iii. c. x.—Anton. Pagi. Crit. in Ann. Bar. tom. i. ad an. 1037, sect. iii. Lud. Ant. Muratori Antiq. Ital. mediæ ævi, tom. v. p. 82, who have demonstrated this in the most ample, learned, and satisfactory manner. Nor need we, indeed, look any where else for the origin of this word. It is abundantly known, that the Manichæans, and their brethren the Paulicians, were extremely averse to marriage, which they looked upon as an institution invented by the evil principle: they in consequence, who considered the marriages of the clergy as lawful, employed the ignominious name of *Paterini*, to show that the pontiffs, who prohibited these marriages, were followers of the odious doctrines of the Manichæans.

\* We must always remember that the priests, to whom their wives or mistresses were much dearer than the laws of the pontiffs, were not all of the same character; nor were such of them as might be justly deemed criminal, all criminal in the same degree. The better sort of these ecclesiastics (among which we may count the Belgic and Milanese clergy) desired nothing more than to live after the manner of the Greeks, maintaining that it was lawful for a priest, before his consecration, to marry one virgin, though a plurality of wives had been justly prohibited; and they grounded this their opinion upon the authority of St. Ambrose. See Jo. Petri Puricelli Dissertatio utrum S. Ambrosius Clero suo Mediolani, permisisset, ut Virgini semel nubere possent, republished by Muratori, in his *Scriptores Italie*, tom. iv. p. 123. Gregory and his successors ought to have dealt more gently with this kind of ecclesiastics (as the warmest admirers of the pontiffs acknowledge) than with those priests who were either the patrons of concubinage, or who pretended to justify their espousing of a plurality of wives. It was also unjust to treat, in the same manner, the monks, who, by the nature of their profession and vows, were necessarily excluded from the nuptial state; and the priests, who could not bear the thoughts of being torn from the chaste partners of their beds, whom they had espoused with virtuous sentiments and upright intentions, or from the tender offspring which were the fruit of virtuous love.

† Theodorici Verduinensis Epistola ad Gregorium VII. in Martenne's *Thesaur. Anecdotorum*, tom. i. p. 218.—“Faciem meam in eo vel maxime confusione perfundit, quod legem de clericorum incontinentia per laicorum insanias cohænda unquam suscepim—Nec putetis eos qui ita sentiunt. . . ecclesiasticorum gradum incontinentiam talibus defensionibus fovere velle. Honestam conversationem in desiderio habent, nec aliter, quam oportet, ecclesiasticæ ultionis censuram intentari gaudent.”

nor did any of the European kings and princes concern themselves so much about the marriages of the clergy as to maintain their cause, and thereby to prolong the controversy. But the troubles which arose from the law that regarded the extirpation of simony were not so easily appeased; the tumults it occasioned became greater from day to day; the methods of reconciliation more difficult; and it involved both the church and state during several years in the deepest calamities and in the most complicated scenes of confusion and distress.\* Henry IV. received indeed graciously the legates of Gregory, and applauded his zeal for the extirpation of simony; but neither this prince, nor the German bishops, would permit these legates to assemble in council in Germany, or to proceed judicially against those, who, in time past, had been chargeable with simoniacal practices. The pontiff, exasperated at this restraint in the execution of his designs, called another council to meet at Rome, in 1075, in which he pursued his adventurous project with greater impetuosity and vehemence than ever; for he not only excluded from the communion of the church several German and Italian bishops and certain favourites of Henry, of whose counsels that prince was said to make use in the traffic of ecclesiastical dignities, but also pronounced, in a formal edict, an “Anathema against whoever received the investiture of a bishopric or abbacy from the hands of a layman, as also against those by whom the investiture should

\* We have extant a great number both of ancient and modern writers, who have related the circumstances of this dispute concerning investitures, which was begun by Gregory VII., was carried on by him and his successors on the one side, and the emperors Henry IV. and V. on the other, and became a source of innumerable calamities to the greatest part of Europe. But few or none of these writers have treated this weighty subject with an entire impartiality. They all pleaded either the cause of the pontiffs, or that of the emperors, and decided the controversy, not by the laws then in being (which ought, no doubt, to be principally consulted,) or by the opinions that generally prevailed at the time of this contest, but by laws of their own invention, and by the opinions of modern times. The famous Gretser, in his *Apologia pro Gregorio VII.* (which is published in the sixth volume of his works, and also separately,) has collected the principal of the ancient writers who maintained the cause of the pontiff: in opposition to whom, they who defended the cause of Henry IV. are collected by Melchior Goldastus, in his *Replicatio contra Gretserum et Apologia pro Henrico IV.* Hanov. 1611, 4to. Among the modern writers who have treated this subject, we may reckon the Centuriatores Magdeburgenses, Baronius, the German and Italian historians, and those who have written the life of the famous Matilda. But, besides these, it will be highly proper to consult Jo. Schiltæus, de *Libertate Ecclesiæ Germanicæ*, lib. iv. p. 461.—Christ. Thomasius, *Historia Contentions inter Imperium et Sacerdotium*—Hen. Meibomius, *Lib. de Jure Investituræ Episcopalis*, tom. iii. *Scriptorum Rer. Germanicar.*—Just. Chr. Dithmarus, *Historia Belli inter Imperium et Sacerdotium*, and, above all, the famous cardinal Norris, who far surpasses in point of erudition those whom we have mentioned, and whose *Historia delle Investiture delle Dignità Ecclesiastiche*, which was published at Mantua, after his death, in 1741, is a most learned work, though it be imperfect and probably maimed, and also extremely partial in favour of the pontiffs; which is not surprising from the pen of a cardinal. See also Jo. Jac. Mascovii *Commentarii de Rebus Imperii Germanici sub Henrico IV.* et V.

"be performed."\* This decree alarmed the emperors, kings, and princes of Europe, who, in consequence of a prevailing custom, had the right of conferring the more important ecclesiastical dignities, and the government of monasteries and convents, of which they disposed in a solemn manner by the well known ceremony of the ring, and the staff or crosier, which they presented to the candidate on whom their choice fell. This solemn investiture was the main support of that power of creating bishops and abbots, which the European princes claimed as their undoubted right, and the occasion of that corrupt commerce called simony, in consequence of which, ecclesiastical promotion was sold to the highest bidder; and hence arose the zeal and ardour of Gregory for the annulment of these investitures, that he might extirpate simony on the one hand, and diminish the power of princes in ecclesiastical matters on the other.

#### *A short digression concerning Investitures.†*

It will not be improper to illustrate the custom now mentioned of investing bishops and abbots in their respective dignities by the ceremony of the ring and crosier, since this custom has been ill understood by some, and imperfectly explained by others. Even the learned cardinal Norris appears highly defective here; for though, in his History of Investitures,‡ there are some pertinent hints and remarks upon the reasons which engaged Gregory to prohibit investitures altogether, yet that learned prelate does not seem to have had a complete notion of this important matter, since he omits in his history certain points that are necessary to the proper knowledge of it. The investiture of bishops and abbots commenced, undoubtedly, at that period when the European emperors, kings, and princes, made grants to the clergy of certain territories, lands, forests, castles, &c. According to the laws of those times (laws which still remain in force) no persons were deemed as lawful possessors of the lands or tenements which they derived from the emperors or other princes, before they repaired to court, took the oath of allegiance to their respective sovereigns, as the supreme proprietors, and received from their hands a solemn mark, indicating a transfer of the property of their respective grants. Such was the manner in which the nobility, and those who had distinguished themselves by military exploits, were confirmed in the possessions which they owed to the liberality of their sovereigns. But the custom of investing the bishops and abbots with the ring and the crosier, which are the ensigns of the sacred function, is of a much more recent date, and was then first introduced, when the European emperors and princes, annulling the elections that were made in the church according to the ecclesiastical laws which had been from the

earliest times established for that purpose, assumed to themselves the power of conferring, on whom they pleased, the bishoprics and abbays that became vacant in their dominions, and even of selling them to the highest bidder. This power, then, being once usurped by the kings and princes of Europe, they at first confirmed the bishops and abbots in their dignities and possessions, with the same forms and ceremonies that were used in investing the counts, knights, and others, with their feudal tenures, even by written contracts, and the ceremony of presenting them with a wand or bough.\* And this custom of investing the clergy and the laity with the same ceremonies would have undoubtedly continued, had not the clergy, to whom the right of electing bishops and abbots originally belonged, artfully eluded the usurpation of the emperors and other princes by the following stratagem. When a bishop or abbot died, they who looked upon themselves as authorised to fill up the vacancy, elected immediately some one of their order in the place of the deceased, and were careful to have him consecrated without delay. The consecration being thus performed, the prince, who had proposed to himself the profit of selling the vacant benefice, or the pleasure of conferring it upon one of his favourites, was obliged to desist from his purpose, and to consent to the election, which the ceremony of consecration rendered irrevocable. Many examples of the success of this stratagem, which was practised both in chapters and monasteries, and which disappointed the liberality or avarice of several princes, might here be alleged; they abound in the records of the tenth century, to which we refer the curious reader. No sooner did the emperors and princes perceive this artful management, than they turned their attention to the most proper means of rendering it ineffectual, and of preserving the valuable privilege they had usurped. For this purpose they ordered, that, as soon as a bishop expired, his ring and crosier should be transmitted to the prince, to whose jurisdiction his diocese was subject; for it was by the solemn delivery of the ring and crosier of the deceased to the new bishop that his election was irrevocably confirmed, and this ceremony was an essential part of his consecration; so that, when these two badges of the episcopal dignity were in the hands of the sovereign, the clergy could not consecrate the person whom their suffrages had appointed to fill the vacancy. Thus their stratagem was defeated, as every election that was not confirmed by the ceremony of consecration might

\* This appears from a passage in cardinal Humbert's third book, adversus Simoniacos, which was composed before Gregory had set on foot the dispute concerning investitures, and which is published in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecd. tom. v. p. 787. The passage is as follows: "Potestas secularis primo ambitiosis ecclesiasticarum dignitatum vel possessionum cupidis favebat prece, dein minis, deinceps verbis concessivis; in quibus omnibus cernens sibi contradicteorem neminem, nec qui moveret penam, vel aperiret os et ganniret, ad majora progreditur, et jam sub nomine investituræ dare primo tabellas vel qualescumque porrigere virgulas, dein baculos. — Quod maximum nefas sic inolevit ut id solum canonicum credatur, nec quæ sit ecclesiastica regula sciatur aut attendatur."

\* Ant. Pagi Critica in Baronium, tom. iii. ad an. 1075.—Hen. Norris, Hist. Investiturarum, p. 39.—Christ. Lupus, Scholia et Dissertation, ad Concilia, tom. vi. op. p. 39—44.

† Here the translator has placed the note (r) of the original in the text, under the form of a dissertation.

‡ Chap. iii. p. 56.



be lawfully annulled and rejected; nor was the bishop qualified to exercise any of the episcopal functions before the performance of that important ceremony. As soon, therefore, as a bishop drew his last breath, the magistrate of the city in which he had resided, or the governor of the province, seized his ring and crosier, and sent them to court.\* The emperor or prince conferred the vacant see upon the person whom he had chosen by delivering to him these two badges of the episcopal office; after which the new bishop, thus invested by his sovereign, repaired to his metropolitan, to whom it belonged to perform the ceremony of consecration, and delivered to him the ring and crosier which he had received from his prince, that he might receive them again from his hands, and be thus doubly confirmed in his sacred function. It appears, therefore, from this account, that each new bishop and abbot received twice the ring and the crosier; once from the hands of the sovereign, and once from those of the metropolitan bishop, by whom they were consecrated.†

It is very uncertain by what prince this custom was originally introduced. If we may believe Adam of Bremen,‡ this privilege was exercised by Louis the Debonnaire, who, in the ninth century, granted to the new bishops the use and possession of the episcopal revenues, and confirmed this grant by the ceremony now under consideration. But the accuracy of this historian is liable to suspicion; and it is probable that he attributed to the transactions of ancient times the same form that accompanied similar transactions in the eleventh century, in which he lived; for it is certain that, in the ninth century, the greatest part of the European princes made no opposition to the right of electing the bishops, which was both claimed and exercised by the clergy and the people; and, consequently, there was

then no occasion for the investiture mentioned by Adam of Bremen.\* We therefore choose to adopt the supposition of cardinal Humbert,† who places the commencement of the custom now under consideration in the reign of Otho the Great; for, though this opinion has not the approbation of Louis Thomassin and Natalis Alexander, yet these learned men, in their deep researches into the origin of investitures,‡ have advanced nothing sufficient to prove it erroneous. We learn also from Humbert,§ that the emperor Henry III., the son of Conrad II. was desirous of abrogating these investitures, though a variety of circumstances concurred to prevent the execution of his design; but he represents Henry I., king of France, in a different point of light, as a turbulent prince, who turned all things into confusion, and indulged himself beyond all measure in simoniacal practices; and he therefore loads him with the bitterest invectives.

In this method of creating bishops and abbots, by presenting to them the ring and crosier, there were two things that gave particular offence to the Roman pontiffs. One was, that by this the ancient right of election was totally changed, and the power of choosing the rulers of the church was usurped by the emperors and other sovereign princes, and was confined to them alone. This indeed was the most plausible reason of complaint, when we consider the religious notions of those times, which were by no means favourable to the conduct of the emperors in this affair. Another circumstance that grievously distressed the pretended vicars of St. Peter, was, to see the ring and crosier, the venerable badges of spiritual authority and distinction, delivered to the bishop elect by the profane hands of un-sanctified laymen; an abuse which they looked upon as little better than sacrilege. Humbert, who, as we previously stated, wrote his book against simony before the contest between the emperor and Gregory had commenced, complains|| heavily of this supposed profanation, and shudders to think, that the *staff* which denotes the ghostly shepherd, and the *ring* which seals the mysteries of heaven,¶ deposited in the bosoms of the episcopal order, should be polluted by the unhallowed touch of a civil

\* We see this fact confirmed in the following passage in Ebo's Life of Otho, bishop of Bamberg, lib. i. sect. 8, 9, in Actis Sanctior. mensis Julii, tom. i. p. 426. "Nec multo post annulus cum virga pastorali Bremensis episcopi ad aulam regiam translata est. "Eo siquidem tempore ecclesia liberam electionem nonha bebat. . . . sed cum quilibet antistes viam universe carnis ingressus fuisset, mox capitaneo civitatis illius annulum et virgam pastorem ad Palatium transmittabant, sicque regia autoritate, communicato cum aulicis consilio, orbata plebi idoneum constituebant presidium. . . . Post paucos vero dies rursus annulus et virga pastoralis Bab- ergenensis episcopi domino imperatori transmissa est: quo audito, multi nobiles—ad aulam regiam confuebant, qui alteram harum prece vel pretio sibi comparare tentabant."

† This appears from a variety of ancient records. See particularly Humbert, lib. iii. contra Simoniacos, cap. vi. in Martene's Thesaur. Anecd. tom. v. p. 779, in which we find the following passage: "Sic encentiatus (i. e. the bishop invested by the emperor) violentus invadit clerum, plebem et ordinem prius dominaturus, quam ab eis cognoscatur, quaratur, ac aut petatur. Sic metropolitanum aggreditur, non ab eo judicandus, sed ipsum judicaturus.—Quid enim sibi jam pertinet ad prodest baculum et anululum, quos portat, reddere? Numquid quia a laica persona dati sunt? Cur redditur quod habetur, nisi ut aut denno res ecclesiastica sub hæc specie nisi sionis vel donationis vendatur, aut certe ut præsumpto laice ordinationis pallietur colore et velamento quodam disciplina clericalis?"

‡ In his Historia Ecclesiastica, lib. i. cap. xxxii. p. 10, xxxiv. p. 12, published among the Scriptorum Septentrionalis of Lindenbrogius.

\* Add to this the refutation of Adam of Bremen, by Daniel Papbroch, in the Acta Sanctorum, tom. i. Febr. p. 557.

† Humbert, lib. iii. contra Simoniacos, cap. vii. p. 780, and cap. xi. p. 787.

‡ See Ludov. Thomassin's Disciplina Eccles. circa Benef. tom. ii. lib. ii. p. 431; and Natal. Alexander, Select. Histor. Eccles. Capit. Sac. xi, xii. Diss. iv. p. 735.

§ Lib. iii. cap. vii.  
|| See Humbert, lib. iii. contra Simoniac. cap. vi. p. 779, 795. His words are, "Quid ad laicas pertinet personas sacramenta ecclesiastica et pontificalia seu pastorem gratiam distribuere, canyros scilicet et baculos et annulos, quibus præcipue perficuntur, militat et inhiitur tota episcopalis consecratio? Equidem in canyris baculis—designatur, que eis committitur cura pastoralis.—Porro annulus signaculum secretorum celestium indicat, præmonens prædicatores, ut secretam Dei sapientiam cum apostolo designent. Quicunque ergo his duobus aliquem initiat, procul-dubio omnem pastorem auctoritatem hoc præsumendo sibi vindicant."

¶ Humbert mistook the spiritual significance of this holy ring, which was the emblem of a nuptial bond between the bishop and his see.

magistrate; and that emperors and princes, by presenting them to their favourites, should thereby usurp the prerogatives of the church, and exercise the pastoral authority and power. This complaint was entirely consistent, as we have already observed, with the opinions of the times in which it was made; for, as the ring and crosier were generally esteemed the marks and badges of pastoral power and spiritual authority, so he who conferred these sacred badges was supposed to confer and communicate with them the spiritual authority of which they were the emblems.

All these things being duly considered, we shall immediately perceive what it was that rendered Gregory VII. so averse to the pretensions of the emperors, and so zealous in depriving them of the privilege they had assumed of investing the bishops with the ceremony of the ring and crosier. In the first council which he assembled at Rome, he made no attempt, indeed, against investitures, nor did he aim at any thing farther than the abolition of simony, and the restoration of the sacerdotal and monastic orders to their ancient right of electing their respective bishops and abbots. But, when he afterwards found that the affair of investiture was inseparably connected with the pretensions of the emperors, who seemed to consider it as empowering them to dispose of the higher ecclesiastical dignities and benefices, he was persuaded that simony could not be extirpated as long as investitures were in being; and, therefore, to pluck up the evil by the root, he opposed the latter custom with the utmost vehemence. All this shows the true rise of the war that was carried on between the pontiff and the emperor with such bitterness and fury.

And to understand still more clearly the merits of this cause, it will be proper to observe, that it was not investiture, generally considered, that Gregory opposed with such keenness and obstinacy, but that particular species which prevailed at this time. He did not pretend to hinder the bishops from swearing allegiance to kings and emperors, or even from becoming their *vassals*; and so far was he from prohibiting that kind of investiture which was performed by a verbal declaration or by a written deed, that, on the contrary, he allowed the kings of England and France to invest in this manner, and probably consented to the use of the sceptre in this ceremony, as did also after him Calixtus II. But he could not bear the ceremony of investiture that was performed with the ensigns of the sacerdotal order, much less could he endure the performance of the ceremony before the solemn rite of consecration; but what rendered *investitures* most odious to this pontiff, was their destroying entirely the free elections of bishops and abbots. It is now time to resume the thread of our history.

XV. The severe law that had been enacted against investitures, by the influence and authority of Gregory, made very little impression upon Henry. He acknowledged, indeed, that in exposing ecclesiastical benefices to sale, he had acted improperly, and he promised amendment in that respect; but he remained inflexible against all attempts that were made to

persuade him to resign his power of creating bishops and abbots, and the right of investiture, which was intimately connected with this important privilege. Had the emperor been seconded by the German princes, he might have maintained this refusal with dignity and success; but this was far from being the case; a considerable number of these princes, and among others the states of Saxony, were the secret or declared enemies of Henry; and this furnished Gregory with an opportunity of extending his authority, and executing his ambitious projects. This was by no means neglected; the imperious pontiff took occasion, from the discords that divided the empire, to insult and depress its chief; he sent, by his legates, an insolent message to the emperor at Goslar, ordering him to repair immediately to Rome, and clear himself, before the council that would be assembled there, of the various crimes that were laid to his charge. The emperor, whose high spirit could not brook such arrogant treatment, was filled with the warmest indignation at the view of that insolent mandate; and, in the vehemence of his just resentment, convoked without delay a council of the German bishops at Worms. In that assembly, Gregory was charged with several flagitious practices, and deposed from the pontificate, of which he was declared unworthy; and orders were given for the election of a new pontiff. Gregory opposed violence to violence; for no sooner had he received, by the letters and ambassadors of Henry, an account of the sentence that had been pronounced against him, than, in a fit of vindictive phrensy, he thundered his anathemas at the head of that prince, excluded him both from the communion of the church and from the throne of his ancestors, and impiously dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken to him as their lawful sovereign. Thus war was declared on both sides; and the civil and ecclesiastical powers were divided into two great factions, of which one maintained the rights of the emperor, while the other seconded the ambitious views of the pontiff. No terms are sufficient to express the complicated scenes of misery that arose from this deplorable schism.

XVI. At the entrance upon this war, the Suabian chiefs, with duke Rodolph at their head, revolted from Henry; and the Saxon princes, whose former quarrels with the emperor had been lately terminated by their defeat and submission,\* followed their example. These united powers, being solicited by the pope to elect a new emperor if Henry should persist in his disobedience to the orders of the church, met at Tribur, in 1076, to take counsel together concerning a matter of such high importance. The result of the deliberation was far from being favourable to the emperor; for they agreed, that the determination of the controversy between him and them should be referred to the pope, who was to be invited for

\* This same Rodolph had, the year before this revolt, vanquished the Saxons, and obliged them to submit to the emperor. Beside the Suabian and Saxon chiefs, the dukes of Bavaria and Carinthia, the bishops of Wurtzburg and Worms, and several other eminent personages, were concerned in this revolt.

that purpose to a congress at Augsburg in the following year, and that, in the mean time, Henry should be suspended from his royal dignity, and live in the obscurity of a private station; to which rigorous conditions they also added, that he was to forfeit his kingdom, if, within the space of a year, he should not be restored to the bosom of the church, and delivered from the anathema that lay upon his head. When things were come to this desperate extremity, and the faction, which was formed against this unfortunate prince, grew more formidable from day to day, his friends advised him to go into Italy, and implore in person the clemency of the pontiff. The emperor yielded to this ignominious counsel, without, however, obtaining from his voyage the advantages he expected. He passed the Alps, amidst the rigour of a severe winter, and arrived, in February, 1077, at the fortress of Canusium, where the *sanctimonious* pontiff resided at that time with the young Matilda, countess of Tuscany, the most powerful patroness of the church, and the most tender and affectionate of all the spiritual daughters of Gregory. Here the suppliant prince, unmindful of his dignity, stood, during three days, in the open air at the entrance of this fortress, with his feet bare, his head uncovered, and with no other raiment than a wretched piece of coarse woollen cloth thrown over his body to cover his nakedness. On the fourth day, he was admitted to the presence of the lordly pontiff, who with difficulty granted him the absolution he demanded; but, as to his political restoration, he refused to determine that point before the approaching congress, at which he made Henry promise to appear, forbidding him, at the same time, to assume, during this interval, the title of king, or to wear the ornaments or exercise the functions of royalty. This opprobrious convention justly excited the indignation of the princes and bishops of Italy, who threatened Henry with all sorts of evils, on account of his base and pusillanimous conduct, and would undoubtedly have deposed him, had not he allayed their resentment by violating the convention into which he had been forced to enter with the imperious pontiff, and resuming the title and other marks of royalty which he had been obliged to relinquish. On the other hand, the confederate princes of Suabia and Saxony were no sooner informed of this unexpected change in the conduct of Henry, than they assembled at Forchheim in March, 1077, and unanimously elected Rodolph, duke of Suabia, emperor in his place.\*

XVII. This rash step kindled a terrible flame in Germany and Italy, and involved, for a long time, those unhappy lands in the calamities of war. In Italy, the Normans, who

were masters of the lower parts of that country, and the armies of the powerful and valiant Matilda, maintained successfully the cause of Gregory against the Lombards, who espoused the interests of Henry; while this unfortunate prince, with all the forces he could assemble, carried on the war in Germany against Rodolph and the confederate princes. Gregory, considering the events of war as extremely doubtful, was at first afraid to declare for either side, and therefore observed, during a certain time, an appearance of neutrality; but, encouraged by the battle of Fladenheim, in which Henry was defeated by the Saxons, in 1080, he excommunicated anew that vanquished prince, and, sending a crown to the victor Rodolph, declared him lawful king of the Germans. The injured emperor did not suffer this new insult to pass unpunished. Seconded by the suffrages of several of the Italian and German bishops, he deposed Gregory a second time in a council which met at Mentz, and, in a synod that was soon after assembled at Brixen, in the province of Tirol, he raised to the pontificate Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, who assumed the title of Clement III. when he was consecrated at Rome in 1084, four years after his election.

XVIII. This election was soon followed by an occurrence which gave an advantageous turn to the affairs of Henry: this event was a bloody battle fought upon the banks of the river Elster, where Rodolph received a mortal wound, of which he died at Mersburg. The emperor, freed from this formidable enemy, marched into Italy, in the following year (1081,) with a design to crush Gregory and his adherents, whose defeat he imagined would contribute effectually to put an end to the troubles in Germany. Accordingly he made several campaigns, with various success, against the valiant troops of Matilda; and, after having raised twice the siege of Rome, he resumed with alacrity that bold enterprise, and became, in 1084, master of the greatest part of that city. His first step after this success was to place Guibert in the papal chair: he then received the imperial crown from the hands of the now pontiff, was saluted emperor by the Roman people, and laid close siege to the castle of St. Angelo, whither his determined enemy, Gregory, had fled for safety. He was, however, forced to raise the siege by the valour of Robert Guiscard, duke of Apulia and Calabria, who brought Gregory in triumph to Rome; but, not thinking him safe there, conducted him afterwards to Salerno. Here the famous pontiff ended his days in the succeeding year, and left Europe involved in those calamities which were the fatal effects of his boundless ambition. He was certainly a man of extensive abilities, endowed with a most enterprising genius, and an invincible firmness of mind; but it must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that he was the most arrogant and audacious pontiff that had hitherto filled the papal chair. The Roman church worships him as a saint, though it is certain that he was never placed in that order by a regular canonization. Paul V., about the beginning of the seventeenth century, appointed the twenty-

\* The ancient and modern writers of Italian and German history have given ample relations of all these events, though not all with the same fidelity and accuracy. In the brief account I have given of these events, I have followed the genuine sources, and those writers whose testimonies are the most respectable and sure, such as Sigonius, Pagi, Muratori, Mascovius, Norris, &c. who, though they differ in some minute circumstances, yet agree in those matters which are of the most importance.

fifth day of May, as a festival sacred to the memory of this pretended saint;\* but the emperors of Germany, the kings of France, and other European princes, have always opposed the celebration of this festival, and have thus effectually prevented its becoming universal. In our times, the zeal of Benedict XIII. to secure to Gregory the saintly honours, occasioned a contest, the result of which was by no means favourable to his superstitious views.†

XIX. The death of Gregory neither restored peace to the church, nor tranquillity to the state; the tumults and divisions which he had excited still continued, and they were augmented from day to day by the same passions to which they owed their origin. Clement III. who was the emperor's pontiff,‡ was master of the city of Rome, and was acknowledged as pope by a great part of Italy. Henry carried on the war in Germany against the confederate princes. The faction of Gregory, supported by the Normans, chose for his successor, in 1086, Dideric, abbot of Mount Cassin, who adopted the title of Victor III. and was consecrated in the church of St. Peter, in 1087, when that part of the city was recovered by the Normans from the dominion of Clement. But this new pontiff was of a character quite opposite to that of Gregory; he was modest and timorous, and also of a mild and gentle disposition; and finding the papal chair beset with factions, and the city of Rome under the dominion of his competitor, he retired to his monastery, where he soon after ended his days in peace. But, before his abdication, he held a council at Benevento, where he confirmed and renewed the laws that Gregory had enacted for the abolition of investitures.

XX. Otho, monk of Clugni, and bishop of Ostia, was, by Victor's recommendation, chosen to succeed him. This new pontiff was elected at Terracini, in 1088, and assumed the name of Urban II. Inferior to Gregory in fortitude and resolution, he was, however, his equal in arrogance and pride, and surpassed him greatly in temerity and imprudence.§ The commencement of his pontificate had a fair aspect, and success seemed to smile upon his undertakings; but on the emperor's return into Italy, in 1090, the face of affairs was totally changed; victory crowned the arms of that prince, who, by redoubled efforts of valour, at length defeated Guelf, duke of Bavaria, and the famous Matilda, who were the formidable

\* See the Acta Sancto. Antwerp. ad d. xxv. Maii, and Mabillon, Acta Sancto. Ord. Benedict. Sec. vi. part II.

† The reader will find an ample and curious account of this matter in a French book published in Holland in 1743, under the following title: L'Avocat du Diable, ou Memoires Historiques et Critiques sur la Vie et sur la Legende du Pape Gregoire VII.

‡ This pontiff died in 1100, as appears evidently from the Chronicon Beneventanum, published by Muratori, in his Antiq. Ital. tom. i. p. 262. See also Rubei Historia Ravennat. lib. v. p. 307.

§ We find in the Posthumous Works of Mabillon, tom. iii. the Life of Urban II. composed by Theod. Ruinart, with much learning and industry, but with too little impartiality and fidelity, as we may naturally suppose even from the name of its author, since it is well known that no monkish writer durst attempt to paint the pontiffs in their true colours.—See also, for an account of Urban, the Hist. Lit. de la France tom. viii. p. 514.

heads of the papal faction. The abominable treachery of his son Conrad, who, yielding to the seduction of his father's enemies, revolted against him, and, by the advice and assistance of Urban and Matilda, usurped the kingdom of Italy, revived the drooping spirits of that faction, who hoped to see the laurels of the emperor blasted by this odious and unnatural rebellion. The consequences, however, of this event, were less mischievous to Henry, than his enemies expected. In the mean time the troubles of Italy still continued; nor could Urban, with all his efforts, reduce Rome under his lordly yoke. Finding all his ambitious measures disconcerted, he assembled a council at Placentia, in 1095, where he confirmed the laws and the anathemas of Gregory; and afterwards undertook a journey into France, where he held the famous council of Clermont, and had the pleasure of kindling a new war against the infidel possessors of the holy land. In this council, instead of endeavouring to terminate the tumults and desolations that the dispute concerning *investitures* had already produced, this unworthy pontiff added fuel to the flame, and so exasperated matters by his imprudent and arrogant proceedings, as to render an accommodation between the contending parties more difficult than ever. Gregory, notwithstanding his insolence and ambition, had never carried matters so far as to forbid the bishops and the rest of the clergy to take the oath of allegiance to their respective sovereigns. This rebellious prohibition was reserved for the audacious arrogance of Urban, who published it as a law in the council of Clermont.\* After this noble expedition, the restless pontiff returned into Italy, where he made himself master of the castle of St. Angelo, and soon after ended his days, in 1099; he was not long survived by his antagonist, Clement III. who died in the following year, and thus left Raynier (a Benedictine monk, who was chosen successor to Urban, and assumed the name of Pascal II.) sole possessor of the papal chair at the conclusion of this century.

XXI. Among the eastern monks in this century, there happened nothing worthy of being consigned to the records of history, while those of the west were concerned immediately in transactions of great consequence, and which deserve the attention of the curious reader. The western monks were remarkable for their attachment to the Roman pontiffs. This connexion had been long formed, and it was originally occasioned by the avarice and violence of both bishops and princes, who, under various pretexts, were constantly encroaching upon the possessions of the monks, and thus obliged them to seek for security against these invasions of their property in the protection of the popes. This protection was readily granted

\* To the fifteenth canon of this council the following words were added: "Ne episcopus vel sacerdos regi vel alicui laico in manibus ligium fidelitatem faciat." i. e. "It is enacted, that no bishop or priest shall promise upon oath, liege obedience to any king or any layman." They are entirely in an error, who affirm that Gregory prohibited the bishops from taking oaths of allegiance to their respective sovereigns, as cardinal Norris has sufficiently demonstrated in his Istoria delle Investiture, chap. x. p. 279.

by the pontiffs, who seized, with avidity, every occasion of enlarging their authority; and the monks, in return, engaged themselves to pay an annual tribute to their ghostly patrons. But in this century things were carried still farther; and the pontiffs (more especially Gregory VII. who was eagerly bent upon humbling the bishops, and transferring their privileges to the Roman see) enlarged their jurisdiction over the monks at the expense of the episcopal order. They advised and exhorted the monks to withdraw themselves and their possessions from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and to place both under the inspection and dominion of St. Peter.\* Hence, from the time of Gregory, the number of monasteries that had received immunities, both from the temporal authority of the sovereign and the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishops, increased beyond measure throughout Europe; and the rights of princes, together with the interests and privileges of the episcopal order, were violated and trampled upon, or rather engrossed, to swell the growing despotism of the all-grasping pontiffs.†

XXII. All the writers of this age complain of the ignorance, licentiousness, frauds, debaucheries, dissensions, and enormities, that dishonoured the greatest part of the monastic orders, not to mention the numerous marks of their profligacy and impiety that have been handed down to our times.‡ However astonished we may be at such gross irregularities among a set of men whose destination was so sacred, and whose profession was so austere, we shall still be more surprised to learn that this degenerate order, far from losing ought of their influence and credit on account of their licentiousness, were promoted, on the contrary, to the highest ecclesiastical dignities, and beheld their opulence and authority increasing from day to day. Our surprise, indeed, will be diminished, when we consider the gross ignorance and superstition, and the unbounded licentiousness and corruption of manners, that reigned in this century among all ranks and orders of men.§ Ignorance and corruption

pervert the taste and judgment even of those who are not void of natural sagacity, and often prevent their being shocked at the greatest inconsistencies. Amidst this general depravation of sentiment and conduct, amidst the flagitious crimes that were daily perpetrated, not only by the laity, but also by the various orders of the clergy, both secular and regular, all such as respected the common rules of decency, or preserved in their external demeanor the least appearance of piety and virtue, were looked upon as saints of the highest rank, and considered as the peculiar favourites of Heaven. This circumstance was, no doubt, favourable to many of the monks who were less profligate than the rest of their order, and might contribute more or less to support the credit of the whole body. Besides, it often happened, that princes, dukes, knights, and generals, whose days had been consumed in debauchery and crimes, and distinguished by nothing but the violent exploits of unbridled lust, cruelty, and avarice, felt, at the approach of old age, or death, the inexpressible anguish of a wounded conscience, and the gloomy apprehensions and terrors it excites. In this dreadful condition, what was their resource? What were the means by which they hoped to disarm the uplifted hand of divine justice, and render the governor of the world propitious? They purchased, at an enormous price, the prayers of the monks to screen them from judgment, and devoted to God and to the saints a large portion of the fruits of their rapine, or entered into the monastic order, and bequeathed their possessions to their new brethren. And thus it was that monkery perpetually received new accessions of opulence and credit.

XXIII. The monks of Clugni in France surpassed all the other religious orders in the renown they had acquired, from a prevailing opinion of their eminent sanctity and virtue. Hence their discipline was universally respected, and hence also their rules were adopted by the founders of new monasteries, and the reformers of those that were in a state of decline. These famous monks arose, by degrees, to the highest summit of worldly prosperity, by the presents which they received from all quarters; and their power and credit grew, with their opulence, to such a height, that, toward the conclusion of this century, they were formed into a separate society, which still subsists, under the title of the Order or Congregation of Clugni.\* And no sooner were they thus established, than they extended their spiritual dominion on all sides, reducing, under their jurisdiction, all the monasteries which they had reformed by their counsels. The famous Hugo, sixth abbot of Clugni, who was in high credit at the court of Rome, and had acquired the peculiar protection and esteem of several princes, laboured with such success, in extending the power and jurisdiction of his order, that, before the end of this century, he

power to maintain their authority, or to perform the duties of their stations.

\* For a particular account of the rapid and monstrous strides which the order of Clugni made to opulence and dominion, see Steph. Baluze, *Miscellan.* tom. v. p. 343, and tom. vi. p. 436, as also Mabillon *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v. *passim.*

\* A specimen of this may be seen in the seventh Epistle of Gregory, in which he reduces the monks of Redon under the jurisdiction of the Roman see, by a mandate conceived in terms that had never been used before his time: see Martenne's *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. i. p. 204. We may add, to this, several similar mandates of Urban II. and the succeeding pontiffs, which are to be found in the collection now cited, and in others of that kind.

† There is not, perhaps, in Germany, a single instance of this pernicious *immunity* before the time of Gregory VII.

‡ See Jo. Launoï, *Assert. in Privileg. S. Medardi.* cap. xxvi. sect. vi. op. tom. iii. part II. p. 499; and Simon, *Biblioth. Critique.* tom. iii. cap. xxvii. p. 331.

§ For an account of the astonishing corruption of this age, see Blondel, *de Formida. regnante Christo.* p. 14.—Boulainvilliers, *de l'Origine et des Droits de la Noblesse.* in *Mollet's Memoires de Littérature et d'Histoire.* tom. ix. part i. p. 63. The corruption and violence that reigned with impunity in this horrid age gave occasion to the institutions of chivalry or knighthood, in consequence of which, a certain set of equestrian heroes undertook the defence of the poor and feeble, and particularly of the fair sex, against the insults of powerful oppressors and ravishers. This order of knights errant certainly became very useful in these miserable times, when the majesty of laws and government had fallen into contempt, and when they who bore the titles of sovereigns and magistrates, had neither resolution nor

saw himself at the head of five-and-thirty of the principal monasteries in France, beside a considerable number of smaller convents that acknowledged him as their chief. Many other religious societies, though they refused to enter into this new order, and continued to choose their respective governors, yet showed respect for the abbot of Clugni, or the Arch-Abbot, as he styled himself, that they regarded him as their spiritual chief.\* This enormous augmentation of opulence and authority was, however, fruitful of many evils; it increased the arrogance of these aspiring monks, and contributed much to the propagation of the several vices that dishonoured the religious societies of this licentious and superstitious age. The monks of Clugni soon degenerated from their primitive sanctity, and were distinguished by nothing but the peculiarities of their discipline, from the rest of the monastic orders.

XXIV. The example of these monks excited several pious men to erect particular monastic fraternities, or congregations, like that of Clugni, the consequence of which was, that the Benedictine order, which had been hitherto one great and compact body, was now divided into separate societies, which, though they were subject to one general rule, differed from each other in various circumstances, both of their discipline and manner of living, and rendered their division still more conspicuous by reciprocal exertions of animosity and hatred. In 1023, Romuald, an Italian fanatic, retired to Camaldoli,† on the mount Apennine, and, in that solitary retreat, founded the order, or Congregation of the Camaldolites, which still remains in a flourishing state, particularly in Italy. His followers were distinguished into two classes, the Cœnobites and the Eremites. Both observed a severe discipline; but the Cœnobites gradually degenerated from their primitive austerity.‡ Some time after this, Gualbert, a native of Florence, founded at Val-Ombroso, amidst the Apennines, a congregation of Benedictine monks, who quickly propagated their discipline in several parts of Italy.§ To these two Italian monasteries we may add that of Hirsauge in Germany,|| erected by William, an eminent abbot, who had reformed many ancient convents, and was the founder

of several new establishments. It is, however, to be observed, that this monastery was rather a branch of the congregation of Clugni, whose laws and manner of living it had adopted, than a new fraternity.

XXV. Toward the conclusion of this century,\* Robert, abbot of Molesme in Burgundy, having in vain employed his most zealous efforts to revive the decaying piety and discipline of his convent, and to oblige his monks to observe, with greater exactness, the rule of St. Benedict, retired, with about twenty monks, who had not been infected with the dissolute turn of their brethren, to Cîteaux, in the diocese of Chalons. In this retreat, which was at that time a miserable desert, covered on all sides with brambles and thorns, but which bears, at present, a quite different aspect, Robert laid the foundations of the famous order, or Congregation of Cistercians, which, like that of Clugni, made a most rapid and astonishing progress, was propagated through the greatest part of Europe in the following century, and was not only enriched with the most liberal and splendid donations, but also acquired the form and privileges of a spiritual republic, and exercised a sort of dominion over all the monastic orders.† The great and fundamental law of this new fraternity, was the rule of St. Benedict, which was to be solemnly and rigorously observed; to this were added several other institutions and injunctions, which were designed to maintain the authority of this rule, to ensure its observance, and to defend it against the dangerous effects of opulence, and those restless efforts of human corruption which render the best establishments imperfect. These injunctions were excessively austere, and grievous to nature, but pious and laudable in the esteem of a superstitious age. They did not, however, secure the sanctity of this holy congregation; for the seductive charms of opulence, that corrupted the monks of Clugni much sooner than was expected, produced the same effect among the Cistercians, whose zeal in the rigorous observance of their rule began gradually to diminish, and who, in process of time, became as negligent and dissolute as the rest of the Benedictines.‡

XXVI. Beside these convents, that were founded upon the principles, and might be considered as branches of the Benedictine order, several other monastic societies were formed, which were distinguished by peculiar laws, and by rules of discipline and obedience, which

\* Mabillon, Præf. Act. SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc. v.—Hist. Generale de Bourgogne par les Moines Benedictins, tom. i. p. 151, published at Paris, in 1739.—Hist. Liter. de la France, tom. ix. p. 470.

† Otherwise called Campo-Malduli.

‡ The writers, who have given any satisfactory accounts of the order of the Camaldolites, are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius in his Bibliotheca Lat. mediæ ævi, tom. i. p. 295.—Add to these Romualdi Vita, in Actis Sanctior. Februar. tom. ii. p. 101, and in Mabillon's Acta Sanctior. Ord. Bened. Sæc. vi. part i. p. 247.—Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, tom. v. p. 236.—Mabillon, Annal. Ord. Bened. tom. v. p. 261.—Magnaulti Zeigelbauer, Centifolium Camaldulense, sive Notitia Scriptior. Camaldulensium, published at Venice in 1750.

§ See the life of Gualbert in Mabillon's Acta Sanctior. Ord. Bened. Sæc. vi. part ii. p. 273. See also Helyot's Hist. des Ordres, tom. v. p. 248. Many interesting circumstances relating to the history of this order have been published by the learned Lami, in the Deliciæ Eruditorum, tom. ii. where the ancient laws of the order are enumerated.

|| See Mabillon, part ii. p. 716.—Helyot, tom. v. p. 332.

\* In the year 1098.

† In about a hundred years after its first establishment, this order boasted of 1800 abbeys, and had become so powerful, that it governed almost all Europe, both in spirituals and temporals.

‡ The principal historian of the Cistercian order, is Ang. Mauriquos, whose Annales Cistercienses (an ample and learned work) were published in four volumes folio, at Lyons, in the year 1642. After him we may place Pierre le Nain, whose Essai de l'Histoire de l'Ordre des Cîteaux, was printed in the year 1696, at Paris, in nine volumes in evo. The other historians, who have given accounts of this famous order, are enumerated by Fabricius, in his Biblioth. Latina mediæ ævi, tom. i. p. 1066. Add to these Helyot's Hist. des Ordres, tom. v. p. 341, and Mabillon, who, in the fifth and sixth volumes of his Annales Benedictini, has given a learned and accurate account of the origin and progress of the Cistercians.

they had drawn up for themselves. To many of those gloomy and fanatical monks, whose austerity was rather the fruit of a bad habit of body, than the result of a religious principle, the rule of Benedict appeared too mild; to others it seemed incomplete and defective, and not sufficiently accommodated to the exercise of the various duties we owe to the Supreme Being. Hence Stephen, a nobleman of Auvergne (who is called by some Stephen de Muret, from the place where he first erected the convent of his order,) obtained from Gregory VII., in 1073, the privilege of instituting a new species of monastic discipline. His first design was to subject his fraternity to the rule of St. Benedict; but he changed his intention, and composed a code which was to be their rule of life, piety, and manners. In his laws there were many injunctions, that showed the excessive austerity of their author. Poverty and obedience were the two great points which he inculcated with the warmest zeal, and all his regulations were directed to promote and secure them in this new establishment. For this purpose it was solemnly enacted that the monks should possess no lands beyond the limits of their convent; that the use of flesh should be allowed to none, not even to the sick and infirm; and that none should be permitted to keep cattle, that they might not be exposed to the temptation of violating their frugal regimen. To these severe precepts many others of equal rigour were added; for this gloomy legislator imposed upon his fraternity the solemn observance of a profound and uninterrupted silence, and insisted so much upon the importance and necessity of solitude, that none but a few persons of the highest eminence and authority were permitted to pass the threshold of his monastery. He prohibited all intercourse with the female sex, and, indeed, excluded his order from all the comforts and enjoyments of life. His followers were divided into two classes, one of which comprehended the *clerks*, and the other what he called the *converted brethren*. The former were totally absorbed in the contemplation of divine things, while the latter were charged with the care and administration of whatever related to the concerns and necessities of the present life. Such were the principal circumstances of the new institution founded by Stephen, which arose to the highest pitch of renown in this and the following century, and was regarded with the most profound veneration as long as its laws and discipline were observed: but two things contributed to its decline, and at length brought on its ruin; the first was, the violent contest which arose between the clerks and the converts, on account of the pre-eminence which the latter pretended over the former; and the second was, the gradual diminution of the rigour and austerity of Stephen's rule, which was softened and mitigated from time to time, both by the heads of the order and by the penitents. This once famous monastic society was distinguished by the title of the Order of Grandmontains, as Muret, where they were first established, was situated near Grammont in the province of Limoges.\*

XXVII. In the year 1084,\* was instituted the famous order of Carthusians, so called from Chartreux, a dismal and wild spot of ground near Grenoble, surrounded with barren mountains and craggy rocks. The founder of this monastic society, which surpassed all the rest in the extravagant austerity of its manners and discipline, was Bruno, a native of Cologne, and canon of the cathedral of Rheims. This zealous ecclesiastic, who had neither power to reform, nor patience to bear, the dissolute manners of his archbishop Manasse, retired from his church with six of his companions, and, having obtained the permission of Hugh, bishop of Grenoble, fixed his residence in the miserable desert already mentioned.† He at first adopted the rule of St. Benedict, to which he added a considerable number of severe and rigorous precepts; his successors, however, went still farther, and imposed upon the Carthusians new laws, much more intolerable than those of their founder,—laws which inculcated the highest degrees of austerity that the most gloomy imagination could invent.‡ Yet it may be affirmed (and the fact is remarkable,) that no monastic society degenerated so little from the severity of its primitive institution and discipline as this of the Carthusians. The progress of the order was indeed less rapid, and its influence less extensive in the different countries of Europe, than the progress and influence of those monastic establishments, whose laws were less rigorous, and whose manners were less aus-

Guidon, whose treatise on that subject is published in the *Bibliotheca Manuscriptorum Phil. Labbei*, tom. ii. p. 275. For an account of the history of this celebrated society, see Mabillon, *Annal. Bened.* tom. v. p. 65, s. p. 99; tom. vi. p. 116; and *Præf. ad Acta SS. Ord. Bened. Sæc. vi. part. ii.* 340; Helyot, tom. vii. p. 409.—*Gallia Christ. Monachor.* Bened. tom. ii. p. 645.—*Baluzii. Vita Pontif. Avenionens.* tom. i. p. 153, et *Miscellanea*, tom. vii. p. 406.—§ The life and spiritual exploits of the founder of this order, are recorded in the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Febr.

\* Some place the institution of this order in 1080, and others in 1086.

† The learned Fabricius mentions, in his *Bibl. Lat. medi ævi*, tom. ii. p. 784, several writers who have composed the history of Bruno and his order; but his enumeration is incomplete, since there are yet extant many histories of the Carthusians, that have escaped his notice. See Innocent. Massoni *Annales Carthusianum*, published in 1687;—Petri Orlandi *Chronicon Carthusianum*, and the elegant, though imperfect history of the order in question, which is to be found in Helyot's *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. vii. Many important illustrations of the nature and laws of this famous society have been published by Mabillon, in his *Annales Benedict.* tom. vi. and a particular and accurate account of Bruno has been given by the Benedictine monks in their *Hist. Liter. de la France*, tom. ix. It was a current report in ancient times, that the occasion of his retreat was the miraculous restoration of a certain priest to life, who, during the performance of the funeral service, raised himself up and said, "By the just judgment of God I am self-damned," and then expired anew. This story is looked upon as fabulous by the most respectable writers, even of the Roman church, especially since it has been refuted by Launoy, in his treatise *de Causa Secessus Brunonis in Desertum*. Nor does it seem to preserve its credit among the Carthusians, who are more interested than others in this pretended miracle. Such of them, at least, as affirm it, do it with a good deal of modesty and diffidence. The arguments on both sides are candidly and accurately enumerated by Cæs. Egasse du Boulay, in his *Histor. Académ. Paris.* tom. i. p. 467.

‡ See Mabillon, *Præf. ad Sæc. vi. part. ii. Actor. SS. Ord. Bened.*

\* The origin of this order is related by Bernard

tere. It was a long time before the tender sex could be engaged to submit to the savage rules of this melancholy institution; nor had the Carthusian order ever reason to boast of a multitude of females subjected to its jurisdiction; it was too forbidding to captivate a sex which, though susceptible of the seductions of enthusiasm, is of a frame too delicate to support the severities of a rigorous self-denial.\*

XXVIII. Toward the conclusion of this century,† the order of St. Antony of Vienne, in Dauphine, was instituted for the relief and support of such as were seized with grievous disorders, and particularly with the disease called St. Antony's fire. All who were infected with that pestilential disorder repaired to a cell built near Vienne by the Benedictine monks of Grammont, in which the body of St. Antony was said to repose, that, by the prayers and intercessions of this eminent saint, they might be miraculously healed. Gaston, an opulent nobleman, and his son Guerin, pretended to have experienced, in their complete recovery, the marvellous efficacy of the saint's intercession, and, in consequence thereof, devoted themselves and their possessions, from a principle of pious gratitude, to his service, and to the performance of generous and charitable offices toward all such as were afflicted with the miseries of poverty and sickness. Their example was followed, at first, only by eight persons; their community, however, was afterwards considerably augmented. They were not bound by particular vows like the other monastic orders, but were consecrated, in general, to the service of God, and lived under the jurisdiction of the monks of Grammont. In process of time, growing opulent and powerful by the multitude of pious donations which they received from all parts, they withdrew themselves from the dominion of the Benedictines, propagated their order in various countries, and at length obtained, in 1297, from Boniface VIII. the dignity and privileges of an independent congregation, under the rule of St. Augustin.‡

\* The Carthusian nuns have not sufficiently attracted the attention of the authors who have written of this famous order; and several writers have even gone so far as to maintain, that there was not in this order a single convent of nuns. This notion, however, is highly erroneous, as there were formerly several convents of Carthusian virgins, of which, indeed, the greatest part have not subsisted to our times. In the year 1368, an extraordinary law was enacted, by which the establishment of any more female Carthusian convents was expressly prohibited. Hence there remain only five at this day; four in France, and one at Bruges in Flanders. See the *Varietes Historiques, Physiques, et Literaires*, tom. i. p. 80, published in 1752. Certain it is, that the rigorous discipline of the Carthusians is quite inconsistent with the delicacy and tenderness of the female sex; and, therefore, in the few female convents of this order that still subsist, the austerity of that discipline has been diminished, as well from necessity as from humanity and wisdom; it was more particularly found necessary to abrogate those severe injunctions of *silence* and *solitude*, that are so little adapted to the known character and genius of the sex.

† In the year 1095.

‡ See *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. ii. Januarii, p. 160.—*Helyot*, tom. ii. p. 108.—*Gabr. Penot. Hist. Canon. Canonorum regular. lib. ii. cap. 70.*—*Jo. Ern. Kapii Diss. de Fratibus S. Anton.* From an account of the present state of the principal hospital, or residence of this order where the abbot remains, see *Martenne*

XXIX. The licentiousness and corruption which had infected all the other ranks and orders of the clergy, were also remarkable among the canons, who composed a middle sort of order between the monks and secular priests, and whose first establishment was in the eighth century. In certain provinces of Europe, the canons were corrupt in a very high degree, and surpassed, in the profligacy of their manners, all the other ecclesiastical and monastic orders. Hence several pious and virtuous persons exerted their zeal for the reformation of this degenerate body; some pontiffs appeared in this good cause, and more especially Nicolas II., who, in a council holden at Rome in 1059, abrogated the ancient rule of the canons, which had been drawn up at Aix-la-Chapelle, and substituted another in its place.\* These laudable attempts were attended with considerable success; and a much better rule of discipline was established in almost all the canonical orders, than that which had been formerly in use. It was not, however, possible to regulate them all upon the same footing, and to subject them to the same degree of reformation and discipline; nor indeed was this necessary. Accordingly, a certain number of these canonical colleges were erected into communities, the respective members of which had one common dwelling, and a common table, which was the point chiefly insisted upon by the pontiffs, as this alone was sufficient to prevent the canons from entering into the bonds of matrimony. It did not, however, exclude them from the possession or enjoyment of private property; for they reserved to themselves the right of appropriating the fruits and revenues of their benefices, and of employing them as they thought expedient. Other canonical congregations subjected themselves to a rule of life less agreeable and commodious, in consequence of the zealous exhortations of Ivo, bishop of Chartres, renouncing all their worldly possessions and prospects, all private property, and living in a manner that resembled the austerity of the monastic orders. Hence arose the well-known distinction between the secular and the regular canons; the former of which observed the decree of Nicolas II., while the latter, more prone to mortification and self-denial, complied with the directions and jurisdictions of Ivo; and, as this austere prelate imitated St. Augustin in the manner of regulating the conduct of his clergy, his canons were called, by many, "the regular canons of St. Augustin."†

and *Durand, Voyage Liter. de deux Benedictins de la Congreg. de St. Maur*, tom. i. p. 260.

\* This decree, by which the primitive rule of the canons was changed, is published by *Mabillon* among the papers which serve as proofs to the fourth volume of his *Annales Bened.* and also in the annals themselves.

† St. Augustin committed to writing no particular rule for his clergy; but his manner of ruling them may be learned from several passages in his *Epistles*.

‡ See *Mabillon, Annal. Bened.* tom. iv. p. 588, et *Opera Posthuma*, tom. ii. p. 102, 115.—*Helyot*, tom. ii. p. 11.—*Lud. Thomassinii Disciplina Ecclesie circa Beneficia*, tom. i. part. i. l. iii. c. xi. p. 657.—*Muratori, Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. v. p. 257. In the *Gallia Christiana* of the Benedictine monks, we find frequent mention made both of this reformation of the canons, and also of their division into seculars and



XXX. The most eminent Greek writers in this century, were,

Theophanes Cerameus, i. e. the potter, of whom there is yet extant a volume of Homilies, not altogether contemptible;

Nilus Doxopatrius, who was remarkable for his knowledge in matters relating to ecclesiastical polity;

Nicetas Pectoratus, who was a most strenuous defender of the religious sentiments and customs of the Greek church;

Michael Psellus, whose vast progress in various kinds of learning and science procured him a most distinguished and shining reputation;

Michael Cerularius, bishop or patriarch of Constantinople, who imprudently revived the controversy between the Greeks and Latins, which had been for some time happily suspended;

Simeon, the Younger, author of a book of Meditations on the Duties of the Christian Life, which is yet extant;

Theophylact, a Bulgarian, whose illustrations of the sacred writings were received with universal approbation and esteem.\*

XXXI. The writers who distinguished them-

regulars. The regular canons are much displeas'd with all the accounts that render the origin of their community so recent; they are extremely ambitious of appearing with the venerable character of an ancient establishment, and therefore trace back their rise, through the darkness of remote ages, to Christ himself, or, at least, to St. Augustin. But the arguments and testimonies, by which they pretend to support this imagin'd antiquity of their order, are proofs of the weakness of their cause and the vanity of their pretensions, and are therefore unworthy of serious refutation. It is true, the title of canon is undoubtedly of much more ancient date than the eleventh century, but not as applied to a particular order or institution; for at its rise it was used in a very vague general sense (See Claud. de Vert, *Explication des Ceremonies de la Messe*, tom. i.) and therefore the mere existence of the title proves nothing. At the same time, it is evident, beyond all possibility of contradiction, that we find not the least mention made of the division of the canons into regular and secular before the eleventh century; and it is equally certain that those canons who had nothing in common but their dwelling and table, were called secular, while those who had divested themselves of all private property, and had every thing, without exception, in common with their fraternity, were distinguished by the title of regular canons.

¶ To Dr. Moshem's account of the canons, it may not be improper to add a few words concerning their introduction into England, and their progress and establishment among us. The order of regular canons of St. Augustin was brought into England by Adelwald, confessor to Henry I., who first erected a priory of his order at Nostel in Yorkshire, and had influence enough to have the church of Carlisle converted into an episcopal see, and given to regular canons, invested with the privilege of choosing their bishop. This order was singularly favoured and protected by Henry I. who gave them, in the year 1107, the priory of Dunstable; and by queen Matilda, who erected for them, the year following, the priory of the Holy Trinity in London, the prior of which was always one of the twenty-four aldermen. They increased so prodigiously, that, beside the noble priory of Merton, which was founded for them, in the year 1117, by Gilbert, an earl of the Norman blood, they had, under the reign of Edward I., fifty-three priories, as appears by the catalogue presented to that prince, when he obliged all the monasteries to receive his protection, and to acknowledge his jurisdiction.

\* For a more ample account of these Greek writers, the reader may consult the *Bibliotheca Græca* of Fabricius.

selves most among the Latins, were the following:

Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, eminent for his love of letters, and his zeal for the education of youth; as also for various compositions, particularly his epistles; and famous for his excessive and enthusiastic attachment to the Virgin Mary;†

Humbert, a cardinal of the Roman church, who far surpassed all the Latins, both in the vehemence and learning which appeared in his controversial writings against the Greeks;‡

Petrus Damianus, who, on account of his genius, candour, probity, and various erudition, deserves to be ranked among the most learned and estimable writers of this century, though he was not altogether untainted with the reigning prejudices and defects of the times;‡

Marianus Scotus, whose Chronicle and other compositions are yet extant;

Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, a man of great genius and subtlety, deeply versed in the dialectics of this age, and most illustriously distinguished by his profound and extraordinary knowledge in theology;§

Lanfranc, also archbishop of Canterbury, who acquired a high degree of reputation by his Commentary upon the Epistles of St. Paul, as also by several other productions,|| which, considering the age in which he lived, discover an uncommon measure of sagacity and erudition;¶

Bruno of Mount-Cassin, and the other famous ecclesiastic, of that name, who founded the monastery of the Carthusians;

Ivo, bishop of Chartres, who was so eminently distinguished by his zeal and activity in maintaining the rights and privileges of the church;

Hildebert, archbishop of Tours, who was a philosopher and a poet, as well as a divine, without being either eminent or contemptible in any of these characters;\*\* but, upon the

\* For a farther account of this eminent man, see the *Hist. Liter. de la France*, tom. vii. p. 261.

† See Martenne, *Thesaurus Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 629.—*Hist. Liter. de la France*, tom. vii. p. 527.

‡ See the *Acta Sanctor.* Febr. tom. iii. p. 406. *General Dictionary*, at the article *Damien—Casim.* Oudin *Diss.* in tom. ii. *Comm. de Scriptor.* *Eccles.* p. 686.

§ See the *Hist. Litteraire de la France*, tom. ix. p. 398.—*Rapin Thoyras*, *Hist. d'Angleterre*, tom. ii. p. 65, 166, de l'ed. en 4to.—*Colonia*, *Hist. Liter. de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 210.—We have already given a more ample account of the eminent abilities and learned productions of Anselm.

¶ Among these productions we may reckon Lanfranc's Letters to pope Alexander II. to Hildebrand, while archdeacon of Rome, and to several bishops in England and Normandy; as also a Commentary upon the Psalms, a Treatise concerning Confession, an Ecclesiastical History, which is not extant, and a remarkable Dissertation concerning the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. In this last performance, Lanfranc endeavours to prove, against Berenger, the reality of a corporal presence in the eucharist, though it is manifest that this opinion was not the doctrine of the church of England at the conclusion of the tenth, or the commencement of the following century. See *Collier's Eccles. History of Great Britain*, vol. i. p. 260, 263.

¶ *Hist. Liter. de la France*, tom. viii. p. 260.

\*\* The Benedictine monks published in folio, at Paris, in the year 1708, the works of Hildebert, illustrated by the observations of Beaugendre.

whole, a man of considerable learning and capacity;

Gregory VII. that imperious and arrogant pontiff, of whom we have several productions, beside his Letters.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church in this Century.*

I. It is not necessary to draw at full length the hideous portrait of the religion of this age. It may easily be imagined, that its features were full of deformity, when we consider that its guardians were equally destitute of knowledge and virtue, and that the heads and rulers of the Christian church, instead of exhibiting models of piety, held forth in their conduct scandalous examples of the most flagitious crimes. The people were sunk in the grossest superstition, and employed all their zeal in the worship of images and relics, and in the performance of a trifling round of ceremonies, imposed upon them by the tyranny of a despotic priesthood. The more learned, it is true, retained still some notions of the truth, which, however, they obscured and corrupted by a wretched mixture of opinions and precepts, of which some were ludicrous, others pernicious, and most of them equally destitute of truth and utility. There were, no doubt, in several places, judicious and pious men, who would have willingly lent a supporting hand to the declining cause of true religion; but the violent prejudices of a barbarous age rendered all such attempts not only dangerous, but even desperate: and those chosen spirits, who had escaped the general contagion, lay too much concealed, and had therefore too little influence, to combat with success the formidable patrons of impiety and superstition, who were very numerous, in all ranks and orders, from the throne to the cottage.

II. Notwithstanding all this, we find, from the time of Gregory VII., several proofs of the zealous efforts of those, who are generally called, by the Protestants, the *witnesses of the truth*; by whom are meant such pious and judicious Christians, as adhered to the pure religion of the Gospel, and remained uncorrupted amidst the growth of superstition; who deplored the miserable state to which Christianity was reduced, by the alteration of its divine doctrines, and the vices of its profligate ministers; who opposed, with vigour, the tyrannic ambition, both of the lordly pontiff and the aspiring bishops; and in some provinces privately, in others openly, attempted the reformation of a corrupt and idolatrous church, and of a barbarous and superstitious age. This was, indeed, bearing witness to the truth in the noblest manner; and it was principally in Italy and France that the marks of this heroic piety were exhibited. (Nor is it at all surprising that the reigning superstition of the times met with this opposition; it is astonishing, on the contrary, that this opposition was not much greater and more general, and that millions of Christians suffered themselves to be hoodwinked with such a tame submission, and closed their eyes upon the light with so little

reluctance.) For, notwithstanding the darkness of the times, and the general ignorance of the true religion, that prevailed in all ranks and orders, yet the very *fragments* of the Gospel (if we may use that term) which were still read and explained to the people, were sufficient, at least, to convince the most stupid and illiterate, that the religion, which was now imposed upon them, was not the true religion of Jesus; that the discourses, the lives and morals of the clergy, were directly opposite to what the divine Saviour required of his disciples, and to the rules he had laid down for the direction of their conduct; that the pontiffs and bishops abused, in a scandalous manner, their power and opulence; and that the favour of God, and the salvation exhibited in his blessed Gospel, were not to be obtained by performing a round of external ceremonies, by pompous donations to churches and priests, or by founding and enriching monasteries, but by real sanctity of heart and manners.

III. It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that they who undertook, with such zeal and ardour, the reformation of the church, were not, for the most part, equal to this arduous and important enterprise, and that, by avoiding, with more vehemence than circumspection, certain abuses and defects, they rushed unhappily into the opposite extremes. They all perceived the abominable nature of those inventions with which superstition had disfigured the religion of Jesus: but they had also lost sight of the true nature and genius of that celestial religion, which lay thus disfigured in the hands of a superstitious and dissolute priesthood. They were shocked at the absurdities of the established worship; but few of them were sufficiently acquainted with the sublime precepts and doctrines of genuine Christianity, to substitute in the place of that superstitious worship a rational service. Hence their attempts of reformation, even where they were not wholly unsuccessful, were very imperfect, and produced little more than a motley mixture of truth and falsehood, of wisdom and indiscretion; of which we might allege a multitude of examples. Observing, for instance, that the corruption and licentiousness of the clergy were, in a great measure, occasioned by their excessive opulence and their vast possessions, they rashly conceived the highest ideas of the salutary effects of indigence, and looked upon voluntary poverty as the most eminent and illustrious virtue of a Christian minister. They had also formed to themselves a notion, that the primitive church was to be the standing and perpetual model, according to which the rites, government, and worship of all Christian churches, were to be regulated in all the ages of the world; and that the lives and manners of the holy apostles were to be rigorously followed, in every respect, by all the ministers of Christ. [These notions, which were injudiciously taken up, and blindly entertained (without any regard to the difference of times, places, circumstances, and characters; without considering that the provident wisdom of Christ and his apostles left many regulations to the prudence and piety of the governors of the church,) were productive of many pernicious

ciap effects, and threw these good reformers, whose zeal was not always according to knowledge, from the extreme of superstition into the extreme of enthusiasm.] Many well-meaning persons, whose intentions were highly laudable, fell into great errors in consequence of these ill-grounded notions. Justly incensed at the conduct of the superstitious multitude, who placed the whole of religion in external services, and hoped to secure their salvation by the performance of a laborious round of unmeaning rites and ceremonies, they rashly maintained, that true piety was to be strictly confined to the inward motions and affections of the soul, and to the contemplation of spiritual and divine things. In consequence of this specious, yet erroneous principle, they treated with the utmost contempt all the external parts of religious worship, and even aimed at the total suppression of sacraments, churches, religious assemblies of every kind, and Christian ministers of every order.

IV. Of the Greek and Latin writers of this age, many employed their learned and pious labours in the exposition and illustration of the Scriptures. Among the Latins, Bruno wrote a commentary on the Book of Psalms, Lanfranc upon the Epistles of St. Paul, Berenger upon the Revelations of St. John, Gregory VII. upon the Gospel of St. Matthew, and others upon other parts of the sacred writings. But all these expositors, in compliance with the prevailing custom of the times, either copied the explanations of the ancient commentators, or made such whimsical applications of certain passages of Scripture, both in explaining the doctrines, and in inculcating the duties of religion, that it is often difficult to peruse their writings without indignation or disgust. The most eminent Grecian expositor was Theophylact, a native of Bulgaria; though he also is indebted to the ancients, and in a particular manner to St. Chrysostom, for the greatest part of his most judicious observations.\* Nor must we pass in silence either the commentary upon the Book of Psalms and the Song of Solomon, that was composed by the learned Michael Psellus, or the chain of commentaries upon the Book of Job, which we owe to the industry of Nicetas.

V. All the Latin doctors, if we except a few Hibernian divines, who blended, with the beautiful simplicity of the Gospel, the perplexing subtleties of an obscure philosophy, had hitherto derived their system of religion, and their explications of divine truth, either from the Scriptures alone, or from these sacred oracles explained by the illustrations, and compared with the theology, of the ancient doctors. But in this century certain writers, and, among others, the famous Berenger,† went

much farther, and employed the rules of logic and the subtleties of metaphysical discussion, both in explaining the doctrines of Scripture, and in proving the truth of their own particular opinions. Hence Lanfranc, the antagonist of Berenger, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, introduced into the field of religious controversy the same philosophical arms, and seemed, in general, desirous of employing the dictates of reason to illustrate and confirm the truths of religion. His example, in this respect, was followed by Anselm, his disciple and successor in the see of Canterbury, a man of a truly metaphysical genius, and capable of giving the greatest air of dignity and importance to the first philosopher. Such were the beginnings of that philosophical theology, which grew afterwards, by degrees, into a cloudy and enormous system, and, from the public schools in which it was cultivated, acquired the name of *scholastic divinity*.\* It is, however, necessary to observe, that the eminent divines, who first set on foot this new species of theology, and thus laudably maintained that most noble and natural connexion of faith with reason, and of religion with philosophy, were much more prudent and moderate than their followers, in the use and application of this conciliatory scheme. They kept, for the most part, within bounds, and wisely reflected upon the limits of reason; their language was clear; the questions they proposed were instructive and interesting; they avoided all discussions that were only proper to satisfy a vain and idle curiosity; and, in their disputes and demonstrations, they made, generally speaking, a wise and sober use of the rules of logic, and of the dictates of philosophy. † Their followers, on the contrary,

religious controversy would have been highly laudable, had not he perverted this respectable science to the defence of the most monstrous absurdities.

\* See Chr. August. Heumannii Praefat. ad Tribblechovii Librum de Doctoribus Scholasticis, p. 14. The sentiments of the learned, concerning the first author or inventor of the scholastic divinity, are collected by Jo. Franc. Buddeus, in his *Isagoge ad Theolog. tom. i. p. 38.*

† We shall here transcribe a passage from the works of Lanfranc, who is considered by many as the father of the scholastic system, that the reader may see how far the first schoolmen surpassed their disciples and followers in wisdom, modesty, and candour. We take this passage from that prelate's book concerning the Body and Blood of Christ,\* and it is as follows: "Testis mihi Deus est et conscientia mea, quia in tractatu divinarum literarum nec proponere nec ad propositas respondere cuperem dialecticas questiones, vel earum solutiones. Et si quando materia disputandi talis est, ut hujus artis regulis valeat enucleatus explicari, in quantum possum, per aequipollentias propositionum tegeo artem, nec videar magis arte, quam veritate sanctorumque patrum auctoritate, confidere." Lanfranc here declares, in the most solemn manner, even by an appeal to God and his conscience, that he was so far from having the least inclination to propose or to answer logical questions in the course of his theological labours, that, on the contrary, when he was forced to have recourse to the dialectic science, in order the better to illustrate his subject, he concealed the succours he thence derived with all possible care, lest he should seem to place more confidence in the resources of art than in the simplicity of truth and the authority of the holy fathers. These last words show plainly the two sources from which the Christian doctors had hither-

\* For an account of Theophylact, see Rich. Simon's *Hist. Critique des principaux Commentateurs du N. T. ch. xviii. p. 390. Critique de la Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, par Du Pin, tom. i. p. 310.* where he also speaks largely of Nicetas and Ceumenius.

† Otherwise called Berengarivus, and famous for the noble opposition he made to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which Lanfranc so absurdly pretended to support upon philosophical principles. The attempt of the latter to introduce the rules of logic into

ran with a metaphysical phrensy into the greatest abuses, and, by the most unjustifiable perversion of a wise and excellent method of searching after, and confirming truth, they banished evidence from religion, common sense from philosophy, and erected a dark and enormous mass of pretended science, in which words passed for ideas, and sounds for sense.]

VI. No sooner was this new method introduced, than the Latin doctors began to reduce all the doctrines of religion into one permanent and connected system, and to treat theology as a science; an enterprise which had hitherto been attempted by none but Taio of Saragossa, a writer of the seventh century, and the learned Damascenus, who flourished among the Greeks in the following age. The Latin doctors had hitherto confined their theological labours to certain branches of the Christian religion, which they illustrated only on certain occasions. The first production which looked like a general system of theology, was that of the celebrated Anselm; this, however, was surpassed by the complete and universal body of divinity, which was composed, toward the conclusion of this century, by Hildebert, archbishop of Tours, who seems to have been regarded both as the first and the best model in this kind of writing, by the innumerable legions of system-makers, who arose in succeeding times.\* This learned prelate demonstrated first the doctrines of his system by proofs drawn from the Scriptures, and also from the writings of the ancient fathers of the church; and in this he followed the custom that had prevailed in the preceding ages; but he went yet farther, and answered the objections which might be brought against his doctrine, by arguments drawn from reason and philosophy: this part of his method was entirely new, and peculiar to the age in which he lived.†

#### VII. The moral writers of this century, who

to derived all their tenets, and the arguments by which they maintained them, viz. from the Scriptures, which Lanfranc here calls the truth, and from the writings of the ancient fathers of the church. To these two sources of theology and augmentation, a third was added in this century, even the science of logic, which, however, was only employed by the managers of controversy to repulse their adversaries, who came armed with syllogisms, or to remove difficulties which were drawn from reason and from the nature of things. But, in succeeding times, the two former sources were either entirely neglected or sparingly employed, and philosophical demonstration (or, at least, something that bore that name) was regarded as a sufficient support to the truths of religion.

\* This body of divinity, which was the first complete theological system that had been composed among the Latins, is inserted in the Works of Hildebert, published by Beaugendre, who shows evidently, in his preface, that Peter Lombard, Pullus, and the other writers of theological systems, did no more than servilely follow the traces of Hildebert.

† It may not be improper to place here a passage which is taken from a treatise written by Anselm, entitled, *Cur Deus homo?* since this passage was respected, by the first scholastic divines, as an immutable law in theology; "Sicut rectus ordo exigit," says the learned prelate, "ut profunda fidei Christianæ credamus, priusquam ea presumamus ratione discutere, ita negligentia mihi videtur, si, postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus quod credimus intelligere;" which amounts to this, That we must first believe without examination, but must afterwards endeavour to understand what we believe.

undertook to unfold the obligations of Christians, and to delineate the nature, the extent, and the various branches of true virtue and evangelical obedience, treated this most excellent of all sciences in a manner quite unsuitable to its dignity and importance. We find sufficient proofs of this in the moral writings of Peter Damian,\* and even of the learned Hildebert.† The moralists of this age generally confined themselves to a jejune explication of, what are commonly called, the four cardinal virtues, to which they added the ten Commandments, to complete their system. Anselm, the famous prelate of Canterbury, surpassed, indeed, all the moral writers of his time; the books which he composed with a design to promote practical religion, and more especially his Book of Meditations and Prayers, contain many excellent remarks, and some happy thoughts, expressed with much energy and unction. [§ Nor did the mystic divines satisfy themselves with penetrating, by ecstatic thought and feeling, into the sublime regions of beauty and love; they conceived and brought forth several productions that were destined to diffuse the pure delights of union and communion through enamoured souls.] Johannes Johannellus, a Latin mystic, wrote a treatise concerning Divine Contemplation;‡ and Simeon the younger, who was a Grecian sage of the same visionary class, composed several discourses upon subjects of a like nature.

VIII. In the controversial writings of this century, we observe the effects of the scholastic method that Berenger and Lanfranc had introduced into the study of theology. We see divines entering the lists armed with syllogisms which they manage awkwardly, and aiming rather to confound their adversaries by the subtleties of logic, than to convince them by the power of evidence; while those who were unprovided with this philosophical armour, made a still more wretched and despicable figure, fell into the grossest and most perverse blunders, and seem to have written without either thinking of their subject, or of the manner of treating it with success. Damianus, already mentioned, defended the truth of Christianity against the Jews; but his success was not equal either to the warmth of his zeal, or to the uprightness of his intentions. Samuel, a convert from Judaism to Christianity, wrote an elaborate treatise against those of his nation, which is still extant. But the noblest champion that appeared at this period in the cause of religion, was the famous Anselm, who attacked the enemies of Christianity, and the audacious contemners of all religion, in an ingenious work,§ which was perhaps, by its depth and acuteness, above the comprehension of those whom it was designed to convince of their errors. [¶ For it happened, no doubt, in these earlier times, as it frequently does in our days, that many gave themselves out for unbelievers, who knew not the first

\* See Petrus Damianus, De Virtutibus.

† See Hildeberti Philosophia Moralis, et Libellus de IV. Virtutibus honestæ Vitæ.

‡ See the Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. viii. p. 48.

§ This work was entitled, Liber adversus insipientem, i. e. The fool refuted.

principles of reasoning, and whose incredulity was the fruit of ignorance and presumption, nourished by licentiousness and corruption of heart.]

IX. The famous contest between the Greek and Latin churches, which, though not decided, had however been suspended for a considerable time, was imprudently revived, in 1053, by Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, a man of a restless and turbulent spirit, who blew the flame of religious discord, and widened the fatal breach by new invectives and new accusations. The pretexes that were employed to justify this new rupture, were, zeal for the truth, and an anxious concern about the interests of religion: but its true causes were the arrogance and ambition of the Grecian patriarch and the Roman pontiff. The latter was constantly forming the most artful stratagems to reduce the former under his imperious yoke; and for this purpose, he left no means unemployed to gain over to his side the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, by withdrawing them from the jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople. The tumultuous and unhappy state of the Grecian empire was apparently favourable to his aspiring views, as the friendship of the Roman pontiff was highly useful to the Greeks in their struggles with the Saracens and the Normans, who were settled in Italy. On the other hand, the Grecian pontiff was not only determined to refuse obstinately the least mark of submission to his haughty rival, but was also laying schemes for extending his dominion, and for reducing all the Oriental patriarchs under his supreme jurisdiction. Thus the contending parties were preparing for the field of controversy, when Cerularius began the charge by a warm letter written in his own name, and in the name of Leo, bishop of Acrida, who was his chief counsellor, to John, bishop of Trani, in Apulia; in which he publicly accused the Latins of various errors.\* Leo IX., who was then in the papal chair, answered this letter in a most imperious manner; and, not satisfied with showing his high indignation by mere words, he assembled a council at Rome, in which the Greek churches were solemnly excommunicated.†

X. Constantine, surnamed Monomachus, who was now at the head of the Grecian empire, endeavoured to stifle this controversy in its birth, and, for that purpose, desired the Roman pontiff to send legates to Constantinople, to concert measures for restoring and confirming the tranquillity of the church. Three legates were accordingly sent from Rome to that imperial city, who took with them letters from Leo IX. not only to the emperor, but also to the Grecian pontiff. These legates were cardinal Humbert, a man of a high and impetuous spirit, Peter, archbishop of Amalfi, and Frederic, archdeacon and chancellor of the church of Rome. The issue of this congress was unhappy in the highest de-

gree, notwithstanding the propensity which the emperor, for political reasons,\* discovered to the cause of the bishop of Rome. The arrogance of Leo IX., and his insolent letters, excited the highest indignation in the breast of Cerularius, and produced a personal aversion to this audacious pontiff, which inflamed, instead of healing, the wounds of the church; while, on the other hand, the Roman legates gave many and evident proofs, that the design of their embassy was not to restore peace and concord, but to establish among the Greeks the supreme authority and the ghostly dominion of the Roman pontiff. Thus all hopes of a happy conclusion of these miserable divisions entirely vanished; and the Roman legates, finding their efforts ineffectual to overcome the vigorous resistance of Cerularius, very imprudently and insolently excommunicated, in the church of St. Sophia, in 1054, the Grecian patriarch, with Leo of Acrida, and all their adherents; and leaving a written act of their inhuman imprecations and anathemas upon the grand altar of that temple, they *shook the dust off their feet*, and thus departed. This violent step rendered the evil incurable, which it was before not only possible, but perhaps easy, to remedy. The Grecian patriarch imitated the vehemence of the Roman legates, and did from resentment what they had perpetrated from a principle of ambition and arrogance. He excommunicated these legates with all their adherents and followers in a public council, and procured an order of the emperor for burning the act of excommunication which they had pronounced against the Greeks.† These vehement measures were followed on both sides by a multitude of controversial writings, that were filled with the most bitter and irritating invectives, and served no other purpose than to add fuel to the flame.

XI. Cerularius added new accusations to the ancient charges adduced by Photius against the Latin churches; of which the principal was, that they used unleavened bread in the celebration of the Lord's supper. This accusation (such were the times) was looked upon as a matter of the most serious nature, and of the highest consequence; it was, therefore, debated between the Greeks and Latins with the utmost vehemence, nor did the Grecian and Roman pontiffs contend with more fury and bitterness about the extent of their power, and the limits of their jurisdiction, than the Greek and Latin churches disputed about the use of unleavened bread. The other heads of accusation that were brought against the Latins by

\* He stood greatly in need of the assistance of the Germans and Italians against the Normans, and hoped to obtain it by the good offices of the pope, who was in high credit with the emperor Henry III.

† Beside Baronius and other writers, whose accounts of this period of time are generally known, and not always exact, see Mabillon, *Annal. Bened.* tom. v. lib. ix. ad an. 1053, et *Præf. ad Sæc. vi. Actor. SS. Benedicti*, part ii. p. 1.—Leo Allatius, *de libris Græcor. Ecclesiast. Diss.* ii. p. 160, ed. Fabricii, et *de perpetua Eccles. Orient. et Occident. Concensione*, lib. ii. cap. ix. p. 614.—Mich. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, tom. i. p. 260, et *Diss. Danascena prima*, sect. xxxi. p. 16.—Hermannii *Historia Concertationum de pane azymo et fermentato*, p. 59, published at Leipsic in the year 1730.—Jo. Bapt. Cotelæus, *Monum. Ecclesiæ Græcæ*, tom. ii. p. 108.

\* See an account of those errors, sect. xi.

† These letters of Cerularius and Leo are published in the *Annals of Baronius*, ad annum. 1053.—The former is also inserted by Canisius in his *Lectio. Antiq.* tom. iii. p. 281, ed. nov.—*Leonis Conclia*, &c.

the Grecian pontiff, discovered rather a malignant and contentious spirit, and a profound ignorance of genuine Christianity, than a generous zeal for the cause of truth. He complains, for instance, in the heaviest manner, that the Latins did not abstain from the use of blood, and of things strangled; that their monks used to eat lard, and permitted the use of flesh to such of the brethren as were sick or infirm: that their bishops adorned their fingers with rings, as if they were bridegrooms; that their priests were beardless: and that in the ceremony of baptism they confined themselves to one immersion.\* Such were the miserable and trifling objects that excited a fatal schism, and kindled a furious war between the Greeks and Latins, who carried their animosities to the greatest lengths, and loaded each other with reciprocal invectives and imprecations. The attentive reader will hence form a just idea of the deplorable state of religion both in the eastern and western world at this period, and will see, in this dreadful schism, the true origin of the various sects that multiplied the different forms of superstition and error in these unhappy times.

XII. This vehement dispute, which the Greeks had to carry on against the Latin church, was nearly followed by a fatal division among themselves. Amidst the straits and difficulties to which the empire was now reduced by the expenses of war, and the calamities of the times, Alexius not only employed the treasures of the church, in order to answer the exigencies of the state, but ordered also the plates of silver, and the figures of that metal that adorned the portals of the churches, to be taken down and converted into money. This measure excited the indignation of Leo, bishop of Chalcedon, a man of austere morals, and of an obstinate spirit, who maintained that the emperor, in this step, was guilty of sacrilege; and, to prove this charge, he published a treatise, in which he affirmed, that in the images of Jesus Christ, and of the saints, there resided a certain kind of inherent sanctity, that was a proper object of religious worship; and that, therefore, the adoration of Christians ought not to be confined to the persons represented by these images, but extended also to the images themselves. This new controversy excited various tumults and seditions among the people; to suppress which, the emperor assembled a council at Constantinople, in which the question was terminated by the following decisions: "That the images of Christ, and of the saints, were to be honoured only with a relative worship, † which was to be offered, not to the substance or matter of which these images were composed, but to the form and features of which they bore the impression; that the representations of Christ, and of the saints, whether in painting or sculpture, did in no sense partake of the nature of the di-

vine Saviour, or of those holy men, though they were enriched with a certain communication of divine grace; and, lastly, that invocation and worship were to be addressed to the saints, only as the servants of Christ, and on account of their relation to him, as their master." These decisions, absurd and superstitious as they were, were not sufficiently so for Leo, the idolatrous bishop of Chalcedon, who maintained his monstrous system with obstinacy, and was, for that reason, sent into banishment.\*

XIII. The famous dispute concerning the presence of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist was revived about the middle of this century in the Latin church. Hitherto the disputants on both sides had proposed their jarring opinions with the utmost freedom, unrestrained by the despotic voice of authority, since no council had given a definitive sentence upon this matter, or prescribed a rule of faith to terminate all inquiry and debate. † Hence it was, that, in the beginning of this century, Leutheric, archbishop of Sens, affirmed, in opposition to the general opinion of the times, that none but the sincere and upright Christians, none but saints and real believers, received the body of Christ in the holy sacrament. This opinion, which was broached in 1004, seemed likely to excite commotions among the people; but these its natural effects were happily prevented by the influence of Robert, king of France, and the wise counsels of some prudent friends, who hindered the fanatical prelate from disseminating this whimsical invention. ‡ It was not so easy to extinguish the zeal, or to stop the mouth of the famous Berenger, principal of the public school at Tours, and afterwards archbishop of Angers, a man of a most acute and subtle genius, and highly renowned both on account of his extensive learning, and the exemplary sanctity of his life and manners. § This eminent ecclesiastic maintained publicly, in 1045, the doctrine of Johannes Scotus; opposed warmly the monstrous opinions of Paschasius Radbert, which were adapted to captivate a superstitious multitude by exciting their astonishment, and persevered with a noble obstinacy in teaching, that the bread and wine were not changed into the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist, but preserved their natural and essential qualities, and were no more than figures and external symbols of the body and blood of the divine Saviour. This wise and rational doctrine was no sooner published,

\* An ample account of this whole matter is given, by Anna Comnena, in her Alexias, lib. v. p. 104, lib. vii. p. 158, edit. Venet.—The acts of this council, the very mention of which is omitted by several historians of considerable note, are published by Moutaillon, in his *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, p. 103.

† The various opinions concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper, that were embraced during this century, are collected by Martenne from an ancient manuscript, and published in his *Voyage Litteraire de deux Benedictins de la Congregation de S. Maur*, tom. ii. p. 126.

‡ See Du Boulay, *Histor. Acad. Paris*, tom. i. p. 354.  
§ See the Life of Berenger in the Works of Hildebert, archdeacon of Mans, p. 1321.—See also *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, tom. viii. p. 197.—Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. i. p. 304, and the authors mentioned by Fabricius, *Biblioth. Lat. mediæ ævi*, tom. i. p. 570. It is probably by an error of the

\* See Cerularii Epistola ad Johannem Tranensem in Canisii *Lection. Antiq.* tom. iii. p. 231, where the reader will also find the refutation of this letter by cardinal Humbert.—See likewise Cerularii Epistola ad Petrum Antiocheni, in Cotelieri *Monumenta Ecclesie Græc.* tom. ii. p. 133; add to these Martenne, *Thesaur. Anecd.* tom. v. p. 847.

† Σχλητικὸς προσκυνητὴς, ἢ λατρευτικὸς, τῆς εἰκόνος.

than it was opposed by certain doctors in France and Germany. The pontiff Leo IX. attacked it with peculiar vehemence and fury in 1050; and, in two councils, one assembled at Rome, and the other at Vercelli, had the doctrine of Berenger solemnly condemned, and the book of Scotus, from which it was drawn, committed to the flames. This example was followed by the council of Paris, which was summoned in the same year by Henry I. and in which Berenger, and his numerous adherents, were menaced with all sorts of evils, both spiritual and temporal. These threats were executed, in part, against this unhappy prelate, whom Henry deprived of all his revenues; but neither threats, nor fines, nor synodical decrees, could shake the firmness of his mind, or engage him to renounce the doctrine he had embraced.

XIV. After these proceedings, the controversy was for some years happily suspended, and Berenger, whose patrons were as numerous as his enemies were formidable,\* enjoyed, for a while, the sweets of liberty and peace. His enemies, however, after the death of Leo IX. rekindled the flame of religious discord, and persuaded his successor Victor II. to examine anew the doctrine of Berenger. The pontiff complied, and sent his legates to two different councils, that were assembled at Tours, in 1054,† for that purpose. In one of these councils the famous Hildebrand, who was afterwards pontiff under the title of Gregory VII., appeared in the character of legate, and opposed the new doctrine with the utmost vehemence. Berenger was also present at this assembly, and, overpowered with threats, rather than convinced by reason and argument, he not only abandoned his opinions, but (if we may believe his adversaries, to whose testimony we are confined in this matter) abjured them solemnly, and, in consequence of this humiliating step, made his peace with the church. This abjuration, however, was far from being sincere, and the docility of Berenger was no more than an act of dissimulation; for, soon after this period, he again taught, though with more circumspection and prudence, the opinions he had formerly professed. That this conduct appears mean and dishonest, is indeed evident; but we are not sufficiently acquainted with the transactions of these councils to fix precisely the degree of his guilt.

XV. The account of Berenger's perfidy being brought to Nicolas II. the exasperated pontiff summoned him to Rome, in 1058, and, in the council which he held there the following year, so terrified the archdeacon, that he declared his readiness to embrace and adhere to the doctrines which that venerable assembly should think proper to impose upon his faith. Humbert was accordingly appointed unanimously by Nicolas and the council to draw up a confession of faith for Berenger, who signed it publicly, and confirmed his adherence to it by a solemn oath. In this confession

press, that Hildebert is styled archbishop instead of archdeacon by Paris, Hist. lib. i. p. 10, edit. Watts.

\* Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, was his most formidable rival and enemy.

† Other historians mention but one council, and place it in the year 1055.

there was, among other tenets equally absurd, the following declaration, that "the bread and wine, after consecration, were not only a sacrament, but also the real body and blood of Jesus Christ; and that this body and blood were handled by the priest and consumed by the faithful, not merely in a sacramental sense, but in reality and truth, as other sensible objects are." This doctrine was so monstrously nonsensical, and was such an impudent insult upon the very first principles of reason, that it could have nothing alluring to a man of Berenger's acute and philosophical turn; nor could it become the object of his serious belief, as appeared soon after this odious act of dissimulation; for no sooner had he returned into France, than, taking refuge in the countenance and protection of his ancient patrons, he expressed the utmost detestation and abhorrence of the doctrines he had been obliged to profess at Rome, abjured them solemnly both in his discourse and in his writings, and returned zealously to the profession and defence of his former, which had always been his real opinion. Alexander II. employed the seducing influence of soft and friendly expostulation to engage Berenger to dissemble anew, or, in other words, to return from his pretended apostasy; but his remonstrances were ineffectual, chiefly because this rebellious son of a superstitious church was powerfully supported in the maintenance of his opinions. Hence the controversy was prolonged, during many years, by a multitude of writings on both sides of the question, and the number of Berenger's followers daily increased.

XVI. Gregory VII., whose enterprising spirit no difficulties or opposition could discourage, was no sooner raised to the pontificate than he undertook to terminate this important controversy, and, for that purpose, sent an order to Berenger, in 1078, to repair to Rome. If we consider the natural character of this pontiff, we shall be inclined to admit that his conduct in this affair was highly laudable, and discovered a degree of impartiality and candour, which his proceedings on other occasions gave little reason to expect. He seems to have had a high esteem for Berenger; and, in the particular points in which he was obliged to oppose him, he did it with all possible mildness, and with a tenderness which showed that he acted rather from a forced compliance with the clamours of his adversaries, than from inclination or principle. In the council which he held at Rome toward the conclusion of the year 1078, he permitted Berenger to draw up a new confession of his faith, and to renounce that which had been composed by Humbert, though it had been solemnly approved and confirmed by Nicolas II. and a Roman council. The sagacious pontiff perceived clearly the absurdity of Humbert's confession, and therefore revoked it, though it had been rendered sacred by papal authority.\*

\* It is worthy of observation, that Gregory, whose zeal in extending the jurisdiction, and exalting the authority of the Roman pontiffs, surpassed that of all his predecessors, acknowledged, at least tacitly, by this step, that a pope and council might err, and had erred in effect. How otherwise could he allow Berenger to renounce a confession of faith that had been

In consequence of this, the persecuted arch-deacon made a second declaration, confirmed by an oath, that he would adhere for the future to the following propositions: That "the bread deposited upon the altar became, after consecration, the true body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, suffered on the cross, and now sits at the right-hand of the Father: and that the wine placed upon the altar became, after consecration, the true blood, which flowed from the side of Christ." The pontiff was satisfied with this declaration, which was far from producing the same effect upon the enemies of Berenger; they showed that it was ambiguous, and so it was in reality; and they insisted that Berenger should be obliged not only to sign a declaration less vague and equivocal, but should also be required to prove his sincerity by the fiery trial. Gregory absolutely refused the latter demand, and would have equally refused the other, had not his favourable intentions toward Berenger yielded to the importunate clamours of his enemies and persecutors.

XVII. The pontiff, therefore, granted that part of their demand which related to a new declaration; and in a council convoked at Rome, in 1079, procured from the members a third confession of faith, less absurd than the first, though more harsh than the second; and to this creed Berenger, after reading and subscribing it in the midst of the assembly, was obliged to declare his assent by a solemn oath. By this assent, he professed to believe, "That the bread and wine, by the mysterious influence of the holy prayer, and the words of our Redeemer, were substantially changed into the true, proper, and vivifying body and blood of Jesus Christ;" and to remove all grounds of suspicion, to dispel all doubt about the reality of his attachment to this ridiculous system, he added to his second confession\* a solemn declaration, that "the bread and wine, after consecration, were converted into the real body and blood of Christ, not only in quality of external signs and sacramental representations, but in their essential properties, and in substantial reality." No sooner had Berenger made this strange declaration, than the pontiff redoubled the marks of esteem which he had formerly shown him, and sent him back to his country loaded with the most honourable testimonies of liberality and friendship. The double-minded doctor did not, however, think himself bound by this declaration, solemn as it was; and therefore retracted publicly, upon his return to his residence, what he had subscribed as his real sentiments in the council of Rome, and went even so far as to compose an elaborate refutation of the doctrine to which he had been engaged to profess his assent. This new change excited a warm and vehement controversy, in which Lanfranc and Guitmund endeavoured to perplex Berenger with their sophistry, and to overwhelm him with their invectives. Gregory, to whose papal thunder the affronted council looked with impatience, seemed neither surprised nor of-

fended at the inconstancy of Berenger; nor did he take any step which could testify the smallest mark of resentment against this pretended apostate. Hence it appears more than probable, that the second confession had entirely satisfied the pontiff, and that the violent imposition of the third was by no means agreeable to one who seems to have adopted, in a great measure (if not wholly,) the sentiments of Berenger.\*

\* A remarkable treatise of Berenger's composition, which has been published by Martenne in his *Theat. Anecd.* tom. iv. p. 99, 103, will contribute to throw a satisfactory light upon this whole affair, and will fully unfold the real sentiments of Gregory concerning the eucharist. For from this piece it is undoubtedly evident; 1st, That Berenger was esteemed and favoured in a singular manner by Gregory; 2dly, That this pontiff was of the same opinion with Berenger respecting the eucharist; it is certain, at least, that he was for adhering to the words of Scripture in this matter, and was eager in suppressing all curious researches and all positive decisions concerning the manner of Christ's presence in the holy sacrament. This appears from the following words which he addressed to Berenger before the meeting of the last council of Rome, and in which he speaks of his design to consult the Virgin Mary upon the conduct which it was proper for him to observe in the course of this controversy: "Ego plane te" (says the pontiff in the 10th page of the work, cited in the beginning of this note) "de Christi sacrificio secundum Scripturas bene sentire non dubito: tamen quia consuetudinis mihi est, ad B. Mariam de his que movent recurrere—inoposui religioso cuidam amico—a B. Maria obtinere, ut per eum mihi non taceret, sed verbis commendaret, quorsum me de negotio quod in manibus habebam de Christi sacrificio recipere, in quo immotus persisterem." We see here plainly, that Gregory expresses a strong propensity to the sentiments of Berenger, not, however, without some hesitation concerning the manner in which he was to conduct himself, and also concerning the precise doctrine, which it was necessary to embrace in relation to the presence of Christ in the eucharist. It was this hesitation which led him to consult the Virgin Mary, whose answer the pontiff gives in the following words: "B. Maria audivit et ad me retulit, nihil de sacrificio Christi cogitandum, nihil esse tenendum, nisi quod tenent authenticę Scripturę, contra quas Berengarius nihil habebat. Hoc tibi manifestare volui, ut securiorem ad nos fiduciam et alacriorem spem habeas." Here we see an answer of the Virgin pronouncing, that it was necessary to adhere to the express declarations of Scripture concerning the presence of Christ in the sacrament; and whether Gregory was fanatic enough to confide in this answer as real, or rogue enough to force it, it is still certain, that he confined his belief respecting the point in debate to the language of Scripture, and held that the true body and blood of Christ were exhibited in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, though it was neither necessary nor expedient to inquire into the nature or manner of this mysterious presence. 3dly, It appears manifest, from the treatise already mentioned, that the assembling of the second council, and the imposition of another confession of faith upon the conscience of Berenger, were measures into which Gregory was forced by the enemies of that ecclesiastic. "Dejectus est," says Berenger, speaking of that pontiff, "importunitate Paduani curie, non episcopi, et Pisani non episcopi, sed antichristi . . . ut permitteret calumniatoribus veritatis in posteriori quadagesimali concilio scriptum a se firmatum in priori mutari." 4thly, We see here the true reason why Gregory showed not the smallest mark of resentment against Berenger, when, upon his return to his own country, he violated the promise by which he had so solemnly bound himself at the last council, and refused the confession to which he had sworn his assent. For the pontiff was very far from adopting the sentiments of those who had drawn up or suggested that monstrous confession, and deemed it sufficient to believe with Berenger, that the body and blood of Jesus Christ were exhibited to Christians in the eucharist. Hence he suffered the violent adversaries

solemnly approved and confirmed by Nicolas II. in a Roman council?

\* Mentioned in the preceding section.



XVIII. Amidst the clamours of his incensed adversaries, Berenger observed a profound silence, and was so prudent as to return no answer to their bitter and repeated invectives. Fatigued with a controversy, in which the first principles of reason were so impudently insulted, and exhausted by an opposition which he was unable to overcome, he abandoned all his worldly concerns, and retired to the isle of St. Cosme, in the neighbourhood of Tours, where he spent the remainder of his days in fasting, prayer, and pious exercises. In the year 1088, death put an end to the affliction he suffered in his retirement, from a bitter reflection upon the dissimulation he had been guilty of at Rome, and to the penitential acts of mortification and austerity, to which he seems to have submitted with a view of expiating the enormity of his criminal compliance, and the guilt of his perjury.\* He left in the minds of the people a deep impression of his extraordinary sanctity, and his followers were as numerous as his fame was illustrious.† There have been disputes among the learned about the real sentiments of this eminent man: yet, notwithstanding the art which he sometimes used to conceal his opinions, and the ambiguity that is often remarkable in his expressions, whoever examines with impartiality and attention such of his writings as are yet extant, will immediately perceive, that he looked upon the bread and wine in the sacrament as no more than the signs or symbols of the body and blood of the divine Saviour.‡ In this opinion Berenger per-

of his persecuted friend to murmur, scribble, hawl, and refute, while he himself observed a profound silence, and persisted in his resolution to put that unhappy man to no farther trouble. It is, however, proper to observe, that, in the same book from which these particulars are taken, we find Berenger addressing himself, with the utmost humility, to the divine mercy, for the pardon of the crime of dissimulation and perjury he had committed at Rome, and confessing that the fear of death had extorted from him oaths and declarations diametrically opposite to his real sentiments, and engaged him to subscribe to a set of tenets which he abhorred. "Deus omnipotens," says he, "miserece, fons misericordiarum, tantum sacrilegium agnoscere."

\* This will appear evident to such as peruse the treatise of his composition, which we have mentioned in the preceding note, as published in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. iv.

† The canons of the cathedral of Tours continue to honour the memory of Berenger by an annual procession, in which they perform a solemn service at his tomb in the isle of St. Cosme. See Moleon, Voyages Liturgiques, p. 130.

‡ Mabillon and other Roman catholic writers, as also a few Lutheran divines, are of opinion that Berenger denied only the doctrine of Transubstantiation, while he maintained, at the same time, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist; and this opinion will, indeed, appear plausible to such as consider only the declaration he signed in the first council at Rome, to which he was summoned by Gregory VII. and which he never retracted, without comparing this declaration with the rest of his writings. On the other hand, Usher, Basnage, and almost all the writers of the reformed church, maintain, that the doctrine of Berenger was exactly the same with that which Calvin afterwards adopted; and I cannot help joining with them in this opinion, when I peruse attentively the following words of his Letter to Almannus, published in Martenne's Thesaur. tom. iv. Constat, says Berenger in express terms, "verum Christi corpus in ipsa mensa proponi, sed spiritualiter interiori homini eorum in ea Christi corpus ab his duntaxat, qui Christi membra sunt, incorruptum, intaminatum, inatri-

severed to the last; nor have we any authentic proof of his having departed from it before his death, as some of the Romish writers vainly pretend.\*

tunque spiritualiter manducari." These words demonstrate so clearly, that, by the presence of Christ's body in the eucharist, Berenger meant no more than a spiritual presence, as to dispel all doubt about his real sentiments, though, upon other occasions, he concealed these sentiments under dubious expressions, to deceive his adversaries.

\* It is well known what laborious efforts the Roman catholic writers have employed to persuade us, that Berenger, before his death, abandoned the opinion he had so long and so warmly defended, and returned to the doctrine of the church of Rome concerning the corporal presence of Christ in the eucharist. But when we inquire into the reasons on which this assertion is founded, we shall immediately perceive their weakness and insufficiency. They allege, in the first place, that Berenger gave an account of his doctrine and belief in the council of Bordeaux, in 1087; and add to this, that the ancient writers applaud his penitential sentiments, and affirm that he died in the catholic faith. In all this, however, we see no proof of Berenger's retraction. He adhered, indeed, to the confession of faith, which he had subscribed and adopted in the first of the two Roman councils, to which he had been summoned by Gregory, and which that pontiff judged sufficient to clear him from the imputation of heresy; and they who confined their attention to the literal sense of the words of that confession, without considering their spirit, and the different meanings of which they were susceptible, might easily imagine that Berenger's confession was agreeable to the doctrine of the church. Gregory, in order to pacify matters, confirmed them in this notion; and though he was well informed of Berenger's having retracted the confession which he had signed in the last Roman council before which he appeared, and of his opposing, with the utmost warmth, the opinion he had there so solemnly professed, yet he suffered the inconstant doctor to remain unmolested, and thereby tacitly acquitted him of the crime and the error that were laid to his charge.

It is of the utmost importance to observe here, that the Roman church had not come, in this century, to a fixed determination concerning the nature and manner of Christ's presence in the eucharist. This appears most evidently from the three confessions which Berenger signed by the order of three councils; which confessions differed from each other, not only in the terms and the turn of expression, but also in the opinions and doctrines they contained. Pope Nicolas II. and the council he assembled at Rome, in 1059, obliged him to subscribe, as the true and orthodox doctrine of the church, the first of these confessions, or that which cardinal Humbert had composed. This confession was, however, rejected, not only as harsh in point of expression, but also as erroneous and unsound, by Gregory and the two Roman councils, which he had expressly summoned to inquire into that matter; for, had Humbert's declaration appeared to the pontiff to be a just expression of the doctrine and sense of the church concerning the eucharist, neither he nor the succeeding councils would have permitted other forms of doctrine to be substituted in its place. Gregory, as we have already seen, was of opinion, that it was highly improper to pry with too much curiosity into the mysteries of the eucharist, and that, laying aside all disputes concerning the manner of Christ's presence in that holy institution, it was safest to adhere to the plain words of Scripture; and as this was also the opinion of Berenger, and was plainly expressed in his confession of faith, the judicious pontiff pronounced him innocent. But a following council departed from this equitable sentence of Gregory, who, though with much reluctance, was induced to confirm their rigorous decision; and hence arose a third confession, which was extremely different from the two preceding ones. We may remark, by the bye, that in this controversy the councils seem plainly to have swayed the pontiffs, since we see the obstinate, the invincible Gregory, yielding, against his will, to one of these clamorous assemblies. Berenger had no sooner gotten out of the hands of his enemies, than he returned to the second

XIX. It is not rare to find, in the history of the church, the most trifling objects exciting the warmest and most vehement controversies. Such was the dispute that arose in France, in 1023, between the priests and monks of Limoges, concerning the place that was to be assigned in the public liturgy to Martial, the first bishop of that diocese. One party, headed by Jordan, bishop of Limoges, were for placing him among the confessors, while Hugo, abbot of the monastery of St. Martial, maintained, that the prelate in question was to be ranked among the apostles, and branded, with the opprobrious and heretical title of Ebionites, all such as adhered to the proposal of Jordan. This *momentous* affair was debated, first, in a council holden at Poitiers in 1023, and in another assembled at Paris the year following; in which latter it was determined that Martial was to be honoured with the title of an apostle, and that all who refused him this eminent rank were to be considered as Ebionites, who, as is well known, confined the number of the apostles to twelve, that they might exclude St. Paul from that sacred order. The decree, however, of this council did not produce the effects that were expected from it; for it exasperated, instead of calming, the zeal and animosity of the contending parties, so that this miserable dispute became daily more general, and spread like a contagion through all the provinces of France. The matter was at length brought before the tribunal of the Roman pontiff, John XIX. who decided it in favour of the monks, and, in a letter addressed to Jordan and the other bishops of the nation, pronounced Martial worthy of the title and honours of an apostle. This decision produced the most substantial and permanent effects: for in a council assembled at

confession, which the pontiff had approved, and publicly declaimed against that which had been imposed upon him in the last Roman council before which he had appeared, without receiving the least mark of disapprobation from Gregory. From this it was natural to conclude, that although he opposed the decree of that council, he adopted the opinion of the pope and of the church.

In the account which I have here given of this memorable controversy, I have not only consulted the ancient records relating to that matter, which have been made public (for several of them lie yet in manuscript in the cabinets of the curious,) but have also been assisted by the labours of those among the learned, who have treated that important branch of ecclesiastical history in the most accurate and ample manner: such as, first, Franc. de Roye's book, published at Angers in 1656; "Ad Can. Ego Berengerius 41. de consecrat. distinct. 2 Ubi vita, heresis, et penitentia Berengarii Andegavensis Archidiaconi, et ad Josephi locum de Christo," (a book which is extremely curious, and very little known.) Mabillon's Præf. ad tom. ix. Act. SS. Ord. Bened. seu Sec. vi. part II. p. 4. et Dissert. de multiplici damnatione, fidei professione et lapsu, which is published in his *Analecta veteris ævi*, tom. ii. p. 456. De Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. i. p. 404. tom. ii. p. 452. The authors of the reformed church, whom I have followed in this controversy, are, archbishop Usher, de *Successione Ecclesiar. Christianar. in occidente*, cap. vii. sect. 24. p. 195. Basnage, *Hist. des Eglises Reformées*, tom. i. p. 105. and *Hist. de l'Eglise*, tom. ii. p. 1391.—Cas. Oudin, *Dissert. de Doctrina et Scriptis Berengarii in Comment. de Scrip. Ecclesiar.* tom. ii. p. 634. There appears, more or less, a certain spirit of partiality in all these writers; but this spirit is particularly notorious among those of the church of Rome.

Limoges, in 1029, Jordan declared his acquiescence in the papal sentence; in a provincial council at Bourges, two years after, Martial was associated to the company of the apostles with great solemnity, in consequence of the decision of the Roman see; and about the same time this controversy was completely and finally terminated in a numerous council convoked at Limoges, in which the prayers that had been consecrated to the memory of the apostle Martial, by the zealous pontiff, were publicly recited.\* The warm contenders for the apostleship of Martial asserted, that he was one of the seventy disciples of Christ; whence they concluded, that he had an equal title with Paul and Barnabas to the honour of an apostle.

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### *Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. THE form of public worship, which was established at Rome, had not yet been received in all the western provinces. This was looked upon by the imperious pontiffs as an insult upon their authority, and therefore they used their utmost efforts to introduce universally the Roman ceremonies, and to promote a perfect uniformity of worship in every part of the Latin world. Gregory VII. employed all his diligence, activity, and zeal in this enterprise, as appears from several passages in his letters; and he alone, perhaps, was equal to the execution of such an arduous attempt. The Spaniards had long distinguished themselves above all other nations, by their noble and resolute resistance to the despotic attempts of the popes upon this occasion; for they adhered to their ancient Gothic liturgy† with great obstinacy, and could not be brought to change it for the method of worship established at Rome. Alexander II. had indeed proceeded so far, in 1068, as to persuade the inhabitants of Arragon into his measures,‡ and to conquer the aversion which the Catalonians had discovered for the Roman worship. But the honour of finishing this difficult work, and bringing it to perfection, was reserved for Gregory, who, without interruption, exhorted, threatened, admonished, and intreated Sanchez and Alphonso, the kings of Arragon and Castile, until, fatigued with the importunity of this restless pontiff,

\* See Boulay, tom. i. p. 372, 101.—J. Longueval, *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. vii. p. 188, 189, 231.—The Benedictine monks, in their *Gallia Christiana*, tom. ii. Append. Documentor. p. 162, have published the Letter of Jordan to Pope Benedict VIII. against the Apostleship of Martial. The decrees of the councils of Bourges and Limoges concerning this matter are published by Labbe, in his *Biblioth. Nova Manuscriptor.* tom. ii. p. 766. Mabillon has given an ample account of Ademar, a monk of St. Cybar, the first promoter of this ridiculous controversy, in his *Annal. Ord. S. Benedict.* tom. iv. p. 318, and, among the original papers subjoined to that volume, has published a letter written by that monk in favour of the apostleship of Martial. See also the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, tom. vii. p. 301.

† See Mabillon, de *Liturgia Gallicana*, lib. i. cap. i. p. 10.—Jo. Bona, *Res Liturg.* lib. i. cap. xi. p. 220, op.—Pet. Le Brun, *Explication des Ceremonies de la Messe*, tom. ii. Diss. v. p. 272.

‡ Pet. de Marca, *Histoire de Bearn*, liv. ii. cap. ix.

they consented to abolish the Gothic service in their churches, and to introduce the Roman in its place. Sanchez was the first who complied with the request of the pontiff; and, in 1080, his example was followed by Alphonso. The methods which the nobles of Castile employed to decide the matter were very extraordinary. First, they chose two champions, who were to determine the controversy by single combat, the one fighting for the Roman liturgy, the other for the Gothic. This first trial ended in favour of the latter; for the Gothic hero proved victorious. Recourse was next had to the fiery trial for the decision of the dispute: the Roman and Gothic liturgies were committed to the flames, which, as the story goes, consumed the former, while the latter remained unblenished and entire. Thus were the Gothic rites crowned with a double victory, which, however, was not sufficient to maintain them against the authority of the pope, and the influence of the queen Constan-tia, who determined Alphonso in favour of the Roman service.\*

II. The zeal of the Roman pontiffs for introducing uniformity of worship into the western churches may be, in some measure, justified; but their not permitting every nation to celebrate divine worship in their mother tongue was absolutely inexcusable. While, indeed, the Latin language was in general use amongst the western nations, or, at least, was unknown only to a very small number, there was no reason why it should not be employed in the public service of the church. But when the decline of the Roman empire drew on by degrees the extinction of its language in several places, and its decay in all the western provinces, it became just and reasonable that each people should serve the Deity in the language they understood, and which was peculiar to them. This reasoning, however, evident and striking, had no sort of influence upon the Roman pontiffs, who, neither in this nor in the following centuries, could be persuaded to change the established custom, but persisted, on the contrary, with the most senseless obstinacy, in retaining the use of the Latin language in the celebration of divine worship, even when it was no longer understood by the people.† This strange conduct has been variously accounted for by different writers, who have tortured their inventions to find out its secret reasons, and have imagined many that seem extremely improbable and far-fetched. A superstitious and extravagant veneration for whatever carried the hoary aspect of a remote antiquity, was undoubtedly the principal reason that rendered the pontiffs unwilling to abolish the use of the Latin language in the celebration of divine worship. The same absurd principle produced a similar effect in the eastern churches; thus the Egyptian Christians perform their religious service in the language of the ancient Copts, the Jacobites and the Nestorians, in the Syriac, and the Abyssinians in the old Ethio-

pic, though all these languages have been long since obsolete, and are consequently unintelligible to the multitude.\*

III. It would be tedious to enumerate, in a circumstantial manner, the new inventions that were imposed upon Christians, in this century, under the specious titles of piety and zeal, by the superstitious despotism of an imperious clergy. It also unnecessary to mention the additions that were made to former inventions, the multiplication, for example, of the rites and ceremonies that were used in the worship of saints, relics, and images, and the new directions that were administered to such as undertook pilgrimages, or other superstitious services of that nature. We shall only observe, that, during the whole of this century, all the European nations were most diligently employed in rebuilding, repairing, and adorning their churches.‡ Nor will this appear surprising, when we consider, that, in the preceding century, all Europe was alarmed with a dismal apprehension that the day of judgment was at hand, and that the world was approaching to its final dissolution; for, among the other effects of this panic terror, the churches and monasteries were suffered to fall into ruin, or at least to remain without repair, from an idea that they would soon be involved in the general fate of all sublunary things. But, when these apprehensions were removed, affairs immediately assumed a new aspect; the tottering temples were rebuilt; and the greatest zeal, attended with the richest and most liberal donations, was employed in restoring the sacred edifices to their former lustre, or rather in giving them new degrees of magnificence and beauty.

## CHAPTER V.

*Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. THE state of the ancient sects, and particularly of the Nestorians and Monophysites, who resided in Asia and Egypt, under the Mohammedan government, was now much the same as it had been in the preceding century, neither extremely prosperous, nor absolutely miserable. The case of the Manichæans, or Paulicians, whom the Grecian emperors had banished from the eastern provinces into Bulgaria and Thrace, was much more unhappy on account of the perpetual conflicts they had to sustain with the Greeks, who persecuted and oppressed them with much keenness and animosity. The Greeks, as usually happens on the like occasions, laid the blame of their violent measures upon the Manichæans, whom they represented as a turbulent, perfidious, and sanguinary faction, and as the declared and inveterate enemies of the Grecian empire.‡ This, however, is by no means to be received

\* See Euseb. Renaudot, *Dissertation de Liturgiæ Romanæ origine et antiquitate*, cap. vi. p. 40.

† Glab. Rudolph. *Hist. lib. iii. cap. iv. in Duchesne's Script. Franc. tom. iv. p. 217.* "Infra millesimum tertio jam fere imminente anno contigit in universo pene terrarum orbe, præcipue tamen in Italia et in Gallia, innovari ecclesiarum basilicas."

‡ See the *Alexias* of Anna Commena, lib. v. p. 105; lib. vi. p. 124, 145.

\* Bona, *Res Liturg. lib. i. cap. xi. p. 216.*—Le Brun, *tom. ii. p. 292.*—Jo. de Ferreras, *Historia de España*, tom. iii.

† *Usserii Historia Dogmatica de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis*, ab Hen. Whartonio edita et aucta, Londini, 1690, in 4to.

as an impartial state of the case; at least, it appears from many circumstances, that, if the Manichæans were exasperated against the Greeks, their resentment was in some measure justified by the violent and injurious treatment which they had received from them. The Grecian pontiffs and clergy were far from being destitute of the odious spirit of persecution; and it is certain that the emperors, instigated by them, had exhausted the patience of the Paulicians by repeated vexations and cruelties, and alienated their affections by inflicting upon them, without interruption, a variety of punishments, such as banishment, confiscation of goods, and other marks of severity and violence.

Alexius Comnenus, who, by his learning, was an ornament to the imperial sceptre, perceiving that the Manichæans were not to be vanquished, without the greatest difficulty, by the force of arms, and observing also that their numbers increased from day to day both in Thrace and in the adjacent provinces, had recourse to the power of reason and argument to conquer their obstinacy, and spent whole days at Philippopolis, in disputing with the principal doctors of that pernicious sect. Many of them yielded to the victorious arguments of this royal disputant, and his learned associates; nor is this to be wondered at, since their demonstrations were accompanied and enforced by rewards and punishments. Such of the Manichæans as retracted their errors, and returned to the bosom of the Greek church, were loaded with gifts, honours, and privileges, according to their respective stations, while such as stood firm against the reasoning of the emperor, were inhumanly condemned to perpetual imprisonment.\*

II. Many of the Paulicians, either from a principle of zeal for the propagation of their opinions, or from a desire of relieving themselves from the persecution and oppression they suffered under the Grecian yoke, retired from Bulgaria and Thrace, and formed settlements in other countries. Their first migration was into Italy; whence, in process of time, they sent colonies into almost all the other provinces of Europe, and formed gradually a considerable number of religious assemblies, who adhered to their doctrine, and were afterwards persecuted with the utmost vehemence by the Roman pontiffs.† It is difficult to fix

\* There is an ample and circumstantial account of this controversy between the emperor and the Manichæans in the work mentioned in the preceding note, lib. xiv. p. 357.

† See Muratori, *Antiquitat. Ital. mediæ ævi*, tom. v. p. 83.—Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis*, p. 31.—Ricini's *Dissertatio de Catharis*, prefixed to the *Summa B. Moneta contra Catharos*. We might also refer, upon this occasion, to *Glob. Rodolph. Histor.* lib. iii. cap. viii. to *Matth. Paris*, and other ancient writers. Certain Italian authors, and among others Ricini, seemed unwilling to acknowledge that the Paulicians arrived first in Italy, and proceeded thence into the other provinces of Europe; and maintain, on the contrary, that their first settlement was in France, whence they repaired to Italy. These writers look upon it as ignominious to their country, to be considered as the first European nation which fostered such a pernicious and impious sect in its bosom. Be that as it may, their hypothesis is favoured by Peter de Marca himself, a Frenchman, who in his *Histoire de Béarn*, livr. viii. cap. xiv.

the precise period when the Paulicians began to take refuge in Europe; it is, however, certain, from the most authentic testimonies, that a considerable number of that sect were, about the middle of this century, settled in Lombardy, Insabria, and principally at Milan, and that many of them led a wandering life in France, Germany, and other countries, where they captivated the esteem and admiration of the multitude, by their sanctimonious looks, and the uncommon air of piety, which they put on with much affectation. In Italy they were called Paterini and Cathari, or rather Gazari, which latter appellation the Germans have preserved, with a small alteration only, which was proper to adapt it to the genius of their language.\* In France they were called Albigenes† from the town of Albi, and Bulgarians because they came from Bulgaria, and because the head of their sect resided in that country; as also *Publicans*, which was probably a corrupt pronunciation of *Paulicians*, and *boni homines* or 'good men,' with several other titles and epithets.‡

declares it as his opinion, that the Paulicians joined themselves to the Gallic armies that returned from the holy war by the province of Bulgaria, and were thus conducted into France. But that learned author alleges no proof to support this opinion: it appears on the contrary, from the records of the Inquisition of Toulouse, published by Limborch, and from other authentic pieces, that the Paulicians settled first in Sicily, Lombardy, Liguria, and the Milanese, and thence sent many doctors and missionaries into France. See the *Codex Tolosanus*, passim. We learn also from the *Code de Toulouse*, that the French Paulicians, who were called Albigenes, had no bishop to consecrate their *Anciani* (such was the title they gave to their presbyters,) so that such of them as were desirous of being placed in the order of presbyters, were obliged to repair to Italy, in order to their being regularly installed.

\* The title of Paterini, which was given to this sect in Italy, has been already explained in the second chapter of the second part of this century, sect. 13. note [†]. As to the term Catharus, it was undoubtedly, when applied to the Paulicians, the same with Gazarus, as I have elsewhere demonstrated. See *Histor. Ord. Apostol.* p. 367. The country which bore, in this century, the name of Gazaria, was what we now call the Minor Tartary.

† That the Paulicians were called Albigenes in France, and were a sect entirely distinct from the Waldenses and other heretics, appears evidently from the *Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanæ*. They received this name from a town in Aquitaine, called Albizia, or Albi, where their errors were condemned in a council which met in 1176. See *Chatelet's Mémoires de l'Histoire de Languedoc*, p. 305. It is, therefore, a mistake to consider the Albigenes as a sect so called from Albi's being the place of their birth, their residence, or the seat of their principal assembly, since that name was given them for no other reason than their having been condemned in a council holden in that town. There were, indeed, several Paulicians among the various sects of dissenters from the church of Rome, that inhabited the country about Albi; and it is also true, that the title of Albigenes is usually extended to all the heretics, of whatever sect or denomination they were, who dwelt in those parts.

‡ The learned Du Fresne, in his *Glossarium Latinæ mediæ ævi*, tom. i. p. 1338, has proved, in an ample manner, that the Paulicians were called in France Bulgares, and (by a corrupt pronunciation of that word) Bongres. The same author, in his *Observationes ad Villeharduini Historiam Constantinopolit.*, has fully demonstrated, that the names Popoliciani and Publiciani, that were imposed upon these Manichæans, were no more than a corruption of the term Pauliciani, ill pronounced. The appellation of *Boni Homines*, or *Los bos Homos*, as the southern French spoke at that time, was a title which the Paulicians

III. The first religious assembly which the Paulicians formed in Europe, is said to have been discovered at Orleans, in 1017, under the reign of Robert. A certain Italian lady is said to have been at the head of this sect; its principal members were twelve canons of the cathedral of Orleans, men eminently distinguished by their piety and learning, among whom Lisoius and Stephen held the first rank; and it was composed, in general, of a considerable number of citizens, who were far from being of the meanest condition. The impious doctrines, professed by these canons, were discovered by a certain priest named Heribert, and by Arifastus, a Norman nobleman; upon which Robert assembled a council at Orleans, and employed the most effectual methods that he could devise to bring these heretics to a better mind. But all his endeavours were to no purpose; this pernicious sect adhered obstinately to its principles; and its members were at length condemned to be burned alive.\*

It is difficult to come to a fixed determination with respect to the character and doctrine of these sectaries; for, when we examine matters attentively, we find that even their enemies acknowledged the sincerity of their piety, that they were blackened by accusations which were evidently false, and that the opinions for which they were punished differ widely from the Manichean system.† As far as we can see into the case, it appears to us, that these pretended Manicheans of Orleans were a set of Mystics, who looked with contempt upon all external worship, rejected all rites and ceremonies, and even the Christian sacraments, as destitute of any, even the least spiritual efficacy or virtue; placed the whole of religion in the internal contemplation of God, and the elevation of the soul to divine and celestial things; and, in their philosophical speculations concerning God, the Trinity, and the human soul, soared above the comprehension of the age in which they lived. A like set of men proceeded in vast numbers out of Italy in the following ages, spread like an inundation through all the European provinces, and were known in Germany under the name of the Brethren of the free Spirit, while they were distinguished in other countries by the appellation of Beghards.‡

attributed to themselves. See the Codex Inquisit. Tolosana.

\* The accounts that the ancient writers have given of these heretics are collected by Boulay, in his Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. i. p. 364.—D'Argente, Collectio Judicior. de novis Erroribus, tom. i. p. 5.—Jo. Launoy, de Scholis celeberrimis Caroli Magni, cap. xxiv. p. 50.—The history of the synod of Orleans, in which this sect was condemned, is given by D'Acheri, in his Spicilieg. Veter. Scriptor. tom. i. p. 601.

† Basnage, in his Histoire des Eglises Reformées, tom. i. period iv. p. 97, and in his Hist. de l'Eglise, tom. ii. p. 1388, pleads the cause of the canons of Orleans; but this learned and worthy man seems to have been carried too far by his zeal for augmenting the number of those who have been martyrs to the truth.

‡ We shall have occasion to give a more copious account of these fanatics in the history of the thirteenth century, in which they were first drawn from their obscurity, and condemned by many councils, especially in Germany. It is, however, certain, that they had a clandestine existence long before that period, and that they propagated their tenets secretly in several places. Their doctrine resembles, in some particulars, that of the Manicheans; and

IV. We find in history another branch of this numerous sect, whose errors were not accompanied with the crimes that were laid to the charge of their brethren, and who were converted by a pathetic discourse that was addressed to them by Gerard, bishop of Cambrai and Arras, in an assembly of the clergy, holden in the latter city, in 1030. These honest Mystics, who were equally remarkable for their docility and their ignorance, had received the doctrine they professed from the Italians, and particularly from a certain eccentric doctor, whose name was Gundulf. They maintained, in general, according to their own confession, that the whole of religion consisted in the study of practical piety, and in a course of action conformable to the divine laws; and they treated all external modes of worship with the utmost contempt. Their particular tenets may be reduced to the following heads: 1. They rejected baptism, and, in a more especial manner, the baptism of infants, as a ceremony that was in no respect essential to salvation: 2. They rejected, for the same reason, the sacrament of the Lord's supper: 3. They denied, that the churches were endowed with a greater degree of sanctity than private houses, or that they were more adapted to the worship of God than any other place: 4. They affirmed, that the altars were to be considered in no other light than as heaps of stones, and were therefore unworthy of any marks of veneration or regard: 5. They disapproved the use of incense and consecrated oil in services of a religious nature: 6. They looked upon the use of bells in the churches, as an intolerable superstition: 7. They denied, that the establishment of bishops, presbyters, deacons, and other ecclesiastical dignities, was of divine institution, and went so far as to maintain that the appointment of stated ministers in the church was entirely unnecessary: 8. They affirmed, that the institution of funeral rites was an effect of sacerdotal avarice, and that it was a matter of indifference whether the dead were buried in the churches, or in the fields: 9. They looked upon the voluntary punishment, called penance, so generally practised in this century, as unprofitable and absurd: 10. They denied that the sins of departed spirits could be, in any measure, atoned for by the celebration of masses, the distribution of alms to the poor, or a vicarious penance; and they consequently treated the doctrine of purgatory as a ridiculous fable: 11. They considered marriage as a pernicious institution, and absurdly condemned, without distinction, all connubial bonds:‡ 12. They looked upon a certain sort of veneration and worship as due to the apostles and martyrs, from which, however, they excluded such as were only confessors, in

hence it was natural for the ignorant divines of the age in which they lived, to consider them as a branch of that pernicious sect.

§ \* By a vicarious penance is understood the course of mortification and voluntary suffering, that one person undergoes in order to procure absolution for another.

‡ This eleventh article is scarcely credible, at least as it is here expressed. It is more reasonable to suppose, that these Mystics did not absolutely condemn marriage, but only held celibacy in higher esteem, as a mark of superior sanctity and virtue.

which class they comprehended the saints, who had not suffered death for the cause of Christ, and whose bodies, in their esteem, had nothing more sacred than any other human carcase: 13. They declared the use of instrumental music in the churches, and other religious assemblies, superstitious and unlawful: 14. They denied, that the cross on which Christ suffered was in any respect more sacred than other kinds of wood, and, in consequence, refused to pay to it the smallest degree of religious worship: 15. They not only refused all acts of adoration to the images of Christ, and of the saints, but were also for having them removed out of the churches: 16. They were shocked at the subordination and distinctions that were established among the clergy, and at the different degrees of authority conferred upon the different members of that sacred body.\*

When we consider the corrupt state of religion in this century, and particularly the superstitious notions that were generally adopted in relation to outward ceremonies, the efficacy of penance and the sanctity of churches, relics, and images, it will not appear surprising, that many persons of good sense and solid piety, running from one extreme to another, fell into the opinions of these Mystics, in which, among several absurdities, there were many things plausible and specious, and some highly rational.

V. A controversy, of a much more subtle and difficult nature, arose in France, about the year 1089. It had for its principal author Roscellinus, a canon of Compeigne, a profound dialectician, and the most eminent doctor of the sect called Nominalists. He deemed it inconceivable and impossible that the Son of God should assume the human nature alone, i. e. without the Father and the Holy Ghost becoming incarnate also, unless by the three persons in the godhead were meant three distinct objects, or natures existing separately (such as three angels, or three distinct spirits,) though endowed with one will, and acting by one power. When it was insinuated to Roscellinus, that this manner of reasoning led directly to Tritheism, or the doctrine of three gods, he answered boldly, that the existence of three gods might be asserted with truth,†

were not the expression harsh and contrary to the phraseology generally received. He was, however, obliged to retract this error in a council assembled at Soissons, in 1092; but he resumed it when the council was dismissed, and the danger over. Persecuted anew on account of his doctrine, he took refuge in England, and excited there divisions and contests of another kind, by maintaining, among other things, that persons born out of lawful wedlock ought to be deemed incapable of admission to holy orders. This doctrine, which was by no means suited to the times, procured Roscellinus many enemies, and was in a great measure the occasion of his involuntary removal from England. Banished thence, he returned to France, and, taking up his residence at Paris, fomented again the old dispute concerning the Trinity. This, however, succeeded not according to his hopes, but exposed him to much trouble and vexation from the redoubled attacks of his adversaries, who fiercely assailed him from all quarters. Fatigued with their persecutions, he retired at last into Aquitaine, where he acquired universal esteem by his eminent piety, and passed the rest of his days in tranquillity and repose.\*

Nominalists, of whom Roscellinus was the chief, he grants, in his book de Fide Trinitatis, cap. iii. that the opinion of his antagonist may be admitted, or at least tolerated, in a certain sense; and even frequently intimates, that he is not perfectly assured of his understanding fully the meaning of Roscellinus, and that he believes the sentiments of that ecclesiastic less pernicious than his accusers have represented them. "Sed forsitan (says Anselm) ipse (Roscellinus) non dicit, sicut sunt tres anime aut tres Angeli: sed ille, qui mihi ejus mandavit questionem, hanc ex suo posuit similitudinem: sed solum modo tres personas affirmat esse tres Res, sine additamento alienius similitudinis." The same Anselm (Epistolar. lib. ii. ep. xli. p. 357.) declares, that the account which he had received of the opinions of Roscellinus appears to him extremely dubious, "Quod tamen (says he) absque dubietate credere non possum." From all this it is evident, that Anselm was far from having an entire confidence in the equity and impartiality of the accusers of Roscellinus, or from looking upon that ecclesiastic as so black, as his enemies had endeavoured to make him.

As to the merits of the cause, it appears manifest to me, that this subtle dispute was a consequence of the warm controversy that subsisted in this century, between the Realists and the Nominalists. The former attacked the latter by the dangerous conclusions that seemed deducible from their principles, and reasoned thus: "If, as your doctrine supposes, universal substances are no more than mere sounds or denominations, and the whole science of logic is only conversant about words, it must of necessity follow, that the three persons in the Godhead are only three names, and not three realities or things."—"We deny the conclusion," replied Roscellinus; "the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are not placed by us in the rank of denominations, but in the class of realities, or things." The subtle doctor here, as all must more or less do after him, by avoiding Scylla fell into Charybdis, and was charged by his adversaries with the introduction of tritheism, by holding an opinion that supposed the existence of three divine substances. Were any of the writings of Roscellinus now extant, they would help us to form a more just notion of this controversy than we can have at present.

\* Boulay, tom. i. p. 485.—Mabillon, Annal. tom. v. p. 262.—Histoire Littéraire de la France, tom. ix. p. 358.—Anton, Pagi, Critica in Baronium ad Annum 1094, tom. iv. p. 317.—Longueval, Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. viii. p. 59.

\* See an account of the synod of Arras in the Spicilegium Scriptor. Veter. tom. i. p. 607.—624; also Car. Plessis D'Argente, Collectio Judiciorum de Novis Erroribus, tom. i.

† Such is the account given by John, the accuser of this metaphysical ecclesiastic, in a letter to Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, published by Baluzius, in his Miscellanea, tom. iv. The same account is confirmed by Anselm himself, in the book de fide Trinitatis, which he wrote against Roscellinus: see Oper. tom. i. p. 41, 43, and lib. ii. Epistolar. ep. xxxv. p. 335. tom. ii. op.—and also by Fulco, bishop of Beauvais, as may be seen in the second book of the Epistles of Anselm, ep. xli. lib. ii. tom. ii. op. p. 357. It must, however, be considered, that the learned men now mentioned were the inveterate enemies of Roscellinus, and that they perhaps comprehended his meaning imperfectly, or perverted it wilfully. Several circumstances prove, that some of his adversaries were in one or the other of these two cases. Anselm himself furnishes sufficient grounds for this suspicion, since, notwithstanding his aversion to the

# THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

## PART I.

### THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the Prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

A CONSIDERABLE part of Europe lay yet involved in pagan darkness, which reigned more especially in the northern provinces. It was, therefore, in these regions of gloomy superstition, that the zeal of the missionaries was principally exerted in this century; though their efforts were not all equally successful, nor the methods they employed for the propagation of the Gospel equally prudent. Boleslaus, duke of Poland, having conquered the Pomeranians, offered them peace, upon condition that they would receive the Christian teachers, and permit them to exercise their ministry in that vanquished province. This condition was accepted; and Otho, bishop of Bamberg, a man of eminent piety and zeal, was sent, in the year 1124, to inculcate and explain the doctrines of Christianity, among that superstitious and barbarous people. Many were converted to the faith by his ministry, while great numbers stood firm against his most vigorous efforts, and persisted, with an invincible obstinacy, in the religion of their idolatrous ancestors.—Nor was this the only mortification which that illustrious prelate received, in the execution of his pious enterprise; for, upon his return into Germany, many of those whom he had engaged in the profession of Christianity, apostatised in his absence, and relapsed into their ancient prejudices: this obliged Otho to undertake a second voyage into Pomerania, A. D. 1126, in which, after much opposition and difficulty, his labours were crowned with a happier issue, and contributed much to enlarge the bounds of the rising church, and to establish it upon solid foundations.\* From this period, the Christian religion seemed daily to acquire new degrees of stability among the Pomeranians, who had hitherto refused to permit the settlement of a bishop among them. They now received Adalbert, or Albert, in that character, who was accordingly the first bishop of Pomerania.

II. Of all the northern princes of this century, none appeared with a more distinguished lustre than Waldemar I. king of Denmark, who acquired an immortal name by the glorious battles he fought against the pagan nations, such as the Slavonians, Venedi, Van-

dals, and others, who, either by their incursions or by revolt, drew upon them the weight of his victorious arm. He unsheathed his sword, not only for the defence and happiness of his people, but also for the propagation and advancement of Christianity; and wherever his arms were successful, he pulled down the temples and images of the gods, destroyed their altars, laid waste their sacred groves, and substituted in their place the Christian worship, which deserved to be propagated by better means than the sword, by the authority of reason, rather than by the despotic voice of power. The island of Rugen, which lies in the neighbourhood of Pomerania, submitted to the victorious arms of Waldemar, A. D. 1168; and its fierce and savage inhabitants, who were, in reality, no more than a band of robbers and pirates, were obliged, by that prince, to hear the instructions of the pious and learned doctors that followed his army, and to receive the Christian worship. This salutary work was brought to perfection by Absalom, archbishop of Lunden, a man of superior genius, and of a most excellent character in every respect, whose eminent merit raised him to the summit of power, and engaged Waldemar to place him at the head of affairs.\*

III. The Finlanders received the Gospel in the same manner in which it had been propagated among the inhabitants of the isle of Rugen. They were also a fierce and savage people, who lived by plunder, and infested Sweden in a terrible manner by their perpetual incursions, until, after many bloody battles, they were totally defeated by Eric IX. styled after his death the Saint, and reduced under the Swedish yoke. Historians differ about the precise time when this conquest was completed;† but they are all unanimous in their accounts of its effects. The Finlanders were commanded to embrace the religion of the conqueror, which the greatest part of them did,

\* Saxo-Græmmatæus, *Histor. Danic. lib. xiv. p. 230.*—Helmoldus, *Chron. Sclavorum, lib. ii. cap. xii. p. 234.* and Henr. Bangertus, ad h. l.—Pontoppidan, *Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ, tom. i. p. 404.*

† Beside the historians here mentioned by Dr. Meibom, we refer the curious reader to an excellent history of Denmark, written in French, by M. Mal't, professor at Copenhagen. In the first volume of this history, the ingenious and learned author has given a very interesting account of the progress of Christianity in the northern parts of Europe, and a particular relation of the exploits of Absalom, who was, at the same time, archbishop, general, admiral, and prime minister, and who led the victorious Danes to battle, by sea and land, without neglecting the cure of souls, or in the least diminishing his pious labours in the propagation of the Gospel abroad, and its maintenance and support at home.

† Most writers, with Baronius, place this event in the year 1151. Different, however, from this is the chronology of Vastovius and Oernhielmus, the former placing it in 1150, and the latter in 1157.

\* See Henr. Canisii *Lectiones Antiquæ, tom. iii. part ii. p. 31.* where we find the life of Otho, who, A. D. 1120, was canonised by Clement III. See the *Acta Sanctior. Mensis Julii, tom. i. p. 349.* Dan. Cræmeri *Chronicon Ecclesiæ Pomeraniæ, lib. i.* as also a learned Dissertation concerning the conversion of the Pomeranians by the ministry of Otho, written in the German language, by Christopher Schotgen, and published at Stargard, in the year 1724. Add to these Mabillon, *Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 123, 146, 323.*

though with the utmost reluctance.\* The founder (and ruler) of this new church was Henry, archbishop of Upsal, who accompanied the victorious monarch in that bloody campaign. This prelate, whose zeal was not sufficiently tempered with the mild and gentle spirit of the religion he taught, treated the new converts with great severity, and was assassinated at last, in a cruel manner, on account of the heavy penance he imposed upon a person of great authority, who had been guilty of homicide. This melancholy event procured Henry the honours of sainthood and martyrdom, which were solemnly conferred upon him by pope Adrian IV. †

IV. The propagation of the Gospel among the Livonians was attended with much difficulty, and also with horrible scenes of cruelty and bloodshed. The first missionary, who attempted the conversion of that savage people, was Mainhard, a regular canon of St. Augustin, in the monastery of Segeberg, who, toward the conclusion of this century, ‡ travelled to Livonia, with a company of merchants of Bremen, and improved this opportunity of spreading the light of the Gospel in that barbarous region of superstition and darkness. The instructions and exhortations of this zealous apostle were little attended to, and produced little or no effect upon that uncivilized nation; whereupon he addressed himself to the Roman pontiff, Urban III. who consecrated him bishop of the Livonians, and, at the same time, declared a holy war against that obstinate people. This war, which was at first carried on against the inhabitants of the province of Esthonia, was continued with still greater vigour, and rendered more general, by Berthold, abbot of Lucca, who left his monastery to share the labours and laurels of Mainhard, whom he accordingly succeeded in the see of Livonia. The new bishop marched into that province at the head of a powerful army which he had raised in Saxony, preached the Gospel sword in hand, and proved its truth by blows instead of arguments. Albert, canon of Bremen, became the third bishop of Livonia, and followed, with a barbarous enthusiasm, the same military methods of conversion that had been practised by his predecessor. He entered Livonia, A. D. 1198, with a fresh body of troops drawn out of Saxony, and, encamping at Riga, instituted there, by the direction of pope Innocent III., the military order of the knights sword-bearers, § who were commissioned to dragoon the Livonians into the profession of Christianity, and oblige them by force of arms to receive the benefits of baptism. || New legions were sent from Germany to second the efforts, and add efficacy to the mission of these booted apostles; and they, in concert with the knights sword-bearers, so cruelly oppressed, slaughter-

ed, and tormented this wretched people, that, exhausted at length, and unable longer to stand firm against the arm of persecution, strengthened still by new accessions of power, they abandoned the statues of their pagan deities, and substituted in their places the images of the saints. But, while they received the blessings of the Gospel, they were deprived of all earthly comforts; for their lands and possessions were taken from them, with the most odious circumstances of cruelty and violence, and the knights and bishops divided the spoil.\*

V. None of the northern nations had a more rooted aversion to the Christians, or a more obstinate antipathy to their religion, than the Slavonians, a rough and barbarous people, who inhabited the coast of the Baltic sea. This excited the zeal of several neighbouring princes, and of a multitude of pious missionaries, who united their efforts, in order to conquer the prejudices of this people, and to open their eyes upon the light of the Gospel. Henry, duke of Saxony, surnamed the Lion, distinguished himself in a particular manner, by the ardour which he discovered in the execution of this pious design, as well as by the wise methods he employed to render it successful. Among other measures that were proper for this purpose, he restored from their ruins, and endowed richly, three bishoprics † that had been ravaged and destroyed by these barbarians, namely, the bishoprics of Ratzeburg and Schwerin, and that of Oldenburg, which was afterwards transplanted to Lubeck. The most eminent of the Christian doctors, who attempted the conversion of the Slavonians, was Vicelinus, a native of Hamelen, a man of extraordinary merit, who surpassed almost all his contemporaries in genuine piety and solid learning, and who, after having presided many years in the society of the regular canons of St. Augustin at Falderen, was at length consecrated bishop of Oldenburg.—This excellent man employed the last thirty years of his life, ‡ amidst numberless vexations, dangers and difficulties, in instructing the Slavonians, and exhorting them to com-

\* See the Origines Livoniae, seu Chronicon vetus Livonicum, published in folio, at Francfort, in the year 1740, by Jo. Daniel Gruberus, and enriched with ample and learned observations and notes, in which the laborious author enumerates all the writers of the Livonian history, and corrects their mistakes.

† Dr. Mosheim's account of this matter is very different from that which is given by Fleury, who asserts, that it was Hartwick, archbishop of Bremen, who restored the three ruined sees, and consecrated Vicelinus bishop of Oldenburg; and that, as he had done this without addressing himself to Henry, the duke seized the tithes of Vicelinus, until a reconciliation was afterwards brought about between the offended prince and the worthy bishop. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. liv. lxx. p. 665, 668. edit. Bruxelles. Fleury, in this and other parts of his history, shows, that he is but indifferently acquainted with the history of Germany, and has not drawn from the best sources. The authorities which Dr. Mosheim produces for his account of the affair, are the Origines Guelphicae, tom. iii. p. 16, 19, 34, 55, 61, 63, 72, 82, with the celebrated Preface of Scheidius, sect. xiv. p. 41. Ludewig's Reliquia Manuscriptorum, tom. vi. p. 230. Jo. Ern. de Westphalen, Monumenta inedita Rerum Cimbrica- rum et Megapolens. tom. ii. p. 1998.

‡ That is, from the year 1124 to the year 1154, in which he died.

\* Oernhielmii Histor. Eccles. Gentis Sueciorum, lib. iv. cap. iv. sect. 13.—Jo. Loeccni Histor. Suecica, lib. iii. p. 76, ed. Francof.—Erlandi Vita Erici Sancti, cap. vii.—Vastovij Vitae Aquilonia, p. 65.

† Vastovij Vitae Aquilon. seu Vita Sanctiorum Regni Suegotiæ, p. 62. Eric. Benzeli Monumenta Ecclesie Suegoticae, part. i. p. 33.

‡ In the year 1186.

§ Equestris Ordo Militum Ensisiferorum.

|| See Hebr. Leonardi Schurtzfleischer Historia Ordinis Ensisiferorum Equitum, Wittenberg 1701, 5vo.



ply with the invitations of the Gospel of Christ; and, as his pious labours were directed by true wisdom, and carried on with the most indefatigable industry and zeal, so were they attended with much fruit, even among that fierce and intractable people. Nor was his ministry among the Slavonians the only circumstance that redounds to the honour of his memory; the history of his life and actions in general furnishes proofs of his piety and zeal, sufficient to transmit his name to the latest generations.\*

VI. It is needless to repeat here the observation we have so often had occasion to make upon such conversions as these, or to intimate to the reader that the savage nations, who were thus dragged into the church, became the disciples of Christ, not so much in reality, as in outward appearance. [They professed, with an inward reluctance, a religion which was inculcated by violence and bloodshed, which recalled to their remembrance nothing but scenes of desolation and misery; and which, indeed, when considered in the representations that were given of it by the greatest part of the missionaries, was but a few degrees removed from the absurdities of paganism.] The pure and rational religion of the Gospel was never presented to these unhappy nations in its native simplicity; they were only taught to appease the Deity, and to render him propitious, by a senseless round of trifling ceremonies and bodily exercises, which, in many circumstances, resembled the superstitions they were obliged to renounce, and might have been easily reconciled with them, had it not been that the name and history of Christ, the sign of the cross, and some diversity between certain rites and ceremonies of the two religions, opposed this coalition. Besides, the missionaries whose zeal for imposing the name of Christians upon this people was so vehement and even furious, were extremely indulgent in all other respects, and opposed their prejudices and vices with much gentleness and forbearance. They permitted them to retain several rites and observances that were in direct opposition to the spirit of Christianity, and to the nature of true piety. The truth of the matter seems to have been this, that the leading views of these Christian heralds, and propagators of the faith, a smaller number excepted, were rather turned toward the advancement of their own interests, and the confirming and extending the dominion of the Roman pontiffs, than toward the true conversion of these savage Pagans; that conversion which consists in the removal of ignorance, the correction of error, and the reformation of vice

VII. A great revolution in Asiatic Tartary, which borders upon Cathay, changed the face of things in that distant region about the com-

mencement of this century, and proved, by its effects, extremely beneficial to the Christian cause. Toward the conclusion of the preceding century, died Koirem Khan, otherwise called Ken Khan, the most powerful monarch that was known in the eastern regions of Asia; and, while that mighty kingdom was deprived of its chief, it was invaded with such uncommon valour and success, by a Nestorian priest, whose name was John, that it fell before his victorious arms, and acknowledged this warlike and enterprising presbyter as its monarch. This was the famous Prester John (as he was called,) whose territory was, for a long time, considered by the Europeans as a second paradise, as the seat of opulence and complete felicity. As he was a presbyter before his elevation to the royal dignity, many continued to call him Presbyter John, even when he was seated on the throne;† but his kingly name was Unkhan. The high notions which the

\* The account I have here given of this famous Presbyter, commonly called Prester John, who was, for a long time, considered as the greatest and happiest of all earthly monarchs, is what appeared to me the most probable among the various relations that have been given of the life and adventures of that extraordinary man. This account is moreover confirmed by the testimonies of contemporary writers, whose knowledge and impartiality render them worthy of credit; such as William of Tripoli, (see Dufresne's *Adnot. ad Vitam Ludovici Sti. a Joinville scriptam*, p. 89.) as also a certain bishop of Gabala mentioned by Otto Frising, *Chron. lib. vii. cap. xxxii.* See also Guillaume Rubrique, *Voyage*, cap. xviii. p. 36, in the *Antiqua in Asiam Itinera*, collected by father Bergeron, and Alberic in *Chronico*, ad A. 1165, and 1170, in *Leibnitii Accessionibus Historicis*, tom. ii. p. 345, 355. It is indeed surprising, that such authentic records as these should have escaped the observation of the learned, and that so many different opinions should have been advanced concerning Prester John, and the place of his residence. But it is too generally the fate of learned men, to overlook those accounts that carry the plainest marks of evidence, and, from a passion for the marvellous, to plunge into the regions of uncertainty and doubt. In the fifteenth century, John II. king of Portugal, employed Pedro Covilliano in a laborious inquiry into the real situation of the kingdom of Prester John. The curious voyager undertook this task, and, for information in the matter, travelled with a few companions into Abyssinia; and observing in the emperor of the Abyssinians, or Ethiopians, many circumstances that resembled the accounts which, at that time, prevailed in Europe concerning Prester John, he persuaded himself that he had fulfilled his commission, and found out the residence of that extraordinary monarch, who was the object of his researches. His opinion easily gained credit in Europe, which had not yet emerged out of its ignorance and barbarism. See Morinus, de *Saceris Eccles. Ordinationibus*, part ii. p. 367. But a new light was cast upon this matter in the seventeenth century, by the publication of several pieces, which the industry of the curious drew forth from their obscurity, and by which a great number of learned men were engaged to abandon the Portuguese opinion, and were convinced that Prester John reigned in Asia, though they still continued to dispute about the situation of his kingdom, and other particular circumstances. There are, notwithstanding all this, some men of the most eminent learning in our times, who maintain, that John was emperor of the Abyssinians, and thus prefer the Portuguese opinion, though destitute of authentic proofs and testimonies to the other above mentioned, though supported by the strongest evidence, and the most unquestionable authorities. See Euseb. Renaudot, *Hist. Patriarch. Alexandr.* p. 223, 237. Jos. Fraue. Laïtau, *Hist. des Découvertes des Portugais*, tom. i. p. 58, and tom. iii. p. 57. *Henr. le Grand. Dis. de Johanne Presbytero in Lobo's Voyage d'Abyssinie*, tome i. p. 295.

\* There is a particular and ample account of *Vicelinus* in the *Cimbrica Literata* of Mollerus, tom. ii. p. 910, and in the *Res Hamburg.* of Lambecius, lib. ii. p. 12. See also upon this subject the *Origines Neomaneaster.* at *Bordesholmeus.* of the most learned and industrious *Joh. Ern. de Westphalen*, which are published in the second tome of the *Monumenta inedita Cimbrica*, p. 2344, and the Preface to this tome, p. 33. There is in this work a print of *Vicelinus* well engraven

Greeks and Latins generally entertained of the grandeur and magnificence of this royal presbyter, were principally produced by the letters he wrote to the Roman emperor Frederic I. and to Emanuel emperor of the Greeks, in which, puffed up with prosperity, and flushed with success, he vaunted his victories over the neighbouring nations that disputed his passage to the throne; described, in the most pompous and extravagant terms, the splendour of his riches, the grandeur of his state, and the extent of his dominions; and exalted himself far above all other earthly monarchs. All this was easily believed; and the Nestorians were extremely zealous in confirming the boasts of their vain-glorious prince. He was succeeded by his son, or, as others think, his brother, whose name was David, though, in common discourse, he was also called Prester John, as his predecessor had been. The reign of David was far from being happy, nor did he end his days in peace; Genghiz Khan, the great and warlike emperor of the Tartars, invaded his territories toward the conclusion of this century, and deprived him both of his life and his dominions.

VIII. The new kingdom of Jerusalem, which had been erected by the holy warriors of France, near the close of the preceding century, seemed to flourish considerably at the beginning of this, and to rest upon firm and solid foundations. This prosperous scene was, however, but transitory, and was soon succeeded by the most terrible calamities and desolations. For, when the Mohammedans saw vast numbers of those who had engaged in this holy war returning into Europe, and the Christian chiefs that remained in Palestine divided into factions, and every one advancing his private interest, without any regard to the public good, they resumed their courage, recovered from the terror and consternation into which they had been thrown by the amazing valour and rapid success of the European legions, and, gathering troops and soliciting succours from all quarters, they harassed and exhausted the Christians by invasions and wars without interruption. The Christians, on the other hand, sustained these efforts with their usual fortitude, and maintained their ground during many years; but when Atabeck Zenghi,\* after a long siege, made himself master of the city of Edessa, and threatened Antioch with the same fate, their courage began to fail, and a diffidence in their own strength obliged them to turn their eyes once more toward Europe. They accordingly implored, in the most lamentable strain, the assistance of the European princes; and requested that a new army of cross-bearing champions might be sent to support their tottering empire in the Holy Land. Their entreaties were favourably received by the Roman pontiffs, who left no method of persuasion unemployed, that might

engage the emperor and other Christian princes to undertake a new expedition into Palestine.

IX. This new expedition was not, however, resolved upon with such unanimity and precipitation as the former had been; it was the subject of long deliberation, and its expediency was keenly debated both in the cabinets of princes, and in the assemblies of the clergy and the people. Bernard, the famous abbot of Clairval, a man of the boldest resolution and of the greatest authority, put an end to those disputes under the pontificate of Eugenius III. who had been his disciple, and who was wholly governed by his counsels. This eloquent and zealous ecclesiastic preached the cross, i. e. the crusade, in France and Germany, with great ardour and success; and in the grand parliament assembled at Vezelai, A. D. 1146, at which Louis VII. king of France, his queen, and a prodigious concourse of the principal nobility, were present, Bernard recommended this holy expedition with such a persuasive power, and declared with such assurance that he had a divine commission to foretell its glorious success, that the king, the queen, and all the nobles, immediately put on the military cross, and prepared themselves for the journey into Palestine. Conrad III. emperor of Germany, was, for some time, unmoved by the exhortations of Bernard; but he was at length gained over by the urgent solicitations of the fervent abbot, and followed the example of the French monarch. The two princes, each at the head of a numerous army, set out for Palestine, to which they were to march by different roads. But, before their arrival in the Holy Land, the greatest part of their forces perished miserably, some by famine, some by the sword of the Mohammedans, some by shipwreck, and a considerable number by the perfidious cruelty of the Greeks, who looked upon the western nations as more to be feared than the infidels themselves. Louis VII. left his kingdom A. D. 1147, and, in the month of March of the following year, he arrived at Antioch, with the wretched remains of his army, dejected and exhausted by a series of hardships. Conrad set out also in the year 1147, in the month of May; and, in November following, he arrived at Nice, where he joined the French army, after having lost the greatest part of his own by calamities of various kinds. From Nice, the two princes proceeded to Jerusalem, A. D. 1148; whence they led back into Europe, the year following, the miserable handful of troops, which had survived the disasters of the expedition. Such was the unhappy issue of this second crusade, which was rendered ineffectual by a variety of causes, but more particularly by the jealousies and divisions that reigned among the Christian chiefs in Palestine. Nor was it more ineffectual in Palestine than it was detrimental to Europe, by draining the wealth of its fairest provinces, and destroying a prodigious number of its inhabitants.\*

\* Atabeck was a title of honour given by the sultans to the viceroys or lieutenants, whom they intrusted with the government of their provinces. The Latin authors, who have written the history of this holy war, and of whom Bongarsius has given us a complete list, call this Atabeck Zenghi. Sanguinius. See Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* at the word *Atabeck*, p. 142.

\* For the historians enumerated by Bongarsius, see Mabillon, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 399, 404, 407, 417, 451. Jac. Gervasi *Histoire de l'Abbe Suger*, tom. iii. p. 104, 123, 173, 190, 239. This was the famous Suger, abbot of St. Denys, who had succeeded the exhortations of Bernard in favour of the

X. The unhappy issue of this second expedition was not however sufficient, when considered alone, to render the affairs of the Christians in Palestine entirely desperate. Had their chiefs and princes relinquished their animosities and contentions, and attacked the common enemy with their united force, they would have soon repaired their losses, and recovered their glory. But this was far from being the case. A fatal corruption of sentiments and manners reigned among all ranks and orders. Both the people and their leaders, and more especially the latter, abandoned themselves without reluctance to all the excesses of ambition, avarice, and injustice; they indulged themselves in the practice of all sorts of vices; and by their intestine quarrels, jealousies, and discords, they weakened their efforts against the enemies that surrounded them, and consumed their strength by thus unhappily dividing it. Saladin, viceroy or rather sultan of Egypt and Syria,\* and the most valiant chief of whom the Mohammedan annals boast, took advantage of these lamentable divisions. He waged war against the Christians with the utmost valour and success; took prisoner Guy of Lusignan, king of Jerusalem, in a fatal battle fought near Tiberias, A. D. 1187; and, in the course of the same year, reduced Jerusalem itself under his dominion.† The carnage and desolation that accompanied this dreadful campaign, threw the affairs of the Christians in the east into a deplorable condition, and left them no glimpse of hope, but what arose from the expected succours of the European princes. Succours were obtained for them by the Roman pontiffs with much difficulty, in consequence of repeated solicitations and entreaties. But the event, as we shall soon see, was by no means answerable to the deep schemes that were concerted, or to the pains that were employed, for the support of the tottering kingdom of Jerusalem.

XI. The third expedition was undertaken, A. D. 1189, by Frederic I. surnamed Barbarossa, emperor of Germany, who, with a prodigious army, marched through several Grecian provinces, where he had innumerable difficulties and obstacles to overcome, into Asia Minor, whence, after having defeated the sultan of Iconium, he penetrated into Syria. His valour and conduct promised successful and glorious campaigns to the army he commanded, when, by an unhappy accident, he

crusade, and whom Louis appointed regent of France during his absence. Vertot, *Histoire des Chevaliers de Malte*, tom. i. p. 86. Joh. Jac. Mascovius, *de Rebus Imperii sub Conrad. III.*

‡ \* Saladin, so called by the western writers, Salaha'ddin by the Orientals, was no longer viceroy or viceroy of Egypt, when he undertook the siege of Jerusalem, but had usurped the sovereign power in that country, and had also added to his dominions, by right of conquest, several provinces of Syria.

† See the Life of Saladin by Boha'ddin Elm Sheddad, an Arabian writer, whose history of that warlike sultan was published at Leyden in the year 1732, by the late celebrated professor Albert Schulstens, and accompanied with an excellent Latin translation. See also Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* at the article Salaha'ddin, p. 712, and Margny's *Histoire des Arabes*, tome iv. p. 289. ¶ But, above all, see the learned *History of the Arabians in the modern part of the Universal History*.

lost his life in the river Saleph,\* which runs through Seleucia. The manner of his death is not known with certainty; the loss however of such an able chief dejected the spirits of his troops, so that considerable numbers of them returned into Europe. Those who remained continued the war under the command of Frederic, son of the deceased emperor; but the greatest part of them perished miserably by a pestilential disorder, which raged with extraordinary violence in the camp, and swept off vast numbers every day. The new general died of this terrible disease, A. D. 1191; those who escaped its fury were dispersed, and few returned to their own country.†

XII. The example of Frederic Barbarossa was followed, in the year 1190, by Philip Augustus king of France, and the lion-hearted Richard, king of England. These two monarchs set out from their respective dominions with a considerable number of ships of war and transports;‡ arrived in Palestine in the year 1191, each at the head of a separate army; and were pretty successful in their first encounters with the infidels. After the reduction of the strong city of Acre or Ptolemais, which had been defended by the Moslems with the most obstinate valour, the French monarch returned into Europe, in the month of July, 1191, leaving, however, a considerable part of the army which he had conducted into Palestine. After his departure the king of England pushed the war with the greatest vigour, gave daily marks of his heroic intrepidity and military skill, and not only defeated Saladin in several engagements, but also made himself master of Jafa and Cesarea. Deserted, however, by the French and Italians, and influenced by other motives and considerations of the greatest weight, he concluded, A. D. 1192, with Saladin, a truce of three years, three months, and as many days, and evacuated Palestine with his whole army.‡ Such was the issue of the third expedition against the infidels, which nearly exhausted England, France, and Germany, both of men and money, without bringing any solid advantage, or giving even a favourable turn, to the affairs of the Christians in the Holy Land.

XIII. These bloody wars between the Christians and the Mohammedans gave rise to three famous military orders, whose office it was

§ \* \* Maimbourg, in his *Histoire des Croisades* and Margny in his *Hist. du XII. Siècle*, say, that Frederic perished in the Cydnus, a river of Cilicia. But they are easily to be reconciled with our author, since, according to the descriptions given of the Saleph by several learned geographers, and among others by Roger the Annalist, it appears that the Saleph and the Cydnus were the same river under different names.

† See an ample and satisfactory account of this unhappy campaign in the *Life of Frederic I.* written in German by Henry count Bawan, p. 278, 293, 309.

‡ The learned authors of the *Modern Universal History* affirm that Philip arrived in Palestine, with a supply of men, money, &c. on board of six ships, whereas Renandot mentions 100 sail as employed in this expedition. The fleet of Richard consisted of 150 large ships, beside galleys, &c.

§ More commonly known by the name of Joppa. † Daniel, *Histoire de France*, tome iii. p. 426.—Rapin Thoyras, *Histoire d'Angleterre*, tome ii. *Regne de Richard Cœur-de-Lion*.—Margny, *Histoire des Arabes*, tome iv. p. 285.

destroy the robbers that infested the public roads, to harass the Moslems by perpetual inroads and warlike achievements, to assist the poor and sick pilgrims, whom the devotion of the times conducted to the holy sepulchre, and to perform other services that tended to the general good.\* The first order was that of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, who derived their name, and particularly that of Hospitalers, from an hospital in that city, dedicated to St. John the Baptist, in which certain pious and charitable brethren were constantly employed in relieving and refreshing with necessary supplies the indigent and diseased pilgrims, who were daily arriving at Jerusalem. When this city became the metropolis of a new kingdom, the revenues of the hospital were so highly augmented by the liberality of several princes, and the pious donations of such opulent persons as frequented the holy places, that they far surpassed the wants of those whom they were designed to cherish and relieve. Hence it was that Raymond du Puy, who was the ruler of this charitable house, offered to the king of Jerusalem to make war upon the Mohammedans at his own expense, seconded by his brethren, who served under him in this famous hospital. Baldwin II. to whom this proposal was made, readily accepted it, and the enterprise was solemnly approved and confirmed by the authority of the Roman pontiff. Thus was the world surprised with the strange transformation of a devout fraternity, who had lived remote from the noise and tumult of arms, in the performance of works of charity and mercy, into a valiant and hardy band of warriors. The whole order was upon this occasion divided into three classes: the first contained the knights, or soldiers of illustrious birth, who were to unsheath their swords in the Christian cause; in the second were comprehended the priests, who were to officiate in the churches that belonged to the order; and in the third were the serving brethren, or the soldiers of low condition. This celebrated order gave, upon many occasions, eminent proofs of resolution and valour, and acquired immense opulence by heroic exploits. When Palestine was irrecoverably lost, the knights passed into the isle of Cyprus; they afterwards made themselves masters of the isle of Rhodes, where they maintained themselves for a long time; but, being finally driven thence by the Turks, they received from the emperor Charles V. a grant of the island of Malta.†

XIV. Another order, which was entirely of a military nature, was that of the knights templars, so called from a palace, adjoining to the temple of Jerusalem, which was appropriated to their use for a certain time by Baldwin II. The foundations of this order were laid at Jerusalem, in the year 1118, by

Hugues des Payens, Geoffroy of St. Aldemar, or of St. Amour, as some will have it, and seven other persons, whose names are unknown; but it was not before the year 1228 that it acquired a proper degree of stability, by being solemnly confirmed in the council of Troyes, and subjected to a rule of discipline drawn up by St. Bernard.\* These warlike templars were to defend and support the cause of Christianity by force of arms, to have inspection over the public roads, and to protect the pilgrims, who came to visit Jerusalem, against the insults and barbarity of the Moslems. The order flourished for some time, and acquired, by the valour of its knights, immense riches, and an eminent degree of military renown; but, as their prosperity increased, their vices were multiplied, and their arrogance, luxury, and inhuman cruelty, rose at last to such a monstrous height, that their privileges were revoked, and their order suppressed with the most terrible circumstances of infamy and severity, by a decree of the pope and of the council of Vienne in Dauphine, as we shall see in the history of the fourteenth century.‡

XV. The third order resembled the first in this respect, that, though it was a military institution, the care of the poor and relief of the sick were not excluded from the services it prescribed. Its members were distinguished by the title of Teutonic Knights of St. Mary of Jerusalem; and as to its rise, we cannot, with any degree of certainty, trace it farther back than the year 1190, during the siege of Acre, or Ptolemais, though there are historians adventurous enough to seek its origin (which they place at Jerusalem) in a more remote period. During the long and tedious siege of Acre, several pious and charitable merchants of Bremen and Lubeck, moved with compassion at the sight of the miseries which the besiegers suffered in the midst of their success, devoted themselves entirely to the service of the sick and wounded soldiers, and erected a kind of hospital, or tent, where they gave constant attendance to all such unhappy objects as had recourse to their charity. This pious undertaking was so agreeable to the German princes, who were present at this terrible siege, that they thought proper to form a fraternity of German knights to bring it to perfection. Their resolution was highly approved by pope Celestine III. who confirmed the new order by a bull issued on the twenty-third of February, A. D. 1192. This order was entirely appropriated to the Germans; and even of them none were admitted as members of it, but such as were of an illustrious birth. The support of Christianity, the defence of the Holy Land, and the relief of the poor and needy, were the important duties and services to which the Teutonic knights devoted themselves by a solemn vow. Austerity and frugality were the first characteristics of this rising

\* The writers, who have given the history of these three orders, are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Bibliograph. Antiquar. p. 465; but his enumeration is not complete.

† The best and the most recent history of this order is that which was composed by Vertot at the request of the knights of Malta; it was first published at Paris, and afterwards at Amsterdam, in five volumes 8vo. in the year 1732. See also Helyot's Hist. des Ordres, tome iii. p. 72.

\* See Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 159.

‡ See Matthew Paris, Histor. Major. p. 56, for an account of the commencement of this order. See also Putean, Histoire de l'Ordre Militaire des Templiers, which was republished with considerable additions, at Brussels, in 4to. in the year 1751; and Nic. Gurtleri Historia Templariorum Militum, Amstelodam. 1691, in 8vo.

order, and the equestrian garment,\* bread, and water, were the only rewards which the knights derived from their generous labours. But as, according to the fate of human things, prosperity generates corruption, so it happened that this austerity was of a short duration, and diminished in proportion as the revenues and possessions of the order were augmented. The Teutonic knights, after their retreat from Palestine, made themselves masters of Prussia, Livonia, Courland, and Semigallia; but, in process of time, their victorious arms received several checks; and when the light of the reformation arose upon Germany, they were deprived of the richest provinces which they possessed in that country; though they still retain there a certain portion of their ancient territories.†

### CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THE progress of Christianity in the west had disarmed its most inveterate enemies, and deprived them of the power of doing much mischief, though they still entertained the same aversion to the disciples of Jesus. The Jews and Pagans were no longer able to oppose the propagation of the Gospel, or to oppress its ministers. Their malignity remained; but their credit and authority were gone. The Jews were accused by the Christians of various crimes, whether real or fictitious we shall not determine; but, instead of attacking their accusers, they were content to defend their own lives, and secure their persons, without daring to give vent to their resentment. Affairs were in a somewhat different state in the northern provinces. The Pagans were yet numerous there in several districts; and wherever they composed the majority, they persecuted the Christians with the utmost barbarity, the most unrelenting and merciless fury.‡ It is true, the Christian kings and princes, who lived in the neighbourhood of these persecuting barbarians, checked by degrees their impetuous rage, and never ceased to harass and weaken them by hostilities and incursions, until at length they subdued them entirely, and deprived them, by force, both of their independence and their superstitions.

II. The writers of this century complain grievously of the inhuman rage with which the Saracens persecuted the Christians in the east; nor can we question the truth of what they relate on the subject of this severe persecution. But they pass over in silence the principal rea-

sons that inflamed the resentment of this fierce people, and voluntarily forget that the Christians were the aggressors in this dreadful war. If we consider the matter with impartiality and candour, the conduct of the Saracens, however barbarous it may have been, will not appear so surprising, particularly when we reflect on the provocations they received. In the first place, they had a right, by the laws of war, to repel by force the violent invasion of their country; and the Christians could not expect, without being chargeable with the most audacious impudence, that a people whom they attacked with a formidable army, and whom, in the fury of their misguided zeal, they massacred without mercy, should receive insults with a tame submission, and give up their lives and possessions without resistance. It must also be confessed, though with sorrow, that the Christians did not content themselves with making war upon the Mohammedans in order to rescue Jerusalem and the holy sepulchre out of their hands, but carried their brutal fury to the greatest length, disgraced their cause by the most detestable crimes, filled the eastern provinces through which they passed with scenes of horror, and made the Saracens feel the terrible effects of their violence and barbarity wherever their arms were successful. Is it then so surprising to see the infidel Saracens committing, by way of reprisal, the same barbarities that the holy warriors had perpetrated without the least provocation? Is there any thing so new and so extraordinary in this, that a people naturally fierce, and exasperated, moreover, by the calamities of a religious war, carried on against them in contradiction to all the dictates of justice and humanity, should avenge themselves upon the Christians who resided in Palestine, as professing the religion which gave occasion to the war, and attached, of consequence, to the cause of their enemies and invaders?

III. The rapid and amazing victories of the great Genghiz-Khan, emperor of the Tartars, gave an unhappy turn to the affairs of the Christians in the northern parts of Asia, near the close of this century. This warlike prince, who was by birth a Mogul, and whose military exploits raise him in the list of fame above almost all the commanders either of ancient or modern times, rendered his name formidable throughout all Asia, whose most flourishing dynasties fell successively before his victorious arms. David, or Unkhan, who, according to some, was the son, or, as others will have it, the brother, but who was certainly the successor, of the famous Prester John, and was himself so called in common discourse, was the first victim that Genghiz sacrificed to his boundless ambition. He invaded his territory, and put to flight his troops in a bloody battle, where David lost, at the same time, his kingdom and his life.\* The princes, who governed

\* This garment was a white mantle with a black cross.

† See Raymondi Duellii Histor. Ord. Teutonici, published in folio at Vienna, in 1727.—Chronicon Prussie, by Peter Dufburg, published in 4to. at Jena, in the year 1679, by Christoph. Hartknoch.—Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, tome iii. p. 140.—Chronicon Ordinis Teutonici, in Anton. Matthai Analectis veteris ævi, tom. v. p. 621, 658, ed. nov.—Privilegia Ordinis Teutonici in Petr. a Ludewig Reliquis Manuscriptor. tom. vi. p. 43.

‡ Helmsold. Chronic. Sclavor. lib. i. cap. xxxiv. p. 86, cap. xxxv. p. 89, cap. xl. p. 99.—Lindenbrogius Scriptor. Septentrional. p. 195, 196, 201. Petri Lamberti Res Hamburg lib. i. p. 23.

\* The Greek, Latin, and Oriental writers are far from being agreed concerning the year in which the emperor of the Tartars attacked and defeated Prester John. The greater part of the Latin writers place this event in the year 1202, and consequently in the thirteenth century. But Marcus Paulus Venetus (in his book de Regionibus Orientalibus, lib. i. cap. li. lii. liii.) and other historians whose accounts

the Turks, Indians, and the province of Cathay, fell, in their turn, before the victorious Tartar, and were all either put to death, or rendered tributary; nor did Genghiz stop here, but proceeding into Persia, India, and Arabia, he overturned the Saracen dominion in those regions, and substituted that of the Tartars in its place.\* From this period the Christian

I have followed as the most probable, place the defeat of this second Prester John in the year 1187. The learned and illustrious Demetrios Cantemir (in his *Præf. ad Histor. Imperii Ottomanici*, p. 45. tom. i. of the French edition) gives an account of this matter different from the two now mentioned, and affirms, upon the authority of the Arabian writers, that Genghiz did not invade the territories of his neighbours before the year 1214.

\* See *Petit de la Croix Histoire de Genghiz-Can*, p. 120, 121, in *12uo.* at Paris in the year 1711.—Herbelot, *Biblioth. Oriental.* at the article *Genghiz-Khan*, p. 378.—*Assemani Biblioth. Oriental.*

cause lost much of its authority and credit in the provinces that had been ruled by Prester John and his successor David, and continued to decline and lose ground until it sunk entirely under the weight of oppression, and was succeeded in some places by the errors of the Mohammedan faith, and in others by the superstitions of paganism. We must except, however, in this general account, the kingdom of Tangut, the chief residence of Prester John, in which his posterity, who persevered in the profession of Christianity, maintained, for a long time, a certain sort of tributary dominion, which exhibited, indeed, but a faint shadow of their former grandeur.\*

*Vatican.* tom. iii. part i. p. 101, and 235.—*Jean du Plan Carpin, Voyage en Tartarie*, ch. v. in the *Recueil des Voyages au Nord*, tome vii. p. 350.

\* *Assemani Biblioth. Oriental. Vatican*, tom. iii. part ii. p. 500.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the state of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.*

I. NOTWITHSTANDING the decline of the Grecian empire, the calamities in which it was repeatedly involved, and the frequent revolutions and civil wars that consumed its strength, and were precipitating its ruin, the arts and sciences still flourished in Greece, and covered with glory such as cultivated them with assiduity and success. This may be ascribed, not only to the liberality of the emperors, and to the extraordinary zeal which the family of the Comneni discovered for the advancement of learning, but also to the provident vigilance of the patriarchs of Constantinople, who took all possible measures to prevent the clergy from falling into ignorance and sloth, lest the Greek church should thus be deprived of able champions to defend its cause against the Latins. The learned and ingenious commentaries of Eustathius, bishop of Thessalonica, upon Homer and Diouysius the Geographer, are sufficient to show the diligence and labour that were employed by men of the first genius in the improvement of classical erudition, and in the study of antiquity. And if we turn our view toward the various writers who composed in this century the history of their own times, such as Cinnamus, Glycas, Zonaras, Nicephorus, Briennius and others, we shall find in their productions undoubted marks of learning and genius, as well as of a laudable ambition to obtain the esteem and approbation of future ages.

II. Nothing could equal the zeal and enthusiasm with which Michael Anchialus, patriarch of Constantinople, encouraged the study of philosophy by his munificence, and still more by the extraordinary influence of his illustrious example.\* It seems, however, to

have been the Aristotelian philosophy that was favoured in such a distinguished manner by this eminent prelate; and it was in the illustration and improvement of this profound and intricate system that those Greeks who had a philosophical turn were principally employed, as appears from several remains of ancient erudition, and particularly from the commentaries of Eustratius upon the ethics and other treatises of the Grecian sage. We are not, however, to imagine that the sublime wisdom of Plato was neglected in this century, or that his doctrines had fallen into disrepute. It appears, on the contrary, that they were adopted by many. Such, more especially, as had imbibed the precepts and spirit of the Mystics, preferred them infinitely to the Peripatetic philosophy, which they considered as an endless source of sophistry and presumption, while they looked upon the Platonic system as the philosophy of reason and piety, of candour and virtue. This diversity of sentiment produced the famous controversy, which was managed with such vehemence and erudition among the Greeks, concerning the respective merit and excellence of the Peripatetic and Platonic doctrines.

III. In the western world the pursuit of knowledge was now carried on with incredible emulation and ardour; and all branches of science were studied with the greatest application and industry. This literary enthusiasm was encouraged and supported by the influence and liberality of some of the European monarchs, and Roman pontiffs, who perceived the happy tendency of the sciences to soften the savage manners of uncivilized nations, and thereby to administer an additional support to civil government, as well as an ornament to human society. Hence learned societies were formed, and colleges established, in which the

\* *Theodorus Balsamon, Præf. ad Photii Nomencl.*

onem in *Henr. Justelli Bibliotheca Juris canonici veteris*, tom. ii. p. 814.

liberal arts and sciences were publicly taught. The prodigious concourse of students, who resorted thither for instruction, occasioned, in process of time, the enlargement of these schools, which had arisen from small beginnings, and their erection into universities, as they were called, in the succeeding age. The principal cities of Europe were adorned with establishments of this kind; but Paris surpassed them all in the number and variety of its schools, the merit and reputation of its public teachers, and the immense multitude of the studious youth that frequented its colleges. And thus was exhibited in that famous city the model of our present schools of learning; a model indeed defective in several respects, but which, in after-times, was corrected and improved, and brought gradually to higher degrees of perfection.\* About the same time the famous school of Angers, in which the youth were instructed in various sciences, and particularly and principally in the civil law, was founded by the zeal and industry of Ulgerius, bishop of that city;† and the college of Montpellier, where law and physic were taught with great success, had already acquired a considerable reputation.‡ The same literary spirit reigned also in Italy. The academy of Bologna, whose origin may be traced higher than this century, was now in the highest renown, and was frequented by great numbers of students, and more especially by such as were desirous of being instructed in the civil and canon laws. The fame of this academy was, in a great measure, established by the munificence of the emperor Lotharius II. who took it under his protection, and enriched it with new privileges and immunities.§ In the same province flourished also the celebrated school of Salerno, where great numbers resorted, and which was wholly set apart for the study of physic. While this zealous emulation, in advancing the cause of learning and philosophy, animated so many princes and prelates, and discovered itself in the erection of so many

academies and schools of learning, the Roman pontiff, Alexander III. was seized also with noble enthusiasm. In a council holden at Rome, A. D. 1179, he caused a solemn law to be published, for erecting new schools in the monasteries and cathedrals, and restoring to their primitive lustre those which, through the sloth and ignorance of the monks and bishops, had fallen into ruin.\* But the effect which this law was intended to produce was prevented by the growing fame of the newly-erected academies, to which the youth resorted from all parts, and left the episcopal and monastic schools entirely empty; so that they gradually declined, and sunk, at last, into a total oblivion.

IV. Many were the signal advantages that attended these literary establishments; and what is particularly worthy of notice, they not only rendered knowledge more general by facilitating the means of instruction, but were also the occasion of forming a new circle of sciences, better digested, and much more comprehensive than that which had been hitherto studied by the greatest adepts in learning. The whole extent of learning and philosophy, before this period, was confined to the seven liberal arts, as they were commonly called, of which three were known by the name of the trivium, which comprehended grammar, rhetoric, and logic; and the other four by the title of quadrivium, which included arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. The greatest part of the learned, as we have formerly observed, were satisfied, with their literary acquisitions, when they had made themselves masters of the trivium, while such as with an adventurous flight aspired to the quadrivium, were considered as stars of the first magnitude, as the great luminaries of the learned world. But in this century the aspect of letters underwent a considerable and an advantageous change. The liberal arts and sciences were multiplied; and new and unfrequented paths of knowledge were opened to the emulation of the studious youth. Theology was placed in the number of the sciences; not that ancient theology which had no merit but its simplicity, and which was drawn, without the least order or connexion, from diverse passages of the holy scriptures, and from the opinions and inventions of the primitive doctors, but that philosophical or scholastic theology which, with the deepest abstraction, traced divine truth to its first principles, and thence followed it into its various connexions and branches. Nor was theology alone added to the ancient circle of sciences; the studies of the learned languages, of the civil and canon law, and of physic,‡ were now brought into high repute. Particular academies were consecrated to the culture of each of these sciences, in various places; and thus it was natural to consider them as important branches of erudition, and an acquaintance with them as a qualification

\* Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 463.—Pasquier, Recherches de la France, liv. iii. ch. xxix.—Petri Lambecii Histor. Biblioth. Vindobon. lib. ii. cap. v. p. 260.—Histoire Liter. de la France, tome ix. p. 60—80.

† Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 215. Pocquet de la Livoniere, Dissert. sur l'Antiquite de l'Universite d'Angers, p. 21, published in 4to. at Angers, 1736.

‡ Histoire Gen. de Languedoc, par les Benedictins, tome ii. p. 517.

§ The inhabitants of Bologna pretend, that their academy was founded in the fifth century by Theodosius II. and they pretend to show the diploma by which that emperor enriched their city with this valuable establishment. But the greatest part of those writers, who have studied with attention and impartiality the records of ancient times, maintain, that this diploma is a spurious production, and allege weighty arguments to prove, that the academy of Bologna is of no older date than the eleventh century, and that in the succeeding age, particularly from the time of Lotharius II. it received those improvements that rendered it so famous throughout all Europe. See Sigonii Historia Bononiensis, as it is published, with learned observations, in the works of that excellent author.—Muratori Antiq. Italic. medii ævi, tom. ii. p. 23, 284, 298.—Just. Hen. Bohmeri Praefat. ad Corpus Juris Canon. p. 9, as also the elegant History of the Academy of Bologna written in the German language by the learned Keufelius, and published at Helmstadt in 8vo. in the year 1750.

\* See B. Bohmeri Jus Eccles. Protestant. tom. iv. p. 705.

† The word *physica*, though, according to its etymology, it denotes the study of natural philosophy in general, was, in the twelfth century, applied particularly to medicinal studies; and it has also preserved that limited sense in the English language.

necessary to such as aimed at universal learning. All this required a considerable change in the division of the sciences hitherto received; and this change was accordingly brought about. The seven liberal arts were, by degrees, reduced to one general title, and were comprehended under the name of philosophy, to which theology, jurisprudence, and physic, were added. And hence originated the four classes of science, or, to use the academic phrase, the four faculties which prevailed in the universities, in the following century.

V. A happy and unexpected event restored in Italy the lustre and authority of the ancient Roman law, and, at the same time, lessened the credit of those systems of legislation which had been received for several ages past. This event was the discovery of the original manuscript of the famous Pandect of Justinian, which was found in the ruins of Amalphi, or Meli, when that city was taken by Lotharius II. in 1137, and of which that emperor made a present to the inhabitants of Pisa, whose fleet had contributed, in a particular manner, to the success of the siege. This admirable collection, which had been almost buried in oblivion, was no sooner recovered, than the Roman law became the grand object of the studies and labours of the learned. In the academy of Bologna, colleges were erected expressly for the study of the Roman jurisprudence; and these excellent institutions were multiplied in several parts of Italy, in process of time, and animated other European nations to imitate so wise an example. Hence arose a great revolution in the public tribunals, and an entire change in their judicial proceedings. Hitherto different systems of law had been followed in different courts; and every person of distinction, particularly among the Franks, had the liberty of choosing that code of law which was to be the rule of his conduct. But the Roman law acquired such credit and authority, that it superseded, by degrees, all other laws in the greatest part of Europe, and was substituted in the place of the Salic, Lombard, and Burgundian codes, which before this period were in the highest reputation. It is an ancient opinion, that Lotharius II. pursuant to the counsels and solicitations of Irnerius,\* principal professor of the Roman law in the academy of Bologna, published an edict enjoining the abrogation of all the statutes then in force, and substituting in their place the Roman law, by which, for the future, all without exception were to modify their contracts, terminate their differences, and regulate their actions. But this opinion, as many learned men have abundantly proved,† is far from being supported by sufficient evidence.

\* Otherwise called Werner.

† See Herm. Conringius de Origine Juris Germanici. cap. xxii.—Guido Grandus, Epist. de Pandectis. p. 21. 69, published at Florence, in 4to. in 1737.—Henry Brencmann, Historia Pandectar. p. 41.—Lud. Ant. Muratori, Pref. ad Leges Langobardicas, apud scriptor. rerum Ital. tom. i. part. ii. p. 4. &c. Antiq. Ital. medii ævi, tom. ii. p. 285. There was a warm controversy carried on concerning this matter between George Calixtus and Barthol. Nihusius, the latter of whom embraced the vulgar opinion concerning the edict of Lotharius, obtained by the solicitations of Irnerius. of this controversy there is a cir-

VI. No sooner was the civil law placed in the number of the sciences, and considered as an important branch of academical learning, than the Roman pontiffs, and their zealous adherents, judged it, not only expedient, but also highly necessary, that the canon law should have the same privilege. There existed, before this time, certain collections of the canons or laws of the church; but these collections were so destitute of order and method, and were so defective, both in respect to matter and form, that they could not be conveniently explained in the schools, or be brought into use as systems of ecclesiastical polity. Hence it was, that Gratian, a Benedictine monk, belonging to the convent of St. Felix and Nabor at Bologna, and by birth a Tuscan composed, about the year 1130, for the use of the schools, an abridgement, or Epitome of Canon Law, drawn from the letters of the pontiffs, the decrees of councils, and the writings of the ancient doctors. Pope Eugenius III. was extremely pleased with this work, which was also received with the highest applause by the doctors and professors of Bologna, and was unanimously adopted, as the text they were to follow in their public lectures. The professors at Paris were the first that followed the example of those of Bologna, which, in process of time, was imitated by the greatest part of the European colleges. But, notwithstanding the encomiums bestowed upon this performance, which was commonly called the decretal of Gratian,\* and was entitled, by the author himself, the re-union or coalition of the jarring canons,† several most learned and eminent writers of the Romish communion acknowledge, that it is full of errors and defects.‡ As, however, the main design of this abridgement was to support the despotism, and to extend the authority of the Roman pontiffs, its innumerable defects were overlooked, its merits were exaggerated; and, what is still more surprising, it enjoys, at this day, in an age of light and liberty, that high degree of veneration and authority, which was inconsiderately, though more excusably, lavished upon it in an age of tyranny, superstition, and darkness.§

cumstantial account in the Cimbricia Literata of Mollerus, tom. iii. p. 142.

\* Decretum Gratiani.

† Concordia Discordantium Canonum.

‡ See, among others, Anton. Augustinus, De Emendatione Gratiani, published in 8vo. at Arnheim, A. D. 1678, with the learned observations of Steph. Baluze and Ger. a Maestricht.

§ See Gerhard. a Maestricht, Historia Juris Ecclesiastici, sect. 293, p. 325.—B. Just. Hen. Bohmer's Jus Eccles. Protestant. tom. i. p. 100, and more particularly the learned Preface, with which he enriched the new edition of the Canon Law, published at Halle in 4to. in the year 1747. See also Alex. Machiavelli Observaciones ad Sigonij Histor. Bononiensem, tom. iii. Oper. Sigonij, p. 123. This writer has drawn, from the Kalendarium Archi-Gymnasii Bononiensis, several particularities concerning Gratian and his work, which were generally unknown, but whose truth is also much disputed. What increases the suspicion of their being fabulous is, that this famous Kalendar, of which the Bolognese boast so much, and which they have so often promised to publish in order to dispel the doubts of the learned, has never yet seen the light. Besides, in the fragments that have appeared, there are manifest marks of unfair dealing.



VII. Such among the Latins as were ambitious of making a figure in the republic of letters, applied themselves to philosophy with the utmost zeal and diligence. Taken in its most extensive and general meaning, that study comprehended, according to the method which was the most generally received toward the middle of this century, four classes: it was divided into theoretical, practical, mechanical, and logical. The first class comprised natural theology, mathematics, and natural philosophy. In the second class were ranked ethics, æconomics, and politics. The third contained the seven arts that are more immediately subservient to the purposes of life, such as navigation, agriculture, hunting, &c. The fourth was divided into grammar and composition, the latter of which was subdivided into rhetoric, dialectics, and sophistry; and under the term dialectic was comprehended that part of the metaphysic science which treats of general notions. This division was almost universally adopted. Some, indeed, were inclined to separate grammar and mechanics from philosophy; a separation highly condemned by others, who, under the general term philosophy, comprehended the whole circle of the sciences.\*

VIII. The learned, who taught or who cultivated these different branches of study, were divided into various factions, which attacked each other with the utmost animosity and bitterness.† At this time, three methods of teaching philosophy were practised by different doctors. The first was the ancient and plain method, which confined its researches to the philosophical notions of Porphyry, and the dialectic system, commonly attributed to St. Augustine, and in which was laid down this general rule, that philosophical inquiries were to be limited to a small number of subjects, lest, by their becoming too extensive, religion might suffer by a profane mixture of human subtilty with its divine wisdom. The second method was called the Aristotelian, because it consisted in explications of the works of that philosopher,‡ several of whose productions, being translated into Latin, were now almost every where in the hands of the learned. These translations were, indeed, extremely ob-

scure and incorrect, and led those who made use of them in their academical lectures, into various blunders, and often into such notions as were not more absurd than whimsical and singular. The third was termed the free method, employed by such as were bold enough to search after truth, in the manner they thought the most adapted to render their inquiries successful, and who followed the bent of their own genius, without rejecting, however, the aid of Aristotle and Plato. Laudable as this method was, it became an abundant source of sophistry and chicanery, by the imprudent management of those who employed it; for these subtle doctors, through a wanton indulgence of their metaphysical fancies, did little more than puzzle their disciples with vain questions, and fatigue them with endless distinctions and divisions.\* These different systems, and vehement contests that divided the philosophers, gave to many a disgust against philosophy in general, and prompted them to desire, with impatience, its banishment from the public schools.

IX. Of all the controversies that divided the philosophers in this century, there were none carried on with greater animosity, and treated with greater subtilty and refinement, than the contest of the Dialecticians concerning universals. The sophistical doctors were wholly occupied about the intricate questions relating to genus and species, to the solution of which they directed all their philosophical efforts, and the whole course of their metaphysical studies; but not all in the same method, nor upon the same principles.‡ The two leading sects into which they had been divided long before this period, and which were distinguished by the titles of Realists and Nominalists, not only still subsisted, but were subdivided, each into smaller parties and factions, according as the two opposite and leading schemes were modified by new fancies and inventions. The Nominalists, though they had their followers, were nevertheless much inferior to the Realists, both with respect to the number of their disciples, and to the credit and reputation of their doctrine. A third sect arose under the name of Formalists, who pretended to termi-

\* These literary anecdotes I have taken from several writers, particularly from Ilugo a St. Victore, Didascalio Libro ii. cap. ii. p. 7. tom. i. op. and from the Metalogium of John of Salisbury.

† See Godof. de St. Victore, *Carmen de Sectis Philosophis*, published by Le Beuf, in his *Diss. sur l'Histoire Ecclesiast. et Civile de Paris*, tome ii. p. 254.—*Houlay. Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. ii. p. 562.—*Ant. Wood, Antiq. Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 51. *Jo. Sarisburiensis Metalog. et Polierat. passim.*

‡ *Rob. de Monte. Append. ad Sigbertum Gemblacens.* published by d'Acheri, among the works of Guibert, abbot of Nogent, ad annum 1128, p. 753. "Jacobus Clericus de Venetia transtulit de Græco in Latinum quosdam libros Aristotelis et commentatus est, scilicet Topica, *Annales* priores et posteriores et elenchos: quamvis antiquior translatio super eosdem libros haberetur." Thom. Becket, *Epistolæ*, lib. ii. ep. xciii. p. 454. edit. *Bruxell.* 1682, in 4to. "Hæro præces, quatenus libros Aristotelis, quos habetis, mihi faciatis describi.—Precor etiam literata supplicatione quatenus in operibus Aristotelis, ubi difficultiora fuerint, notulas faciatis, eo quod interpretem aliquatenus suspectum habeo, quia, licet eloquens fuerit alia, ut sæpe audivi, minus tamen tuit in grammatica institutus."

\* See *Jo. Sarisburiensis Polierat.* p. 434, et *Metalog.* p. 814, &c.

‡ *John of Salisbury*, a very elegant and ingenious writer of this age, censures, with no small degree of wit, the crude and unintelligible speculations of these sophists in his book intitled *Polieration. seu de Nugis Curialium*, lib. vii. p. 451. He observes, that more time had been consumed in resolving the question relating to genus and species, than the Cæsars had employed in making themselves masters of the whole world; that the riches of Cræsus were inferior to the treasures which had been exhausted in this controversy; and that the contending parties, after having spent their whole lives upon this single point, had neither been so happy as to determine it to their satisfaction, nor to make, in the labyrinths of science where they had been groping, any discovery that was worth the pains they had taken. His words are: "Veterem paratus est solvere questionem de generibus et speciebus (he speaks here of a certain philosopher) in qua laborans mundus jam senit, in qua plus temporis consumptum est, quam in acquirendo et regendo orbis imperio consumpsit Cæsarea domus plus effusum pecunie, quam in omnibus divitiis suis possederit Cræsus. Hæc enim tam diu multos tenuit, ut cum hoc unum tota vita quærerent, tandem nec istud nec aliud invenirent."

nate the controversy, by steering a middle course between the jarring systems now mentioned; but, as the hypotheses of these new doctors were most obscure and unintelligible, they only perplexed matters more than they had hitherto been, and furnished new subjects of contention and dispute.\*

Those among the learned, who turned their pursuits to more interesting and beneficial branches of science, than the intricate and puzzling doctrine of universals, travelled into the different countries, where the kinds of knowledge, which they wished to cultivate, chiefly flourished. The students of physic, astronomy, and mathematics, continued to frequent the schools of the Saracens in Spain. Many of the learned productions of the Arabians were also translated into Latin; for the high fame which that people had acquired for erudition, together with a desire of converting the Spanish Saracens to Christianity, had excited many to study their language, and to acquire a considerable knowledge of their doctrine.

\* See the above cited author's Polierat. lib. vii. p. 451, where he gives a succinct account of the Formalists, Realists, and Nominalists, in the following words: "Sunt qui more mathematicorum formas abstractant, et ad illas quicquid de universalibus dicitur referunt." Such were the Formalists, who applied the doctrine of universal ideas to what the mathematicians call abstract forms. "Alii dicitur Intellectus, et eos universalium nominibus censerit confirmant." Here we find the Realists pointed out, who, under the name of universals, comprehended all intellectual powers, qualities, and ideas. "Fucruat et qui voces ipsas genera dicent et species: sed eorum jam explosa sententia est, et facile cum auctore suo evanuit. Sunt tamen adhuc, quiprehenduntur in vestigiis eorum, licet crubescant vel auctorem vel scientiam profiteri, solis nominibus inhaerentes, quod rebus et intellectibus subtrahunt, sermonibus ascribunt." This was a sect of the Nominalists, who, ashamed (as this author alleges) to profess the exploded doctrine of Roscellinus, which placed genus and species in the class of mere words, or simple denominations, modified that system by a slight change of expression only, which did not essentially distinguish their doctrine from that of the ordinary Nominalists. It appears from all this, that the sect of the Formalists is of more ancient date than John Duns Scotus, whom many learned men consider as its founder. See Jo. Sarisbur. Metalogic. lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 84, where that eminent author describes at large the various contests of these three sects, and sums up their differences in the following words: "Alius consistit in vocibus, licet hec opinio cum Roscellino suo fere jam evanuerit; alius sermones intuetur; alius versatur in intellectibus," &c.

† Gerard of Cremona, who was so famous among the Italians for his eminent skill in astronomy and physic, undertook a voyage to Toledo, where he translated into Latin several Arabian treatises; see Muratori's Antiq. Ital. mediæ ævi. tom. iii. p. 936, 937.—Mirmet, a French monk, travelled into Spain and Africa, to learn geography among the Saracens. See Luc. Dacherii Spicilegium Scriptor. tom. ix. p. 443, ed. Antiq.—Daniel Morlach, an Englishman, who was extremely fond of mathematical learning, undertook a journey to Toledo, whence he brought into his own country a considerable number of Arabian books: Ant Wood, Antiquit. Oxon. tom. i. p. 55.—Peter, abbot of Clugny, surnamed the Venerable, after having sojourned for some time among the Spaniards, in order to make himself master of the Arabian language, translated into Latin the Koran, and the Life of Mohammed: see Mabillon, Annal. Bened. tom. vi. lib. lxxvii. 345. This eminent ecclesiastic, as appears from the Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, p. 1169, found, upon his arrival in Spain, persons of learning from England and other countries, who applied themselves with extraordinary assiduity and ardour to the study of astrology. We might multiply the examples of those who travelled in quest of

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government, during this Century.*

I. WHEREVER we turn our eyes among the various ranks and orders of the clergy, we perceive, in this century, the most flagrant marks of licentiousness and fraud, ignorance and luxury, and other vices, whose pernicious effects were deeply felt both in church and state. If we except a very small number, who retained a sense of the sanctity of their vocation, and lamented the corruption and degeneracy of their order, it may be said, with respect to the rest, that their whole business was to satisfy their lusts, to multiply their privileges by grasping perpetually at new honours and distinctions, to increase their opulence, to diminish the authority and encroach upon the privileges of princes and magistrates, and, neglecting entirely the interests of religion and the cure of souls, to live in ease and pleasure, and draw out their days in an unmanly and luxurious indolence. This appears manifestly from two remarkable treatises of St. Bernard, in one of which he exposes the corruption of the pontiffs and bishops,\* while he describes in the other the enormous crimes of the monastic orders, whose licentiousness he chastises with a just severity.†

II. The pontiffs, who successively ruled the Latin church, governed that spiritual and mystical body by the maxims of worldly ambition, and thereby fomented the warm contest that had arisen between the imperial and sacerdotal powers. On the one hand, the popes not only maintained the opulence and authority which they had already acquired, but extended their views, and laboured strenuously to enlarge both, though they had not all equal success in this ambitious attempt. The European emperors and princes, on the other hand, alarmed at the strides which the pontiffs were making to universal dominion, used their utmost efforts to disconcert their measures, and to check their growing opulence and power. These violent dissensions between the empire and the priesthood (for so the contending parties were styled in this century,) were most unhappy in their effects, which were felt throughout all the European provinces. Pascal II. who had been raised to the pontificate about the conclusion of the preceding age, seemed now to sit firm and secure in the apostolic chair, without the least apprehension from the imperial faction, whose affairs had taken an unfavourable turn, and who had not the courage to elect a new pope of their party in the place of Guibert, who died in the year 1100.‡

science during this century; but those now alleged are sufficient for our purpose.

\* In the work entitled, Considerationum Libri V. ad Eugenium Pontificem.

† See his defence of the crusades, under the title of Apologia ad Guilielmum Abbatem; as also Gerhohus, de corrupto Ecclesie Statu, in Baluzii Miscell. tom. v. p. 63.—Gallia Christiana, tom. i. p. 6. App. tom. ii. p. 265, 273, &c. Boulay's Histor. Academ. Paris. tom. ii. p. 490, 690.

‡ Dr. Mosheim's affirmation here must be somewhat modified in order to be true; it is certain

Unwilling to let pass unimproved the present success of the papal faction, Pascal renewed, in a council assembled at Rome, A. D. 1102, the decrees of his predecessors against investitures, and the excommunications they had thundered on against Henry IV. and used his most vigorous endeavours to raise up on all sides new enemies to that unfortunate emperor. Henry opposed, with great constancy and resolution, the efforts of this violent pontiff, and eluded, with much dexterity and vigilance, his perfidious stratagems. But his heart, wounded in the tenderest part, lost all its firmness and courage, when, in the year 1106, an unnatural son, under the impious pretext of religion, took up arms against his person and his cause. Henry V. (so was this monster afterwards named) seized his father in a most treacherous manner, and obliged him to abdicate the empire; after which the unhappy prince retired to Liege, where, deserted by all his adherents, he shook off, in 1106, the burden of life and of misery. It has been a matter of dispute, whether it was the instigation of the pontiff, or the ambitious and impatient thirst of dominion, that engaged Henry V. to declare war against his father; nor is it, perhaps, easy to decide this question with a perfect degree of evidence. One thing, however, is unquestionably certain, that Pascal II. not only dissolved, or rather impiously attempted to dissolve, the oath of fidelity and obedience that Henry had taken to his father, but adopted the cause, and supported the interests of this unnatural rebel with the utmost zeal, assiduity, and fervour.\*

III. The revolution that this odious rebellion caused in the empire, was, however, much less favourable to the views of Pascal, than that lordly pontiff expected. Henry V. could by no means be persuaded to renounce his right of investing the bishops and abbots, though he was willing to grant the right of election to the canons and monks, as was usual before his time. Upon this the exasperated pontiff renewed, in the councils of Guastalla and Troyes, the decrees that had so often been promulgated against investitures; and the flame broke out with new force. It was, indeed, suspended during a few years, by the wars in which Henry was engaged, and which prevented his bringing the affair to a decision. But no sooner had he made peace with his enemies, and composed the tumults that troubled the tranquillity of the empire, than he set out for Italy with a formidable army, A. D. 1110, in order to put an end to this long and unhappy contest. He advanced towards Rome by slow marches, while the trembling pontiff, seeing himself destitute of all succour, and reduced to the lowest and most defenceless con-

dition, proposed the following conditions of peace: That the emperor, on the one hand, should renounce the right of investing with the ring and crosier; and that the bishops and abbots should, on the other hand, resign and give over, to him and his successors, all the grants, received from Charlemagne, of the rights and privileges that belong to royalty, such as the power of raising tribute, coining money, and possessing independent lands and territories, with other immunities of a like nature. These conditions were agreeable to Henry, who accordingly gave a formal consent to them in the year 1111; but they were extremely displeasing to the Italian and German bishops, who expressed their dissent in the strongest terms. Hence a terrible tumult arose in the church of St. Peter, where the contending parties were assembled with their respective followers; upon which Henry ordered the pope to be seized, and to be confined in the castle of Viterbo. After having remained there for some time, the captive pontiff was engaged, by the unhappy circumstances of his present condition, to enter into a new convention, by which he solemnly receded from the article of the former treaty that regarded investitures, and confirmed to the emperor the privilege of inaugurating the bishops and abbots with the ring and crosier. Peace being thus concluded, the vanquished pontiff arrayed Henry with the imperial diadem.\*

IV. This transitory peace, which was the fruit of violence and necessity, was followed by greater tumults and more dreadful wars, than had yet afflicted the church. Immediately after the conclusion of this treaty, Rome was filled with the most vehement commotions; and a loud clamour was raised against the pontiff, who was accused of having violated, in a scandalous manner, the duties and dignity of his station, and of having prostituted the majesty of the church by his ignominious compliance with the demands of the emperor. To appease these commotions, Pascal assembled, in the year 1112, a council in the Lateran church, and not only confessed, with contrition and humility, the fault he had committed in concluding such a convention with Henry, but submitted the question to the determination of the council, who accordingly took that treaty into consideration, and solemnly annulled it.† This step was followed by many events that gave, for a long time, an unfavourable turn to the affairs of the emperor. He was excommunicated in many synods and councils, both in France and Germany; he was even placed in the black lists of heretics, a denomination which exposed him to the greatest dangers in those superstitious and barbarous times;‡ and, to complete his anxiety,

that, after the death of Gubert, the imperial party chose in his place a person named Albert, who, indeed, was seized and imprisoned on the day of his election. Theodoric and Magunif were successively chosen after Albert, but could not long support their claims to the pontificate. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. liv. lxx. vol. xiv. p. 10. Brussels edition in eva.

\* These accounts are drawn from the most authentic sources, and also from the eminent writers, whose authority I made use of, and whose names I mentioned, in that part of the preceding century which corresponds with the subject here treated.

\* Beside the writers already mentioned, see Mabillon, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. v. p. 681, and tom. vi. p. 1. at the particular years to which the events here noticed belong.

† Pascal, upon this occasion, as Gregory VII. had formerly done in the case of Berenger, submitted his proceedings and his authority to the judgment of a council, to which, of consequence, he acknowledged his subordination. That council even condemned his measures, and declared them scandalous.

‡ See Gervaise, *Diss. sur l'Herésie des Investi-*

he saw the German princes revolting from his authority in several places, and taking up arms in the cause of the church. To put an end to calamities that thus afflicted the empire on all sides, Henry set out a second time for Italy, with a numerous army, in the year 1116, and arrived, in the following year, at Rome, where he assembled the consuls, senators, and nobles, while the fugitive pontiff retired to Benevento. Pascal, however, during this forced absence, engaged the Normans to come to his assistance; and, encouraged by the prospect of immediate succour, prepared every thing for a vigorous war against the emperor, and attempted to make himself master of Rome. But, in the midst of these warlike preparations, which drew the attention of Europe, and portended great and remarkable events, the military pontiff yielded to fate, A. D. 1118.

V. A few days after the death of Pascal, John of Gaieta, a Benedictine monk of Mont-Cassin, and chancellor of the Roman Church, was raised to the pontificate under the title of Gelasius II. In opposition to this choice, Henry elected to the same dignity Maurice Burdin, archbishop of Braga, in Spain,\* who assumed the denomination of Gregory VIII.† Upon this, Gelasius, not thinking himself safe at Rome, or indeed in Italy, set out for France, and soon after died at Clugni. The cardinals, who accompanied him in his journey, elected to the papacy, immediately after his departure, Guy, archbishop of Vienne, count of Burgundy, who was nearly related to the emperor, and is distinguished in the list of the Roman pontiffs by the name of Calixtus II. The elevation of this eminent ecclesiastic was, in the issue, extremely fortunate both for the church and state. Remarkably distinguished by his illustrious birth, and still more by his noble and heroic qualities, this magnanimous pontiff continued to oppose the emperor with courage and success, and to carry on the war both with the sword of the spirit, and with the arm of flesh. He made himself master of Rome, threw into prison the pontiff who had been chosen by the emperor, and fomented the civil commotions in Germany. But his fortitude and resolution were tempered with moderation, and accompanied with a spirit of generosity and compliance which differed much from the obstinate arrogance of his lordly predecessors. Accordingly, he lent an ear to prudent counsels, and was willing to relinquish a part of the demands upon which the former pontiffs had so vehemently insisted, that he might restore the public tranquillity, and satisfy the ardent desires of so many nations, who groaned under the dismal effects of these deplorable divisions.‡

It will appear unquestionably evident to

tutes, which is the fourth of the Dissertations prefixed to his History of the Abbot Suger.

\* Braga was the metropolis of ancient Galicia, but at present is one of the three archbishoprics of Portugal, in the province of Entre Duero e Minho. The archbishop of that see claims the title of primate of Spain, which is annexed in Spain to the see of Toledo.

† See Stephani Baluzii Vita Mauriti Burdini, in Miscellaneis tom. iii. p. 471.

‡ The paragraph following is the note (1) of the original placed in the text.

every attentive and impartial observer of things, that the illiberal and brutal manners of those who ruled the church were the only reason that rendered the dispute concerning investitures so violent and cruel, so tedious in its duration, and so unhappy in its effects. During the space of fifty-five years, the church was governed by monks, who, to the obscurity of their birth, the asperity of their natural tempers, and the unbounded rapacity of their ambition and avarice, joined that inflexible obstinacy which is one of the essential characteristics of the monastic order. Hence arose those bitter feuds, those furious efforts of ambition and vengeance, that dishonoured the church and afflicted the state during the course of this controversy. But as soon as the papal chair was filled by a man of a more dignified nature, and of a liberal education, the face of things changed entirely, and a prospect of peace arose to the desires and hopes of ruined and desolate countries.

VI. These hopes were not disappointed; for, after much contestation, peace was, at length, concluded between the emperor and the pope's legates, at a general diet, holden at Worms, A. D. 1122. The conditions were as follow:

“That for the future the bishops and abbots should be chosen by those to whom the right of election belonged;\* but that this election should be made in presence of the emperor, or of an ambassador appointed by him for that purpose:†

“That, in case of a dispute among the electors, the decision of it should be left to the emperor, who was to consult with the bishops upon that occasion:

“That the bishop or abbot elect should take an oath of allegiance to the emperor, receive from his hand the regalia, and do homage for them:

“That the emperor should no more confer the regalia by the ceremony of the ring and crosier, which were the ensigns of a ghostly dignity, but by that of the sceptre, which was more proper to invest the person elected in the possession of rights and privileges “merely temporal.”‡

This convention was solemnly confirmed in the following year in the Lateran council, and remains still in force in our times, though the true sense of some of its articles has occasioned disputes between the emperors and pontiffs.§

VII. Calixtus did not long enjoy the fruits of this peace, to which he had so much contributed by his prudence and moderation. He

\* The expression is ambiguous; but it signifies that the elections of bishops and abbots were to be made by monks and canons as in former times.

† From this period the people in Germany were excluded from the right of voting in the election of bishops. See Petr. de Marca, de concordia sacerdotii et imperii, lib. vi. cap. ii. sect. 9, p. 788, edit. Bohmeri.

‡ See Muratori, Antiq. Ital. mediævi, tom. vi. p. 76. Schilterus, de Libertate Ecl. Germanicæ, lib. iv. cap. iv. p. 545.—Cæsar Rasponus, de Basilica Lateranensi, lib. iv. p. 215.

§ It was disputed among other things, whether the consecration of the bishop elect was to precede or follow the collation of the regalia. See Jo. Wilh. Hoffman, ad concordatum Henrici V. et Calisti II. Vitembergæ, 1739, in 4to.

died in the year 1124, and was succeeded by Lambert, bishop of Ostia, who assumed the title of Honorius II. and under whose pontificate nothing worthy of mention was transacted. His death, which happened A. D. 1130, gave rise to a considerable schism in the church of Rome, or rather in the college of cardinals, of whom one party elected, to the papal chair, Gregory, a cardinal deacon of St. Angelo, who was distinguished by the name of Innocent II. while the other chose, for successor to Honorius, Peter, the son of Leo, a Roman prince, under the title of Anacletus II. The friends of Innocent were far from being numerous in Rome, or throughout Italy in general, for which reason he judged it expedient to retire into France, where he had many adherents, and where he sojourned during the space of two years. His credit was very great out of Italy; for, beside the emperor Lotharius, the kings of England, France, and Spain, with other princes, espoused warmly the cause of Innocent, principally by the influence of St. Bernard, who was his intimate friend, and whose counsels had the force and authority of laws in almost all the countries of Europe. The patrons of Anacletus were fewer in number, and were confined to the kings of Sicily and Scotland. His death, in the year 1138, terminated the contest, and left Innocent in the entire and undisputed possession of the apostolic chair. The surviving pontiff presided, in the year 1139, at the second Lateran council, and, about four years after, ended his days in peace.\*

VIII. After the death of Innocent, the Roman see was filled by Guy, cardinal of St. Mark, who ruled the church about five months, under the title of Celestine II. If his reign was short, it was, however, peaceable, and not like that of his successor, Lucius II. whose pontificate was disturbed by various tumults and seditions, and who, about eleven months after his elevation to the papacy, was killed in a riot which he was endeavouring to suppress by his presence and authority. He was succeeded by Bernard, a Cistercian monk, and an eminent disciple of the famous St. Bernard, abbot of Clairval. This worthy ecclesiastic, who is distinguished among the popes by the title of Eugenius III. was raised to that high dignity in the year 1145, and, during a period of eight years, he was involved in the same perils and perplexities that had embittered the government of his predecessor. He was often obliged to leave Rome, and to save himself by flight from the fury of the people; and the same reason engaged him to retire into France, where he resided for a considerable time. At

\* Beside the ordinary writers of the papal history, see Jean de Lannes, *Histoire du Pontificat du Pape Innocent II.* Paris, 1711, in 8vo.

† There was a party formed in Rome at this time, whose design was to restore the Roman senate to its former privileges, and to its ancient splendour and glory; and, for this purpose, to reduce the papal revenues and prerogatives to a narrower compass, even to the tithes and oblations that were offered to the primitive bishops, and to the spiritual government of the church, attended with an utter exclusion from all civil jurisdiction over the city of Rome. It was this party that produced the feuds and seditions to which Dr Mosheim has an eye in this eighth section

length, exhausted by the opposition he met with in supporting what he deemed the prerogatives of the papacy, he died in the year 1153. The pontificate of his successor Conrad, bishop of Sabino, who, after his elevation to the see of Rome, assumed the title of Anastasius IV., was less disturbed by civil commotions; but it was not of long duration; for Anastasius died about a year and four months after his election.

IX. The warm contest between the emperors and the popes, which was considered as at an end ever since the time of Calixtus II., was unhappily renewed under the pontificate of Adrian IV. who was a native of England, and whose original name was Nicolas Breakspear. Frederic I. surnamed Barbarossa, being placed in 1152 on the imperial throne, publicly declared his resolution to maintain the dignity and privileges of the Roman empire in general, and more particularly to render it respectable in Italy; nor was he at all studious to conceal the design he had formed of reducing the overgrown power and opulence of the pontiffs and clergy within narrower limits. Adrian perceived the danger that threatened the majesty of the church and the authority of the clergy, and prepared himself for defending both with vigour and constancy. The first occasion of trying their strength was offered at the coronation of the emperor at Rome, in the year 1155, when the pontiff insisted upon Frederic's performing the office of querry, and holding the stirrup to his holiness. This humiliating proposal was at first rejected with disdain by the emperor, and was followed by contests of a more momentous nature, relating to the political interests of the empire.

These differences were no sooner reconciled, than new disputes, equally important, arose in the year 1158, when the emperor, in order to put a stop to the enormous opulence of the pontiffs, bishops, and monks, which increased from day to day, enacted a law to prevent the transferring of fiefs without the knowledge or consent of the superior, or lord, in whose name they were holden,\* and turned the whole force of his arms to reduce the little republics of Italy under his dominion. An open rupture between the emperor and the pontiff, was expected as the inevitable consequence of such vigorous measures, when the death of Adrian, which happened on the first of September, 1159, suspended the storm.†

X. In the election of a new pontiff, the cardinals were divided into two factions. The more numerous and powerful of the two parties raised to the pontificate, Rowland, bishop of Sienna, who assumed the name of Alexander III. while the rest of the conclave elected to

\* This prohibition of transferring the possession of fiefs from one to another, without the consent of the sovereign, or supreme lord, under whom they were holden, together with other laws of a like nature, formed the first effectual barrier that was opposed to the enormous and growing opulence and authority of the clergy. See Muratori, *Antiq. Ital. medii ævi*, tom. vi. p. 239.

† See the accurate and circumstantial account of this whole affair that is given by the illustrious and learned count Buaui, in his history of Frederic I. written in German, p. 45, 49, 73, 92, 105, &c.

that high dignity Octavian, cardinal of St. Cecilia, known by the title of Victor IV. The latter was patronized by the emperor, to whom Alexander was extremely disagreeable on several accounts. The council of Pavia, which was assembled by the emperor in the year 1160, adopted his sentiments, and pronounced in favour of Victor, who thus became triumphant in Germany and Italy; so that France alone was left open to Alexander, who accordingly fled thither from Rome for safety and protection. Amidst the tumults and commotions which this schism occasioned, Victor died at Lucca, in the year 1164; but his place was immediately filled by the emperor, at whose desire Guy, cardinal of St. Calixtus, was elected pontiff under the title of Pascal III. and acknowledged in that character by the German princes assembled in the year 1167, at the diet of Wurtzburg. In the mean time Alexander recovered his spirits, and, returning into Italy, maintained his cause with uncommon resolution and vigour, and not without some promising hopes of success. He held at Rome, in the year 1167, the Lateran council, in which he solemnly deposed the emperor (whom he had, upon several occasions before this period, publicly loaded with anathemas and execrations,) dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken to him as their lawful sovereign, and encouraged and exhorted them to rebel against his authority, and to shake off his yoke. But, soon after this audacious proceeding, Frederic made himself master of Rome; upon which the insolent pontiff fled to Benevento, and left the apostolic chair to Pascal, his competitor.

XI. The affairs of Alexander seemed, soon after, to take a more prosperous turn, when (the greatest part of the imperial army being consumed by a pestilential disorder) the emperor was forced to abandon Italy, and when the death of Pascal, which happened in the year 1168, delivered him from a powerful and formidable rival. But this fair prospect soon vanished; for the imperial faction elected to the pontificate John, abbot of Strum, under the title of Calixtus III. whom Frederic, notwithstanding his absence in Germany, and the various wars and disputes in which he was involved, supported to the utmost of his power. When peace was in some measure restored to the empire, Frederic marched into Italy, A. D. 1174, to chastise the perfidy of the states and cities that had revolted during his absence, and seized the first opportunity of throwing off his yoke. Had this expedition been crowned with the expected success, Alexander would, undoubtedly, have been obliged to desist from his pretensions, and to yield the papal chair to Calixtus. But the event came far short of the hopes which this grand expedition had excited; and the emperor, after having, during the space of three years, been alternately defeated and victorious, was at length so fatigued with the hardships he had suffered, and so dejected at a view of the difficulties he had yet to overcome, that, in the year 1177, he concluded a treaty of peace at Venice with Alexander, and a truce with the rest of his ene-

mies.\* Some writers affirm, that, upon this occasion, the haughty pontiff trod upon the neck of the suppliant emperor, while he kissed his foot, repeating at the same time those words of the royal Psalmist: "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet."† The greatest part, however, of modern authors have called this event in question, and consider it as utterly destitute of authority and unworthy of credit.‡

XII. Alexander III., who was rendered so famous by his long and successful contest with Frederic I., was also engaged in a warm dispute with Henry II. king of England, which was occasioned by the arrogance of Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury. In the council of Clarendon, which that prince held in the year 1164, several laws were enacted, by which the king's power and jurisdiction over the clergy were accurately explained, and the rights and privileges of the bishops and priests reduced within narrow bounds.§ Becket

\* All the circumstances of these conventions are accurately related by count Bunau, in his *History of Frederic I.* p. 115—242.—See also Fortunati *Olmi Istoria della Veneta a Venetia occultamente nel A. 1177, di Papa Alessandro III. Venet.* 1629, in 4to.—Muratori, *Antiq. Italicæ mediæ ævi*, tom. iv. p. 2, 9.—Origines *Guelphicæ*, tom. ii. p. 379.—*Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. April. p. 46, in *Vita Hugonis abbatis Bona-Vallis*, & tom. ii. April. in *Vita Galdini Mediolanensis*, p. 596, two famous ecclesiastics, who were employed as ambassadors and arbiters in the treaty of peace here mentioned.

† Psalm xci. 13.

‡ See Bunau's *Life of Frederic I.* p. 242.—*Heumannii Pœciles*, tom. iii. lib. i. p. 145.—*Bibliothèque Italique*, tom. vi. p. 5, as also the authors mentioned by Caspar Sagittarius, in his *Introduc. in Histor. Ecclæs.* tom. i. p. 630, tom. ii.

§ See *Matth. Paris, Histor. Major.* p. 82, 83, 101, 114. Dav. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Britannicæ*, tom. i. p. 434.

¶ Henry II. had formed the wise project of bringing the clergy under the jurisdiction of the civil courts, on account of the scandalous abuse they had made of their immunities, and the crimes which the ecclesiastical tribunals let pass with impunity. The Constitutions of Clarendon, which consisted of sixteen articles, were drawn up for this purpose: and, as they are proper to give the reader a just idea of the prerogatives and privileges that were claimed equally by the king and the clergy, and which occasioned of consequence such warm debates between state and church, it will not be altogether useless to transcribe them at length.

I. When any difference relating to the right of patronage arises between the laity, or between the clergy and laity, the controversy is to be tried and ended in the King's court.

II. Those churches which are fees of the crown, cannot be granted away in perpetuity without the king's consent.

III. When the clergy are charged with any misdemeanour, and summoned by the judiciary, they shall be obliged to make their appearance in his court, and plead to such parts of the indictment as shall be put to them; and likewise to answer such articles in the ecclesiastical courts as they shall be prosecuted for by that jurisdiction; always provided, that the king's judiciary shall send an officer to inspect the proceedings of the Court Christian. And in case any clerk is convicted, or pleads guilty, he is to forfeit the privilege of his character, and to be protected by the church no longer.

IV. No archbishops, bishops, or parsons, are allowed to depart from the kingdom, without a licence from the crown; and provided they have leave to travel, they shall give security, not to act or solicit any thing during their passage, stay, or return, to the prejudice of the king or kingdom.

refused obedience to these laws, which he deemed prejudicial to the divine rights of the church in general, and to the prerogatives of the Roman pontiffs in particular. Upon this

V. When any of the laity are prosecuted in the ecclesiastical courts, the charge ought to be proved before the bishop by legal and reputable witnesses; and the course of the process is to be so managed that the archdeacon may not lose any part of his right, or the profits accruing to his office; and if any offenders seem to have been screened from prosecution upon the score either of favour or quality, the sheriff, at the bishop's instance, shall order twelve sufficient men of the neighbourhood to make oath before the bishop, that they will discover the truth according to the best of their knowledge.

VI. Excommunicated persons shall not be obliged to make oath, or give security to continue upon the place where they live, but only to abide by the judgment of the church in order to their absolution.

VII. No person that holds in chief of the king, or any of his barons, shall be excommunicated, nor any of their estates put under an interdict, before application be made to the king, provided he be in the kingdom; and if his highness be out of England, the justiciary must be acquainted with the dispute, in order to make satisfaction; and thus what belongs to the cognizance of the king's court, must be tried there; and that which belongs to the Court Christian, must be remitted to that jurisdiction.

VIII. In case of appeals in ecclesiastical causes, the first step is to be made from the archdeacon to the bishop, and from the bishop to the archbishop; and, if the archbishop fails to do justice, recourse may be had to the king, by whose order the controversy is to be finally decided in the archbishop's court. Neither shall it be lawful for either of the parties to move for any farther remedy without leave from the crown.

IX. When a difference happens to arise between any clergyman and layman concerning a tenement, and the clerk pretends that it is holden by frank *Almoine*,\* and the layman pleads it a lay fee, the tenure shall be tried by the inquiry and verdict of twelve sufficient men of the neighbourhood, summoned according to the custom of the realm. And, if the tenement or thing in controversy shall be found frank *Almoine*, the dispute concerning it shall be tried in the ecclesiastical court. But if it is brought in a lay-fee, the suit shall be followed in the king's courts, unless both the plaintiff and defendant hold the tenement in question of the same bishop; in which case the cause shall be tried in the court of such bishop or baron, with this farther proviso, that he who is seized of the thing in controversy, shall not be disseized during the suit (*pendente lite*) upon the ground of the verdict above-mentioned.

X. With regard to one who holds of the king in any city, castle, or borough, or resides upon any of the demesne lands of the crown, in case he is cited by the archdeacon or bishop to answer for any misbehaviour belonging to their cognizance; if he refuses to obey their summons, and to stand to the sentence of the court, it shall be lawful for the ordinary to put him under an interdict, but not to excommunicate him, till the king's principal officer of the town shall be pre-acquainted with the case, in order to enjoin him to make satisfaction to the church. And if such officer or magistrate shall fail in his duty, he shall be fined by the king's judges. And then the bishop may exert his discipline on the refractory person as he thinks fit.

XI. All archbishops, bishops, and ecclesiastical persons, who hold of the king in chief, and by the tenure of a barony, are for that reason obliged to appear before the king's justices and ministers, to answer the duties of their tenure, and to observe all the usages and customs of the realm, and, like other barons, are bound to be present at trials in the king's court, till sentence is to be pronounced for the losing of life or limbs.

XII. When any archbishopric, bishopric, abbey, or priory, of royal foundation, become vacant, the king is to make seizure; from which time all the profits and issues are to be paid into the exchequer, as if they were the demesne lands of the crown.

\* *L. e.* A tenure by divine service, as Britten explains it.

there arose a violent debate between the resolute monarch and the rebellious prelate, which obliged the latter to retire into France, where Alexander was at that time in a kind of exile. This pontiff and the king of France interposed their good offices in order to compose these differences, in which they succeeded so far, after much trouble and difficulty, as to encourage Becket to return to England, where he was reinstated in his forfeited dignity. But the generous and indulgent proceedings of his sovereign toward him, were not sufficient to subdue his arrogant and rebellious obstinacy in maintaining what he called the privileges of the church; nor could he be induced by any means to comply with the views and measures of Henry. The consequences of this inflexible resistance were fatal to the haughty prelate; for he was, soon after his return into England, assassinated before the altar while he was at vespers in his cathedral by four persons, who certainly did not commit this act of violence without the king's knowledge and connivance.\* This event produced warm de-

And when it is determined that the vacancy shall be filled up, the king is to summon the most considerable persons of the chapter to court, and the election is to be made in the chapel royal, with the consent of our sovereign lord the king, and by the advice of such persons of the government, as his highness shall think fit to consult; at which time, the person elected shall, before his consecration, be obliged to do homage and fealty to the king, as his liege lord; which homage shall be performed in the usual form, with a clause saving the privilege of his order.

XIII. If any of the temporal barons, or great men, shall encroach upon the rights or property of any archbishop, bishop, or archdeacon, and refuse to make satisfaction for wrong done by themselves, or their tenants, the king shall do justice to the party aggrieved. And if any person shall disseize the king of any part of his lands, or trespass upon his prerogative, the archbishops, bishops, and deacons, shall call him to an account, and oblige him to make the crown restitution; i. e. "They were to excommunicate such disseizers and injurious persons, in case they proved refractory and incorrigible."

XIV. The goods and chattles of those who lie under forfeitures of felony or treason are not to be detained in any church or church-yard, to secure them against seizure and justice, because such goods are the king's property, whether they are lodged within the precincts of a church or without it.

XV. All actions, and pleas of debts, though particularly solemn in the circumstances of the contract, shall be tried in the king's courts.

XVI. The sons of copy holders are not to be ordained without the consent of the lord of the manor where they were born.

Such were the articles of the constitutions of Clarendon, against the greatest part of which the pope protested. They were signed by the English clergy, and also by Becket. The latter, however, repented of what he had done, and retiring from court, suspended himself from his office in the church for about forty days, till he received absolution from Alexander, who was then at Sens. His aversion to these articles manifested itself by an open rebellion against his sovereign, in which he discovered his true character, as a most daring turbulent, vindictive, and arrogant priest, whose ministry was solely employed in extending the despotic dominion of Rome, and whose fixed purpose was to aggrandize the church upon the ruins of the state. See Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. sixth century. Rapin de Thoyras, in the reign of Henry II.

† This assertion is in our opinion by much too strong. It can only be founded upon certain indelicate and passionate expressions which the intolerable insolence and phrenetic obstinacy of Becket drew from Henry in an unguarded moment, when, after having received new affronts, notwithstanding the reconciliation he had effected with so much

bates between the king of England and the Roman pontiff, who gained his point so far as to make the suppliant monarch undergo a severe course of penance, in order to expiate a crime of which he was considered as the principal promoter, while the murdered prelate, in 1173, was solemnly enrolled in the highest rank of saints and martyrs.\*

XIII. It was not only by force of arms, but also by uninterrupted efforts of dexterity and artifice, by wise counsels and prudent laws, that Alexander III. maintained the pretended rights of the church, and extended the authority of the Roman pontiffs. For, in the third Lateran council, holden at Rome in 1179, the following decrees, among many others upon different subjects, were passed by his advice and authority. 1st, In order to put an end to the confusion and dissensions which so often accompanied the election of the Roman pontiffs, it was determined that the right of election should be vested in the cardinals alone, and that the person, in whose favour two-thirds of the college of cardinals voted, should be considered as the lawful pontiff. This law is still in force; it was therefore from the time of Alexander that the election of the pope acquired that form which it still retains, and by which, not only the people, but also the Roman clergy, are excluded from all share in the honour of conferring that important dignity.

trouble and condescension, he expressed himself to this purpose: 'Am I not unhappy, that, among the numbers who are attached to my interests, and employed in my service, there is no one possessed of spirit enough to resent the affronts which I am constantly receiving from a miserable priest?' These words, indeed, were not pronounced in vain. Four gentlemen of the court, whose names were Fitz-Urse, Tracy, Brito, and Morville, murdered Becket in his chapel, and thus performed, in a licentious and criminal manner, an action which the laws might have commanded with justice. But it is extremely remarkable, that, after the murder, the assassins were afraid they had gone too far, and durst not return to the king's court, which was then in Normandy; but retired at first to Knaresborough in Yorkshire, which belonged to Morville, whence they repaired to Rome for absolution, and being admitted to penance by Alexander, were sent by that pontiff to Jerusalem, and passed the remainder of their lives upon the Black Mountain in the severest acts of austerity and mortification. All this does not look as if the king had been deliberately concerned in this murder, or had expressly consented to it. On the contrary, various circumstances concur to prove that Henry was entirely innocent of this murder. Mr. Hume mentions particularly one, which is worthy of notice. The king, suspecting the design of the four gentlemen above-mentioned, by some menacing expressions they had dropped, "despatched" (says Mr. Hume) a messenger after them, ordering "them to attempt nothing against the person of the "primate." But these orders came too late." See his History of England, vol. i. p. 294. Rapin Thoyras, Histoire d'Angleterre, Collier's Ecclesiastical History of England. The works to which Dr. Mosheim refers for an account of this matter, are as follow: Guiliel. Stephandæ Historia Thomæ Cantuariensis apud Scriptores rerum Anglicarum, published in folio at London by Sparke, in the year 1723.—Christ. Lupi Epistolæ et Vita Thomæ Cantuar.—Epistolæ Alexandri III. Ludovici VII. Henrici II. in hac causa, ex M. S. Vaticano, Bruxelles, 1682, 2 vol. 4to.—Natalis Alexandri Select. Histor. Eccles. Capita, Sec. xii. Diss. x. p. 833.—Thomæ Stapletoni Tres Thomæ, seu res gestæ Thomæ Apostoli, S. Thomæ Cantuariensis, et Thomæ Mori. Coloniae, 1612, in 8vo.

\* Boulay, *Histor. Academiæ Paris.* tom. ii. p. 328, et de *Die Festo ejus*, p. 397. Dom. Colonia, *Historie Literaire de la Villa de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 249.

2dly, A spiritual war was declared against the heretics, whose numbers, increasing considerably about this time, created much disturbance in the church in general, and infested, in a more particular manner, several provinces in France, which groaned under the fatal dissensions that accompanied the propagation of their errors.\* 3dly, The right of recommending and nominating to the saintly order was also taken away from councils and bishops, and canonization was ranked among the greater and more important causes, the cognizance of which belonged to the pontiff alone.† We must not forget to add, that the power of erecting new kingdoms, which had been claimed by the pontiffs from the time of Gregory VII., was not only assumed, but also exercised by Alexander in a remarkable instance; for, in the year 1179, he conferred the title of king, with the ensigns of royalty, upon Alphonso I. duke of Portugal, who, under the pontificate of Lucius II., had rendered his province tributary to the Roman see.‡

XIV. Upon the death of Alexander, Ubald, bishop of Ostia, otherwise known by the name of Lucius III., was raised to the pontificate, A. D. 1181, by the suffrages of the cardinals alone, in consequence of the law mentioned in the preceding section. The administration of this new pontiff was embittered by violent tumults and seditions; for he was twice driven out of the city by the Romans, who could not bear a pope that was elected in opposition to the ancient custom, without the knowledge and consent of the clergy and the people. In the midst of these troubles he died at Verona in the year 1185, and was succeeded by Hubert Crivelli, bishop of Milan, who assumed the title of Urban III. and who, without having transacted any thing worthy of mention during his short pontificate, died of grief in the year 1187, upon hearing that Saladin had made himself master of Jerusalem. The pontificate of his successor Albert,§ whose papal denomination was Gregory VIII. exhibited a still more striking instance of the fragility of human grandeur; for this pontiff yielded to fate about two months after his elevation. He was succeeded by Paul, bishop of Preneste, who filled the papal chair above three years under the title of Clement III. and died in 1191,

\* See Natalis Alexander, *Select. Histor. Eccles. Capit. Sec. xii. Diss. ix. p. 819*, where he treats particularly of this council.—See also tom. vi. part ii. *Conciliorum Harduini*, p. 1671.

† Dr. Mosheim, as also Spanheim and Fleury, call this the 3d Lateran council, whereas other historians mention eight preceding councils holden in the Lateran church, viz. those of the years 649, 864, 1105, 1112, 1116, 1123, 1139, 1167. Our author has also attributed, to this council of 1179, decrees that probably belong to a later period.

‡ See what has been observed already, under the xth century, concerning the election of the popes, and the canonization of saints.

§ Baronius, *Annal. ad. A. 1179.*—Innocentius III. *Epistolæ Lib. ep. xlix. p. 54, tom. i. ed. Baluz.*

¶ Alphonso had been declared, by his victorious army, king of Portugal, in the year 1136, in the midst of the glorious exploits he had performed in the war against the Moors; so that Alexander did no more than confirm this title by an arrogant bull, in which he treats that excellent prince as his vassal.

§ This prelate, before his elevation to the papacy, was bishop of Benevento, and chancellor of the Roman church.



without having distinguished his ecclesiastical reign by any memorable achievement, if we except his zeal for draining Europe of its treasures and inhabitants by the publication of new crusades. Celestine III.\* makes a more shining figure in history than the pontiffs we have been now mentioning; for he thundered his excommunications against the emperor Henry VI. and Leopold, duke of Austria, on account of their having seized and imprisoned Richard I. king of England, as he was returning from the Holy Land: he also subjected to the same malediction Alphonso X. king of Galicia and Leon, on account of an incestuous marriage into which that prince had entered; and commanded Philip Augustus, king of France, to readmit to the conjugal state and honours Ingelburga his queen, whom he had divorced for reasons unknown; though this order, indeed, produced little effect.† But the most illustrious and resolute pontiff, that filled the papal chair during this century, and whose exploits made the greatest noise in Europe, was Lotharius, count of Segni, cardinal deacon, otherwise known by the name of Innocent III. The arduous undertakings and bold achievements of this eminent pontiff, who was placed at the head of the church in the year 1198, belong to the history of the following century.

XV. If, from the series of pontiffs that ruled the church in this century, we descend to the other ecclesiastical orders, such as the bishops, priests, and deacons, very unpleasing objects will be exhibited to our view. The unanimous voice of the historians of this age, the laws and decrees of synods and councils, loudly declare the gross ignorance, odious frauds, and flagitious crimes, that reigned among the different ranks and orders of the clergy now mentioned. It is not therefore at all surprising, that the monks, whose rules of discipline obliged them to a regular method of living, and placed them out of the way of many temptations to licentiousness, and occasions of sinning, to which the episcopal and sacerdotal orders were exposed, were in higher estimation than these were. The reign of corruption became, however, so general, that it reached at last even the convents; and the monks, who were gaining with the most ardent efforts the summit of ecclesiastical power and authority, and who beheld both the secular clerks and the regular canons with aversion and contempt,‡ began, in many places, to degenerate from that sanctity of manners, and that exact obedience to their rules of discipline, by which they had been formerly distinguished, and to exhibit to the people scandalous examples of immorality and vice.§ The Benedictines of Clugni, who

undoubtedly surpassed, in regularity of conduct and purity of manners, all the monastic orders who lived under their rule, maintained their integrity for a long time, amidst the general decay of piety and virtue: but they were at length carried away with the torrent. Seduced by the example of their abbot Pontius, and corrupted by the treasures that were poured daily into their convent by the liberality of the opulent and pious, they fell from their primitive austerity, and following the dissolute examples of the other Benedictines, they gave themselves up to pleasure, and dwelt carelessly.\* Several of the succeeding abbots endeavoured to remedy this disorder, and to recover the declining reputation of their convent; but their efforts were much less successful than they expected, nor could the monks of Clugni ever be brought back to their primitive sanctity and virtue.†

XVI. The Cistercian Order, which was much inferior to the monks of Clugni, both with respect to the antiquity of its institution, and the possessions and revenues of its convent, far surpassed them in external regularity of life and manners, and in a striking air of innocence and sanctity. Hence its members acquired that high degree of reputation and authority which the Order of Clugni had formerly enjoyed; and the fraternity increased daily in number, credit, and opulence. The famous St. Bernard, abbot of Clairval, whose influence throughout Europe was incredible, whose word was a law, and whose counsels were regarded by kings and princes as so many orders to which the most respectful obedience was due, was the person who contributed most to enrich and aggrandize the Cistercian order. Hence he is justly considered as its second parent and founder; and hence the Cistercians, not only in France, but also in Germany and other countries, were distinguished by the title of Bernardine monks.‡ A hundred and sixty religious communities derived their origin, or their rules of discipline, from this illustrious abbot; and he left, at his death, seven hundred monks in the monastery of Clairval. The church abounded with bishops and archbishops who had been formed and prepared for the ministry by his instructions; and he also reckoned, among the number of his disciples, Eugenius III. one of the best and wisest of the Roman pontiffs.

XVII. The growing prosperity of the Cistercian Order excited the envy and jealousy of the monks of Clugni, and, after several dissensions of less consequence, produced at length an open rupture, a declared war, between these opulent and powerful monasteries. They both followed the rule of St. Benedict, though they

\* Whose name was Hyacinth, a native of Rome, and a cardinal deacon.

† It was in consequence of the vigorous and terrible proceedings of Innocent III. that the re-union between Philip and Ingelburga was accomplished. See *L'Histoire de France*, par l'Abbe Velly, tom. iii. p. 367.

‡ See Rupertus Epistola in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecd. tom. i. p. 285. This writer prefers the monks to the apostles.

§ See Bernardi Considerationes ad Eugenium, lib. iii. cap. iv.—See also the Speculum Stultorum, or Brunelles, a poem, composed by Nigel Wireker, an English bard of no mean reputation, who lived about

the middle of the xiith century. In this poem, of which several editions have been published, the different orders of monks are severely censured; the Carthusians alone have escaped the keen and virulent satire of this witty writer.

\* Isaiah, xlvii. 8.

† See Martenne's *Amplissima Collectio Monumentorum*, Veter. tom. ix. p. 1119.

‡ See Jo. Mabillon, *Annal. Ord. Benedict.* tom. vi. passim, in vita Sti. Bernardi, which he has prefixed to his edition of the works of that saint.—See also the *Annales Cistercienses*, by Manriquez, tom. ii. and iii.

differed in their habit, and in certain laws, which the Cisterians more especially had added to that rule. The monks of Clugni accused the Cisterians of affecting an extravagant austerity in their manners and discipline; while the Cisterians, on the other hand, charged them, upon very good grounds, with having degenerated from their former sanctity and regularity of conduct. St. Bernard, who was the oracle and protector of the Cisterians, wrote, in the year 1127, an apology for his own conduct with respect to the division that subsisted between the two convents, and inveighed, with a just but not intemperate severity, against the vices that corrupted the monks of Clugni.\* This charge was answered, though with uncommon moderation and candour, by Peter Mauricius, abbot of Clugni; and hence arose a controversy in form, which spread from day to day its baneful influence, and excited disturbances in several provinces of Europe.† It was, however, followed by a much more vehement and bitter contest concerning an exemption from the payment of tithes, granted among other privileges and immunities to the Cisterians, A. D. 1132, by Innocent II. A considerable part of the lands which the Cisterians possessed, and to which the pontiff granted this exemption, were subject to the monks of Clugni, who consequently suffered by this act of liberality, and disputed the matter, not only with the Cisterians, but with the pope himself. This keen dispute was, in some measure, terminated in the year 1155; but in what manner, or upon what conditions, we do not precisely know.‡

XVIII. The regular canons, who had been formed into a fixed and permanent order in the preceding century, employed their time in a much more useful and exemplary manner than the monastic drones, who passed their days in luxury and sloth. They kept public

⊘ \* This apology, as it is called, of St. Bernard is well worth the attention of the curious reader, as it exhibits a true and lively picture of monastic opulence and luxury, and shows how the religious orders in general lived in this century. The famous abbot, in this performance, accuses the monks of Clugni of luxury and intemperance at their table, of superfluity and magnificence in their dress, their bed-chambers, their furniture, equipage, and buildings. He points out the pride and vanity of the abbots, who looked much more like the governors of provinces, than the spiritual fathers of humble and holy communities, whose original profession it was, to be crucified and dead to the interests and pleasures, the pomps and vanities of the present world. He declares, with a pious concern, that he knew several abbots, each of whom had more than sixty horses in his stable, and such a prodigious variety of wines in his cellar, that it was scarcely possible to taste the half of them at a single entertainment. See Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, liv. lxxvii. tom. xiv. p. 351, edit. Bruxelles.

† See S. Bernardi Apologia in Oper. tom. i. p. 523—533. The apology of Peter, abbot of Clugni, surnamed the venerable, which is published among his Epistles, lib. i. ep. 28, in the Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, tom. i. p. 657—695. See also the Dialogus inter Cluniacensem et Cisterciensem, published by Martenne, in his Thesaur. Anecd. tom. v. p. 1573—1613. Compare with all these Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 80, and Manriquez, Annal. Cisterc. tom. i. p. 28.

‡ See Manriquez, Annal. Cisterciensium, tom. i. p. 232.—Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 212, 179, and præfat. ad Opera S. Bernardi.—Jo. de Laanes, Histoire du Pontificat d'Innocent II. p. 68.—79.—10, Nic. Hættin diss. de exemptione Cisterc. a decimis

schools for the instruction of youth, and exercised a variety of ecclesiastical functions, which rendered them extremely useful to the church.\* Hence they rose daily in credit and reputation, received many rich and noble donations from several persons, whose opulence and piety rendered them able and willing to distinguish merit, and were also often put in possession of the revenues of the monks, whose dissolute lives occasioned, from time to time, the suppression of their convents. This, as might well be expected, inflamed the rage of the monastic orders against the regular canons, whom they attacked with the greatest fury, and loaded with the bitterest invectives. The canons, in their turn, were far from being backward in making reprisals; they exclaimed, on the contrary, against the monks with the utmost vehemence; enumerated their vices both in discourses and in writings, and insisted upon their being confined to their monasteries, sequestered from human society, and excluded from all ecclesiastical honours and functions. Hence arose, between the monks and canons, a long and warm contest for pre-eminence; in which both parties carried their pretensions too high, and exceeded the bounds of decency and moderation.‡ The champions, who espoused the interest of the monks, were the famous Peter Abelard, Hugh of Amiens, Rupert of Duytz; while the cause of the canons was defended by Philip Harvengius, a learned abbot, and several other men of genius and abilities.‡ The effects and remains of this ancient controversy are yet visible in our times.

XIX. A new society of religious Benedictines arose about the commencement of this century, whose principal monastery was erected in a barren and solitary place, called Fontevraud, between Angers and Tours; whence the order derived its name. Robert of Arbrisselles, its founder, who had been first a hermit, and afterwards a monk, prescribed to his religious of both sexes the rule of St. Benedict, amplified, however, by the addition of several new laws, which were extremely singular and excessively severe. Among other singularities that distinguished this institution, one was, that the several monasteries which Robert had built, within one and the same inclosure, for his monks and nuns, were all subjected to the authority and government of one abbess; in justification of which measure, the example of Christ was alleged, who recommended St. John to the Virgin Mary, and imposed it as an order upon that beloved disciple, to be obedient to her as to his own mother.§

\* See the Histoire Literaire de la France, tom. ix. p. 112.

† See Lamberti Epistola in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecd. tom. i. p. 329.

‡ Abelardi Opera, p. 228. Paris, 1616, in 4to.—Martenne's Thesaur. Anecd. tom. v. p. 970—975, 1614. et Amplissima ejusdem Collectio, tom. ix. p. 971, 972.—Phil. Harvengii Opera, p. 385. Duaci 1621, in folio.

§ See the works of Abelard, p. 48, whose testimony in this matter is confirmed by the present state and constitution of this famous order; though Mabillon, from an excessive partiality in favour of the Benedictines, has endeavoured to diminish its credit in his Annal. Benedict. tom. v. p. 423. For an account of Robert and his order, see the Acta Sanctor. Tom. iii. Februar. o. 593.—Dion. Sannarhanti Gallia

This new order, like all other novelties of that kind, gained immediately a high degree of credit: the singularity of its discipline, its form, and its laws, engaged multitudes to embrace it; and thus the labours of its founder were crowned with remarkable success. [§ But the association of vigorous monks and tender virgins, in the same community, was an imprudent measure, and could not but be attended with many inconveniences. However that may be, Robert continued his pious labours, and the odour of his sanctity perfumed all the places where he exercised his ministry.] He was, indeed, suspected by some, of too great an intimacy with his female disciples; and it was rumoured, that in order to try his virtue, by opposing it to the strongest temptations, he exposed it to an inevitable defeat by the manner in which he conversed with these holy virgins. It was affirmed, that their commerce was softened by something more tender than divine love; against which charge his disciples have used their most zealous endeavours to defend their master.\*

XX. Norbert, a German nobleman, who took holy orders, and was afterwards archbishop of Magdeburg, employed his most strenuous efforts to restore to its primitive severity the discipline of the regular canons, which was extremely relaxed in some places, and almost totally abolished in others. This eminent reformer founded, in the year 1121, the Order of Premontré in Picardy, whose fame spread throughout Europe with an amazing rapidity, and whose opulence, in a short space of time, became excessive and enormous;‡ in

consequence of the high esteem which the monks of this community had acquired by the gravity of their manners, and their assiduous application to the liberal arts and sciences. But their overgrown prosperity was the source of their ruin; it soon diminished their zeal for the exercises of devotion, extinguished their thirst after useful knowledge, and thus gradually plunged them into all kinds of vice. The rule which they followed was that of St. Augustine, with some slight alterations, and an addition of certain severe laws, whose authority, however, did not long survive their austere founder.\*

XXI. About the middle of this century, a Calabrian, whose name was Berthold, set out with a few companions for mount Carmel, and upon the very spot where the prophet Elias is said to have disappeared, built an humble cottage, with an adjoining chapel, in which he led a life of solitude, austerity, and labour. This little colony subsisted, and the places of those that died were more than filled by newcomers; so that it was, at length,‡ erected into a monastic community by Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem. This austere prelate drew up, for the new monks, a rule of discipline, which was afterwards confirmed by the authority of the Roman pontiffs, who modified and altered it in several respects, and, among other corrections, mitigated its excessive rigour.‡ Such was the origin of the famous Order of Carmelites, or, as they are commonly called, the Order of our Lady of Mount Carmel, which was afterwards transplanted from Syria into Europe, and obtained the principal rank among the mendicant or begging orders. It is true, the Carmelites reject, with the highest indignation, an origin so recent and obscure, and affirm to this very day, that the prophet Elias was the parent and founder of their ancient community.§ Very few, however, have

Christiana, tom. ii. p. 1311.—Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Pontevraud.—Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, tom. vi. p. 83.—The present state of this monastery is described by Moleau, in his Voyages Liturgiques, p. 102, and by Martenne, in the second part of his Voyage Littéraire de deux Benedictins.

\* See the letters of Geoffry, abbot of Vendome, and of Marbod, bishop of Rennes; in which Robert is accused of lying in the same bed with the nuns. How the grave abbot was defended against this accusation by the members of his order, may be seen in Mainfrème's *Clypeus Nascentis Ordinis Pontevraudensis*, published in 8vo at Paris, in the year 1684; and also by another production of the same author, entitled, *Dissertationes in Epistolam contra Robertum de Abrissello*, Salurni, 1682, in 8vo. Bayle's account of this famous abbot, in which there is such an admirable mixture of wit, sense, and malice, has been also attacked by several writers; see, among other works, the viii and viii volumes of Mabillon's *Annals*, and the *Dissertation Apologetica pour le bienheureux Robert d'Abrisselles sur ce qu'en a dit M. Bayle*, Anvers 1701, in 8vo.

‡ In the year 1177, some nuns of this order were brought into England at the desire of Henry II. who gave them the monastery of Ambresbury, in Wiltshire. They had two other houses here; one at Eton, the other at Westwood, in Worcestershire.

§ † The religious of this order were at first so poor, that they had nothing they could call their own, but a single ass, which served to carry the wood they cut down every morning, and sent to Laon in order to purchase bread. But in a short time they received so many donations, and built so many monasteries, that, thirty years after the foundation of this order, they had above a hundred abbeyes in France and Germany. In process of time, the order increased so prodigiously, that it had monasteries in all parts of Christendom, amounting to 1000 abbeyes, 300 provostships, a vast number of priories, and 500 nunneries. But this number is now greatly diminished. Besides what they lost in Protestant countries, of 65 abbeyes, that they had in Italy, there is not one now remaining

\* See Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. ii. p. 156 — Chrysost. Vander Sterre, *Vita S. Norberti Pramonstransium Patriarche*, published in 8vo., at Antwerp, in 1656.—Louis Hughes, *Vie de S. Norbert, Luxemb. 1704*, in 4to.—Add to these, notwithstanding his partiality, Jo. Launoy, *Inquisit. in Privilegia Ordinis Pramonstrat. cap. i. ii. Oper. tom. iii. part. i. p. 448*. For an account of the present state of the Order of Premontré, see Martenne's *Voyage Littéraire de deux Benedictins*, tom. ii. p. 59.

‡ The Pramonstratenses, or monks of Premontré, vulgarly called White Canons, came first into England in the year 1046. Their first monastery, called New House, was built in Lincolnshire, by Peter de Saulia, and dedicated to St. Martial. In the reign of Edward I. the order in question had 27 monasteries in England.

† In the year 1205.

‡ I have here principally followed Dan. Papebroch, an accurate writer, and one who is always careful to produce sufficient testimonies of the truth of his narrations. See the *Acta Sanctior. Antwerp. Mensis April. tom. iii. p. 774—802*. It is well known, that an accusation was brought against this learned Jesuit, before the tribunal of the pope, by the Carmelites, on account of his having called in question the dignity and high antiquity of their order. We have in Helyot's *Hist. des Ordres* (tom. i. p. 282) an account of this long and tedious contest, which was so far determined, or at least suspended, in the year 1698, by Innocent XII. that silence was imposed upon the contending parties.

§ The most concise and accurate of all the Carmelite writers, who have treated this matter, is Thomas Aquinas, a French monk, in his *Dissertatio Histor. Theol. in qua Patriarchatus Ordinis Carmelitarum*

been engaged to adopt this fabulous and chimerical account of the establishment, except the members of the order; and many Roman Catholic writers have treated their pretensions to such a remote antiquity with the utmost contempt.\* [§] And scarcely, indeed, can any thing be more ridiculous than the circumstantial narrations of the occasion, origin, founder, and revolutions of this famous order, which we find in several ecclesiastical authors, whose zeal for this fraternity has rendered them capable of adopting without reluctance, or, at least, of reciting without shame, the most puerile and glaring absurdities. They tell us that Elias was introduced into the state of monachism by the ministry of angels; that his first disciples were Jonah, Micah, and also Obadiah, whose wife, in order to shake off an importunate crowd of lovers, who fluttered about her at the court of Ahab after the departure of her husband, bound herself by a vow of chastity, received the veil from the hands of father Elias, and thus became the first abbess of the Carmelite order. They enter into a minute detail of the circumstances that relate to the rules of discipline which were drawn up for this community, the habit which distinguished its members, and the various alterations which were successively introduced into their rule of discipline. They observe, that among other marks which were used to distinguish the Carmelites from the seculars, the tonsure was one; that this mark of distinction exposed them, indeed, to the mockeries of a profane multitude; and that this furnishes the true explication of the term bald-head, which the children addressed, by way of reproach, to Elisha as he was on his way to Carmel.† They also affirm, that Pythagoras was a member of this ancient order; that he drew all his wisdom from Mount Carmel, and had several conversations with the prophet Daniel at Babylon, upon the subject of the Trinity. They even go farther into the region of fable, and assert, that the Virgin Mary, and Jesus himself, assumed the habit and profession of Carmelites; and they loaded this fiction with a heap of absurd circumstances, which it is impossible to read without the highest astonishment.‡

Prophetæ Eliæ vindicatur, published in 8vo. at Paris in the year 1632. The modern writers who have maintained the cause of the Carmelites against Papebroch, are extremely prolix and tiresome.

\* See Harduini Opera Posthum. p. 652.—Labat, Voyage en Espagne et Italie, tom. iii. p. 87.—Coudrayer, Examen des Defauts Theologiques, tom. i. p. 455.

† See 2 Kings ii. 23.

‡ For an ample account of all the absurd inventions here hinted at, see a very remarkable work, entitled, "Ordres Monastiques, Histoire exacte de tous les Auteurs qui ont conserve a la Posterite ce qu'il y a de plus curieux dans chaque Ordre, enrichie d'un tres grand nombre de passages des memes Auteurs, pour servir de demonstration que ce qu'on y avance est egalement veritable et curieux." This work, which was first printed at Paris in 1751, under the title of Berlin, and which was suppressed almost as soon as it appeared, is written with great wit, eloquence, and learning; and all the narrations it contains are confirmed by citations from the most eminent authors, who have given accounts of the religious orders. The author's view seems to have been to expose the monks of every denomination to the laughter of his readers; and it is very remarkable, that, in the execution of

XXII. To this brief account of the religious orders, it will not be amiss to add a list of the principal Greek and Latin writers who flourished in this century. The most eminent among the Greeks were those that follow:

Philippus Solitarius, whose Dioptra, or controversy between the soul and the body, is sufficiently known;

Eustratius, who maintained the cause of the Greek church against the Latins with great learning and spirit, and who wrote commentaries on certain books of Aristotle;

Euthymius Zigabenus, who, by his anti-heretical Panoply, together with his commentaries upon several parts of the sacred writings, acquired a place among the principal authors of this century;\*

Johannes Zonaras, whose Annals, with several other productions of his learned pen, are still extant;

Michael Glycas, who also applied himself to historical composition, as well as to other branches of learning;†

Constantius Harmenopolus, whose commentaries on the civil and canon laws are deservedly esteemed;

Andronicus Camaterus, who wrote with great warmth and vehemence against the Latins and Armenians;

Eustathius, bishop of Thessalonica, the most learned of the Greeks in this century, and the celebrated commentator upon the Iliad;

Theodorus Balsamon, who employed great diligence, erudition and labour, in explaining and digesting the civil and ecclesiastical laws of the Greeks.‡

XXIII. The most eminent among the Latin writers were,

Bernard, abbot of Clairval, from whom the Cistercian monks (as has been already observed) derived the title of Bernardines; a man who was not destitute of genius and taste, and whose judgment, in many respects, was just and penetrating; but who, on the other hand, discovered in his conduct many marks of superstition and weakness, and what is still worse, concealed the lust of dominion under the mask of piety, and made no scruple of loading, with false accusations, such as had the misfortune to incur his displeasure;§

his purpose, he has drawn his materials from the gravest writers, and from the most zealous defenders of monarchism. If he has embellished his subject, it is by the vivacity of his manner, and the witty elegance of his style, and not by imputing to the monastic communities any practices which their most serious historians omit or disavow. The authors of the Bibliothéque des Sciences et des Beaux Arts, at the Hague, have given several interesting extracts from this work in the 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th volumes of that literary journal.

¶ The Carmelites came into England in the year 1240, and erected a vast number of monasteries in that kingdom. See Broughton's Historical Library, vol. i. p. 208.

\* See Rich. Simon, Critique de la Bibliothéque des Auteurs Eccles. par M. Du Pin, tom. i. p. 318, 324.

† Other historians place Glycas in the fifteenth century. See Lami Dissertatio de Glyca, which is prefixed to the first volume of his *Delectia Virorum eruditiorum*.

‡ See the Bibliotheca Græca of Fabricius.

§ The learned Mabillon has given a splendid edition of the works of St. Bernard, and has not only, in his preface, made many excellent observations upon the life and history of this famous abbot, but

Innocent III. bishop of Rome, whose epistles and other productions contribute to illustrate the religious sentiments, as also the discipline and morals, that prevailed in this century;\*

Anselm of Laon, a man of a subtle genius, and deeply versed in logical disquisition;

Abelard, the disciple of Anselm, and most famous in this century, on account of the elegance of his wit, the extent of his erudition, the power of his rhetoric, and the severity of his fate;†

Geoffry of Vendome, whose Epistles and Dissertations are yet extant;

Rupert of Druyt, the most eminent, perhaps, of all the scriptural expositors who flourished among the Latins during this century, a man of a sound judgment and an elegant taste;‡

Hugh of St. Victor, a man distinguished by the fecundity of his genius, who treated of all the branches of sacred and profane erudition that were known in his time, and composed several dissertations that are not destitute of merit;§

Richard of St. Victor, who was at the head of the Mystics in this century, and whose treatise, entitled, *The Mystical Ark*, which contains, as it were, the marrow of that kind of theology, was received with the greatest avidity, and applauded by the fanatics of the times;||

Honorius of Autun,¶ not mean philosopher, and tolerably versed in theological learning;

Gratian, a learned monk, who reduced the canon law into a new and regular form, in his vast compilation of the decisions of the ancient and modern councils, the decretals of the pontiffs, the capitularies of the kings of France, &c.;

William of Rheims, the author of several productions, calculated to excite pious sentiments, and contribute to the progress of practical religion;

Peter Lombard, who was commonly called, in France, *Master of the Sentences*, because

has also subscribed to his works the accounts that have been given, by the ancient writers, of his life and actions.

\* The Epistles of Innocent III. were published at Paris, in two large volumes in folio, by Baluze, in the year 1682.

† See Bayle's Dictionary, at the articles *Abelard* and *Paraclet*.—Gervais, *Vie de Pierre Abeillard*, Abbe de Ruys, et d'Heloise, published at Paris in two volumes 8vo., in the year 1728. The works of this famous and unfortunate monk were published at Paris in 1616, in one volume 4to., by Franc. Amboise. Another edition, much more ample, might be given, since there are a great number of the productions of Abelard that have never yet seen the light.

‡ See Mahillon, *Annal. Bened.* tom. vi. p. 19, 42, 141, 168, 261, 282, 296. He gives an ample account of Rupert, and of the disputes in which he was involved.

§ See *Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 661. The works of this learned man were published at Rouen, in three folio volumes, in the year 1648. See, for a farther account of him, *De Ranzi Dissert. de Hugone a S. Victore*, Helmstadt, 1746, in 4to., and *Martenne's Voyage Literaire*, tom. ii. p. 91, 92.

|| *Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 669.

¶ Such is the place to which Honorius is said to have belonged. But *Le Bouf* proves him to have been a German, in his *Dissert. sur l'Hist. Francoise*, tom. i. p. 254.

he had composed a work so entitled, which was a collection of opinions and sentences relative to the various branches of theology, extracted from the Latin doctors, and reduced into a sort of system;\*

Gilbert de la Porree,† a subtle dialectician, and a learned divine, who is, however, said to have adopted several erroneous sentiments concerning the Divine Essence, the Incarnation, and the Trinity;‡

William of Auxerre, who acquired a considerable reputation by his *Theological System*;§

Peter of Blois,|| whose epistles and other productions may yet be read with profit;

John of Salisbury, a man of great learning and true genius, whose philosophical and theological knowledge was adorned with a lively wit and a flowing eloquence, as appears in his *Metalogicus*, and his book *de Nugis Curialium*;

Petrus Comestor, author of *An Abridgement of the Old and New Testament*, which was used in the schools for the instruction of the youth, and called (probably from that circumstance) *Historia Scholastica*.

A more ample account of the names and characters of the Latin writers may be found in those authors who have professedly treated of that branch of literature.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church in this Century.*

I. WHEN we consider the multitude of causes which united their influence in obscuring the lustre of genuine Christianity, and corrupting it by a profane mixture of the inventions of superstitious and designing men with its pure and sublime doctrines, it will appear surprising, that the religion of Jesus was not totally extinguished. All orders contributed, though in different ways, to corrupt the native purity of true religion. The popes led the way; they would not suffer any doctrines to prevail that had the smallest tendency to diminish their despotic authority; but obliged the public teachers to interpret the precepts of Christianity in such a manner, as to render them subservient to the support of papal dominion and tyranny. This order was so much the more terrible, as those who refused to comply with it, and to force the words of scripture into significations totally opposite to the intentions of its divine author (such, in a word, as had the courage to place the authority of the Gospel above that of the Roman pontiffs, and to consider it as the supreme rule of their conduct,) were answered with the formidable arguments of fire and sword, and received death in the most cruel forms, as the

\* *Gallia Christiana*, tom. vii. p. 68.

† Called, in Latin, *Gilbertus Porretanus*.

‡ He held, among other things, this trifling and sophistical proposition, that the divine essence and attributes are not God; a proposition that was every way proper to exercise the quibbling spirit of the scholastic writers.

§ *Le Bouf*, *Dissert. sur la Somme Theologique de Guillaume d'Auxerre*, in *Molat's Continuation des Memoires d'Histtoire et de Literature*, tom. iii. part ii. p. 317.

|| *Petrus Blesensis*.

fruit of their sincerity and resolution. The priests and monks contributed, in their way, to disfigure the beautiful simplicity of religion; and, finding it their interest to keep the people in the grossest ignorance and darkness, dazzled their feeble eyes with the ludicrous pomp of a gaudy worship, and led them to place the whole of religion in vain ceremonies, bodily austerities and exercises, and particularly in a blind and stupid veneration for the clergy. The scholastic doctors, who considered the decisions of the ancients, and the precepts of the Dialecticians, as the great rule and criterion of truth, instead of explaining the doctrines of the Gospel, undermined them by degrees, and sunk divine truth in the ruins of a captious philosophy; while the Mystics, running into the opposite extreme, maintained, that the souls of the truly pious were incapable of any spontaneous motions, and could only be moved by a divine impulse; and thus not only set limits to the pretensions of reason, but excluded it entirely from religion and morality, if they did not in some measure deny its very existence.

II. The consequences of all this were superstition and ignorance, which were substituted for true religion, and reigned over the multitude with an universal sway. Relics, which were for the most part fictitious, or at least uncertain, attracted more powerfully the confidence of the people, than the merits of Christ, and were supposed by many to be more effectual, than the prayers offered to heaven, through the mediation and intercession of that divine Redeemer.\* The opulent, whose circumstances enabled them either to erect new temples, or to repair and embellish the old, were considered as the happiest of all mortals, and as the most intimate friends of the Most High; whilst they, whom poverty rendered incapable of such pompous acts of liberality, contributed to the multiplication of religious edifices by their bodily labours, cheerfully performed the services in which beasts of burden are usually employed (such as carrying stones and drawing wagons,) and expected to obtain eternal salvation by these voluntary and painful efforts of misguided zeal.† The saints had a greater number of worshippers, than the Supreme Being and the Saviour of mankind; nor did these superstitious worshippers trouble their heads about that knotty question, which occasioned much debate and many laborious disquisitions in succeeding times, viz. How the inhabitants of heaven came to the knowledge of the prayers and supplications that were addressed to them from the earth? This question was prevented in this century by an opinion, which the Christians had received from their pagan ancestors, that the inhabitants of heaven descended often from above, and frequented the places in which they had formerly taken pleasure

\* See Guibert de Novigento, de Pignoribus, (so were relics called) Sanctorum, in his Works published by d'Acheri, p. 327, where he attacks, with judgment and dexterity, the superstition of these miserable times.

† See Haymon's Treatise concerning this custom, published by Mabillon, at the end of the sixth tome of his *Annal. Benedict.* See also those *Annals* p. 302.

during their residence upon earth.\* To finish the horrid portrait of superstition, we shall only observe, that the stupid credulity of the people in this century went so far, that when any persons, either through the plerency of a disordered imagination, or with an intention of deceiving, published the dreams or visions, which they fancied or pretended they had from above, the multitude resorted to the new oracle, and respected its decisions as the commands of God, who in this way was pleased, as they imagined, to communicate counsel, instruction, and the knowledge of his will to men. This appears (to mention no other examples) from the extraordinary reputation which the two famous prophetesses Hildegard, abbess of Bingen, and Elizabeth of Schonauge, obtained in Germany.‡

III. The general prevalence of ignorance and superstition was dexterously, yet basely improved, by the rulers of the church, to fill their coffers, and to drain the purses of the deluded multitude: indeed each rank and order of the clergy had a peculiar method of fleecing the people. The bishops, when they wanted money for their private pleasures, or for the exigencies of the church, granted to their flock the power of purchasing the remission of the penalties imposed upon transgressors, by a sum of money, which was to be applied to certain religious purposes; or, in other words, they published indulgences, which became an inexhaustible source of opulence to the episcopal orders, and enabled them, as is well known, to form and execute the most difficult schemes for the enlargement of their authority, and to erect a multitude of sacred edifices, which augmented considerably the external pomp and splendour of the church.‡ The abbots and monks, who were not qualified to grant indulgences, had recourse to other methods of enriching their convents. They carried about the country the carcases and relics of the saints in solemn procession, and permitted the multitude to behold, touch, and embrace, at fixed prices, these sacred and lucrative remains. The monastic orders often gained as much by this rare-show, as the bishops did by their indulgences.§

IV. When the Roman pontiffs cast an eye

\* As a proof that this assertion is not without foundation, we shall transcribe the following remarkable passage of the life of St. Altman, bishop of Padua, as it stands in Seb. Tengenel's *Collect. Vet. Monumentor.* p. 41. " Vos licet, sancti Domini, somno vestro requiescatis. . . haud tamen crediderim, spiritus vestros deesse locis qua viventes tanta devotione construxistis et dilexistis. Credo vos adesse cunctis illis degentibus, astare videlicet orantibus, succurrere laborantibus, et vota singulorum in conspectu divinae majestatis promovere."

† See Mabillon, *Annales Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 431, 529, 554.

‡ Stephanus Obazinensis in Baluzii *Miscellan.* tom. iv. p. 130.—Mabillon, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 535, &c.

§ We find in the records of this century innumerable examples of this method of extorting contributions from the multitude. See the *Chronicon Centulense* in Dacherii *Spicilegio Veter. Scriptor.* tom. ii. p. 351.—Vita *Stae. Romane.* *ibid.* p. 137.—Mabillon, *Annal. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 332, 641.—Acta *Sanctor. Mendis Maii.* tom. vii. p. 533, where we have an account of a long journey made by the relics of St. Marculus. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 519, 520, tom. ii. p. 732.

upon the immense treasures that the inferior rulers of the church were accumulating by the sale of indulgences, they thought proper to limit the power of the bishops in remitting the penalties imposed upon transgressors, and assumed, almost entirely, this profitable traffic to themselves. In consequence of this new measure, the court of Rome became the general magazine of indulgences; and the pontiffs, when either the wants of the church, the emptiness of their coffers, or the demon of avarice, prompted them to look out for new subsidies, published not only a general, but also a complete, or what they called a plenary remission of the temporal pains and penalties, annexed by the church to certain transgressions. They went still farther; and not only remitted the penalties, which the civil and ecclesiastical laws had enacted against transgressors, but audaciously usurped the authority which belongs to God alone, and impiously pretended to abolish even the punishments which are reserved in a future state for the workers of iniquity; a step which the bishops, with all their avarice and presumption, had never once ventured to take.\*

The pontiffs first employed this pretended prerogative in promoting the holy war, and shed abroad their indulgences, though with a certain degree of moderation, in order to encourage the European princes to form new expeditions for the conquest of Palestine; but, in process of time, the charm of indulgence was practised upon various occasions of much less consequence, and merely with a view to base lucre.† Their introduction, among other things, destroyed the credit and authority of the ancient canonical and ecclesiastical discipline of penance, and occasioned the removal and suppression of the penitentials,‡ by which the reins were let loose to every kind of vice. Such proceedings stood much in need of a plausible defence; but this was impossible. To vindicate in an authoritative manner these scandalous measures of the pontiffs, an absurd and even monstrous doctrine was now invented, which was modified and embellished by St. Thomas in the succeeding century, and which contained among others the following enormities: "That there actually existed an immense treasure of merit, composed of the pious deeds, and virtuous actions, which the saints had performed beyond what was necessary for their own salvation,§ and which were therefore applicable to the benefit of others; that the guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure was the Roman pontiff; and that consequently he was empow-

ed to assign, to such as he deemed proper objects, a portion of this inexhaustible source of merit, suitable to their respective guilt, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes." It is a most deplorable mark of the power of superstition, that a doctrine, so absurd in its nature, and so pernicious in its effects, should yet be retained and defended in the church of Rome.\*

V. Nothing was more common in this century than expositors and interpreters of the sacred writings; but nothing was so rare, as to find, in that class of authors, the qualifications that are essentially required in a good commentator. Few of these expositors were attentive to search after the true signification of the words employed by the sacred writers, or to investigate the precise sense in which they were used; and these few were destitute of the succours which such researches demand. The Greek and Latin commentators, blinded by their enthusiastic love of antiquity, and their implicit veneration for the doctors of the early ages of the church, drew from their writings, without discernment or choice, a heap of passages, which they were pleased to consider as illustrations of the holy scriptures. Such were the commentaries of Euthymius Zigabenus, an eminent expositor among the Greeks, upon the Psalms, the Gospels and Epistles; though it must, at the same time, be acknowledged, that this writer follows, in some places, the dictates of his own judgment, and gives, upon certain occasions, proofs of penetration and genius. Among the Latins, we might give several examples of the injudicious manner of expounding the divine word that prevailed in this century, such as the Lucubrations of Peter Lombard, Gilbert de la Porree, and the famous Abelard, upon the Psalms of David, and the Epistles of St. Paul. Nor do those Latin commentators who expounded the whole of the sacred writings, and who are placed at the head of the expositors of this age, (such as Gilbert, bishop of London, surnamed the Universal, on account of the vast extent of his erudition,† and Hervey,‡ a most studious Benedictine monk) deserve a higher place in our esteem, than the authors before mentioned. The writers that merit the preference among the Latins are Rupert of Duytz, and Anselm of Laon; the former of whom expounded several books of scripture, and the latter composed, or rather compiled, a glossary upon the sacred writings.

\* For a satisfactory and ample account of the enormous doctrine of indulgences, see a very learned and judicious work, entitled, *Lettres sur les Jubiles*, published in the year 1751, in three volumes, 8vo. by the Rev. Mr. Chais, minister of the French church at the Hague, on occasion of the universal Jubilee celebrated at Rome in the preceding year, by the order of Benedict XIV. In the second volume of this excellent work, which we shall have frequent occasion to consult in the course of this history, a clear account and a satisfactory refutation of the doctrine may be found, with the history of that monstrous practice from its origin to the present times.

† For an account of this prelate, see Le Beuf, *Memoires concernant l'Histoire d'Auxerre*, tom. ii. p. 486.

‡ An ample account of this learned Benedictine is to be found in Gabr. Liron's *Singularites Historiques et Literaires*, tom. iii. p. 29.—See also Mabillon, *Annales Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 477. 719.

\* Morinus, de administratione Sacramenti Penitentiae, lib. x. cap. xx. xxi. xxii. p. 768.—Rich. Simon, *Biblioth. Critique*, tom. iii. cap. xxviii. p. 371. Mabillon, *Præf. ad Acta Sanctor. Sac. v. Acta Sanctor. Benedict.* p. 54, not to speak of the protestant writers, whom I designedly pass over.

† Muratori, *Antiq. Italic. mediæ ævi*, tom. v. p. 761. Franc. Pagi, *Breviar. Rom. Pontif.* tom. ii. p. 60.—Theod. Romarti *Vita Urbani II.* p. 231, tom. iii. Op. Posthum.

‡ The Penitential was a book, in which the degrees and kinds of penance, that were annexed to different crimes, were registered.

§ These works are known by the name of Works of Supererogation.

As to those doctors who were not carried away by an enthusiastical veneration for the ancients, who had courage enough to try their own talents, and to follow the dictates of their own sagacity, they were chargeable with defects of another kind; for, disregarding and overlooking the beautiful simplicity of divine truth, they were perpetually bent on the search of all sorts of mysteries in the sacred writings, and were constantly on the scent after some hidden meaning in the plainest expressions of scripture. The Mystics excelled peculiarly in this manner of expounding; and, by their violent explications, forced the word of God into a conformity with their visionary doctrines, their enthusiastic feelings, and the system of discipline which they had drawn from the excursions of their irregular fancies. Nor were the commentators, who pretended to logic and philosophy, and who, in effect, had applied themselves to these profound sciences, free from the contagion of mysticism in their explications of scripture. That they followed the example of those fanatics may be seen by the Allegorical Exposition which Hugh of St. Victor gave of the Old and New Testament, by the Mystical Ark of Richard of St. Victor, and by the Mystical Commentaries of Guibert, abbot of Nogent, on Obadiah, Hosea, and Amos;\* not to mention several other writers, who seem to have been animated by the same spirit.

VI. The most eminent teachers of theology resided at Paris, which city was, from this time forward, frequented by students of divinity from all parts of Europe, who resorted thither in crowds, to receive instruction from these celebrated masters. The French divines were divided into different sects. The first of these sects, who were distinguished by the title of the Ancient Theologists, explained the doctrines of religion, in a plain and simple manner, by passages drawn from the holy scriptures, from the decrees of councils, and the writings of the ancient doctors, and very rarely made use of the succours of reason or philosophy in their theological lectures. In this class we place St. Bernard, Peter surnamed the Chanter, Walter of St. Victor, and other theologians, who declared an open and bitter war against the philosophical divines. The doctors, who were afterwards known by the name of positive and sententiary teachers of religion, were not, in all respects, different from these now mentioned. Imitating the examples of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, Laufranc, Hildebert, and other doctors of the preceding century, they taught and confirmed their system of theology, principally by collecting the decisions of the inspired writers, and the opinions of the ancients. At the same time they were far from rejecting the succours of reason, and the discussions of philosophy, to which they more especially had recourse, when difficulties were to be solved, and adversaries to be refuted, but, in the application of which, all did not discover the same degree of moderation and prudence. Hugh of St. Victor is supposed to have been the first writer of this

century, who taught in this manner the doctrines of Christianity, digested into a regular system. His example was followed by many; but no one acquired such a shining reputation by his labours, in this branch of sacred erudition, as Peter, bishop of Paris, surnamed Lombard from the country which gave him birth. The four books of Sentences of this eminent prelate, which appeared in the year 1162,\* were not only received with general applause, but acquired also such a high degree of authority, as induced the most learned doctors in all places to employ their labours in illustrating and expounding them. Scarcely was there any divine of note that did not undertake this popular task, except Henry of Ghent, and a few others;† so that Lombard, who was commonly called Master of the Sentences, on account of the famous work now mentioned, became truly a classic author in divinity.‡

VII. The followers of Lombard who were called Sententiarii, though their manner of teaching was defective in some respects, and not altogether exempt from vain and trivial questions, were always attentive to avoid entering too far into the subtleties of the Dialecticians, nor did they presumptuously attempt to submit the divine truths of the Gospel to the uncertain and obscure principles of a refined and intricate logic, which was rather founded on the excursions of fancy than on the true nature of things. They had for contemporaries another set of theologians, who were far from imitating their moderation and prudence in this respect; a set of subtle doctors, who taught the plain and simple truths of Christianity, in the obscure terms, and with the perplexing distinctions used by the Dialecticians, and explained, or rather darkened with their unintelligible jargon, the sublime precepts of that wisdom which emanates from above. This method of teaching theology, which was afterwards called the scholastic system, because it was in general use in the schools, had for its author, Peter Abelard, a man of the most subtle genius, whose public lectures in philosophy and divinity had raised him to the highest summit of literary renown, and who was successively canon of Paris, and monk

\* Erpoldi Lindenbrogi Scriptores Rerum Septentrionalium, p. 250.

† A list of the commentators who laboured in explaining the Sentences of Lombard, is given by Anton. Possevinus, in his Biblioth. Selecta, tom. i. lib. iii. cap. xiv. p. 242.

‡ The Book of Sentences, which rendered the name of Peter Lombard so illustrious, was a compilation of sentences and passages drawn from the fathers, whose manifold contradictions this eminent prelate endeavoured to reconcile. His work may be considered as a complete body of divinity. It consists of four books, each of which is subdivided into various chapters and sections. In the first he treats of the Trinity, and the Divine Attributes; in the second, of the Creation in general, of the Origin of Angels, the Formation and Fall of Man, of Grace and Free Will, of Original Sin and Actual Transgression; in the third, of the Incarnation and Perfections of Jesus Christ, of Faith, Hope, and Charity, of the Gifts of the Spirit, and the Commandments of God. The Sacraments, the Resurrection, the Last Judgment, and the State of the Righteous in Heaven, are the subjects treated in the fourth and last book of this celebrated work, which was the wonder of the twelfth century, but is little more than an object of contempt in ours.

\* The Prologus in Abdiam was published by Mabillon, in his *Annales Benedict.* tom. vi. p. 637.



and abbot of Ruys.\* The fame he acquired by this new method engaged many ambitious divines to adopt it; and, in a short space of time, the followers of Abelard multiplied prodigiously, not only in France, but also in England and Italy. Thus was the pure and peaceable wisdom of the Gospel perverted into a science of mere sophistry and chicanery; for these subtle doctors never explained or illustrated any subject, but, on the contrary, darkened and disfigured the plainest expressions, and the most evident truths, by their laboured and useless distinctions, fatigued both themselves and others with unintelligible solutions of abstruse and frivolous questions, and, through a rage for disputing, maintained with equal vehemence and ardour the opposite sides of the most serious and momentous questions.†

VIII. From this period, therefore, an important distinction was made between the Christian doctors, who were divided into two classes. In the first class were placed those, who were called by the various names of *biblici*, i. e. bible-doctors, *dogmatici*, and *positivi*, i. e. didactic divines, and also *veteres*, or ancients; and in the second were ranged the scholastics, who were also distinguished by the titles of *Sententiarii*, after the Master of the Sentences, and *Novi*, to express their recent origin. The former expounded, though in a wretched manner, the sacred writings in their public schools, illustrated the doctrines of Christianity, without deriving any succour from reason or philosophy, and confirmed their opinions by the united testimonies of Scripture and Tradition. The latter expounded, instead of the Bible, the famous Book of Sentences; reduced, under the province of their subtle philosophy, whatever the Gospel proposed as an object of faith, or a rule of practice; and perplexed and obscured its divine doctrines and precepts by a multitude of vain questions and idle speculations.‡ The method of the scholastics exhibited a pompous aspect of learning, and these disputants seemed to surpass their adversaries in sagacity and genius; hence they excited the admiration of the studious youth, who flocked to their schools in multitudes, while the *biblici* or doctors of the sacred page, as they were also called, had the mortification to see their auditories unfrequented, and almost deserted.§ The scholastic theo-

logy continued in high repute in all the European colleges until the time of Luther.

IX. It must, however, be observed, that these metaphysical divines had many difficulties to encounter, and much opposition to overcome, before they could obtain that boundless authority in the European schools, which they so long enjoyed. They were attacked from different quarters; on the one hand, by the ancient divines, or bible doctors; on the other by the mystics, who considered true wisdom and knowledge as unattainable by study or reasoning, and as the fruit of mere contemplation, inward feeling, and a passive acquiescence in divine influences. Thus that ancient conflict between faith and reason, that had formerly divided the Latin doctors, and had been for many years hushed in silence, was now unhappily revived, and produced various tumults, and bitter dissensions. The patrons of the ancient theology, who attacked the schoolmen, were Guibert, abbot of Nogent,\* Peter, abbot of Moustier-la-Celle,† Peter the Chanter,‡ and principally Walter of St. Victor.§ The mystics also sent forth into the field of controversy, upon this occasion, their ablest and most violent champions, such as Joachim abbot of Flori, Richard of St. Victor, who loaded with invectives the scholastic divines, and more especially Lombard, though he was, undoubtedly, the most candid and modest doctor of that subtle tribe. These dissensions and contests, whose deplorable effects augmented from day to day, engaged pope Alexander III. to interpose his authority, in order to restore tranquillity and concord in the church. For this purpose he convoked a solemn and numerous assembly of the clergy in the year 1164,|| in which the licentious rage of religious disputation was condemned; and another in 1179, in which some particular errors of Peter Lombard were pointed out and censured.¶

X. But of all the adversaries that assailed the scholastic divines in this century, no one was so formidable as the famous St. Bernard, whose zeal was ardent beyond all expression, and whose influence and authority were equal to his zeal. And, accordingly, we find this

*legit Bibliam, caret his, et mendicat horam legendi secundum quod placet lectori sententiarum: et qui legit summas, disputat ubique et pro magistro habetur; religiosi qui textum legit, non potest disputare, sicut fuit hoc anno Bononie, et in multis aliis locis, quod est absurdum: manifestum est igitur, quod textus illius facultatis (sc. Theologie) subijcitur uni summe magistrali." Such was now the authority of the scholastic theology, as appears from the words of Bacon, who lived in the following century, and in whose writings there are many things highly worthy of the attention of the curious.*

\* In his *Tropologia* in *Oscam*, p. 203, op.

† *Opuscul.* p. 277. 396. edit. Benedict.

‡ In his *Verbum Abbatiæ*, cap. iii. p. 6, 7, published at Mons in the year 1639, in 4to. by George Galopin.

§ In his *Libri IV. contra Quatuor Franciæ Labyrinthos et novos Hæreticos*. He called Abelard, Gilbert de la Porree, Lombard, and Peter of Poitiers, who were the principal scholastic divines of this century, the four Labyrinths of France. For an account of this work, which is yet in manuscript, see Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 619, 659.

|| *Ant. Pagi, Critic.* in *Baronium*, tom. iv. ad A. 1164, p. 614, 615.

¶ *Matth. Paris. Hist. Major.* p. 115.—Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 402.

\* Abelard acknowledges this himself, *Epist.* i. cap. ix. p. 20. *Oper.*—See also Launoy, de *Scholis Caroli M.* p. 67, cap. lix. tom. iv. op. part. i.

† *Ces. Egasse de Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 201, 523.—Anton. Wood, *Antiquit. Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 54.—Launoy, de *varia Aristotelis Fortuna* in *Acad. Paris.* cap. iii. p. 187, *Edit. Elsvichii*, Vitæ, 1720, in 8vo.

‡ See Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 657.

§ The Book of Sentences seemed to be at this time in much greater repute than the Holy Scriptures; and the compilations of Peter Lombard were preferred to the doctrines and precepts of Jesus Christ. This appears evident from the following remarkable passage in Roger Bacon's *Op. Maj.* ad *Clementem IV. Pontif. Rom.* published in 1731 at London, by Sam. Jebb, from the original MS. "Baccalaureus qui legit textum (scripturæ) succumbit lectori sententiarum, et ubique in omnibus honoratur et præfertur: nam ille, qui legit sententias, habet principalem horam legendi secundum suam voluntatem, habet et socium et cameram apud religiosos: sed qui

illustrious abbot combating the Dialecticians, not only in his writings and his conversation, but also by his deeds; arming against them synods and councils, the decrees of the church, and the laws of the state. The renowned Abelard, who was as much superior to St. Bernard in sagacity and erudition, as he was his inferior in credit and authority, was one of the first who felt, by a bitter experience, the aversion of the lordly abbot to the scholastic doctors: for, in the year 1121, he was called before the council of Soissons, and before that of Sens in 1140; in both of which assemblies he was accused by St. Bernard of the most pernicious errors, and was finally condemned as an egregious heretic.\* The charge brought against this subtle and learned monk was, that he had notoriously corrupted the doctrine of the Trinity, blasphemed against the majesty of the Holy Ghost, entertained unworthy and false conceptions of the person and offices of Christ, and the union of the two natures in him; denied the necessity of the divine grace to render us virtuous; and, in a word, by his doctrines struck at the fundamental principles of all religion. It must be confessed, by those who are acquainted with the writings of Abelard, that he expressed himself in a very singular and incongruous manner upon several points of theology;† and this, indeed, is one of the inconveniences to which subtle refinements upon mysterious doctrines frequently lead. But it is certain, on the other hand, that St. Bernard, who had much more genius than logic, misunderstood some of the opinions of Abelard, and wilfully perverted others: for the zeal of this good abbot too rarely permitted him to consult in his decisions the dictates of impartial equity; and hence it was, that he almost always applauded beyond measure, and censured without mercy.‡

XI. Abelard was not the only scholastic divine who paid dearly for his metaphysical refinement upon the doctrines of the Gospel, and whose logic exposed him to the unrelenting fury of persecution; Gilbert de la Porree, bishop of Poitiers, who had taught theology and philosophy at Paris, and in other places, with the highest applause, met with the same fate. Unfortunately for him, Arnold and Ca-

\* See Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Abelard.—Gervais, Vie d'Abelard et d'Heloïse.—Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 63, 84, 395.—Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. v. p. 1139.

† He affirmed, for example, among other things equally unintelligible and extravagant, that the names, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were improper terms, and were only used to express the fulness of the sovereign good; that the Father was the plenitude of power, the Son a certain power, and the Holy Ghost no power at all; that the Holy Ghost was the soul of the world, with other crude fancies of a like nature, mingled, however, with bold truths.

‡ See Gervais, Vie d'Abelard, tom. ii. p. 162.—Le Clerc, Biblioth. Ancienne et Moderne, tom. ix. p. 352.—Dionys. Petav. Dogmata Theolog. tom. i. lib. v. cap. vi. p. 217, as also the works of Bernard, *passim*. Abelard, who, notwithstanding all his crude notions, was a man of true genius, was undoubtedly worthy of a better fate than that which fell to his lot, and of a more enlightened age than that in which he lived. After passing through the furnace of persecution, and having suffered afflictions of various kinds, of which he has transmitted the history to posterity, he retired to the monastery of Clugny, where he ended his days in the year 1142.

lo, two of his archdeacons, who had been educated in the principles of the ancient theology, heard him one day disputing, with more subtilty than was meet, of the divine nature. Alarmed at the novelty of his doctrine, they brought a charge of blasphemy against him before pope Eugenius III. who was at that time in France; and, to give weight to their accusation, they engaged St. Bernard in their cause. The zealous abbot treated the matter with his usual vehemence, and opposed Gilbert with the utmost severity and bitterness, first in the council of Paris, A. D. 1147, and afterwards in that which was assembled at Rheims in the following year. In the latter council the accused bishop, in order to put an end to the dispute, offered to submit his opinions to the judgment of the assembly, and of the Roman pontiff, by whom they were condemned. The errors attributed to Gilbert were the fruits of an excessive subtilty, and of an extravagant passion for reducing the doctrines of Christianity under the empire of metaphysics and dialectics. He distinguished the divine *essence* from the *Deity*, the properties of the three divine persons from the persons themselves, not in reality, but by abstraction, *in statu rationis*, as the metaphysicians speak; and, in consequence of these distinctions, he denied the incarnation of the divine nature. To these he added other opinions, derived from the same source, which were rather vain, fanciful, and adapted to excite surprise by their novelty, than glaringly false, or really pernicious. These refined notions were far above the comprehension of good St. Bernard, who was by no means accustomed to such profound disquisitions, to such intricate researches.\*

XII. The important science of morality was not now in a very flourishing state, as may be easily imagined when we consider the genius and spirit of that philosophy, which, in this century, reduced all the other sciences under its dominion, and of which we have given some account in the preceding sections. The only moral writer among the Greeks, worthy of mention, is Philip, surnamed the Solitary, whose book, entitled *Dioptra*, which consists of a dialogue between the body and the soul, is composed with judgment and elegance, and contains many remarks proper to nourish pious and virtuous sentiments.

The Latin moralists of this age may be divided into two classes, the *scholastics* and *mystics*. The former discoursed about virtue, as they did about truth, in the most unfeeling jargon, and generally subjoined their arid system of morals to what they called their *didactic theology*. The latter treated the duties of morality in a quite different manner; their language was tender, persuasive, and affecting, and their sentiments were often beautiful and sublime; but they taught in a confused and ir-

\* See Du Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 223, 232.—Mabillon, Annal. Benedictin. tom. vi. p. 343, 415, 433.—Gallia Christiana Benedictin. tom. ii. p. 1175.—Matth. Paris, Histor. Major, p. 56.—Petavii Dogmata Theologica, tom. i. lib. i. cap. viii.—Longueval, Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. ix. p. 147.

regular manner, without method or precision, and frequently mixed the dross of Platonism with the pure treasures of celestial truth.

We might also place in the class of moral writers the greatest part of the commentators and expositors of this century, who, laying aside all attention to the signification of the words used by the sacred writers, and scarcely ever attempting to illustrate the truths which they reveal, or the events which they relate, turned, by forced and allegorical explanations, every passage of scripture to practical uses, and drew lessons of morality from every quarter. We could produce many instances of this way of commenting, beside Guibert's Moral Observations on the Book of Job, the Prophecy of Amos, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah.

XIII. Both Greeks and Latins were seized with that enthusiastic passion for dialectical researches, which raged in this century, and were thus rendered extremely fond of captious questions and theological contests; and, at the same time, the love of controversy seduced them from the paths that lead to truth, and involved them in labyrinths of uncertainty and error. The discovery of truth was not, indeed, the great object they had in view; their principal aim was to perplex and embarrass their adversaries, and overwhelm them with an enormous heap of fine spun distinctions, an impetuous torrent of words without meaning, a long list of formidable authorities, and a specious train of fallacious consequences, embellished with railings and invectives. The principal polemic writers among the Greeks were Constantinus Harmenopolus, and Euthymius Zigabenus. The former published a short treatise *de Sectis Hæreticorum*, i. e. concerning the Sects of Heretics. The latter, in a long and laboured work, entitled *Panoplia*, attacked all the heresies and errors that troubled the church; but, not to mention the extreme levity and credulity of this writer, his mode of disputation was highly defective, and all his arguments, according to the wretched method that now prevailed, were drawn from the writings of the ancient doctors, whose authority supplied the place of evidence. Both these authors were sharply censured in a satirical poem composed by Zonaras. The Latin writers were also employed in various branches of religious controversy. Honorius of Autun wrote against certain heresies; and Abelard combated them all. The Jews, whose credit was now extremely low, and whose circumstances were miserable in every respect, were refuted by Gilbert de Castilione, Odo, Peter Alfonsus, Rupert of Duyt, Peter Mauritius, Richard of St. Victor, and Peter of Blois, according to the logic of the times, while Euthymius and several other divines directed their polemic force against the Saracens.

XIV. That contest between the Greeks and Latins, the subject of which has been already mentioned, was still carried on by both parties with the greatest obstinacy and vehemence. The Grecian champions were Euthymius, Nicetas, and others of less renown; while the cause of the Latins was vigorously maintained by Anselm, bishop of Havelberg, and Hugo Etherianus, who eminently distinguished them-

selves by their erudition in this famous controversy.\* Many attempts were made, both at Rome and Constantinople, to reconcile these differences, and heal these divisions; and this union was solicited, in a particular manner, by the emperors of the Comnene family, who expected to draw great advantage from the friendship and alliance of the Latins, toward the support of the Grecian empire, which was at this time in a declining, and almost in a desperate condition. But as the Latins aimed at nothing less than a despotic supremacy over the Greek church, and as, on the other hand, the Grecian bishops could by no means be induced to yield an implicit obedience to the Roman pontiff, or to condemn the measures and proceedings of their ancestors, the negotiations, undertaken for the restoration of peace, widened the breach instead of healing it; and the terms proposed on both sides, but especially by the Latins, exasperated, instead of calming, the resentments and animosities of the contending parties.

XV. Many controversies of inferior moment were carried on among the Greeks, who were extremely fond of disputing, and were scarcely ever without debates upon religious matters. We shall not enter into a circumstantial narration of these theological contests, which would fatigue rather than amuse or instruct; but shall confine ourselves to a brief mention of those which made the greatest noise in the empire. Under the reign of Emanuel Comnenus, whose extensive learning was accompanied with an excessive curiosity, several theological controversies were carried on, in which he himself bore a principal part, and which fomented such discords and animosities among a people already exhausted and dejected by intestine tumults, as threatened their destruction. The first question that exercised the metaphysical talent of this over-curious emperor and his subtle doctors, was this:—in what sense was it, or might it be, affirmed that an incarnate God was at the same time the *offerer* and the *oblation*? When this knotty question had been long debated, and the emperor had maintained, for a considerable time, that solution of it which was contrary to the opinion generally received, he yielded at length, and embraced the popular notion of that unintelligible subject. The consequence of this step was, that many men of eminent abilities and great credit, who had differed from the doctrine of the church upon this article, were deprived of their honours and employments.† What the emperor's opinion of this matter was, we are not satisfactorily informed; and we are equally ignorant of the sentiments adopted by the church in this question. It is highly probable that Emanuel, followed by certain learned doctors, differed from the opinions generally received among the Greeks concerning the Lord's supper, and the *oblation* or sacrifice of Christ in that holy ordinance.

XVI. Some years after this, a still more warm contest arose concerning the sense of these words of Christ, John xiv. 28. 'For

\* See Leo Allatius, *de perpetua Consensione Ecclesie Oriental. et Occident. lib. ii. cap. xi. p. 644.*

† Nicetas Choniates, *Annal. lib. vii. sect. 5.*

my Father is greater than I,' and divided the Greeks into the most bitter and deplorable factions. To the ancient explications of that important passage new illustrations were now added; and the emperor himself, who, from an indifferent prince, had become a wretched divine, published an exposition of that remarkable text, which he obtruded, as the only true sense of the words, upon a council assembled for that purpose, and was desirous of having received as a rule of faith by all the Grecian clergy. He maintained that the words in question related to the flesh that was hidden in Christ, and that was possible, *i. e.* subject to suffering,\* and not only ordered this decision to be engraven on tables of stone in the principal church of Constantinople, but also published an edict, in which capital punishments were denounced against all such as should presume to oppose this explication, or teach any doctrine repugnant to it.† This edict, however, expired with the emperor by whom it was issued; and Andronicus, upon his accession to the imperial throne, prohibited all those contests concerning speculative points of theology, that arose from an irregular and wanton curiosity, and suppressed, in a more particular manner, all inquiry into the subject now mentioned, by enacting the severest penalties against such as should in any way contribute to revive this dispute.‡

XVII. The same theological emperor troubled the church with another controversy concerning the God of Mohammed. The Greek catechisms pronounced an anathema against the Deity worshipped by that false prophet, whom they represented as a *solid* and *spherical Being*;§ for so they translated the Arabian word *elemed*, which is applied in the Koran to the Supreme Being, and which indeed is susceptible of that sense, though it also signifies *eternal*.|| The emperor ordered this anathema to be effaced in the catechism of the Greek church, on account of the high offence it gave to those Mohammedans, who had either been already converted to Christianity, or were disposed to embrace that divine religion, and who were extremely shocked at such an insult offered to the name of God, with whatever restrictions and conditions it might be attended. The Christian doctors, on the other hand, opposed with resolution and vehemence this imperial order. They observed that the anathema, pronounced in the catechism, had no relation to the nature of God in general, or to the true God in particular; and that, on the contrary, it was solely directed against the error of Mohammed, against that phantom of a divinity which he had imagined; for that impostor pretended that the Deity could neither be *engendered* nor *engender*, whereas the Christians adore God the *Father*. After the bitterest disputes concerning this abstruse subject, and various efforts to reconcile the contending parties, the bishops assembled in council consented, though with the utmost difficulty, to trans-

fer the imprecation of the catechism from the God of Mohammed to the pseudo-prophet himself, his doctrine, and his sect.\*

XVIII. The spirit of controversy raged among the Latins, as well as among the Greeks; and various sentiments concerning the sacrament of the Lord's supper were propagated, not only in the schools, but also in the writings of the learned; for, though all the doctors of the church were now exceedingly desirous of being looked upon as enemies to the system of Berenger, yet many of them, and among others† Rupert of Duytz, differed very little from the sentiments of that great man; at least it is certain, that the famous controversy, which had arisen in the church concerning the opinions of Berenger, had still left the manner of Christ's presence in the eucharist undetermined.

Rupert had also religious contests of another nature with Anselm, bishop of Laon, William of Champeaux, and their disciples, who maintained their doctrine when they were no more. The divine will and the divine omnipotence were the subjects of this controversy; and the question debated was, "Whether God *really* *willed*, and *actually produced*, all things that *exist*, or whether there are certain things *whose existence he merely permits*, and whose *production, instead of being the effect of his* *will*, was contrary to it?" The affirmative of the latter part of this question was maintained by Rupert, while his adversaries affirmed that all things were the effects, not only of the divine power, but also of the divine will. This learned abbot was also accused of having taught that the angels were formed out of darkness; that Christ did not administer his body to Judas, in the last supper; and several other doctrines,‡ contrary to the received opinions of the church.

XIX. These and other controversies of a more private kind, which made little noise in the world, were succeeded, about the year 1140, by one of a more public nature, concerning what was called the *Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary*.§ Certain churches in France began, about that time, to celebrate the festival consecrated to this pretended conception, which the English had observed before this period in consequence of the exhortations of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, as some authors report. The church of Lyons was one of the first that adopted this new festival, which no sooner came to the knowledge of St. Bernard, than he severely censured the canons on account of this innovation, and opposed the *Immaculate Conception of the Virgin* with the greatest vigour, as it supposed her being honoured with a privilege which belonged to Christ alone. Upon this a warm contest arose; some siding with the canons of Lyons, and adopting the new festival, while

\* Nicet. Chron. Annales, lib. vii. p. 113—116.

† Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 30.

‡ See the Epistle of Mengoz, published by Martenne, in his Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. i. p. 290.—Jo. Mabillon, Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 19, 42, 168, 261.

§ § The defenders of the *Immaculate Conception* maintained, that the *Virgin Mary* was conceived in the womb of her mother with the same *purity* that is attributed to Christ's conception in her womb.

\* ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΟ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΤΗΡΙΩ ΣΑΡΚΑ.

† Nicetas Choniates, Annal. lib. vii. sect. 6. p. 113.

‡ Nicetas in Andronico, lib. ii. sect. 5. p. 175.

§ ΟΛΟΣΦΑΡΟΣ.

¶ Reland, de religione Mohammedica, lib. ii. sect. 3. p. 142.

others adhered to the sentiments of St. Bernard.\* The controversy, however, notwithstanding the zeal of the contending parties, was carried on, during this century, with a certain degree of decency and moderation. But, in subsequent times, when the Dominicans were established in the academy of Paris, the contest was renewed with the greatest vehemence, and the same subject was debated, on both sides, with the utmost animosity and contention of mind. The Dominicans declared for St. Bernard, while the academy patronised the canons of Lyons, and adopted the new festival.

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### *Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. THE rites and ceremonies used in divine worship, both public and private, were now greatly augmented among the Greeks; and the same superstitious passion for the introduction of new observances, discovered itself in all the eastern churches. The Grecian, Nestorian, and Jacobite pontiffs, who were in any degree remarkable for their credit or ambition, were desirous of transmitting their names to posterity by the invention of some new rite, or by the introduction of some striking change into the method of worship that had hitherto prevailed. This was, indeed, almost the only way left to distinguish themselves in an age when, a due sense of the excellence of genuine religion and substantial piety being almost totally lost, the whole care and attention of an ostentatious clergy, and a superstitious multitude, were employed upon the round of external ceremonies and observances substituted in their place. Thus some attempted, though in vain, to render their names immortal, by introducing a new method of reading or reciting the prayers of the church; others changed the church music; some tortured their inventions to find out some new mark of veneration, that might be offered to the relics and images of the saints; while several ecclesiastics did not disdain to employ their time, with the most serious assiduity, in embellishing the garments of the clergy, and in forming the motions and postures they were to observe, and the looks they were to assume, in the celebration of divine worship.

II. We may learn from the book *de Divinis Officiis*, composed by the famous Rupert, or Robert, of Duytz, what were the rites in use among the Latins during this century, as also the reasons on which they were founded. According to the plan we follow, we cannot here enlarge upon the additions that were made to the doctrinal part of religion. We shall therefore only observe, that the enthusiastic veneration for the Virgin Mary, which had been hitherto carried to such an excessive height, increased now instead of diminishing, since her dignity was at this time considerably augmented by the new fiction or invention relating to

her immaculate conception; for, though St. Bernard and others opposed with vigour this chimerical notion, yet their efforts were counteracted by the superstitious fury of the deluded multitude, whose judgment prevailed over the counsels of the wise; so that, about the year 1138, there was a solemn festival instituted in honour of this pretended conception, though we neither know by whose authority it was established, nor in what place it was first celebrated.\*

#### CHAPTER V.

##### *Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. THE Greek and eastern churches were infested with fanatics of different kinds, who gave them much trouble, and engaged them in the most warm and violent contests. Some of these fanatics professed to believe in a double trinity, rejected wedlock, abstained from flesh, treated with the utmost contempt the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, as also all the various branches of external worship; placed the essence of religion in internal prayer alone, and maintained, as it is said, that an evil being, or genius, dwelt in the breast of every mortal, and could be thence expelled by no other method than by perpetual supplications to the Supreme Being. The founder of this enthusiastical sect is said to have been a person called Lucopetrus. His chief disciple was named Tychicus, who corrupted, by false and fanatical interpretations, several books of the sacred writings, and particularly the Gospel according to St. Matthew.† It is well known, that enthusiasts of this kind, who were rather wrong headed than vicious, lived among the Greeks and Syrians, especially among the monks, for many ages before this period, and also in this century. The accounts, indeed, that have been given of them, are not in all respects to be depended upon: and there are several circumstances, which render it extremely probable, that many persons of eminent piety, and zeal for genuine Christianity, were confounded by the Greeks with these enthusiasts, and ranked in the list of heretics, merely on account of their opposing the vicious practices and the insolent tyranny of the priesthood, and their treating with derision that motley spectacle of superstition which was supported by public authority. In Greece, and in all the eastern provinces, these fanatics were distinguished by the general and individious appellation of *Massalians* or *Euchites*,‡ as

\* Mabillon, *Annal. Benedet.* tom. vi. p. 327, 412.—*Galila Christiana*, tom. i. p. 1198.

† Euthemii Triumph. de Secta Massalianorum, in Jac. Tolla Insignibus Itineris Italici, p. 106—125.

‡ *Massalians* and *Euchites* are denominations that signify the same thing, and denote, one in the Hebrew, and the other in the Greek language, *persons who pray*. A sect, under this denomination, arose during the reign of the emperor Constantius, about the year 361, founded by certain monks of Mesopotamia, who dedicated themselves wholly to prayer, and held many of the doctrines attributed by Mosheim to the Massalians of the twelfth century. See August. de *Hæres.* cap. lvii. and Theod. *Hæret.* Fab. lib. iv. Epiphanius speaks of another sort of Massalians still more ancient, who were mere Gentiles, acknowledged several gods, yet adored only one

\* Sti. Bernardi Epistola 174.—Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 135.—Mabillon, *Annal. Benedet.* tom. vi. p. 327.—Dom. Colonia, *Hist. Lit. de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 233.

the Latins comprehended all the adversaries of the Roman pontiff under the general terms of *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*. It is, however, necessary to observe, that the names above-mentioned were very vague and ambiguous in the way they were applied by the Greeks and the Orientals, who made use of them to characterize, without distinction, all such as complained of the multitude of useless ceremonies, and of the vices of the clergy, without any regard to the difference that existed between such persons in point of principles and morals. In short, the righteous and the profligate, the wise and the foolish, were equally comprehended under the name of Massalians, whenever they opposed the raging superstition of the times, or considered true and genuine piety as the essence of the Christian character.

II. From the sect now mentioned, that of the *Bogomiles* is said to have proceeded, whose founder Basilus, a monk by profession, was committed to the flames at Constantinople, under the reign of Alexius Comnenus, after all attempts to make him renounce his errors had proved ineffectual. By the accounts we have of this unhappy man, and of the errors he taught, it appears sufficiently evident, that his doctrine resembled, in a striking manner, the religious system of the ancient Gnostics and Manichæans; though, at the same time, the Greeks may have falsified his tenets in some respects. Basilus maintained, that the world and all animal bodies were formed, not by the Deity, but by an evil demon, who had been cast down from heaven by the Supreme Being; whence he concluded, that the body was no more than the prison of the immortal spirit, and that it was, therefore, to be enervated by fasting, contemplation, and other exercises, that so the soul might be gradually restored to its primitive liberty; for this purpose also wedlock was to be avoided, with many other circumstances which we have often had occasion to explain and repeat in the course of this history. It was in consequence of the same principles, that this unfortunate enthusiast denied the *reality* of Christ's body (which, like the Gnostics and Manichæans, he considered only as a phantom,) rejected the law of Moses, and maintained that the body, upon its separation by death, returned to the malignant mass of matter, without either the prospect or possibility of a future resurrection to life and felicity. We have so many examples of fanatics of this kind in the records of ancient times, and also in the history of this century, that it is by no means to be wondered, that some one of them, more enterprising than the rest, should found a sect among the Greeks. The name of this sect was taken from the *divine mercy*, which its members are said to have incessantly implored; for the word *bogomilus*, in the Mæsan language, signifies *calling out for mercy from above*.\*

whom they called *Almighty*, and had oratories in which they assembled to pray and sing hymns. This resemblance between the Massalians and the Esenes, induced Scaliger to think that Epiphanius confounded the former with the latter.

\* See the *Alexias* of Anna Comnena, lib. xv. p. 384, edit. Venet.—Zonare *Annales*, lib. xviii. p. 336.—Jo. Christ. Wolf. *Historia Bogomilorum*, published

III. The Latin sects were yet more numerous than those of the Greeks; and this will not appear at all surprising to such as consider the state of religion in the greatest part of the European provinces. As the prevalence of superstition, the vices of the clergy, the luxury and indolence of the pontiffs and bishops, the encouragement of impiety by the traffic of *indulgences*, increased from day to day, several pious, though weak men, who had the true religion of Christ at heart, easily perceived that it was in a most declining and miserable state, and therefore attempted a reformation in the church, in order to restore Christianity to its primitive purity and lustre. But the knowledge of these good men did not equal their zeal; nor were their abilities in any proportion to the grandeur of their undertakings. The greater part of them were destitute both of learning and judgment, and, being involved in the general ignorance of the times, very imperfectly understood the holy scriptures, whence Christianity was derived, and by which alone the abuses that had been mingled with it could be reformed. In a word, few of these well-meaning Christians were equal to an attempt so difficult and arduous as an universal reformation; and the consequence of this was, that while they avoided the reigning abuses, they fell into others that were as little consistent with the genius of true religion, and carried the spirit of censure and reformation to such an excessive length, that it degenerated often into the various extravagances of enthusiasm, and engendered a number of new sects, that became a new dishonour to the Christian cause.

IV. Among the sects that troubled the Latin church during this century, the principal place is due to the *Cathari* or *Catharists*, whom we have already had occasion to mention.\* This numerous faction, leaving their first residence, which was in Bulgaria, spread themselves throughout almost all the European provinces, where they occasioned much tumult and disorder; but their fate was unhappy; for, wherever they were found, they were put to death with the most unrelenting cruelty.† Their religion resembled the doctrine of the Manichæans and Gnostics, on which account they commonly received the denomination of the former, though they differed in many respects from the genuine and primitive Manichæans. They all indeed agreed in the following points of doctrine, *viz.* That matter was the source of all evil; that the creator of this world was a being distinct from the Supreme Deity; that Christ was neither clothed with a real body, nor could be properly said to have been born, or to have seen death; that human bodies were the production of the evil

at Wittenberg, in 1712.—Sam. Andræ Diss. de Bogomilis in Jo. Voigtii Bibliotheca Historiæ Hæresiologicalæ, tom. i. part. ii. p. 121. Chr. Aug. Heumannii Dissertat. de Bogomilis.

\* See Cent. III. Part II. Ch. V. sect. xviii.; but principally, for the Catharists here mentioned, see Cent. XI. Part II. Ch. V. sect. i.

† See the account given of this unhappy and persecuted sect by Charles Plessis d'Argente, in his *Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus*, tom. i. in which, however, several circumstances are omitted.

principle, and were extinguished without the prospect of a new life; and that baptism and the Lord's Supper were useless institutions, destitute of all efficacy and power. They exhorted all who embraced their doctrine to a rigorous abstinence from animal food, wine, and wedlock, and recommended to them in the most pathetic terms the most severe acts of austerity and mortification. They moreover treated with the utmost contempt all the books of the Old Testament, but expressed a high degree of veneration for the New, particularly for the four Gospels; and, to pass over many other peculiarities in their doctrine, they maintained, that human souls, endued with reason, were shut up by an unhappy fate in the dungeons of mortal bodies, from which they could only be delivered by fasting, mortification, and continence of every kind.\*

V. These principles and tenets, though they were adopted and professed by the whole sect, were variously interpreted and modified by different doctors. Hence the Catharists were divided into various sects, which, however, on account of the general persecution in which they were involved, treated each other with candour and forbearance, disputed with moderation, and were thus careful not to augment their common calamity by intestine feuds and animosities. Out of these factions arose two leading and principal sects of the Catharists, which were distinguished from the rest by the number of their respective followers, and the importance of their differences. The one, borrowing hints from the Manichæan system, maintained the doctrine of two eternal Beings, from whom all things are derived, the God of light, who was also the father of Jesus Christ, and the principle of darkness, whom they considered as the author of the material world. The other believed in one eternal principle, the father of Christ, and the Supreme God, by whom also they held that the *first matter* was created; but they added to this, that the *evil being*, after his rebellion against God and his fall from heaven, arranged this original matter according to his fancy, and divided it into four elements, for the production of this visible world. The former maintained, that Christ, clothed with the celestial body, descended into the womb of the Virgin, and derived no part of his substance from her; while the latter taught, that he first assumed a real body in the womb of Mary, though not *from* her.† The sect which held the doctrine of two principles, derived the name of Albanenses from the place where their spiritual ruler resided; and this sect was subdivided into two, of which one took the name of Balazinansa, bishop of Verona, and the other that of John

de Lugio, bishop of Bergamo. The sect which adhered to the doctrine of one eternal principle was also subdivided into the congregation of Baioli, the capital town of the province, and that of Concoregio, or Concorezzo. The Albigenses, who were settled in France, belonged to the church or congregation of Baioli.\*

VI. In the internal constitution of the church that was founded by this sect, there were many rules and principles of a singular nature, which we pass over in silence, as they would oblige us to enter into a detail inconsistent with our intended brevity. The government of this church was administered by bishops; and each of these had two vicars, of whom one was called the elder son, and the other the younger, while the rest of the clergy and doctors were comprehended under the general denomination of deacons.† The veneration, which the people had for the clergy in general, and more especially for the bishops and their spiritual sons, was carried to a height that almost exceeds credibility. The discipline observed by this sect was so excessively rigid and austere, that it was practicable only by a certain number of robust and determined fanatics. But that such as were not able to undergo this discipline might not, on that account, be lost to the cause, it was thought necessary, in imitation of the ancient Manichæans, to divide this sect into two classes, one of which was distinguished by the title of the *consolati* (comforted,) while the other received only the denomination of *confederates*. The former gave themselves out for persons of consummate wisdom and extraordinary piety, lived in perpetual celibacy, and led a life of the severest mortification and abstinence, without allowing themselves the enjoyment of any worldly comfort. The latter, if we except a few particular rules which they observed, lived like the rest of mankind, but at the same time were obliged by a solemn agreement they had made with the church, and which, in Italian, they called *la convenenza*, to enter before their death, in their last moments, if not sooner, into the class of the comforted, and to receive the *consolamentum*, or form of inauguration, by which they were introduced into that fanatical order.‡

VII. A much more rational sect was that which was founded about the year 1110 in Languedoc and Provence, by Peter de Bruys,

\* Raineri Sacheri Summa de Catharis et Leonistis, in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. v. p. 1761, 1768.—Peregrinus Priscarius in Muratori's Antiq. Ital. mediæ ævi, tom. v. p. 93, who exhibits, in a sort of table, these different sects, but erroneously places the Albigenses, who were a branch of the Baiolenses, in the place of the Albanenses; this, perhaps, may be an error of the press. The opinions of these Baiolenses or Bagnolenses, may be seen in the Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanae, which Limborch published with his History of the Inquisition. The account, however, which we have in this history (Book i. ch. viii.) of the opinions of the Albigenses, is by no means accurate. A great variety of causes have contributed to involve in darkness and perplexity the distinctive characters of these different sects, whose respective systems we cannot enlarge upon at present.

† See Sacheri Summa de Catharis, p. 1766.

‡ For a further account of this sect, see the writers mentioned before, and particularly the Codex Inquisitionis Tolosanae.

\* Beside the works which will be soon mentioned, see the Disputatio inter Catholicum et Patrum, published by Martenne, in his Thesaur. Anecdot. tom. v. p. 1703, as also Bonacursi Manifestatio Heresis Catharorum, in d'Acheri's Spicileg. tom. i. p. 208.

† See Bern. Moneta, Summa adversus Catharos et Waldenses, published at Rome in the year 1743, by Thom. August. Riccini, who prefixed to it a dissertation concerning the Cathari, that is by no means worthy of the highest encomiums. Moneta was no mean writer for the time in which he lived. See lib. i. p. 2 et 5. lib. ii. p. 247. &c.

who made the most laudable attempts to reform the abuses and to remove the superstitions that disfigured the beautiful simplicity of the Gospel; but, after having engaged in his cause a great number of followers, during a laborious ministry of twenty years, he was burned at St. Giles', in the year 1130, by an enraged populace, instigated by the clergy, whose traffic was in danger from the enterprising spirit of this reformer. The whole system of doctrine, which this unhappy martyr, whose zeal was not without a considerable mixture of fanaticism, taught to the *Petrobrussians*, his disciples, is not known; it is however certain, that the five following tenets made a part of his system: 1. That no persons were to be baptized before they had the full use of their reason; 2. that it was an idle superstition to build churches for the service of God, who will accept a sincere worship wherever it is offered; and that therefore such churches as had already been erected were to be destroyed; 3. that the crucifixes, as instruments of superstition, deserved the same fate; 4. that the real body and blood of Christ were not exhibited in the eucharist, but were merely represented in that holy ordinance by figures and symbols; 5. and, lastly, that the oblations, prayers, and good works of the living, could in no respect be advantageous to the dead.\*

VIII. This innovator was succeeded by another, who was an Italian by birth, and whose name was Henry, the founder and parent of the sect called *Henricians*. It was, no doubt, a rare thing to see a person, who was at the same time monk and hermit, undertaking to reform the superstitions of the times; yet such was the case of Henry, who, leaving Lausanne, a city in Switzerland, travelled to Mans, and being banished thence, removed successively to Poitiers, Bourdeaux, and the neighbouring places, and at length to Toulouse in the year 1147, exercising his ministerial function with the utmost applause from the people, and declaiming with vehemence and fervour against the vices of the clergy, and the superstitions they had introduced into the Christian church. At Toulouse he was warmly opposed by St. Bernard, by whose influence he was overpowered, notwithstanding his popularity, and obliged to save himself by flight. But being seized by a prelate in his retreat, he was carried before pope Eugenius III., who presided in person at a council then assembled at Rheims, and who, in consequence of the accusations brought against Henry, committed him, in the year 1148, to a close prison, where he soon ended his days.† We have no satisfactory account of the doctrines of this reformer. We merely know that he rejected the baptism of infants, censured with severity the corrupt and licen-

tious manners of the clergy, treated the festivals and ceremonies of the church with the utmost contempt, and held clandestine assemblies, in which he explained and inculcated the novelties he taught. Several writers affirm, that he was the disciple of Peter de Bruys; but I cannot see upon what evidence or authority this assertion is grounded.\*

IX. While the Henricians were propagating their doctrines in France, an illiterate man, called Tanquelin, or Tanquelm, arose in Brabant about the year 1115, excited the most deplorable commotions at Antwerp, and drew after him a most numerous sect. If the accounts given of this heresiarch by his adversaries may be at all depended upon, he must either have been a monstrous impostor, or an outrageous madman. For he walked in public with the greatest solemnity, pretended to be God, or, at least, the Son of God, ordered daughters to be ravished in presence of their mothers, and committed himself the greatest disorders. Such are the enormities that are attributed to Tanquelm; but they are absolutely incredible, and cannot be true.‡ What seems most worthy of credit in this matter is, that this new teacher had imbibed the opinions and spirit of the Mystics; that he treated with contempt the external worship of God, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the rite of baptism; and held clandestine assemblies to propagate more effectually his visionary notions. But as, beside all this, he inveighed against the clergy, like the other heretics already mentioned, and declaimed against their vices with vehemence and intrepidity, it is probable that these blasphemies were falsely charged upon him by a vindictive priesthood. Be that as it may, the fate of Tanquelm was unhappy; for he was assassinated by an ecclesiastic in a cruel manner. His sect, however, did not perish with him, but acquired strength and vigour under the ministry of his disciples, until it was at length extinguished by the famous St. Norbert, the founder of the order of *Præmonstratenses*, or *Premontrés*.§

X. In Italy, Arnold of Brescia, a disciple of Abelard, and a man of extensive erudition and remarkable austerity, but of a turbulent and impetuous spirit, excited new troubles and commotions both in church and state. He was, indeed, condemned in the Lateran council, A. D. 1139, by Innocent II., and obliged to retire into Switzerland; but, upon the death of that pontiff, he returned into Italy, and raised at Rome, during the pontificate of Eu-

\* That Henry was the disciple of Peter de Bruys is not at all probable; since, not to insist upon other reasons, the latter could not bear the sight of a cross, and in all likelihood owed his death to the multitude of crucifixes which he had committed to the flames; whereas the former, when he entered into any city, appeared with a cross in his hand, which he bore as a standard, to attract the veneration of the people. See Mabillon, *Analecta*, p. 316.

† *Epistola Trajectens. Ecclesie ad Fredericum Episcopum de Tanchelmo*, in *Seb. Tengnagelii Collectio Veterum Monumentorum*, p. 363.—*Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 98.*—*Argentor. Collectio Judicior. de novis Erroribus*, tom. i. p. 10.

‡ Louis Hugo, *Vie de S. Norbert*, liv. ii. p. 126.—*Chrys. Vander Sterre Vita S. Norberti*, cap. xxxvi. p. 161. et *Polye. de Heitogh, ad illam Annotationes*, p. 357.

\* See *Petri Venerab. Lib. contra Petrobrussianos in Bibliotheca Cluniensi*, p. 117.—*Mabillon. Annal. Benedict. tom. iv. p. 346.*—*Basnage, Histoire des Eglises Reformées*, period iv. p. 140.

† *Gesta Episcoporum Cenomanens. in Mabillon, Analect. veter. ævi. p. 315.*—*Gautridi Epistola in lib. vi. Vita Sti. Bernardi*, tom. ii. Op. Bernardi, p. 1307.—*Matth. Paris, Histor. Maj. p. 71.*—*Mabillon, Præf. ad Opera Bernardi sect. vii. et Annal. Benedict. tom. vi. p. 319, 320, 331.*



genius III. several tumults and seditions among the people, who changed, by his instigation, the government of the city, and insulted the persons of the clergy in the most disorderly manner. He fell however at last a victim to the vengeance of his enemies; for, after various turns of fortune, he was seized in the year 1155, by a prefect of the city, by whom he was crucified, and afterwards burned to ashes. This unhappy man seems not to have adopted any doctrines inconsistent with the spirit of true religion; and the principles upon which he acted were chiefly reprehensible from their being carried too far, applied without discernment or discretion, and executed with a degree of vehemence which was both imprudent and criminal. Having perceived the discords and animosities, the calamities and disorders that sprang from the overgrown opulence of the pontiffs and bishops, he was persuaded that the interests of the church and the happiness of nations in general required, that the clergy should be divested of all their worldly possessions, of all their temporal rights and prerogatives. He, therefore, publicly maintained, that the treasures and revenues of popes, bishops, and monasteries, ought to be resigned and transferred to the supreme rulers of each state, and that nothing was to be left to the ministers of the gospel but a spiritual authority and a subsistence drawn from tithes, and from the voluntary oblations and contributions of the people.\* This violent reformer, in whose character and manners there were several points worthy of esteem, drew after him a great number of disciples, who derived from him the denomination of *Arnoldists*, and, in succeeding times, evinced the spirit and intrepidity of their leader, as often as any opportunities of reforming the church seemed to be offered to their zeal.

XI. Of all the sects that arose in this century, not one was more distinguished by the reputation it acquired, by the multitude of its votaries, and the testimony which its bitterest enemies bore to the probity and innocence of its members, than that of the Waldenses, so called from their parent and founder Peter Waldus. This sect was known by different denominations. From the place where it first appeared, its members were called *The poor men of Lyons*,† or *Lyonsists*, and, from the wooden shoes which its doctors wore, and a certain mark that was imprinted upon these

shoes, they were called *Insabbatati*, or *Sabbatati*.\* The origin of this famous sect was as follows: Peter, an opulent merchant of Lyons, surnamed *Valdensis*, or *Validisius*, from *Vaux*, or *Waldun*, a town in the marquisate of Lyons, being extremely zealous for the advancement of true piety and Christian knowledge, employed a certain priest,‡ about the year 1160, in translating from Latin into French the Four Gospels, with other books of Holy Scripture, and the most remarkable sentences of the ancient doctors, which were so highly esteemed in this century. But no sooner had he perused these sacred books with a proper degree of attention, than he perceived that the religion, which was now taught in the Roman church, differed totally from that which was originally inculcated by Christ and his apostles. Shocked at this glaring contradiction between the doctrines of the pontiffs and the truths of the Gospel, and animated with a pious zeal for promoting his own salvation, and that of others, he abandoned his mercantile vocation, distributed his riches among the poor,‡ and forming an association with other pious men, who had adopted his sentiments and his turn of devotion, he began, in the year 1180, to assume the quality of a public teacher, and to instruct the multitude in the doctrines and precepts of Christianity. The archbishop of Lyons, and the other rulers of the church in that province, opposed, with vigour, this new doctor in the exercise of his ministry. But their opposition was unsuccessful; for the purity and simplicity of that religion which these good men taught, the spotless innocence that shone forth in their lives and actions, and the noble contempt of riches and honours manifested in the whole of their conduct and conversation, appeared so engaging to all such as had any sense of true piety, that the number of their disciples and followers increased from day to day.§ They accordingly formed

\* See Steph. de Borbone, de septem donis Spiritus Sancti, in Echard and Quefit, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Dominicanorum, tom. i. p. 192.—Anonym. Tractatio de Hæresi Pauperum de Lugduno, in Martene's Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. v. p. 1777.

† This priest was called Stephanus de Evisa.

‡ It was on this account that the Waldenses were called *Pauperes de Lyons*, or *Poor Men of Lyons*.

§ Certain writers give different accounts of the origin of the Waldenses, and suppose they were so called from the valleys in which they had resided for many ages before the birth of Peter Waldus. But these writers have no authority to support this assertion; and, besides this, they are amply refuted by the best historians. I do not mean to deny, that there were in the valleys of Piedmont, long before this period, a set of men who differed widely from the opinions adopted and inculcated by the church of Rome, and whose doctrine resembled, in many respects, that of the Waldenses; all that I maintain is, that these inhabitants of the valleys above-mentioned are to be carefully distinguished from the Waldenses, who, according to the unanimous voice of history, were originally inhabitants of Lyons, and derived their name from Peter Waldus, their founder and chief. ¶ We may venture to affirm the contrary, with the learned Beza and other writers of note; for it seems evident from the best records, that Valdis derived his name from the true Waldenses of Piedmont, whose doctrine he adopted, and who were known by the names of *Fauldois* and *Valdenses*, before he or his immediate followers existed. If the Waldenses had derived their name from any eminent teacher, it would probably have been from Valdo, who was remarkable for the purity of

\* See Otto Frising, de Gestis Frederici I. lib. ii. cap. xx.—S. Bernardus, Epist. 195, 196, tom. i. p. 187.—Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris, tom. ii. p. 157.—Muratori, Droits de l'Empire sur l'Etat Ecclesiastique, p. 137.—Henr. de Bunau, Vita Frederici I. p. 41.—Chamflépid, Nouveau Diction. Hist. Crit. tom. i. p. 482.

† They were called *Leonists* from *Leona*, the ancient name of Lyons, where their sect took its rise. The more eminent persons of that sect manifested their progress toward perfection by the simplicity and meanness of their external appearance. Hence, among other things, they wore wooden shoes, which in the French language are termed *sabots*, and had imprinted upon these shoes the sign of the cross, to distinguish themselves from other Christians; and it was on these accounts that they acquired the denomination of *sabbatati* and *insabbatati*. See Du Fresne, Glossarium Latin. medi. Ævi, vi. voce *Sabbatati*. Nicol. Emmerici Directorium Inquisitorum, Part III. N. 112, &c

religious assemblies, first in France, and afterwards in Lombardy, whence they propagated their sect through the other provinces of Europe with incredible rapidity, and with such invincible fortitude, that neither fire nor sword, nor the most cruel inventions of merciless persecution, could damp their zeal, or entirely ruin their cause.\*

XII. The attempts of Peter Waldus and his followers were neither employed nor intended to introduce new doctrines into the church, nor to propose new articles of faith to Christians. All they aimed at was, to reduce the form of ecclesiastical government, and the lives and manners both of the clergy and people, to that amiable simplicity, and that primitive sanctity, which had characterised the apostolic ages, and which appear so strongly recommended in the precepts and injunctions of the divine author of our holy religion. In consequence of this design, they complained that the Roman church had degenerated, under Constantine the Great, from its primitive purity and sanctity. They denied the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, and maintained that the rulers and ministers of the church were obliged, by their vocation, to imitate the poverty of the apostles, and to procure for themselves a subsistence by the work of their hands. They considered every Christian, as in a certain measure qualified and authorized

his doctrine in the IXth century, and was the contemporary and chief counsellor of Berengarius. But the truth is, that they derive their name from the valleys in Piedmont, which in their language are called *Vaux*; hence *Vaudois*, their true name; hence Peter, or (as others call him) John of Lyons, was called in Latin, *Valdus*, because he had adopted their doctrine; and hence the term *Valdenses* and *Waldenses*, used by those who write in English or Latin, in the place of *Vaudois*. The bloody inquisitor Reinerus Sacco, who exerted such a furious zeal for the destruction of the Waldenses, lived but about 80 years after Valdus of Lyons, and must therefore be supposed to have known whether he was the real founder of the Valdenses or Leonists; and yet it is remarkable that he speaks of the Leonists (mentioned by Dr. Mosheim in this section, as synonymous with Waldenses) as a sect that had flourished above 500 years, and even mentions authors of note, who make their antiquity remount to the apostolic age. See the account given of Sacco's book by the Jesuit Gretser, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. I know not upon what principle Dr. Mosheim maintains, that the inhabitants of the valleys of Piedmont are to be carefully distinguished from the Waldenses; and I am persuaded, that whoever will be at the pains to read attentively the 2d, 25th, 26th, and 27th chapters of the first book of Leger's *Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudaises*, will find this distinction entirely groundless.—When the Papists ask us, where our religion was before Luther, we generally answer, *in the Bible*; and we answer well. But to gratify their taste for tradition and human authority, we may add to this answer, *and in the valleys of Piedmont*.

\* See the following ancient writers, who have given accounts of the sect in question; namely, Sathon Summa contra Valdenses.—Moneta Summa contra Catharos et Valdenses, published by Riccini.—Tr. de Haresi Pauperum de Lugduno, published by Martenne, in his *Thesaur. Anecdot.* tom. v. p. 177.—Plichthorius contra Valdenses, t. xxv. B. Max. Patr.—Add to these authors, Jo. Paul Perrin, *Histoire des Vandois*, published at Geneva in 1619.—Jo. Leger, *Histoire Generale des Eglises Vandoises*, liv. i. ch. xiv. p. 156.—Usher, de successione Ecclesiarii Occidentis, cap. viii. p. 209.—Jac. Basnage, *Histoire des Eglises Reformees*, tom. i. period iv. p. 329.—Thom. August. Riccini, *Dissertat. de Valdensibus*, prefixed to his edition of the *Summa Monetae*, p. 36.—Boulay, *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 292.

to instruct, exhort, and confirm the brethren in their Christian course, and demanded the restoration of the ancient penitential discipline of the church, *i. e.* the expiation of transgressions by prayer, fasting, and alms, which the new-invented doctrine of indulgences had nearly abolished. They at the same time affirmed, that every pious Christian was qualified and entitled to prescribe to penitents the kind and degree of satisfaction or expiation that their transgressions required; that confession made to a priest was by no means necessary, since the humble offender might acknowledge his sins and testify his repentance to any true believer, and might expect from such the counsels and admonitions that his case and circumstances demanded. They maintained, that the power of delivering sinners from the guilt and punishment of their offences belonged to God alone; and that indulgences, in consequence, were the criminal inventions of sordid avarice. They looked upon the prayers, and other ceremonies that were instituted in behalf of the dead, as vain, useless, and absurd, and denied the existence of departed souls in an intermediate state of purification, affirming, that they were immediately, upon their separation from the body, received into heaven, or sent down to hell. These and other tenets of a like nature composed the system of doctrine propagated by the Waldenses. Their rules of practice were extremely austere; for they adopted, as the model of their moral discipline, the sermon of Christ on the mount, which they interpreted and explained in the most rigorous and literal manner, and consequently prohibited and condemned in their society all wars, and suits of law, all attempts toward the acquisition of wealth, the infliction of capital punishments, self-defence against unjust violence, and oaths of all kinds.\*

XIII. The government of the church was committed, by the Waldenses, to bishops,† presbyters, and deacons; for they acknowledged that these three orders were instituted by Christ himself. But they deemed it absolutely necessary, that all these orders should resemble exactly the apostles of the divine Saviour, and be, like them, illiterate, poor, destitute of all worldly possessions, and furnished with some laborious trade or vocation, in order to gain by constant industry their daily subsistence.‡ The laity were divided into two classes; one of which contained the *perfect*, and the other the *imperfect* Christians. The former spontane-

\* See the *Codex Inquisitionis Tolosane*, published by Limborch, as also the *Summa Monetae contra Valdenses*, and the other writers of the Waldensian history. Though these writers are not all equally accurate, nor perfectly agreed about the number of doctrines that entered into the system of this sect, yet they are nearly unanimous in acknowledging the sincere piety and exemplary conduct of the Waldenses, and show plainly enough that their intention was not to oppose the doctrines which were universally received among Christians, but only to revive the piety and manners of the primitive times, and to combat the vices of the clergy, and the abuses that had been introduced into the worship and discipline of the church.

† The bishops were also called *majorales* or *elders*.  
‡ The greatest part of the Waldenses gained their livelihood by weaving; hence the whole sect, in some places, were called the *sect of weavers*.

ously divested themselves of all worldly possessions, manifested their extreme poverty in the wretchedness of their apparel, and emaciated their bodies by frequent fasting. The latter were less austere, and approached the method of living generally received, though they abstained, like the graver sort of anabaptists in later times, from all appearance of pomp and luxury. It is, however, to be observed, that the Waldenses were not without their intestine divisions. Such as resided in Italy differed considerably in their opinions from those who dwelt in France and the other European countries. The former considered the church of Rome as the church of Christ, though much corrupted and sadly disfigured; they also acknowledged the validity of its seven sacraments, and solemnly declared that they would ever continue in communion with it, provided that they might be allowed to live as they thought proper, without molestation or restraint. The latter affirmed, on the contrary, that the church of Rome had apostatized from Christ, was deprived of the Holy Spirit, and was, in reality, the *whore of Babylon* mentioned in the Revelations of St. John.\*

XIV. Beside these famous sects, which made a great noise in the world, and drew after them multitudes from the bosom of a corrupt and superstitious church, there were religious factions of less importance, which arose in Italy, and more especially in France, though they seem to have expired soon after their birth. † In Lombardy, which was the principal residence of the Italian heretics, there sprang up a singular sect, known (for what reason I cannot tell) by the denomination of *Pasaginians*, and also by that of the *circumcised*. Like the other sects already mentioned, they had the utmost aversion to the dominion and discipline of the church of Rome; but they were, at the same time, distinguished by two religious tenets, which were peculiar to themselves. The first was a notion, that the observance of the law of Moses, in every thing except the offering of sacrifices, was obligatory upon Christians; in consequence of which they circumcised their followers, abstained from those meats, the use of which was prohibited under the Mosaic economy, and celebrated the Jewish sabbath. The second tenet that distinguished this sect was advanced in opposition to the doctrine of three persons in the divine nature; for the Pasaginians maintained that Christ was no more than the first and purest creature of God; nor will their adoption of this opinion seem very surprising, if we consider the prodigious number of Arians that were scattered throughout Italy long before this period. ‡

\* *Moneta: Summa contra Catharos et Valdenses*, p. 406, &c. They seem to have been also divided in their sentiments concerning the possession of worldly goods, as appears from the accounts of Stephanus de Borbone, apud Echard Script. Dominican. tom. i. This writer divides the Waldenses into two classes, the poor men of Lyons, and the poor men of Lombardy. The former rejected and prohibited all sorts of possessions; the latter looked upon worldly possessions as lawful. This distinction is confirmed by several passages of other ancient authors.

† For an account of these obscure sects, see Stephanus de Borbone, apud Echard Script. Dominican. tom. i.

‡ See F. Bonacursi Manifestatio heresis Catharo-

XV. A sect of fanatics, called *Caputiati*, from a singular kind of cap that was the badge of their faction, infested the province of Burgundy, the diocese of Auxerre, and several other parts of France, in all which places they excited much disturbance among the people. They wore upon their caps a leaden image of the Virgin Mary; and they declared publicly, that their purpose was to level all distinctions, to abrogate magistracy, to remove all subordination among mankind, and to restore that primitive liberty, that natural equality, which were the inestimable privileges of the first mortals. Hugo, bishop of Auxerre, attacked these disturbers of human society in the proper manner, employing against them the force of arms, instead of arguments.\*

The sect of the *apostolics*, whom St. Bernard opposed with such bitterness and fury, and who were so called, as that zealous abbot himself acknowledged, because they professed to exhibit, in their lives and manners, the piety and virtues of the holy apostles, were very different from the audacious heretics now mentioned. They were a clownish set of men, of the lowest birth, who gained their subsistence by bodily labour; yet, as soon as they formed themselves into a sect, they drew after them a multitude of adherents of all ranks and orders. Their religious doctrine, as St. Bernard confesses, was free from error, and their lives and manners were irreproachable and exemplary; but they were reprehensible on account of the following peculiarities: 1. They held it unlawful to take an oath; 2. They suffered their hair and their beards to grow to an enormous length, so that their aspect was inexpressibly extravagant and savage; 3. They preferred celibacy to wedlock, and called themselves the *chaste brethren and sisters*; notwithstanding which, 4. Each man had a spiritual sister with him, after the manner of the apostles, with whom he lived in a domestic relation, lying in the same chamber with her, though not in the same bed. †

XVI. In the council assembled at Rheims, in the year 1148, in which pope Eugenius III. presided, a gentleman of the province of Bretagne, whose name was Eon, and whose brain was undoubtedly disordered, was condemned for pretending to be the Son of God. Having heard, in the form that was used for exorcising malignant spirits, these words pronounced, *per Eum, qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos*, he concluded, from the resemblance between the word *Eum* and his name, that he was the person who was to come and judge both the quick and the dead. This poor man should rather have been delivered over to the physicians than placed in the list of heretics. He ended his days in a miserable prison, and left a considerable number of followers and adherents, whom persecution and death in the most dreadful forms could not persuade to abandon

rum, in d'Acheri's Spicileg. Veter. Scriptor. tom. i. p. 211. Gerard. Bergamensis contra Catharos et Pasagios, in Lud. Anton. Muratorii Antiq. Ital. mediæ ævi, tom. v. p. 151.

\* Jacques Le Beuf, Mémoires sur l'Histoire d'Auxerre, tom. i. p. 317.

† St. Bernardi Serm. lxxv. in Canticum, tom. iv. op. p. 1495, edit. Mabillon.

his cause, or to renounce an absurdity, which one would think could never have gained credit, but in a receptacle of lunatics.\* This re-

\* Matth. Paris, *Historia Major*, p. 68.—Guil. Neubrigensis, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, lib. i. p. 50.—Boulay, *Historia Acad. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 241.

markable example is sufficient to show, not only the astonishing credulity of the stupid multitude, but also how far even the rulers of the church were destitute of judgment, and unacquainted with true and genuine religion.

## THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

### PART I.

#### THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

##### CHAPTER I.

###### *Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THOUGH the successors of Genghiz-Khan, the powerful emperor of the Tartars, or rather of the Mogols, had carried their victorious arms through a great part of Asia, and, having reduced China, India, and Persia, under their yoke, had involved in many calamities and sufferings the Christian assemblies which were established in those vanquished lands,\* yet we learn from the best accounts, and the most respectable authorities, that in China, and in the northern parts of Asia, the Nestorians continued to have a flourishing church, and a great number of adherents. The emperors of the Tartars and Mogols had no great aversion to the Christian religion. It even appears from authentic records, that several kings and grandees of those nations had either been instructed in the doctrines of the Gospel by their ancestors, or were converted to Christianity by the ministry and exhortations of the Nestorians.† But the religion of Mohammed, which was so calculated to flatter the passions of men, gradually infected these noble converts, opposed with success the progress of the Gospel, and at length so effectually triumphed over it, that not the least remains of Christianity were to be perceived in the courts of those eastern princes.

II. The Tartars having made an incursion into Europe, in the year 1241, and having laid waste, with the most unrelenting and savage barbarity, Hungary, Poland, Silesia, and the adjacent countries, the Roman pontiffs thought it incumbent upon them to endeavour to calm the fury, and soften the ferocity, of these new and formidable enemies. For this purpose, in 1245, Innocent IV. sent an embassy to the Tartars, which consisted of Dominican and

Franciscan friars.\* In 1274, Abaca, the emperor of that fierce nation, sent ambassadors to the council of Lyons, which was holden under the pontificate of Gregory X.† About four years after this, pope Nicolas III. paid the same compliment to Coblai, emperor of the whole Tartar nation, to whom he sent a solemn embassy of Franciscan monks, with a view to render that prince propitious to the Christian cause. The last expedition of this kind that we shall mention at present, was that of Johannes à Monte Corvino, who, in 1289, was sent with other ecclesiastics to the same emperor, by Nicolas IV., and who carried letters to the Nestorians from that zealous pontiff. This mission was far from being useless, since those spiritual ambassadors converted many of the Tartars to Christianity, engaged considerable numbers of the Nestorians to adopt the doctrine and discipline of the church of Rome, and erected churches in various parts of Tartary and China. In order to accelerate the propagation of the Gospel among these darkened nations, Johannes à Monte Corvino translated the New Testament and the Psalms of David into the language of the Tartars.‡

III. The Roman pontiffs employed their most zealous and assiduous efforts in the support of the Christian cause in Palestine, which was now in a most declining, or rather in a desperate state. They had learned, by a delightful experience, how much these Asiatic wars, undertaken from a principle, or at least carried on under a pretext of religion, had contributed to fill their coffers, augment their authority, and cover them with glory; and therefore they had nothing more at heart than the renewal and prolongation of these sacred expe-

\* See Wadding, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. p. 116, 149, 179, 256.

† Wadding, tom. iv. p. 35. tom. v. p. 128. See particularly an accurate and ample account of the negotiations between the pontiffs and the Tartars, in the *Historia Ecclesiastica Tartarorum*, already mentioned.

‡ Odor. Raynaldus, *Annal. Ecclesiastic.* tom. xiv. *ad annum* 1278, sect. 17, and *ad annum* 1289, sect. 59.—Pierre Bergeron, *Traite des Tartares*, chap. xi. See also the writers mentioned in the *Historia Ecclesiastica Tartarorum*.

\* Gregor. Abulfaraj, *Historia Dynastiar.* p. 281, edit. Pocock.

† See Marc. Paul. Venet. de *Regionibus Oriental.* lib. i. c. iv. lib. ii. c. vi.—Haytho the Armenian's *Histor.* Oriental cap. xix. p. 35, cap. xxiii. p. 39, cap. xxiv.—Jos. Sim. Assemani *Biblioth. Orient. Vatic.* tom. iii. part ii. See particularly the Ecclesiastical History of the Tartars, published in Latin at Hehstadt, in 1741, under my auspices and inspection.

ditions.\* Innocent III., therefore, sounded the charge; but the greatest part of the European princes and nations were deaf to the voice of the holy trumpet. At length, however, after many unsuccessful attempts in different countries, a body of French nobles entered into an alliance with the republic of Venice, and set sail for the east with an army that was far from being formidable. The event of this new expedition was by no means answerable to the expectations of the pontiff. The French and Venetians, instead of steering their course toward Palestine, sailed directly for Constantinople, and, in 1203, took that imperial city by storm, with a design of restoring to the throne Isaac Angelus, who implored their succour against the violence of his brother Alexius, the usurper of the empire. In the following year a dreadful sedition was raised at Constantinople, in which the emperor Isaac was put to death, and his son, the young Alexius, was strangled by Alexius Ducas, the ringleader of this furious faction.† The account of this atrocity no sooner came to the ears of the chiefs of the crusade, than they made themselves masters of Constantinople for the second time, dethroned and drove from the city the tyrant Ducas, and elected Baldwin, count of Flanders, emperor of the Greeks. This proceeding was a source of new divisions; for, about two years after this, the Greeks resolved to set up, in opposition to this Latin emperor, one of their own nation, and elected, for that purpose, Theodore Lascaris, who chose Nice in Bithynia for the place of his imperial residence. From this period until the year 1261, two emperors reigned over the Greeks; one of their own nation, who resided at Nice; and the other of Latin or French extraction, who lived at Constantinople, the ancient metropolis of the empire. But, in the year 1261, the face of things was changed by the Grecian emperor, Michael Palæologus, who, by the valour and stratagems of his general, Cæsar Alexius, became master of Constantinople, and forced the Latin emperor to abandon that city, and save himself by flight into Italy. Thus fell the empire of the Franks at Constantinople, after a duration of fifty-seven years.‡

IV. Another sacred expedition was undertaken in 1217, under the pontificate of Honorius III., by the confederate arms of Italy and Germany. The allied army was commanded in chief by Andrew, king of Hungary, who was joined by Leopold, duke of Austria, Louis

of Bavaria, and several other princes. After the lapse of a few months, Andrew returned into Europe. The remaining chiefs carried on the war with vigour, and, in 1220, made themselves masters of Damietta, the strongest city in Egypt; but their prosperity was of a short duration; for, in the following year, their fleet was totally ruined by that of the Saracens, their provisions were cut off, and their army reduced to the greatest difficulties. This irreparable loss, being followed by that of Damietta, blasted all their hopes, and removed the flattering prospects which their successful beginnings had presented to their expectations.\*

V. The legates and missionaries of the court of Rome still continued to animate the languishing zeal of the European princes in behalf of the Christian cause in Palestine, and to revive the spirit of crusading, which so many calamities and disasters had almost totally extinguished. At length, in consequence of their lively remonstrances, a new army was raised, and a new expedition undertaken, which excited great expectations, and drew the attention of Europe so much the more, as it was generally believed that this army was to be commanded by the emperor Frederic II. That prince had, indeed, obliged himself by a solemn promise, made to the Roman pontiff, to undertake the direction of this enterprise; and what added a new degree of force to this engagement, and seemed to render the violation of it impossible, was the marriage that he had contracted, in 1223, with Jolanda, daughter of John, count of Brienne, and king of Jerusalem; by which alliance that kingdom was to be added to his European dominions. Notwithstanding these inducements, he postponed his voyage under various pretences, and did not set out until the year 1228, when, after having been excommunicated on account of his delay, by the incensed pontiff Gregory IX,† he followed with a small train of attendants the troops, who expected, with the most anxious impatience, his arrival in Palestine. No sooner did he land in that disputed kingdom, than, instead of carrying on the war with vigour, he turned all his thoughts toward peace, and, without consulting the other princes and chiefs of the crusade, concluded, in 1229, a treaty of peace, or rather a truce of ten years, with Malec-al-Camel, sultan of Egypt. The principal article of this treaty was, that Frederic should be put in possession of the city and kingdom of Jerusalem. This condition was immediately executed; and the emperor,

\* This is remarked by the writers of the twelfth century, who soon perceived the avaricious and despotic views of the pontiffs, in the encouragement they gave to the crusades. See Matth. Paris, Hist. Major.

† The learned authors of the Universal History call this ringleader, by mistake, John Ducas.

‡ See, for a full account of this empire, Du Fresne, Histoire de l'Empire de Constantinople sous les Empereurs Francois; in the former part of which we find the Histoire de la Conquete de la Ville de Constantinople par les Francois, written by Godfrey de Ville-Harduin, one of the French chiefs concerned in the expedition. This work makes a part of the Byzantine history. See also Claude Fontenay, Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. x. Gunther Monachi Roman. captæ a Latinis Constantinopolæ, in Henr. Canisii Lect. Antiq. tom. iv.—Innocent III. Epistol. a Baluzio edit.

\* See Jac. de Vitriaco, Histor. Oriental. et Marinus Saanus. Secret. fidel. Crucis inter Bongarsianos de sacris bellis Scriptores, seu Gesta Dei per Francos.

† This papal excommunication, which was drawn up in the most outrageous and indecent language, was so far from exciting Frederic to accelerate his departure for Palestine, that it produced no effect upon him at all, and was, on the contrary, received by him with the utmost contempt. He defended himself by his ambassador at Rome, and showed that the reasons of his delay were solid and just, and not mere pretences, as the pope had pretended. At the same time, he wrote a remarkable letter to Henry III. king of England, in which he complained of the insatiable avarice, the boundless ambition, the perfidious and hypocritical proceedings of the Roman pontiffs. See Fleury, Histoire Ecclesiastique, liv. lxxix. tom. xvi.

entering the city with great pomp, accompanied by a numerous train, placed the crown upon his head with his own hands; and, having thus settled affairs in Palestine, he returned without delay into Italy, to appease the discords and commotions which the vindictive and ambitious pontiff had excited in his absence. Notwithstanding all the reproaches that were cast upon the emperor by the pope and his creatures, this expedition was, in reality, the most successful of any that had been undertaken against the infidels.\*

VI. The expeditions that followed this were less important, and also less successful. In 1239, Theobald VI.,† count of Champagne and king of Navarre, set out from Marseilles for the Holy Land, accompanied by several French and German princes, as did also, in the following year, Richard, earl of Cornwall, brother to Henry III., king of England. The issue of these two expeditions by no means corresponded with the preparations which were made to render them successful. The former failed through the influence of the emperor's‡ ambassadors in Palestine, who renewed the truce with the Moslems; while on the other hand, a considerable body of Christians were defeated at Gaza, and such as escaped the carnage returned into Europe. This fatal event was principally occasioned by the discord that reigned between the templars and the knights of St. John of Jerusalem. Hence it came to pass, that the arrival of Richard, which had been industriously retarded by Gregory, and which had revived, in some degree, the hopes of the vanquished, was ineffectual to repair their losses; and all that this prince could do, was to enter, with the consent of the allies, into a truce, upon as good conditions as the declining state of their affairs would admit. This truce was accordingly concluded with the sultan of Egypt in 1241; after which Richard immediately set sail for Europe.§

VII. The affairs of the Christians in the east daily declined. Intestine discords and ill-conducted expeditions had reduced them almost to extremities, when Louis IX., king of France, who was canonised after his death, and is still worshipped with the utmost devotion, attempted their restoration. It was in consequence of a vow, which this prince had made in the year 1243, when he was seized with a dangerous illness, that he undertook this arduous task; and, in the execution of it, he set sail for

Egypt with a formidable army and a numerous fleet, from a notion that the conquest of this province would enable him to carry on the war in Syria and Palestine with greater facility and success. The first attempts of the zealous monarch were crowned with victory; for Damietta, that famous Egyptian city, yielded to his arms; but the smiling prospect was soon changed, and the progress of the war presented one uniform scene of calamity and desolation. The united horrors of famine and pestilence overwhelmed the royal army, whose provisions were cut off by the Mohammedans, in 1250; Robert, earl of Artois, the king's brother, having surprised the Saracen army, and, through an excess of valour, pursued them too far, was slain in the engagement; and, a few days after, Louis, two of his brothers,\* and the greatest part of his army, were made prisoners in a bloody action, after a bold and obstinate resistance. This valiant monarch, who was endowed with true greatness of mind, and who was extremely pious, though after the manner that prevailed in this age of superstition and darkness, was ransomed at an immense price;‡ and, after having spent about four years in Palestine, returned into France, in 1254, with a handful of men,‡ the miserable remains of his formidable army.

VIII. No calamities could deject the courage or damp the invincible spirit of Louis; nor did he look upon his vow as fulfilled by what he had already done in Palestine. He therefore resolved upon a new expedition, fitted out a formidable fleet, with which he set sail for Africa, accompanied by a splendid train of princes and nobles, and proposed to begin in that part of the world his operations against the infidels, that he might either convert them to the Christian faith, or draw from their treasures the means of carrying on more effectually the war in Asia. Immediately after his arrival upon the African coast, he made himself master of the fort of Carthage; but this success was soon followed by a fatal change in his affairs. A pestilential disease broke out in the fleet, in the harbour of Tunis, carried off the greatest part of the army, and seized, at length, the monarch himself, who fell a victim to its rage, on the 25th of August, 1270.§

\* Alphonso, earl of Poitiers, and Charles, earl of Anjou.

† The ransom, which, together with the restoration of Damietta, the king was obliged to pay for his liberty, was 800,000 gold bezants, and not 80,000, as Collier erroneously reckons. This sum, which was equal then to 500,000 livres of French money, would, in our days, amount to the value of 4,000,000 of livres, that is, to about 170,000l. sterling.

‡ Of 2,800 illustrious knights, who set out with Louis from France, there remained about 100 when he sailed from Palestine. See Joinville's *Hist. de S. Louis*.

§ Among the various histories that deserve to be consulted for a more ample account of this last crusade, the principal place is due to the *Histoire de S. Louis IX. du nom, Roy de France*, écrite par Jean Sr. de Joinville, enrichie de nouvelles Dissertations et Observations Historiques, par Charles du Fresne, Paris, 1688. See also Filleau de la Chaise, *Histoire de S. Louis*, Paris, 1688, 2 vols. 8vo.—Menconis *Chronicon*, in *Ant. Matthei Analect. veteris ævi*, tom. iii.—Luc. Wadding, *Annales Minorum*, tom. iv.—Boutlay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. iii.—Pierre Claude Fontenay, *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. xi.

\* See the writers who have composed the history of the holy wars, and of the life and exploits of Frederic II. See also Muratori's *Annales Italiae*, and the various authors of the Germanic History.

† Dr. Mosheim calls him, by a mistake, Theobald V., unless we attribute this fault to an error of the press.

‡ This was Frederic II. who had a great party in Palestine, and did not act in concert with the clergy and the creatures of his bitter enemy, Gregory IX.; from which division the Christian cause suffered much.

§ All these circumstances are accurately related and illustrated by the learned George Christ. Gebaurens, in his *Historia Ricardi Imperatoris*, lib. i. p. 34.—It appears, however, by the *Epistola Petri de Vineis*, that Richard was created, by Frederic, his lord lieutenant of the kingdom of Jerusalem; and this furnishes a probable reason why Gregory used all possible means to retard Richard's voyage.

Louis was the last of the European princes that embarked in the holy war; the dangers and difficulties, the calamities and disorders, and the enormous expenses that accompanied each crusade, disgusted the most zealous, and discouraged the most intrepid promoters of these fanatical expeditions. In consequence of this, the Latin empire in the east declined apace, notwithstanding the efforts of the Roman pontiffs to maintain and support it; and in the year 1291, after the taking of Ptolemais by the Mohammedans, it was entirely overthrown.\* It is natural to inquire into the true causes that contributed to this unhappy revolution in Palestine; and these causes are evident. We must not seek for them either in the councils or in the valour of the infidels, but in the dissensions that reigned in the Christian armies, in the profligate lives of those who called themselves the champions of the cross, and in the ignorance, obstinacy, avarice, and insolence, of the pope's legates.

IX. Christianity had not yet tamed the ferocity, or conquered the pagan superstitions and prejudices, that still prevailed in some of the western provinces. Among others, the Prussians, a fierce and savage nation, retained the idolatrous worship of their ancestors with the most obstinate perseverance; nor did the arguments and exhortations employed by the ecclesiastics, who were sent from time to time to convert them, produce the least effect upon their stubborn and intractable spirits. The brutish firmness of these Pagans induced Conrad, duke of Masovia, to have recourse to more forcible methods than reason and argument, in order to effect their conversion. For this purpose, he addressed himself, in the year 1230, to the knights of the Teutonic order of St. Mary, (who, after their expulsion from Palestine, had settled at Venice,) and engaged them, by pompous promises, to undertake the conquest and conversion of the Prussians. The knights accordingly arrived in Prussia, under the command of Herman de Saltza, and, after a most cruel and obstinate war of fifty years with that resolute people, obliged them to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Teutonic order, and to embrace the Christian faith.† After having established Christianity, and fixed their own dominion in Prussia, these booted apostles made several incursions into the neighbouring countries, and particularly into Lithuania, where they pillaged, burned, massacred, and ruined all before them, until they forced the inhabitants of that miserable province to profess a feigned submission to the Gospel, or rather to the furious and unrelenting missionaries, by whom it was propagated in a manner so contrary to its divine maxims, and to the benevolent spirit of its celestial author.‡

\* Ant. Matthei *Analecta veteris avi*, tom. v.—Jac. Echardi *Scriptor. Dominican.* tom. i.—*Imola in Dantem*, in *Muratorii Antiq. Italicæ medii ævi*, tom. i.

† See Matthei *Analecta vet. avi*, tom. iii. p. 18. tom. v. p. 684—689.—*Chronicon Prussiae*, by Peter of Duisburg.—*Hartknock's History of the Prussian Church*, written in the German language, book i. chap. i., and *Antiquitates Prussiae*, Diss. xiv.—*Baluzii Miscellanea*, tom. vii.—*Wadding's Annales Minor.* tom. iv.—*Histoire de Pologne par Solignac*, tom. ii.

‡ Beside the authors mentioned in the preceding

X. In Spain the cause of the Gospel gained ground. The kings of Castile, Leon, Navarre, and Arragon, waged perpetual war with the Saracen princes, who held still under their dominion the kingdoms of Valencia, Granada, and Mureia, together with the province of Andalusia; and this war was carried on with such success, that the Saracen dominion declined apace, and was daily reduced within narrower bounds, while the limits of the church were extended on every side. The princes who chiefly contributed to this happy revolution were Ferdinand, king of Leon and Castile, who, after his death, obtained a place in the calendar, his father Alphonso IX., king of Leon, and James I., of Arragon.\* The last, more especially, distinguished himself eminently by his fervent zeal for the advancement of Christianity; nor so sooner had he made himself master of Valencia, in the year 1236, than he employed, with the greatest pains and assiduity, every possible method of converting to the faith his Arabian subjects, whose expulsion would have been an irreparable loss to his kingdom. For this purpose he ordered the Dominicans, of whose ministry he principally made use in this salutary work, to learn the Arabic tongue; and he founded public schools at Majorca and Barcelona, in which a considerable number of youths were educated in a manner that might enable them to preach the Gospel in that language. When these pious efforts were found to be ineffectual, pope Clement IV. exhorted the king to drive the Mohammedans out of Spain. The obsequious prince attempted to follow the counsel of the inconsiderate pontiff; in the execution of which, however, he met with great difficulty, from the opposition of the Spanish nobles on one hand, and from the obstinacy of the Moors on the other.‡

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the Calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THE accounts we have already given of the Tartarian conquests, and of the unhappy issue of the crusades, will be sufficient to suggest a lively idea of the melancholy condition to which the Christians were reduced in Asia; and, if the Saracens had been infected with the same odious spirit of persecution that possessed the crusaders, there would not perhaps have remained a single Christian in that part of the world. But, though these infidels were chargeable with various crimes, and had frequently treated the Christians in a rigorous and injurious manner, they looked with horror upon those scenes of persecution, which the Latins exhibited as the exploits of heroic piety, and considered it as the highest and most atrocious mark of injustice and cruelty, to force unhappy men, by fire and sword, to abandon their religious principles, or to put them to death merely because they refused to change their

note, see Ludwig's *Reliquie Manuscriptorum omnis avi*, tom. i.

\* See Joh. Ferreras, *History of Spain*, vol. iv.

‡ See Goldes' *History of the Expulsion of the Moors*, in his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. 1.

opinions. After the destruction of the kingdom of Jerusalem, many of the Latins remained still in Syria, and, retiring into the dark and solitary recesses of mount Libanus, lived there in a savage manner, and lost, by degrees, all sense of religion and humanity, as appears from the conduct and characters of their descendants, who still inhabit the same uncultivated wilds, and who seem almost entirely destitute of all knowledge of God and religion.\*

II. The Latin writers of this age complain in many places of the growth of infidelity, of daring and licentious writers, some of whom publicly attacked the doctrines of Christianity, while others went so far as atheistically to call in question the perfections and government of the Supreme Being. These complaints, however they might have been exaggerated in some respects, were yet far from being entirely destitute of foundation; and the superstition of the age was too naturally adapted to create a number of infidels and libertines, among men who had more capacity than judgment, more wit than solidity. Persons of this character, when they fixed their attention only upon that absurd system of religion, which the Roman pontiffs and their dependants exhibited as the true religion of Christ, and maintained by the odious influence of bloody persecution, were, for want of the means of being better instructed, unhappily induced to consider the Christian religion as a fable, invented and propagated by greedy and ambitious priests, in order to fill their coffers, and to render their authority respectable. The philosophy of Aristotle, which flourished in all the European schools, and was looked upon as the very essence of right reason, contributed much to support this delusion, and to nourish a proud and presumptuous spirit of infidelity. This quibbling and intricate philosophy led many to reject some of the most evident and important doctrines both of natural and revealed religion, such as the doctrine of a divine providence governing the universe, the immortality of the soul, the scriptural account of the origin of the world, and various points of less moment. Not only were these doctrines rejected, but the most pernicious errors were industriously propagated in opposition to them, by a set of Aristotelians, who were extremely active in gaining proselytes to their impious jargon.†

\* A certain tribe called Derusi, or Drusi, who inhabit the recesses of the mounts Liban and Anti Liban, pretend to a descent from the ancient Franks, who were once masters of Palestine. This derivation is, indeed, doubtful. It is however certain, that there still remain in these countries descendants of those whom the holy war led from Europe into Palestine, though they do very little honour to their ancestors, and have nothing of Christians but the name.

† See St. Thomas Summa contra Gentes, and Bernardi Moneti Summa contra Catharos et Waldenses. The latter writer, in the work now mentioned, combats, with great spirit, those enemies of Christianity who appeared in his time. In the fourth chapter of the fifth book, p. 416, he disputes, in an ample and copious manner, against those who affirmed, that the soul perished with the body; refutes, in the eleventh chapter, p. 477, those Aristotelian philosophers, who held, that the world had existed from all eternity, and would never have an end; and, in the fifteenth chapter, p. 554, he attacks those, who, despising the authority of the sacred writings, deny the existence of human liberty, and

III. If the accusations brought against Frederic II. by pope Gregory IX. deserve any credit, that prince may be ranked among the most inveterate and malignant enemies of the Christian religion, since he was charged by the pontiff with having said, that the world had been deceived by three impostors, Moses, Christ, and Mohammed.‡ This charge was answered by a solemn and public profession of his faith, which the emperor addressed to all the kings and princes of Europe, to whom also had been addressed the accusation brought against him. The charge, however, was founded upon the testimony of Henry Raspon, landgrave of Thuringia, who declared that he had heard the emperor pronounce the abominable blasphemy above mentioned.§ It is, after all, difficult to decide with sufficient evidence upon this point. Frederic, who was extremely passionate and imprudent, may, perhaps, in a fit of rage, have suffered some such expression as this to escape his reflection; and this is rendered probable by the company he frequented, and the number of learned Aristotelians who were always about his person, and might suggest matter enough for such impious expressions, as that now under consideration. It was this affair that gave occasion, in after-times, to the invention of that fabulous account,¶ which supposes the detestable book concerning the three impostors to have been composed by the emperor himself, or by Peter de Vineis, a native of Capua, a man of great credit and authority, whom that prince had chosen for his prime minister, and in whom he placed the highest confidence.

maintain, that all things, and even the crimes of the wicked, are the effects of an absolute and irresistible necessity. Add to these authors, Tempier's Indiculus Errorum, qui a nonnullis Magistris Lutetie publice privatimque docebantur, Anno 1277, in Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima, tom. xxv. p. 233; as also Boulay's Hist. Acad. Paris, tom. iii. p. 43, and Gerard du Bois' Hist. Eccles. Paris, tom. ii. p. 501. The tenets of these doctors will, no doubt, appear of a surprising nature, for they taught, "that there was only one intellect among all the human race; that all things were subject to absolute fate or necessity; that the universe was not governed by a divine providence; that the world was eternal and the soul mortal;" and they maintained these and the like monstrous errors, by arguments drawn from the philosophy of Aristotle. But, at the same time, to avoid the just resentment of the people, they held up as a buckler against their adversaries, that most dangerous and pernicious distinction between theological and philosophical truth, which has been since used, with the most cunning and bad faith, by the more recent Aristotelians of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. "These things," say they, (as we learn from Tempier, who was bishop of Paris), "are true in philosophy, but not according to the catholic faith." Vera sunt hec secundum philosophiam, non secundum fidem catholicam.

\* Matthew Paris, Historia Major, p. 408, 459.—Petr. de Vineis Epistol. lib. i.

† Herm. Gigantii Flores Temporum, p. 126.—Chr. Fred. Ayrmann, Sylloge Anecdotor. tom. v. p. 639.

‡ See Casim. Oudin Comment. de Scriptor. Ecclesiasticis, tom. iii. p. 66.—Alb. Henr. de Sallegre, Memoires d'histoire et de Literature, tom. i. part. i. p. 386.

§ The book entitled Liber de iii. Impostoribus, sive Tractatus de Vanitate Religionum, is really a book which had no existence at the time that the most noise was made about it, and was spoken of by multitudes before it had been seen by any one person. Its supposed existence was probably owing to an impious saying of Simon Tournay, doctor of divinity in the university of Paris in the thirteenth



## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the state of Learning and Philosophy during this Century.*

I. THE Greeks, amidst the dreadful calamities, discords, and revolutions, that distracted and perplexed their unhappy country, had neither that spirit, nor that leisure, which are necessary for the culture of the arts and sciences. Yet, under all these disadvantages, they retained a certain portion of their former spirit, and did not entirely abandon the cause of learning and philosophy, as appears from the writers that arose among them during this century. Their best historians were Nicetas Choniates, Georgius Acropolita, Gregorius Pachymeres, and Joel, whose Chronology is yet extant. We learn from the writings of Gregory Pachymeres, and Nicephorus Blennida, that the Peripatetic philosophy was not without its admirers among the Greeks, though the Platonic was most in vogue. The greatest part of the Grecian philosophers, following the example of the later Platonists, whose works were the subject of their constant meditation, were inclined to reduce the wisdom of Plato and the subtleties of the Stagirite into one system, and to reconcile, as well as they could, their jarring principles. It is not necessary to exhibit a list of those authors, who wrote the lives and discourses of the saints, or distinguished themselves in the controversy with the Latin church, or of those who employed their learned labours in illustrating the canon law of the Greeks. The principal Syrian writer, which this cen-

century, which amounts to this: "That the Jews were seduced out of their senses by Moses, the Christians by Jesus, and the Gentiles by Mohammed." This, or some expressions of a similar kind, were imputed to the emperor Frederic, and other persons, perhaps without any real foundation; and the imaginary book to which they have given rise, has been attributed by different authors to Frederic, to his chancellor Peter de Vineis, to Alphonso, king of Castile, to Boccace, Poggio, the Arcetins, Pomponace, Machiavel, Erasmus, Ocimum, Servetus, Rabelais, Giordano Bruno, Campanella, and many others. In a word, the book was long spoken of before any such work existed; but the rumour that was spread abroad encouraged some profligate traders in brazenness to compose, or rather compile, a bundle of miserable rhapsodies, under the famous title of the Three Impostors, in order to impose upon such as are fond of these pretended rarities. Accordingly, the *Spacio della Bestia Triomphante* of Giordano Bruno, and a wretched piece of impiety called the *Spirit of Spinoza*, were the ground work of materials from which these hireling compilers, by modifying some passages, and adding others, drew the book which now passes under the name of the Three Impostors, of which I have seen two copies in manuscript, but no printed edition. See La Monnoye's Dissertation sur le Livre des Trois Imposteurs, published at Amsterdam in 1745, at the end of the fourth volume of the *Menagianna*. See also an answer to this Dissertation, which was impudently exposed to the public eye, in 1716, from the press of Scheurleer at the Hague, and which contains a fabulous story of the origin of the book in question. Whoever is desirous of a more ample and a very curious account of this matter, will find it in the late Prosper Marchand's *Dictionnaire Historique*, vol. II. at the article *Imposteurs*.

tury produced, was Gregory Abul-Faraj, primate of the Jacobites, a man of true genius and universal learning, who was a judicious divine, an eminent historian, and a good philosopher.\* George Elmacin, who composed the history of the Saracens, was also a writer of no mean reputation.

II. The sciences carried a fairer aspect in the western world, where every branch of erudition was cultivated with assiduity and zeal, and, in consequence, flourished with increasing vigour. The European princes had learned, by a happy experience, how much learning and the arts contribute to the grandeur and happiness of a nation; and therefore they invited into their dominions learned men from all parts of the world, nourished the arts in their bosoms, excited the youth to the love of letters, by crowning their progress with the most noble rewards, and encouraged every effort of genius, by conferring, upon such as excelled, the most honorable distinctions. Among these patrons and protectors of learning, the emperor, Frederic II. and Alphonso X. king of Leon and Castile (two princes as much distinguished by their own learning, as by the encouragement they granted to men of genius,) acquired the highest renown, and rendered their names immortal. The former founded the academy of Naples, had the works of Aristotle translated into Latin, assembled about his person all the learned men whom he could engage by his munificence to repair to his court, and gave other undoubted proofs of his zeal for the advancement of the arts and sciences.† The latter obtained an illustrious and permanent renown by several learned produc-

\* See Bayle's Dictionary, at the article *Abulpharage*; as also Jos. Simon, *Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Vatican. tom. II. caput. Alii. p. 244.

† *Abulpharagus*, or *Abul-Faraj*, was a native of Malatia, a city in Armenia, near the source of the river Euphrates, and acquired a vast reputation in the east, on account of his extensive erudition. He composed an *Abridgment of Universal History*, from the beginning of the world to his own times, which he divided into ten parts or dynasties. The first comprehends the history of the ancient patriarchs from Adam to Moses. The second, that of Joshua and the other judges of Israel. The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth, contain the history of the kings of Israel, of the Chaldean princes, of the Persian Magi, and of the Grecian monarchs. The seventh relates to the Roman history; the eighth to that of the Greek emperors of Constantinople. In the ninth he treats of the Arabian princes; and in the tenth of the Moguls. He is more to be depended upon in his history of the Saracens and Tartars, than in his accounts of other nations. The learned Dr. Edward Pocock translated this work into Latin, and published his translation in 1663-4, with a supplement, which carries on the history of the oriental princes, where *Abul-Faraj* left it. The same learned translator had obliged the public, in 1650, with an abridgment of the ninth dynasty, under the following title: "*Specimen Historiæ Arabum, sive Gregorii Abulpharagi Malatiensis de Origine et Moribus Arabum succincta Narratio.*"

† *Bonlay, Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. III. p. 115. *Giannonne, Historia di Napoli*, tom. II. p. 497. Add to these the observations of Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Latin. mediæ ævi*, tom. II. p. 612.

tions, but more especially by his famous Astronomical tables.\* In consequence then of the protection that was given to the sciences in this century, academies were erected almost in every city; peculiar privileges of various kinds were granted to the youth that frequented them; and these learned societies acquired, at length, the form of political bodies; that is to say, they were invested with a certain jurisdiction, and were governed by their own laws and statutes.

III. In the public schools or academies that were founded at Padua, Modena, Naples, Capua, Toulouse, Salamanca, Lyons, and Cologne, the whole circle of science was not taught, as in our times. The application of the youth, and the labours of their instructors, were limited to certain branches of learning; and thus the course of academical education remained imperfect. The academy of Paris, which surpassed all the rest, both with respect to the number and abilities of its professors, and the multitude of students by whom it was frequented, was the first learned society which extended the sphere of education, received all the sciences into its bosom, and appointed masters for every branch of erudition. Hence it was distinguished, before any other academy, with the title of an university, to denote its embracing the whole body of science; and, in process of time, other schools of learning were ambitious of forming themselves upon the same model, and of being honoured with the same title. In this famous university, the doctors were divided into four colleges or classes, according to the branches of learning they professed; and these classes were called, in after-times, faculties. In each of these faculties, a doctor was chosen by the suffrages of his colleagues, to preside during a fixed period in the society; and the title of dean was given to those who successively filled that eminent office.† The head of the university, whose inspection and jurisdiction extended to all branches of that learned body, was dignified with the name of chancellor; and that high and honourable place was filled by the bishop of Paris, to whom an assistant was afterwards joined, who shared the administration with him, and was invested with an extensive authority.‡ The college set apart for the study of divinity was first erected and endowed, in the year 1250, by an opulent and pious man, whose name was Robert de Sorbonne, (a particular friend and favourite of St. Louis,) whose name was adopted, and is still retained by that theological society.§

\* Nic. Antonii Bibliotheca vetus Hispan. lib. viii. c. v. p. 217. Jo. de Ferreras, Histoire d'Espagne, tom. iv. p. 347.

† This arrangement was executed about the year 1260. See Du Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 557, 564.

‡ See Herm. Conringii Antiquitates Academicæ, a work, however, susceptible of considerable improvements. The important work mentioned in the preceding note, and which is divided into six volumes, deserves to be principally consulted in this point, as well as in all others that relate to the history and government of the university of Paris; add to this, Claud. Hemeræi Liber de Academiâ Parisiensi, qualis primo fuit in insula et episcoporum scholis, Lutet. 1637. in 4to.

§ See Du Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris tom. iii. p.

IV. Such as were desirous of being chosen professors in any of the faculties or colleges of this university, were obliged to submit to a long and tedious course of probation, and to suffer the strictest examinations, and to give, during several years, undoubted proofs of their learning and capacity, before they were received in the character of public teachers. This severe discipline was called the academical course; and it was wisely designed to prevent the number of professors from multiplying beyond measure, and also to prevent such as were destitute of erudition and abilities from assuming an office, which was justly looked upon as of high importance. They who had satisfied all the demands of this academical law, and had gone through the formidable trial with applause, were solemnly invested with the dignity of professors, and were saluted masters with a certain round of ceremonies, that were used in the societies of illiterate tradesmen, when their company was augmented by a new candidate. This vulgar custom had been introduced, in the preceding century, by the professors of law in the academy of Bologna; and, in this century, it was transmitted to that of Paris, where it was first practised by the divinity-colleges, and afterwards by the professors of physic and of the liberal arts. In this account of the trial and installation of the professors of Paris, we may perceive the origin of what we now call academical degrees, which, like all other human institutions, have miserably degenerated from the wise ends for which they were at first appointed, and grow more insignificant from day to day.\*

V. These public institutions, consecrated to the advancement of learning, were attended with remarkable success; but that branch of erudition, which we call humanity or polite literature, derived less advantage from them than the other sciences. The industrious youth either applied themselves entirely to the study of the civil and canon laws, which was a sure path to preferment, or employed their labours in philosophical researches, in order to the attainment of a shining reputation, and of the applause that was lavished upon such as were endowed with a subtle and metaphysical genius. Hence arose the bitter complaints of the pontiffs and other bishops, of the neglect and decline of the liberal arts and sciences; and hence also the zealous, but unsuccessful efforts they used to turn the youth from jurisprudence and philosophy, to the study of humanity and philology.† Notwithstanding all this, the thirteenth century produced several writers, who were very far from being contemptible, such as William Brito,‡ Walter

223.—Du Fresnoy's Annotations upon the Life of St. Louis, written by Joinville, p. 36.

\* Beside the writers above mentioned, see Jo. Chr. Hutterus, de Gradibus Academicis.—Just. Hen. Bohner, Pref. ad Jus Canonicum, p. 14.—Aut. Wood, Antiqu. Oxoniens. tom. i. p. 21.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. ii. p. 256, 682, &c.

† Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iii. p. 265, where there is an epistle of Innocent III., who seems to take this matter seriously to heart.—Aut. Wood, Antiqu. Oxon. tom. i. p. 124.—Imola in Dantem, in Muratori's Antiqu. Ital. mediæ Ævi, tom. i. p. 1362.

‡ See Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres, t. xvi. p. 255.

Mapes,\* Matthew of Vendosme, Alain de l'Isle,† Guntherus, James of Vitri, and several others, who wrote with ease, and were not altogether destitute of elegance. Among the historians, the first place is due to Matthew Paris, a writer of the highest merit, both in point of knowledge and prudence, to whom we may add Roderic Ximenes, Rigord,‡ Vincent of Beauvais, Robert of St. Marino,§ Martinus, a native of Poland, Gervase of Tilbury,|| Conrad of Lichtenau, and William Nangius, whose names are worthy of being preserved from oblivion. The writers who have laboured to transmit to posterity the lives and exploits of the saints, have rather related the superstitions and miseries of the times, than the actions of those holy men. Among these biographers, James of Vitri, mentioned above, makes the greatest figure; he also composed a History of the Lombards, that is full of insipid and trifling stories.¶

VI. Roger Bacon,\*\* John Balbi, and Robert Capito, with other learned men, whose number, however, was inconsiderable, applied themselves to the study of Greek literature. The Hebrew language and theology were much less cultivated; though it appears that Bacon and Capito, already mentioned, and Raymond Martin, author of an excellent treatise, entitled, *Pugio Fidei Christianæ*, or, *The Dagger of the Christian Faith*, were extremely well versed in that species of erudition. Many of the Spaniards, and more particularly the Dominican friars, made themselves masters of the Arabian learning and language, as the kings of Spain had charged the latter with the instruction and conversion of the Jews and Saracens who resided in their dominions.†† As to the Latin grammarians, the best of them were extremely barbarous and insipid, and equally destitute of taste and knowledge. To be con-

vinced of this, we have only to cast an eye upon the productions of Alexander de Villa Dei, who was looked upon as the most eminent of them all, and whose works were read in almost all the schools from this period until the sixteenth century. This pedantic Franciscan composed, in the year 1240, what he called a *Doctrinale*, in Leonine verse, full of the most wretched quibbles, and in which the rules of grammar and criticism are delivered with the greatest confusion and obscurity, or, rather, are covered with impenetrable darkness.

VII. The various systems of philosophy that were in vogue before this century, lost their credit by degrees, and submitted to the triumphant doctrine of Aristotle, which erected a new and despotic empire in the republic of letters, and reduced the whole ideal world under its lordly dominion. Several of the works of this philosopher, and more especially his metaphysical productions, had been, so early as the beginning of this century, translated into Latin at Paris, and were from that time explained to the youth in the public schools.\* But when it appeared, that Almeric† had drawn from these books his erroneous sentiments concerning the divine nature, they were prohibited and condemned as pernicious and pestilential, by a public decree of the council of Sens, in the year 1209.‡ The logic of Aristotle, however, recovered its credit some years after this, and was publicly taught in the university of Paris in the year 1215; but the natural philosophy and metaphysics of that great man were still under the sentence of condemnation.§ It was reserved for the emperor Frederic II. to restore the Stagirate to his former glory, which this prince effected by employing a number of learned men, whom

\* Jo. Wolf, *Lectiones Memorabiles*, tom. i. p. 430.

† Called in Latin, *Alanus ab Insulis*.

‡ See the *Histoire de l'Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres*, tom. xvi. p. 243, which also gives an ample account of William of Nangis, page 292.

§ See *Le Bœuf, Mémoires pour l'Histoire d'Anxerre*, tom. ii. p. 490, where there is also a learned account of Vincent of Beauvais, p. 494.

|| Gervase of Tilbury was nephew to Henry II., king of England, and was in high credit with the emperor Otto IV., to whom he dedicated a description of the world and a Chronicle, both of which he had himself composed. He wrote also a History of England, and one of the Holy Land, with several treatises upon different subjects.

†† See *Schelhornii Amœnitates, Literariæ*, tom. xi. p. 324.

\*\* This illustrious Franciscan, in point of genius and universal learning, was one of the greatest ornaments of the British nation, and, in general, of the republic of letters. The astonishing discoveries he made in astronomy, chemistry, optics, and mathematics, made him pass for a magician in the ignorant and superstitious times in which he lived, while his profound knowledge in philosophy, theology, and the Greek and Oriental languages, procured him, with more justice, the title of the *admirable or wonderful doctor*. Among other discoveries, he is said to have made that of the composition and force of gunpowder, which he describes clearly in one of his letters; and he proposed much the same correction of the calendar, which was executed about 300 years after by Gregory III. He composed an extraordinary number of books, of which a list may be seen in the *General Dictionary*.

†† See *Rich. Simon's Lettres Choisies*, tom. iii. p. 112, and *Nic. Antonii Bibliotheca vetus Hispanica*

\* *Franc. Patriæ Discussiones Peripateticæ*, tom. i. lib. xi. p. 145. Jo. Launojus de *varia Aristot. fortuna in Acad. Parisiensi*, cap. 1. p. 127, ed. Elswich. It is commonly reported, that the books of Aristotle here mentioned, were translated from Arabic into Latin. But we are told positively, that these books were brought from Constantinople, and translated from Greek into Latin. See Rigord's *work de gestis Philippi regis Franc. ad annum 1209*, in *Andr. Chesni Scrip. Hist. Franc.* p. 119.

† Almeric, or Amauri, does not seem to have entertained any enormous errors. He held, that every Christian was obliged to believe himself a member of Jesus Christ, and attached, perhaps, some extravagant and fantastical ideas to that opinion; but his followers fell into more pernicious notions, and adopted the most odious tenets, maintaining, that the power of the Father continued no longer than the Messianic dispensation; that the empire of the Son extended only to the thirteenth century; and that then the reign of the Holy Ghost commenced, when all sacraments and external worship were to be abolished, and the salvation of Christians was to be accomplished merely by internal acts of illuminating grace. Their morals also were as infamous as their doctrine was absurd; and, under the name of charity, they comprehended and committed the most criminal acts of impurity and licentiousness.

‡ Dr. Mosheim has fallen here into two slight mistakes. It was at Paris, and not at Sens, and in the year 1210, and not 1209, that the metaphysical books of Aristotle were condemned to the flames. The works quoted here by our author, are those of Launojus, de *varia Aristotelis fortuna in Acad. Parisiensi*, cap. iv. p. 195, and *Syllabus rationum quibus Durandus causa defenditur*, tom. i. op.

§ *Nat. Alexander, Select. Histor. Ecclesiast. Cap. ix. tom. viii. cap. iii. sect. 7. page 76*

he had chosen with the greatest attention and care,\* and who were profoundly versed in the knowledge of the languages, to translate into Latin, from the Greek and Arabic, certain books of Aristotle, and of other ancient sages. This translation, which was recommended, in a particular manner, to the academy of Bologna by the learned emperor, raised the credit of Aristotle to the greatest height, and gave him an irresistible and despotic authority in all the European schools. This authority was still farther augmented by the translations which were made of some of the books of the Grecian sage by several Latin interpreters, such as Michael Scot, Philip of Tripoli, William Fleming, and others; though these men were quite unequal to the task they undertook, and had neither such knowledge of the languages, nor such an acquaintance with philosophy, as were necessary to the successful execution of such a difficult enterprise.†

VIII. The Aristotelian philosophy received the very last addition that could be made to its authority and lustre, when the Dominican and Franciscan friars adopted its tenets, taught it in their schools, and illustrated it in their writings. These two mendicant orders were looked upon as the chief depositories of all learning, both human and divine; and were followed, with the utmost eagerness and assiduity, by all such as were ambitious of being distinguished from the multitude by superior knowledge. Alexander Hales, an English Franciscan, who taught philosophy at Paris, and acquired, by the strength of his metaphysical genius, the title of the Irrefragable Doctor,‡ and Albert the Great, a German of the Dominican order, and bishop of Ratisbon, a man of great abilities, and an universal dictator at this time,§ were the first eminent writers who illustrated, in their learned productions, the Aristotelian system. But it was the disciple of Albert, Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor, and the great luminary of the scholastic world, that contributed most to the glory of the Stagirite,|| by inculcating, illustrating, and

enforcing his doctrines, both in his lectures and in his writings; and principally by engaging one of his learned colleagues to give, under his inspection, a new translation of the works of the Grecian sage, which far surpassed the former version in exactness, perspicuity, and elegance.\* By these means the philosophy of Aristotle, notwithstanding the hostile efforts of several divines, and even of the Roman pontiffs themselves, who beheld its progress with an unfriendly eye, triumphed in all the Latin schools, and absorbed all the other systems that had flourished before this literary revolution.

IX. There were, however, at this time in Europe several persons of superior genius and penetration, who, notwithstanding their respect for Aristotle, considered the method of treating philosophy, which his writings had introduced, as dry, inelegant, and fit only to confine and damp the efforts of the mind in the pursuit of truth; and who, consequently, were desirous of enlarging the sphere of science by new researches and discoveries.† At the head of these noble adventurers we may justly place Roger Bacon, a Franciscan friar of the English nation, known by the appellation of the *admirable doctor*, who was renowned on account of his most important discoveries, and who, in natural philosophy, mathematics, chemistry, the mechanic arts, and the learned languages, soared far beyond the genius of the times.‡ With him we may associate Arnold

their opinion seems to be founded in truth. See Antoine Tournon, *Vie de St. Thomas*, p. 99. The Franciscans, however, maintain as obstinately, that Alexander Hales was the master of Thomas. See Wadding's *Annales Minorum*, tom. iii. p. 133.

\* It has been believed by many, that William de Moerbeke, a native of Flanders, of the Dominican order, and archbishop of Corinth, was the author of the new Latin translation of the works of Aristotle, which was carried on and finished under the auspicious inspection of Thomas Aquinas. See J. Eclard, *Scriptores Dominicani*, tom. i. p. 388. 469. Casim. Oudinus, *Comm. de Scriptor. Eccles.* tom. iii. p. 468. Jo. Franc. Foppens, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, tom. i. p. 416. Others, however, suppose, though indeed with less evidence, that this translation was composed by Henry Kosheim, who was also a Dominican.

† Bacon's contempt of the learning that was in vogue in his time may be seen in the following passage, quoted by Jebb, in his preface to the *Opus Majus* of that great man: "Nunquam fuit tanta apparentia sapientia; nec tantum exercitium studii in tot facultatibus, in tot regionibus, sicut jam a quadraginta annis: ubique enim doctores sunt dispersi. . . . in omni civitate, et in omni castro, et in omni burgo, præcipue per duos ordines studentes (he means the Franciscans and Dominicans, who were almost the only religious orders that distinguished themselves by an application to study) quod non accidit, nisi a quadraginta annis aut circiter, cum tamen nunquam fuit tanta ignorantia, tantus error. . . . Vultus studentium languet et assuavit circa mala translata (by these wretched versions he understands the works of Aristotle, which were most miserably translated by ignorant bunglers) et tempus et studium mittit in omnibus et expensas. Apparentia quidem sola tenet eos, et non curant quid sciunt, sed quid videantur scire coram multitudine insensata." Thus, according to Bacon, in the midst of the most specious appearance of science, the greatest ignorance and the grossest errors reigned almost universally.

‡ That Bacon deserves this high rank in the learned world appears evidently from his book entitled *Opus Majus*, which was dedicated to pope Clement IV., and which Jebb published at London in

\* Petr. de Vineis, *Epist. lib. iii. ep. lxxvii. p. 503.* This epistle is addressed "ad magistrum et scholares Bononienses;" i. e. "to the masters and scholars of the academy of Bologna;" but it is more than probable, that the emperor sent letters upon this occasion to the other European schools. It is a common opinion, that this learned prince had all the works of Aristotle, that were then extant, translated into Latin about the year 1220; but this cannot be deduced from the letter above mentioned, or from any other sufficient testimony that we know of.

† See Wood's account of the interpreters of Aristotle, in his *Antiquitat. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 119; as also Jebb's preface to the *Opus Majus* of the famous Roger Bacon, published at London in folio, in the year 1733. We shall give here the opinion which Bacon had of the translators of Aristotle, in the words of that great man, who expresses his contempt of these wretched interpreters in the following manner: "Si haberem potestatem supra libros Aristotelis, (Latine conversos,) ego facerem omnes eorum, quia non est nisi temporis amissio studere in illis, et causa erroris et multiplicatio ignorantie, ultra id quod valet explicari."

‡ See Wadding's *Annales Minorum*, tom. iii. p. 233. Du Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 200, 673.

§ Jo. Atb. Fabricii *Biblioth. Latina mediæ ævi*, tom. i. p. 113.

|| The Dominicans maintain, that this Angelic Doctor was the disciple of Albert the Great, and

of Villa Nova, whose place of nativity is fixed by some in France, by others in Spain, and who acquired a shining reputation by his knowledge in chemistry, poetry, philosophy, languages, and physic; as also Peter d'Abano, a physician of Padua, who was surnamed the *Reconciler*, from a book which he wrote in the hope of terminating the dissensions and contests that reigned among the philosophers and physicians; and who was profoundly versed in the sciences of philosophy, astronomy, physic, and mathematics. It must, however, be observed, to the eternal dishonour of the age, that the only fruits which these great men derived from their learned labours, and their noble, as well as successful efforts for the advancement of the arts and sciences, were the furious clamours of an enraged and superstitious multitude, who looked upon them as heretics and magicicians, and thirsted so eagerly after their blood, that they escaped with difficulty the hands of the public executioner. Bacon was confined many years in a comfortless prison; and the other two were, after their death, brought before the tribunal of the inquisition, and declared worthy of being committed to the flames for the novelties they had introduced into the republic of letters.

X. The state of theology, and the method of teaching and representing the doctrines of Christianity that now prevailed, shall be mentioned in their place. The civil and canon laws held the first rank in the circle of the sciences, and were studied with peculiar zeal and application by almost all who were ambitious of literary glory. But these sciences, notwithstanding the assiduity with which they were cultivated, were far from being then brought to any tolerable degree of perfection. They were disfigured by the jargon that reigned in the schools, and were corrupted and rendered intricate by a multitude of trivial commentaries that were intended to illustrate and explain them. Some employed their labours in collecting the letters of the Roman pontiffs, which are commonly known under the title of *Decretals*, and which were deemed a very important branch of ecclesiastical law. Raymond of Penafort, a native of Barcelona, was the most famous of all these compilers, and acquired a considerable reputation by his collec-

tion of the Decretals in five books, which he undertook at the desire of Gregory IX., and which has been since honoured with the name of that pontiff, who ordered it to be added to the Decretals of Gratian, and to be read in all the European colleges. Toward the conclusion of this century, Boniface VIII. caused a new collection to be made, which was entitled, *The Sixth Book of Decretals*, because it was added to the five already mentioned.

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Form of Government, during this Century.*

I. BOTH the Greek and Latin writers, provoked beyond measure by the flagitious lives of their spiritual rulers and instructors, complain loudly of their licentious manners, and load them with the severest reproaches; nor will these complaints and reproaches appear excessive to such as are acquainted with the history of this corrupt and superstitious age. Several eminent men attempted to stem this torrent of licentiousness, which from the heads of the church had carried its pernicious streams through all the members; but their power and influence were unequal to such a difficult and arduous enterprise. The Grecian emperors were prevented from executing any project of this kind by the infelicity of the times, and the various calamities and tumults, which not only reigned in their dominions, but even shook their thrones, while the power and opulence of the Roman pontiffs, and the superstition of the age, prevented the Latins from accomplishing, or even attempting, a reformation in the church.

II. In the history of the popes, we meet with a lively and horrible picture of the complicated crimes that dishonoured the ministers of the church, who were peculiarly required, by their sacred office, to exhibit to the world distinguished models of piety and virtue. Such members of the sacerdotal order as were advanced to places of authority in the church, behaved rather like tyrants than rulers, and showed manifestly, in all their conduct, that they aimed at an absolute and unlimited dominion. The popes, more especially, inculcated this pernicious maxim, "That the bishop of Rome is the supreme lord of the universe, and that neither princes nor bishops, civil governors nor ecclesiastical rulers, have any lawful power in church or state, but what they derive from him." This extravagant maxim, which was considered as the sum and substance of papal jurisprudence, the pontiffs obstinately maintained, and left no means unemployed, that perfidy or violence could suggest, to give it the force of an universal law. It was in

1733, from a manuscript that still exists in the university of Dab'm, enriching it with a learned preface and a considerable number of judicious observations. The other works of Bacon, which are very numerous, lie for the most part concealed in the libraries of the curious. For a farther account of this eminent man, see Wood's *Antiq. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 136.—Wadding, *Annal. Minor.* t. iv. p. 161, t. v. p. 51.—Thom. Gale, ad *Jaublichum de Mysteris Egyptior.* p. 255.—General Hist. and Crit. Dictionary.

\* See Nic. Antonii *Biblioth. vetus Hispan.* tom. ii. lib. ix. c. i.—Pierre Joseph, d'Arnaud *Vie de Ville-neuve*, Aix, 1719.—Niceron, *Memoires des Hommes illustres*, tom. xxxiv.—Nicol. Eyermeri *Directorium Inquisitorum*, pag. 282, where, among other things, we have an account of his errors.

† This book was entitled, *Conciliator Differentiarum Philosophorum et Medicorum.*

‡ There is a very accurate account of this philosopher given by Joh. Maria Mazzuchelli, *Notizie Storiche e Critiche intorno alla Vita di Pietro d'Abano*, in Angh. Calogera *Opus Scientifica e Philologica*, t. viii.

§ See Boulay *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii.

\* Ger. a Maestricht, *Historia juris Ecclesiasticae*, sect. 353.—Jo. Chifflet, *de Juris utriusque Architectura*, cap. vi.—Eldard et Quehl, *Scriptor. Dominican* t. i.—Acta *Sancior.* Antwerp. t. i. Januarii ad d. vii.

† See the remarkable letter of pope Gregory IX. to the archbishop of Bourges, which was written in 1227, with a design to improve and reform the vices which had infected all the various orders of the clergy, and which is published by Dion. Sammarthanus, in his *Gallica Christiana*, tom. ii. in Append.—See also Du Tillac, *Annal.* in *Vitam Ludovici XI.*

consequence of this arrogant pretension, that they not only claimed the right of disposing of ecclesiastical benefices, as they are commonly called, but also of conferring civil dominion, and of dethroning kings and emperors, according to their good pleasure. It is true, this maxim was far from being universally adopted; many placed the authority of councils above that of the pontiffs, and such of the European kings and princes as were not ingloriously blinded and enslaved by the superstition of the times, asserted their rights with dignity and success, excluded the pontiffs from all concern in their civil transactions, and even reserved to themselves the supremacy over the churches that were established in their dominions.\* In thus opposing the haughty pretensions of the lordly pontiffs, it was, indeed, necessary to proceed with mildness, caution, and prudence, on account of the influence which those spiritual tyrants had usurped over the minds of the people, and the power they had of alarming princes, by exciting their subjects to rebellion.

III. In order to establish their authority, both in civil and ecclesiastical matters, upon the firmest foundations, the Roman pontiffs assumed to themselves the power of disposing of the various offices of the church, whether of a higher or more subordinate nature, and of creating bishops, abbots, and canons, according to their fancy. Thus we see the heads of the church, who formerly disputed with such ardour against the emperors in favour of the free election of bishops and abbots, overturning now all the laws that related to the election of these spiritual rulers, reserving for themselves the revenues of the richest benefices, conferring vacant places upon their clients and their creatures, and often deposing bishops who had been duly and lawfully elected, and substituting others for them with a high hand.† The hypocritical pretexes for all these arbitrary proceedings were an ardent zeal for the welfare of the church, and an anxious concern, lest devouring heretics should get a footing among the flock of Christ.‡ The first pontiff who usurped such an extravagant extent of authority, was Innocent III., whose example was followed by Honorius III., Gregory IX., and several of their successors. But it was keenly opposed by the bishops, who had hitherto enjoyed the privilege of nominating to the smaller benefices, and still more effectually by the kings of England and France, who employed the force of warm remonstrances and vigorous edicts to stop the progress of this new jurisprudence.§ Louis IX. king of France,

\* As a specimen of this, the reader may peruse the letters of Innocent III. and the emperor Otto IV., which have been collected by the learned George Christ. Gebauer, in his history of the emperor Richard, written in German. Other princes, and more especially the kings of England and France, displayed, in the defence of their rights and privileges, the same zeal that animated Otto.

† Many examples of this may be taken from the history of this century. See Steph. Baluzii Miscellan. tom. vii.—Gallia Christiana tom. i. Append.—Wadding. Aunal. Minor. in Diplom. —Wood, Antiquit. Oxon. tom. i.

‡ See the Epistle of Innocent IV. in Baluz Miscellan. tom. vii.

§ Boulay Hist. Acad. Paris tom. iii. iv.

now the tutelar saint of that nation, distinguished himself by his noble opposition to these papal encroachments. In 1268, before he set out for the Holy Land, he secured the rights of the Gallican church against the insidious attempts of the popes, by that famous edict, known in France by the name of the *pragmatic sanction*.\* This resolute and prudent measure rendered the pontiffs more cautious and slow in their proceedings, but did not deter them from the prosecution of their purpose. For Boniface VIII. maintained, in the most express and impudent terms, that the universal church was under the dominion of the pontiffs, and that princes and lay patrons, councils and chapters, had no more power in spiritual things, than what they derived from Christ's vicar upon earth.

IV. The legates, whom the pontiffs sent into the provinces, to represent their persons, and execute their orders, imitated perfectly the avarice and insolence of their masters. They violated the privileges of the chapters; disposed of the smaller, and sometimes of the more important ecclesiastical benefices, in favour of such as had gained them by bribes, or the like considerations;‡ extorted money from the people, by the vilest and most iniquitous means; seduced the unwary by forged letters and other stratagems of that nature; excited tumults among the multitude, and were, themselves, the ringleaders of the most furious and rebellious factions; carried on, in the most scandalous manner, the impious traffic of relics and indulgences, and distinguished themselves by several acts of profligacy still more heinous than the practices now mentioned. Hence we find the writers of this age complaining unanimously of the flagitious conduct and the enormous crimes of the pope's legates.‡ We even see pope Alexander IV. enacting, in 1256, a severe law against the avarice and frauds of these corrupt ministers,§ which, however, they easily evaded, by their friends and their credit at the court of Rome.

V. From the ninth century to this period, the wealth and revenues of the pontiffs had not received any considerable augmentation; but at this time they were vastly increased under Innocent III., and Nicolas III., partly by the events of war, and partly by the munificence of kings and emperors. Innocent, as soon as he was seated in the papal chair, reduced under his jurisdiction the præfect of Rome, who had hitherto been considered as subject to the emperor, to whom he had taken an oath of allegiance in entering upon his office. He also seized the territories of Ancona, Spoleto, and Assisi, the town of Montobello, and various cities and fortresses which had, according to him, been unjustly alienated from

\* Boulay, tom. iii.

† See Baluzii Miscellanea, tom. vii.

‡ See that judicious and excellent writer Matth. Paris, in his Historia Major, p. 313, 316, 549, and particularly p. 637, where we find the following remarkable words: "Semper solent legati, et omnes nuncios papales, regna que ingrediuntur de panperare vel aliquo modo perturbare." See also Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris, tom. iii. p. 659.

§ This edict is published by Lami, in his Delicie Euditorum, tom. ii. page 390.

the patrimony of St. Peter.\* On the other hand, Frederic II., who was extremely desirous that the pope should espouse his quarrel with Otho IV., loaded the Roman see with the richest marks of his munificence and liberality, and not only made a noble present in valuable lands to the pope's brother,† but also permitted Richard, count of Fundi, to bequeath all his possessions to the Roman see,‡ and confirmed the immense donation that had formerly been made to it by the opulent Matilda. Such was the progress that Innocent III. made, during his pontificate, in augmenting the splendour and wealth of the church. Nicolas III. followed his example with the warmest emulation, and, in 1278, gave a remarkable proof of his arrogance and obstinacy, in refusing to crown the emperor Rodolphus I. before he had acknowledged and confirmed, by a solemn treaty, all the pretensions of the Roman see, of which, if some were plausible, many were altogether groundless, or, at least, extremely dubious. This agreement, to which all the Italian princes subject to the emperor were obliged to accede, was no sooner concluded, than Nicolas reduced under his temporal dominion several territories in Italy, that had formerly been annexed to the imperial crown, particularly Romania and Bologna. It was therefore under these two pontiffs that the see of Rome arrived, partly by force, and partly by artifice, at that high degree of grandeur and opulence, which it yet maintains in our times.§

VI. Innocent III., who remained at the head of the church until the year 1216, followed the steps of Gregory VII., and not only usurped the despotic government of the church, but also claimed the empire of the world, and entertained the extravagant idea of subjecting all the kings and princes of the earth to his lordly sceptre. He was a man of learning and application; but his cruelty, avarice, and arrogance,¶ clouded the lustre of any good qualities which his panegyrists have thought proper to attribute to him. In Asia and Europe, he disposed of crowns and sceptres with the most wanton ambition. In Asia, he gave a king to the Armenians; in Europe, he usurped the same exorbitant privilege in 1204, and conferred the regal dignity upon Primislaus, duke of Bohemia.¶ The same year, he sent to Johannicus, duke of Bulgaria and Wallachia an extraordinary legate, who, in the name of the pontiff, invested that prince with the ensigns and honours of royalty, while, with his own hand, he crowned Peter II., of Arragon, who

had rendered his dominions subject and tributary to the church, and saluted him publicly at Rome, with the title of king.\* We omit many other examples of this phrenetic pretension to universal empire, which might be produced from the letters of this arrogant pontiff, and many other acts of despotism, which Europe beheld with astonishment, but also, to its eternal reproach, with the ignominious silence of a passive obedience.

VII. The ambition of this pope was not satisfied with the distribution and government of these petty kingdoms. He extended his views farther, and resolved to render the power and majesty of the Roman see formidable to the greatest European kings, and even to the haughty emperors themselves. When the empire of Germany was disputed, about the commencement of this century, between Philip, duke of Suabia, and Otho IV. third son of Henry the Lion, he espoused at first the cause of Otho, thundered out his excommunications against Philip, and on the death of the latter (which happened in 1209,) placed the imperial diadem upon the head of his adversary. But, as Otho was by no means disposed to submit to this pontiff's nod, or to satisfy to the full his ambitious desires, he incurred his lordly indignation; and Innocent, declaring him, by a solemn excommunication, unworthy of the empire, raised in his place Frederic II. his pupil, the son of Henry VI. and king of the two Sicilies, to the imperial throne, in 1212.† The same pontiff excommunicated Philip Augustus, king of France, for having dissolved his marriage with Ingelburga, a princess of Denmark, and espoused another in her place; nor did he cease to pursue this monarch with his anathemas, until he engaged him to receive the divorced queen, and to restore her to her lost dignity.‡

VIII. But of all the European princes, none felt, in so dishonourable and severe a manner, the despotic fury of this insolent pontiff, as John, surnamed *Sans-Terre*, or *Lackland*, king of England. This prince vigorously opposed the measures of Innocent, who had ordered the monks of Canterbury to choose Stephen Langton (a Roman cardinal of English descent) archbishop of that see, notwithstanding the election of John de Grey to that high dignity, which had been regularly made by the convent, and had been confirmed by royal authority.§ The pope after having consecrated Langton at Viterbo, wrote a soothing letter in his favour to the king, accompanied with four

\* See Franc. Pagi Breviar. Romanor. Pontif. tom. iii. p. 161.—Muratori, Antiq. Ital. tom. i. p. 328.

† This brother of the pontiff was called Richard. See, for an account of this transaction, Muratori's fifth volume, p. 652.

‡ Odor. Raynaldus, Continuat. Annal. Baronii, ad annum 1212.

§ Raynaldus ad annum 1278. The papal grandeur and opulence, however, were seriously impaired by the fury of the French revolution, and, although the success of the allied powers replaced the pontiff on his throne, his power is now at a low ebb.—EDR.

¶ See Maith. Paris. Hist. Maj.

⊗ Other historians affirm, that the emperor Philip was the potentate who conferred the royal dignity upon Primislaus, in order to strengthen his party against Otho.

\* Murat. Ant. Ital. med. Ævi, t. vi. J. de Ferreras, Hist. d'Espagne, t. iv.

† All this is amply illustrated in the Orig. Guelfice, tom. iii. hb. vii.

‡ Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iii.—Daniel, Histoire de la France, tom. iii.—Gerard du Bois, Hist. Eccles. Paris. tom. ii.

⊗ Dr. Mosheim passes lightly over this rupture between king John and Innocent III. mentioning in a few lines the interdiction which England was laid by that pontiff, the excommunication of the king's person, and the impious act by which the English were declared to be absolved from their allegiance. The translator, however, thought this event of too great importance to be treated with such brevity, and has, therefore, taken the liberty to enlarge considerably this eighth section, which contains only twelve lines in the original.

rings, and a mystical comment upon the precious stones with which they were enriched. But this present was not sufficient to avert the just indignation of the offended monarch, and he sent troops to drive out of the kingdom the monks of Canterbury, who had been engaged by the pope's menaces to receive Langton as their archbishop. He also declared to the pontiff, that, if he persisted in imposing a prelate upon the see of Canterbury, in opposition to a regular election already made, the consequences of such presumptuous obstinacy would, in the issue, prove fatal to the papal authority in England. Innocent was so far from being terrified by this menacing remonstrance, that, in 1208, he sent orders to the bishops of London, Worcester, and Ely, to lay the kingdom under an interdict, in case of the monarch's refusal to yield, and to receive Langton. John, alarmed at this terrible menace, and unwilling to break entirely with the pope, declared his readiness to confirm the election made at Rome; but in the act that was drawn up for this purpose, he wisely inserted a clause to prevent any interpretation of this compliance, that might be prejudicial to his rights, dignity, and prerogative. This exception was rejected, and the interdict was proclaimed. A stop was immediately put to divine service; the churches were shut in every parish; all the sacraments were suspended except that of baptism; the dead were buried in the highways without the usual rites or any funeral solemnity. But, notwithstanding this interdict, the Cistercian order continued to perform divine service; and several learned and respectable divines, among whom were the bishops of Winchester and Norwich, protested against the injustice of the pope's proceedings.

The interdict not producing the effects that were expected from it, the pontiff proceeded to a still farther degree of severity and presumption, and denounced a sentence of excommunication against the person of the English monarch. This sentence, which was issued in 1209, was followed about two years after by a bull, absolving all his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and ordering all persons to avoid him, on pain of excommunication. But it was in 1212, that Innocent carried his iniquitous tyranny to the most enormous length, when, assembling a council of cardinals and prelates, he deposed John, declared the throne of England vacant, and authorized Philip Augustus, king of France, to execute this sentence, undertake the conquest of England, and unite that kingdom to his dominions for ever. He, at the same time, published another bull, exhorting all Christian princes to contribute whatever was in their power to the success of this expedition, and promising, to such as would assist Philip in this grand enterprise, the same indulgences that were granted to those who carried arms against the infidels in Palestine. The French monarch entered into the views of the pontiff, and made immense preparations for the invasion of England. John, on the other hand, assembled his forces, and was putting himself in a posture of defence, when Pandulf, the pope's legate, arrived at Dover, and proposed a conference in order to

prevent the approaching rupture, and to avert the storm. This artful legate terrified the king, who met him at that town, with an exaggerated account of the armament of Philip on the one hand, and of the disaffection of the English on the other; and persuaded him that there was no possible way left of saving his dominions from the formidable arms of the French king, but that of putting them under the protection of the Roman see. John, finding himself in such a perplexing situation, and full of diffidence both in the nobles of his court and in the officers of his army, complied with this dishonourable proposal, did homage to Innocent, resigned his crown to the legate, and then received it as a present from the see of Rome, to which he rendered his kingdoms tributary, and swore fealty as a vassal and feudatory.\* In the act by which he resigned, thus scandalously, his kingdoms to the papal jurisdiction, he declared that he had neither been compelled to this measure by fear nor by force; but that it was his own voluntary deed, performed by the advice, and with the consent, of the barons of his kingdom. He obliged himself and his heirs to pay an annual sum of seven hundred marks for England, and three hundred for Ireland, in acknowledgment of the pope's supremacy and jurisdiction; and consented that he or such of his successors as should refuse to pay the submission now stipulated, to the see of Rome, should forfeit all right to the British crown.† “This shameful ceremony was performed (says a modern historian) on Ascension-day, in the house of the Templars at Dover, in the midst of a great concourse of people, who beheld it with confusion and indignation. John, in doing homage to the pope, presented a sum of money to his representative, which the proud legate trampled under his feet, as a mark of the king's dependence. Every spectator glowed with resentment, and the archbishop of Dublin exclaimed aloud against such intolerable insolence. Pandulf, not satisfied with this mortifying act of superiority, kept the crown and sceptre five whole days, and then restored them as a special favour of the Roman see. John was despised before this extraordinary resignation; but now he was looked upon as a contemptible wretch, unworthy to sit upon a throne, while he himself seemed altogether insensible of his disgrace.”

IX. Innocent III. was succeeded in the pontificate by Cencio Savelli, who, assuming the title of Honorius III., ruled the church above ten years, and whose government, though not signalized by such audacious exploits as those of his predecessor, disclosed an ardent zeal for maintaining the pretensions, and supporting the despotism, of the Roman see. It was in consequence of this zeal that the new pontiff opposed the measures, and drew upon himself the indignation of Frederic II. that magnani-

\* For a full account of this shameful ceremony, see Matthew Paris, *Historia Major*; Boulay's *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. iii. and Rapin's *Histoire d'Angleterre*, tom. ii.

† [C] *Cadet a jure regni*, is the expression used in the charter of resignation, which may be seen at length in the *Historia Major* of Matthew Paris.

1 Dr. Smollet.



mous prince, on whose head he himself had placed, in 1220, the imperial crown. This spirited prince, following the steps of his illustrious grandfather, had formed the resolution of confirming the authority, and extending the jurisdiction of the emperors in Italy, of depressing the small states of Lombardy, and reducing to narrower limits the immense credit and opulence of the pontiffs and bishops; and it was with a view to the execution of these grand projects, that he deferred the execution of the solemn vow, by which he had engaged himself to lead a formidable army against the infidels of Palestine. The pontiff, on the other hand, urged with importunity the emperor's departure; encouraged, animated, and strengthened, by secret succours, the Italian states that opposed his pretensions; and resisted the progress of his power by all the obstacles which the most fertile invention could suggest. These contests, however, had not yet brought on an open rupture.

X. In 1227, Hugolin, bishop of Ostia, whose advanced age had not extinguished the fire of his ambition, or diminished the firmness and obstinacy of his spirit, was raised to the pontificate, assumed the title of Gregory IX., and kindled the feuds and discussions, that had already secretly subsisted between the church and the empire, into an open and violent flame. No sooner was he placed in the papal chair, than, in defiance of justice and order, he excommunicated the emperor for delaying his expedition against the Saracens to another year, though the postponement manifestly arose from a fit sickness, which seized that prince when he was ready to embark for Palestine. In 1228, Frederic at last set out, and arrived in the Holy Land; but, instead of carrying on the war with vigour, as we have already had occasion to observe, he entered into a truce with Saladin, and contented himself with the recovery of Jerusalem. The pretended vicar of Christ, forgetting (or rather unwilling to persuade himself) that his master's "kingdom was not of this world," made war upon the emperor in Apulia during his absence,\* and used his utmost efforts to arm against him all the European powers. Frederic, having received information of these perfidious and violent proceedings, returned into Europe, in 1229, defeated the papal army, retook the places he had lost in Sicily and in Italy, and, in the succeeding year, made his peace with the pontiff, from whom he received a public and solemn absolution. This peace, however, was not of long duration; for the emperor could not tamely bear the insolent proceedings and the imperious temper of Gregory. He therefore broke all measures with that headstrong pontiff, distressed the states of Lombardy that were in alliance with the see of Rome, seized the island of Sardinia, (which Gregory regarded as a part of his spiritual patrimony,) and erected it into a kingdom for his son Entius. These, with other steps that

were equally provoking to the pope's avarice and ambition, drew the thunder of the Vatican anew upon the emperor's head. Frederic was publicly excommunicated in 1239, with all the circumstances of severity that vindictive rage could invent, and was charged with the most flagitious crimes, and the most impious blasphemies, by the exasperated pontiff, who sent a copy of this terrible accusation to all the courts of Europe. The emperor, on the other hand, defended his injured reputation by solemn declarations in writing, while, by his victorious arms, he avenged himself of his adversaries, maintained his ground, and reduced the pontiff to the greatest difficulties. To extricate himself from these perplexities, the latter convened, in 1240, a general council at Rome, with a view of deposing Frederic by the unanimous suffrages of the cardinals and prelates who were to compose that assembly. But the emperor disconcerted that audacious project by defeating, in 1241, a Genoese fleet, on board of which the greatest part of these prelates were embarked, and by seizing, with all their treasures, the reverend fathers, who were all committed to close confinement. This disappointment, attended with others which gave an unhappy turn to his affairs, and blasted his most promising expectations, dejected and consumed the despairing pontiff, and apparently contributed to the conclusion of his days, which happened soon after this remarkable event.\*

XI. Geoffry, bishop of Milan, who succeeded Gregory IX., under the title of Celestine IV., died before his consecration, and after a vacancy of twenty months, the apostolic chair was filled by Simball, one of the counts of Pieschi, who was raised to the pontificate in 1243, assumed the denomination of Innocent IV., and yielded to none of his predecessors in arrogance and fury.† His elevation, however, offered at first a prospect of peace, as he had formerly been attached to the interests of the emperor; and accordingly the conferences were opened, and a reconciliation was proposed; but the terms offered by the new pope were too imperious and extravagant, not to be rejected with indignation.‡ Hence it was that Innocent, not thinking himself safe in any part of Italy, set out from Genoa, the place of his birth, for Lyons, in 1244, and assembling there a council in the following year, deposed Frederic, in presence of its members, though not with their approbation, and declared the impe-

\* Beside the original and authentic writers collected by Muratori, in his *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, and the German and Italian historians, few or none of whom are absolutely free from partiality in their accounts of these unhappy contests between the empire and the papacy, see Petrus de Vinea, *Epistol. lib. i.* and Matthew Paris, in his *Historia Major*. Add to these Raynald *Annal.*—Muratori, *Annal. Italie*, tom. vii. et *Antiquit. Italic. mediæ ævi*, tom. iv. p. 325, 517. It must, however, be observed, that this branch of history stands yet in need of farther illustration.

† See the *Hist. Maj.* of Matthew Paris, ad annum 1254.

‡ These preliminary conditions were, 1st, That the emperor should give up entirely to the church the inheritance which was left to it by MATTHEW; and, 2dly, That he would oblige himself to submit to whatever terms the pope should think fit to propose, as conditions of peace.

¶ \* Under the feeble reign of Henry III. the pope drew immense sums out of England for the support of this impious war, and carried his avaricious avarice so far, as to demand a fifth part of the ecclesiastical revenues of the whole kingdom

rial throne vacant.\* This unjust and insolent decree was regarded with such veneration, and looked upon as so weighty by the German princes, seduced and blinded by the superstition of the times, that they proceeded instantly to a new election, and raised first, Henry, landgrave of Thuringia, and, after his death, William, count of Holland, to the head of the empire. † Frederic, whose firm and heroic spirit supported without dejection these cruel vicissitudes, continued to carry on the war in Italy, until a violent dysentery put an end to his life, on the 13th of December, 1250. On the death of his formidable and magnanimous adversary, Innocent returned into Italy, ‡ hoping now to enjoy with security the fruits of his ambition. It was principally from this period, that the two famous factions, called *Guelfs* and *Guibellines*, of which the latter espoused the cause of the emperors, and the former that of the pontiffs, involved all the Italian states in the most calamitous dissensions, though their origin is much earlier than this century. †

XII. Raynald, count of Segni and bishop of Ostia, was raised to the pontificate after the death of Innocent, in the year 1254, and is distinguished in the list of the popes by the name of Alexander IV. During the six years and five months that he governed the see of Rome, his time was less employed in civil affairs, than in regulating the internal state of the church, if we except the measures he took for the destruction of Conradin, grandson of Frederic II. and for composing the tumults that had so long prevailed in Italy. The mendicant friars, in particular, and among them the Dominicans and Franciscans, were much favoured by this pontiff, and received several marks of his peculiar bounty.

He was succeeded in the Roman see, A. D. 1261, by Urban IV. a native of Troyes, of obscure birth, who, before his elevation to the pontificate, was patriarch of Jerusalem, and after that period was more distinguished by his institution of the Festival of the Body of Christ, than by any other circumstance in the course of his reign. He had, indeed, formed several important projects; but their execution was prevented by his death, which happened in 1264, after a short reign of three years. His successor, Guy Fuleodi, or Clement IV. a native of France, and bishop of Sabino who was raised to the see of Rome in 1265, did not enjoy much longer that high dignity. His name, however, makes a greater figure in history, and was rendered famous in many respects, and more especially by his conferring of the kingdom of Naples upon Charles of Anjou, brother to Louis IX. king of France. The consequences of this donation, and the melancholy fate of Conradin, the last descendant of Frederic II., (who, after an unfortunate battle fought against Charles, was publicly beheaded by the barbarous victor, if not by the counsel,

yet certainly with the consent, of the Roman pontiff,) are well known to such as have the smallest acquaintance with the history of these unhappy times.

XIII. Upon the death of Clement IV.,\* there arose warm and vehement contests among the cardinals concerning the election of a new pontiff. These debates, which kept the Roman see vacant during the space of almost three years, were at length terminated in favour of Theobald, a native of Placentia, and archbishop of Liege, who was raised to the pontificate in 1271, and assumed the title of Gregory X. † This devout ecclesiastic was in the Holy Land when he received the news of his election; and, as he had been an eye-witness of the miserable condition of the Christians in that country, he had nothing so much at heart, as the desire of contributing to their relief. Hence it was, that, immediately after his consecration, he summoned a council at Lyons, in 1274, in which the relief and maintenance of the Christians in Palestine, and the re-union of the Greek and Latin churches, were the two points that were to come principally under deliberation. This assembly is acknowledged as the fourteenth general council, and is rendered particularly remarkable by the new regulations that were introduced into the manner of electing the Roman pontiff, and more especially by the famous law, which is still in force, and by which it was enacted, that the cardinal electors should be shut up in the conclave during the vacancy of the pontificate. With respect to the character and sentiments of the new pope we shall only observe, that, though he seemed to be actuated by a milder spirit than many of his predecessors, he inculcated, without the least hesitation, the odious maxim of Gregory VII., which declared the bishop of Rome lord of the world, and, in a more particular manner, of the Roman empire. It was in consequence of this presumptuous system, that, in 1271, he wrote an imperious and threatening letter to the German princes; in which, deaf to the pretensions and remonstrances of Alphonso, king of Castile, ‡ he ordered them to elect an emperor without delay, assuring them, that, if they did not do it immediately, he would do it for them. This letter produced the intended effect; an electoral diet was assembled at Franckfort, and Rodolphus, count of Hapsburg, was raised to the imperial throne.

XIV. Gregory X. was succeeded, in 1276, by Peter of Tarentaise, of the Dominican order, and bishop of Ostia, who assumed the name of Innocent V., and died about four months after his election. Ottoboni, a native of Genoa, and cardinal of St. Adrian, was chosen in his place, took the title of Adrian

\* Which happened in November, 1268.

† For records of this election, see Wadding, *Annal. Minor.* t. iv. p. 330.

‡ Alphonso, king of Castile, had been elected emperor in 1256, by the archbishop of Treves, the duke of Saxony, the margrave of Brandenburg, and the king of Bohemia, in opposition to Richard, earl of Cornwall, who was at the same time raised to the same dignity by the archbishops of Mentz and Cologne, the count Palatine of the Rhine, and the duke of Bavaria.

\* This assembly is placed in the list of *ecumenical* or general councils; but it is not acknowledged as such by the Gallican church.

† Beside the writers already mentioned, see Nicol. de Curbio, *Vit. Innocenti IV.* in Baluzi *Miscellan. tom. vii.*

‡ See Murat *Diss. de Guelfis et Gubelinis* in his *Aut. Ital. med. Ev.* t. iv.

V.,<sup>4</sup> and, after having ruled the church during five weeks, was succeeded by Peter Julian, bishop of Tusculum, who enjoyed that high dignity about eight months, and is distinguished in the papal list by the name of John XXI. The see of Rome continued vacant for about six months after the death of the last-mentioned pontiff, but was at length filled, in November, 1277, by John Caietan, of the family of Ursini, cardinal of St. Nicolas, whose name he adopted for his papal title. This famous pontiff (as has been already observed) augmented greatly both the opulence and authority of the bishops of Rome, and had formed vast projects, which his undaunted courage and his remarkable activity would have enabled him, in all probability, to execute with success, had not death blasted his hopes, and disconcerted his ambitious schemes.

XV. He was succeeded, in 1281, about six months after his departure from this life, by Simon de Brie, who adopted the name of Martin IV., and was not inferior to Nicolas III. in ambition, arrogance, and constancy of mind, of which he gave several proofs during his pontificate. Michael Palæologus, the Grecian emperor, was one of the first princes whom this audacious priest solemnly excommunicated; and the pretext was, that he had broken the peace concluded between the Greek and Latin Churches, at the council of Lyons.† The same insult was committed against Peter, king of Arragon, whom Martin not only excluded from the bosom of the church, but also deposed from his throne, on account of his attempt upon Sicily, and made a grant of his kingdom, fiefs, and possessions, to Charles, son of Philip the Bold, § king of France. It was during the execution of such daring enterprises as these, and while he was meditating still greater things for the glory of the Roman hierarchy, that a sudden death, in 1285, obliged him to leave his schemes unfinished. They were, however, prosecuted with great spirit by his successor, James Savelli, who chose the denomination of Honorius IV., but was also stopped short in the midst of his career, in 1287, having ruled the church only two years. Jerome d'Ascoli, bishop of Palestrina, who was raised to the pontificate in 1288, and is known by the denomination of Nicolas IV., distinguished himself, during the four years that he remained at the head of the church, by his assiduous application both to ecclesiastical and political affairs. Sometimes we see the disputes of sovereign powers left to his arbitration, and terminated by his decision; at other times, we find him maintaining the pretensions and privileges of the church with the most resolute zeal and the most obstinate perseverance; and occasionally we see him employing, with the utmost assiduity, every probable method of propagating the Gos-

pel among the Tartars and other eastern nations. But the object, which, of all others, occupied most the thoughts of this vigilant and zealous pontiff, was the desperate state of the Christians in Palestine, who were now reduced to an extremity of misery and weakness. His laborious efforts were therefore employed for the restoration of their former grandeur; they were however employed in vain; and his death, which happened in 1292, disconcerted all the projects he had formed for that purpose.

XVI. The death of this pontiff was followed by a vacancy of two years in the see of Rome, in consequence of the disputes which arose among the cardinals about the election of a new pope. These disputes were at length terminated, and the contending parties united their suffrages in favour of Peter, surnamed De Murrone, from a mountain where he had hitherto lived in the deepest solitude, and with the utmost austerity. This venerable old man, who was in high renown on account of the remarkable sanctity of his life and conversation, was raised to the pontificate, in 1294, and assumed the name of Celestine V. But the austerity of his manners, being a tacit reproach upon the corruption of the Roman court, and more especially upon the luxury of the cardinals, rendered him extremely disagreeable to a degenerate and licentious clergy; and this dislike was so heightened by the whole course of his administration, (which showed that he had more at heart the reformation and purity of the church, than the increase of its opulence and the propagation of its authority,) that he was almost universally considered as unworthy of the pontificate. Hence it was, that several of the cardinals, and particularly Benedict Caietan, advised him to abdicate the papacy, which he had accepted with such reluctance; and they had the pleasure of seeing their advice followed with the utmost docility. The good man resigned his dignity in the fourth month after his election, and died in 1296, in the castle of Fumone, where his tyrannic and suspicious successor kept him in captivity, that he might not be engaged, by the solicitations of his friends, to attempt the recovery of his abdicated honours. His memory was precious to the virtuous part of the church, and he was elevated to the rank of a saint by Clement V. It was from him that the branch of the Benedictine order, called Celestines, yet subsisting in France and Italy, derived its origin.<sup>5</sup>

XVII. Benedict Caietan, who had persuaded the good pontiff now mentioned to resign his place, succeeded him in it, in 1291, with the name of Boniface VIII. We may say, with truth, of this unworthy prelate, that he was born to be a plague both to church and state, a disturber of the repose of nations, and that his attempts to extend and confirm the despotism of the Roman pontiffs, were carried to a length that approached to phrensy. As soon as he entered upon his new dignity, he claimed a supreme and irresistible dominion over all the powers of the earth, both spiritual and temporal, terrified kingdoms and empires with the thunder of his bulls, called princes and sovereign states before his tribunal

<sup>4</sup> We read, in the Latin, Adrian VI. which is more probably an error of the press, than a fault of the author.

<sup>†</sup> In the original, Dr. Mosheim observes, that these three successors of Gregory were elected and carried off by death in 1276; but here he has fallen into a slight mistake; for John XXI. died on the 16th of May, 1277.

<sup>‡</sup> This council had been holden under the pontificate of Gregory X.

<sup>§</sup> Philippe le Hardi, as he is called by the French.

<sup>5</sup> Helvet Hist. des Ordres tom. VI. p. 180

to decide their quarrels, augmented the papal jurisprudence with a new body of laws, entitled the Sixth Book of the Decretals, declared war against the illustrious family of Colonna, who disputed his title to the pontificate;\* in a word, exhibited to the church, and to Europe, a lively image of the tyrannical administration of Gregory VII., whom he perhaps surpassed in arrogance.† This was the pontiff who, in 1300, instituted the famous jubilee, which, since that time, has been regularly celebrated in the Roman church at fixed periods. But the consideration of this institution, which was so favourable to the progress of licentiousness and corruption, as also the other exploits of Boniface, and his deplorable end, belong to the history of the following century.‡

XVIII. In the Lateran council that was holden in 1215, a decree had passed, by the advice of Innocent III., to prevent the introduction of new religions, by which were meant new monastic institutions. This decree, however, seemed to be very little respected, either by that pontiff or his successors, since several religious orders, hitherto unknown in the Christian world, were not only tolerated, but were distinguished by peculiar marks of approbation and favour, and enriched with various privileges and prerogatives. Nor will this tacit abrogation of the decree of Innocent appear at all surprising to such as consider the state of the church in this century; for, not to mention many enormities that contributed to the suspension of this decree, we shall only observe, that the enemies of Christianity, and the heretical sects, increased daily every where; and, on the other hand, the secular clergy were more attentive to their worldly advantages than to the interests of the church, and spent in mirth and jollity the opulence with which the piety of their ancestors had enriched that sacred body. The monastic orders also had almost all degenerated from their primitive sanctity, and, exhibiting the most offensive examples of licentiousness and vice to public view, rendered by their flagitious lives the cause of heresy triumphant, instead of retarding its progress. All these things being considered, it was thought necessary to encourage the establishment of new monastic societies, who, by the sanctity of their manners, might attract the esteem and veneration of the people, and diminish the indignation which the tyranny and ambition of the pontiffs had so generally excited; and who, by their diligence and address, their discourses and their arguments, their power and arms, when these violent means were required, might discover,

\* The reasons which they allege for disputing the title of Boniface to the pontificate were, that the resignation of Celestine was not canonical, and that it was brought about by fraudulent means.

† There is a history of this pontiff written by Jo. Rubens, a Benedictine monk, whose work, which is entitled *Bonifacius VIII. e Familia Cætanorum principum Romanus pontifex*, was published at Rome in the year 1631.

‡ In this account of the popes, I have chiefly followed Daniel Papebroch, Francis Pagi, and Nuratorii, in his *Annales Italiae*, consulting at the same time the original sources collected by the last mentioned author in his *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*

persecute, convert and vanquish, the growing tribe of heretics.

XIX. Of the religious societies that arose in this century, some are now entirely suppressed, while others continue to flourish, and are in high repute. Among the former we may reckon the *Humiliati*, (a title expressive of great humility and self-abasement,) whose origin may be traced to a much earlier period than the present century, though their order was confirmed and new-modelled by Innocent III., who subjected it to the rule of St. Benedict. These humble monks became so shockingly licentious in process of time, that, in 1571, pope Pius V. was obliged to dissolve their society.\* We may also place, in the list of suppressed fraternities, the *Jacobins*, who were erected into a religious order by Innocent III.,‡ and who, in this very century, not long after the council of Lyons, were deprived of their charter; and also the *Valli-Scholares*, or *Scholars of the Valley*, so called from their being instituted by the *scholares*, i. e. the four professors of divinity in the university of Paris, and from a deep vale in the province of Champagne, in which they assembled and fixed their residence in 1234.† This society, whose foundation was laid about the commencement of this century, was formerly governed by the rule of St. Augustin, but is now incorporated into the order of the Regular Canons of St. Genevieve. To the same class we may refer the order of the blessed Virgin Mary, the mother of Christ, which had its commencement in 1266, and was suppressed in 1274;§ the Knights of Faith and Charity, who undertook to disperse the bands of robbers that infested the public roads in France, and who were favoured with the peculiar protection and approbation of Gregory IX;|| the Hermits of St. William, duke of Aquitaine;¶ not to mention the Brethren of the Sack, the Bethlenites, and some orders of inferior note, that started up in this century, which, of all others, was the most remarkable for the number and variety of monastic establishments, that date their origin from it.\*\*

XX. Among the convents that were founded in this century, and still subsist, the principal place is due to that of the *Servites*, i. e. the *Servants of the blessed Virgin*, whose order was first instituted, A. D. 1233, in Tuscany, by seven Florentine merchants, and afterwards made a great progress under the government of Philip Benizi, its chief. This order, though subjected to the rule of St. Augustin, was erected in commemoration of the most holy

\* *Helyot His. des Ord.* t. vi. p. 152

† *Mat. Paris. His. Maj.* p. 161.

‡ *Boutay, Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 15.—*Acta Sanct. Mens. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 482.

§ *Dion. Samarthanii Gallia Christiana*, tom. i. p. 653.

|| *Gallia Christ.* tom. i. *Append.* p. 165.—*Martenne, Voyage Liter. de deux Benedictins*, tom. ii.

¶ *Jo. Balaadi de ordine Eremitar. S. Galielemi Com.* in *actis SS. Februar.* tom. ii. p. 472.

\*\* *Matth. Paris. Hist. Major.* p. 215, edit. Watts, where, speaking of the prodigious number of convents, founded in England during this century, he expresses himself thus: "Tot jam apparuerunt ordines in Anglia, ut ordinum confusio videretur inordinata."

widowhood of the blessed Virgin, for which reason its monks wear a black habit,\* and observe several rules unknown to other monasteries. The prodigious number of Christians, that were made prisoners by the Mohammedans in Palestine, gave rise, toward the conclusion of the 12th century, to the institution of the order named the Fraternity of the Trinity, which, in the following age, received a still greater degree of stability, under the pontificate of Honorius III. and also of Clement IV. The founders of this institution were John de Matha and Felix de Valois, two pious men who led an austere and solitary life at Cerfroy, in the diocese of Meaux. The monks of this society are called the Brethren of the Holy Trinity, because all their churches are solemnly dedicated to that profound mystery; they are also styled Mathurins, from having a monastery at Paris, erected in a place where is a chapel consecrated to St. Mathurin, and Brethren of the Redemption of Captives,† because the grand design of their institution was to find out means for restoring liberty to the Christian captives in the Holy Land, in which charitable work they were obliged to employ a third part of their revenue. Their manner of life was, at first, extremely abstemious and austere; but its austerity has been from time to time considerably mitigated by the indulgence and lenity of the pontiffs.‡

XXI. The religious society that surpassed all the rest in purity of manners, extent of fame, number of privileges, and multitude of members, was that of the Mendicant or begging friars, whose order was first established in this century, and who, by the tenour of their institution, were to remain entirely destitute of all fixed revenues and possessions. The present state and circumstances of the church rendered the establishment of such an order absolutely necessary. The monastic orders, who wallowed in opulence, were, by the corrupting influence of their ample possessions, lulled in a luxurious indolence. They lost sight of all their religious obligations, trampled upon the authority of their superiors, suffered

heresy to triumph unrestrained, and the sectaries to form various assemblies; in short, they were incapable of promoting the true interests of the church, and abandoned themselves, without either shame or remorse, to all sorts of crimes. On the other hand, the enemies of the church, the sects which had left its communion, followed certain austere rules of life and conduct, which formed a strong contrast between them and the religious orders, and contributed to render the licentiousness of the latter still more offensive and shocking to the people. These sects maintained, that voluntary poverty was the leading and essential quality in a servant of Christ; obliged their doctors to imitate the simplicity of the apostles; reproached the church with its overgrown opulence, and the vices and corruptions of the clergy, that flowed thence as from their natural source; and, by their commendation of poverty and contempt of riches, acquired a high degree of respect, and gained a prodigious ascendancy over the minds of the multitude. All this rendered it absolutely necessary to introduce into the church a set of men, who, by the austerity of their manners, their contempt of riches, and the external gravity and sanctity of their conduct and maxims, might resemble those doctors who had gained such reputation to the heretical sects, and who might rise so far above the allurements of worldly profit and pleasure, as not to be seduced, by the promises or threats of kings and princes, from the performance of the duties which they owed to the church, or from persevering in their subordination to the Roman pontiffs. Innocent III. was the first of the popes who perceived the necessity of instituting such an order; and accordingly he treated such monastic societies as made a profession of poverty, with the most distinguishing marks of his protection and favour. These associations were also encouraged and patronised by the succeeding pontiffs, when experience had demonstrated their public and extensive utility. But when it became generally known, that they had such a peculiar place in the esteem and protection of the rulers of the church, their number grew to such an enormous and unwieldy multitude, and swarmed so prodigiously in all the European provinces, that they became a burthen, not only to the people, but to the church itself.

XXII. The great inconvenience that arose from the excessive multiplication of the mendicant orders, was remedied by Gregory X., in 1272, in a general council which he assembled at Lyons; for here all the religious orders, that had sprung up after the council holden at Rome in 1215, under the pontificate of Innocent III., were suppressed, and the "extravagant multitude of mendicants," as Gregory called them, were reduced to a smaller number, and confined to the four following societies, or denominations, viz. the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Carmelites, and the Hermits of St. Augustin.\* The Carmelite order,

\* Concil. Lugd. II. A. 1271, Can. xxxii. in Jo. Harduin Concilios, tom. vii. p. 715. "Impertinens petentium inhiatio Religionum (so were the religious orders entitled) multiplicatorem extorsit, verum etiam aliorum pre-sumptuosa temeritate diversorum ordinum, praeque mendicantium effrenatam multi-

\* Beside the ordinary writers of monastic history, see Pauli Florentini Dialog. de Origine Ordinis Sacerdotum, in Lami Delic. Eruditorum tom. i. p. 1—48.

† Broughton and some other writers make a distinction between the Order of the Redemption of Captives, and the Fraternity of the Holy Trinity. They allege, that the latter order was instituted at Rome by St. Philip Neri, in 1548, about 350 years after the first establishment of the former; and that the monks who composed it, were obliged by their vow to take care of the pilgrims who resorted from all parts of the world to Rome, to visit the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul.

‡ Beside Helyot and the other writers of monastic history, see Toussaint de Plessis, Hist. de l'Eglise de Meaux, tom. i. p. 172, and 566. Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris, tom. ii. p. 523. Ant. Wood, Antiq. Oxon. tom. i. p. 133. In the ancient records, this society is frequently styled the Order of Asses, on account of the prohibition of the use of horses, which made a part of their rule, and which obliged the mendicant monks to ride upon asses. See Car. du Fresnoie's Notes upon Joinville's Life of St. Louis, p. 81. But at present, through the indulgence of the Roman pontiffs, they are permitted to make use of horses when they find them necessary. An order of the same kind was instituted in Spain, in 1228 by Paul Nolasso, under the title of the Order of St. Mary, for the Redemption of Captives. See the Acta Sanctorum Januarii tom. ii. p. 980.

which had been instituted in Palestine during the preceding century, was, in this, transplanted into Europe, and, in 1226, was favoured by pope Honorius III. with a place among the monastic societies, which enjoyed the protection and approbation of the church. The Hermits of St. Augustin had for their founder Alexander IV.,\* who, observing that the hermits were divided into several societies, some of which followed the maxims of the famous William, others the rule of St. Augustin, while others again were distinguished by different denominations, formed the judicious project of uniting them all into one religious order, and subjecting them to the same rule of discipline, even that which bears the name of St. Augustin. This project was put in execution in the year 1256.

XXIII. As the pontiffs allowed to these four Mendicant orders the liberty of travelling wherever they thought proper, of conversing with persons of all ranks, of instructing the youth and the multitude wherever they went;—and as these monks exhibited, in their outward appearance and manner of life, more striking marks of gravity and holiness, than were observable in the other monastic societies,—they arose as it were at once to the very summit of fame, and were regarded with the utmost esteem and veneration in all the countries of Europe. The enthusiastic attachment to these sanctimonious beggars went so far, that, as we learn from the most authentic records, several cities were divided, or partitioned out, into four parts, with a view to these four orders; the first part was assigned to the Dominicans, the second to the Franciscans, the third to the Carmelites, and the fourth to the Augustinians. The people were unwilling to receive the sacraments from any other hands than those of the Mendicants, to whose churches they crowded to perform their devotions, while living, and were extremely desirous to deposit there also their remains after death; all which occasioned grievous complaints among the ordinary priests, who, being entrusted with the cure of souls, considered themselves as the spiritual guides of the multitude. Nor did the influence and credit of the Mendicants end here; for we find in the history of this and of the succeeding ages, that they were employed, not only in spiritual concerns, but also in temporal and political affairs of the greatest consequence, in composing the differences of princes, concluding treaties of peace, concerting alliances, presiding in cabinet-councils, governing courts, levying taxes, and in other occupations, not merely remote from, but absolutely inconsistent with, the monastic character and profession.

XXIV. We must not however imagine, that all the Mendicant friars attained the same degree of reputation and authority; for the power of the Dominicans and Franciscans surpassed greatly that of the other two orders, and rendered them remarkably conspicuous

in the eyes of the world. During three centuries, these two fraternities governed, with an almost universal and absolute sway, both state and church, filled the highest posts ecclesiastical and civil, taught in the universities and churches with an authority before which all opposition was silent, and maintained the pretended majesty and prerogatives of the Roman pontiffs against kings, princes, bishops, and heretics, with incredible ardour and equal success. The Dominicans and Franciscans were, before the Reformation, what the Jesuits became after that happy and glorious event,—the very soul of the hierarchy, the engines of the state, the secret springs of all the motions of both, and the authors or directors of every great and important event both in the religious and political world. Dominic, a Spaniard by birth, a native of Calaroga, descendant of the illustrious house of Guzman, and regular canon of Osma, a man of a fiery and impetuous temper, and vehemently exasperated by the commotions and contests which the heretics of different denominations had excited in the church, set out for France with a few companions, in order to combat the sectaries who had multiplied in that kingdom. This enterprise he executed with the greatest vigour, and, we may add, fury, attacking the Albigenses and the other enemies of the church with the power of eloquence, the force of arms, the subtlety of controversial writings, and the terrors of the *inquisition*, which owed its form to this violent and sanguinary priest. Passing thence into Italy, he was honoured by the Roman pontiffs Innocent III. and Honorius III. with the most distinguished marks of their protection and favour; and, after many labours in the cause of the church, obtained from them the privilege of erecting a new fraternity, whose principal objects were the extirpation of error and the destruction of heretics. The first rule which he adopted for this society was that of the Canons of St. Augustin, to which he added several austere precepts and observances. But he afterwards changed the discipline of the canons for that of the monks; and, holding a chapter of the order at Bologna in 1220, he obliged the brethren to take a vow of absolute poverty, and to abandon all their revenues and possessions. He did not live long enough to see the consequences of this reformation; for he died in the following year at Bologna.† His monks were, at first, distinguished by the denomination of *preaching friars*, because public instruction was the main end of their institution; but, in honour of him, they were afterwards called Dominicans. † [ 𐀀 ] Just before

in the Bullarium Romanum, tom. i. p. 110.—See also Acta Sanctor. Mens. Feb. tom. ii. p. 472.

\* See Jac. Echard and Quetif in Scriptorisbus Ord. Dominic. tom. i. p. 81.—Acta Sanctor. April. tom. iii. p. 872.—Nicol. Jansenii Vita S. Dominici. Add to these the long list of writers mentioned by Fabricius, in his Bibliotheca Lat. med. Ævi, tom. ii. p. 137, and also Antonii Bremondii Bullarium Ordinis Dominicani.

† The Dominicans are called *Fratres Majores* in several of the ancient records: see Ant. Matthæi Analecta vet. Ævi. t. ii. p. 172. This appellation, however, by which the Dominicans were set in opposition to the Franciscans, who called themselves *Fratres Minores*, was rather a term of derision than a real name.—In France the Dominicans were

udinem adinvent . . . Hinc ordines Mendicantes post dictum concilium (i. e. the Lateran council of 1215) adinventos . . . perpetuè prohibiti subiecti sunt.

\* This edict of pope Alexander IV. is to be found

his death, Dominic sent Gilbert de Fresnoy with twelve of the brethren into England, where they founded their first monastery at Oxford, in 1221, and, soon after, another at London. In 1276, the mayor and aldermen of London gave them two whole streets near the river Thames, where they erected a very commodious convent, whence that place still bears the name of Black-Friars; for so the Dominicans were called in England.]

XXV. Francis, the founder of the celebrated order that bears his name, was the son of a merchant of Assisi, in the province of Umbria, and led, in his youth, a most debauched and dissolute life. Upon his recovery from a severe fit of sickness, which was the consequence and punishment of his licentious conduct, he changed his method of living, and, as extremes are natural to men of warm imaginations, fell into an extravagant kind of devotion, that looked less like religion than alienation of mind. Some time after this,\* he happened to be in a church, where he heard that passage of the Scripture repeated, in which Christ addresses his apostles in the following manner: "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves; for the workman is worthy of his meat."† This produced a powerful effect upon his mind, made him consider a voluntary and absolute poverty as the essence of the Gospel and the soul of religion, and prescribe this poverty as a sacred rule both to himself and to the few who followed him. Such was the commencement of the famous Franciscan order, whose chief was undoubtedly a pious and well-meaning man, though grossly ignorant, and manifestly weakened in his intellect by the disorder from which he had recently recovered. Nevertheless the new society, which appeared to Innocent III. extremely adapted to the present state of the church, and proper to restore its declining credit, was solemnly approved and confirmed by Honorius III., in 1223, and had already made a considerable progress when its devout founder, in 1226, was called from this life. Francis, through an excessive humility, would not suffer the monks of his order to be called *Fratres*, i. e. brethren or friars, but *Fratresculi*, i. e. little brethren or friars-minors,‡ by which denomination they continue to be distinguished.§ [§ 7. The Fran-

called *Jacobins*, from the Rue de St. Jaques, where their first convent was erected at Paris.

\* In 1208.

† Matthew x. 9, 10.

‡ They were called *Fratricelli* by the Italians, *Freres Mineurs* by the French, and *Fratres Minores* by the Latin writers.

§ Bonaventura wrote a life of St. Francis, which has passed through several editions. But the most ample and circumstantial accounts of this extraordinary man are given by Luke Wadding, in the first volume of his *Annal. Ord. Min.* a work which contains a complete history of the Franciscan order, confirmed by a great number of authentic records, and the best edition of which is that published at Rome in 1731, and the following years, in eighteen volumes in folio, by Joseph Maria Fonseca ab Ehora. It is to the same Wadding that we are obliged for the *Oposcula Sti. Francis*, and the *Bibliotheca Ordinis Minorum*, the former of which appeared at Antwerp in 1623, and the latter at Rome in 1650. The other writers, who have given accounts of the Franciscan order, are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabri

ciscans came into England in the reign of Henry III., and their first establishment was at Canterbury.]

XXVI. These two orders restored the church from that declining condition in which it had been languishing for many years, by the zeal and activity with which they set themselves to discover and extirpate heretics, to undertake various negotiations and embassies for the interest of the hierarchy, and to confirm the wavering multitude in an implicit obedience to the Roman pontiffs. These spiritual rulers, on the other hand, sensible of their obligations to the new monks, which, no doubt, were very great, not only engaged them in the most important affairs, and raised them to the most eminent stations in the church, but also accumulated upon them employments and privileges, which, if they enriched them on the one hand, could not fail to render them odious on the other,\* and to excite the envy and complaints of other ecclesiastics. Such (among many other extraordinary prerogatives) was the permission they received from the pontiffs, of preaching to the multitude, hearing *confessions*, and pronouncing *absolution*, without any license from the bishops, and even without consulting them; to which we may add the treasure of ample and extensive *indulgences*, whose distribution was committed by the popes to the Franciscans, as a means of subsistence, and a rich indemnification for their voluntary poverty.† These acts of liberality and marks of protection, lavished upon the Dominican and Franciscan friars with such an ill-judged profusion, as they overturned the ancient discipline of the church, and were a manifest encroachment upon the rights of the first and second orders of the ecclesiastical rulers, produced the most unlaippy and bitter dissensions between the Mendicant orders and the bishops. And these dissensions, extending their contagious influence beyond the limits of the church, excited in all the European provinces, and

ciscans, in his *Bibliotheca Lat. mediæ Evi*, tom. ii. p. 573.

\* The popes were so infatuated with the Franciscans, that those whom they could not employ more honourably in their civil negotiations or domestic affairs, they made their publicans, headles, &c. See, for a confirmation of this, the following passages in the *Histor. Major of Matthew Paris*: 'Frates Minores et Predicatores (says he) invitati, ut credimus, jam suos ferit dominus papa, non sine ordinis eorum lesione et scandalo. telonarios et bellos,' p. 634.—'Non cessavit papa pecuniam aggregare, faciens de Fratribus Predicatoribus, et Minoribus, etiam invitati, non jam piscatoribus hominum, sed numerum,' p. 639.—'Erant Minores et Predicatores magnatum consiliatores et nuntii, etiam domini pape secretarii; nuntii in hoc gratiam sibi seculari comparantes; ad an. 1236, p. 354.—'Facti sunt eo tempore Predicatores et Minores regum consiliarii et nuntii speciales, ut sicut quondam molibus induti in domibus regum erant, ita tunc qui vilibus vestiebantur in domibus, cameris, et palatis essent principum; ad an. 1239, p. 465.

† See Baluzii *Miscellan.* tom. iv. p. 490, tom. vii. p. 392.—It is well known, that no religious order had the distribution of so many and such ample indulgences as the Franciscans. Nor could these good friars live and multiply as they did, without some source of profit, since, by their institution, they were to be destitute of revenues and possessions of every kind. It was therefore in the place of fixed revenues, that such lucrative indulgences were put into their hands.

even in the city of Rome,\* under the very eyes of the pontiffs, the most dreadful disturbances and tumults. The measures taken by the popes to appease these tumults were various, but ineffectual, because their principal view was to support the cause of their faithful servants and creatures, the Mendicant friars, and to maintain them in the possession of their honours and advantages.†

XXVII. Among all the controversies which were maintained by the Mendicants, whether against the bishops, abbots, schools, or other religious orders, that was the most famous which arose in 1228, between the Dominicans and the university of Paris, and was prolonged, with various success, until the year 1259. The Dominicans claimed, as their unquestionable right, two theological classes in that celebrated university: one of these had been taken from them, and an acadenical law had passed, importing that no religious order should have what the Dominicans demanded. The latter, however, persisted obstinately in reclaiming the professorship they had lost; while the doctors of the university, perceiving the restless and contentious spirit that animated their efforts, excluded them from their society, and formed themselves into a separate body. This measure was considered as a declaration of war; and, accordingly, the most vehement commotions arose between the contending parties. The debate was brought before the tribunal of the Roman pontiff, in 1255; and the decision, as might have been expected, was in favour of the monks. Alexander IV. ordered the university of Paris not only to restore the Dominicans to their former place in that learned society, but moreover to make a grant to them of as many classes or professorships as they should think proper to demand. This unjust and despotic sentence was opposed by the university with the utmost vigour; and thus the contest was renewed with double fury. But the magistrates of Paris were, at length, so terrified and overwhelmed with the thundering edicts and formidable mandates of the exasperated pontiff, that, in 1259, they yielded to superior force, and satisfied the demands not only of the Dominican, but also of the Franciscan order, in obedience to the pope, and to the extent of his commands.‡ Hence arose that secret enmity and silent ill-will, which prevailed so long between the university and the Mendicant orders, especially the Dominicans.

XXVIII. In this famous debate none pleaded the cause of the university with greater spirit, or asserted its rights with greater zeal and activity, than Guillaume de St. Amour, doctor of the Sorbonne, a man of true genius, worthy to have lived in better times, and capable of adorning a more enlightened age. This vigorous and able champion attacked the whole Mendicant tribe in various treatises with the greatest vehemence, and more especially in a book "concerning the perils of the latter times." He boldly maintained, that their discipline was in direct opposition to the precepts of the Gospel; and that, in confirming and approving it, the popes had been guilty of temerity, and the church was become chargeable with error. What gave occasion to the remarkable title of this celebrated work, was the author's being entirely persuaded that the prophecy of St. Paul, relating to the "perilous times that were to come in the last days,"\* was fulfilled in the establishment of the Mendicant friars. This notion St. Amour maintained in the warmest manner, and proved it, principally from the book called the Everlasting Gospel, which was publicly explained by the Dominicans and Franciscans, and of which we shall have occasion to speak more fully hereafter. The fury and resentment of the Mendicants were therefore kindled in a peculiar manner against this formidable adversary, whom they persecuted without interruption, until, in 1256, the pope ordered his book to be publicly burned, and banished its author out of France, lest he should excite the Sorbonne to renew their opposition to these spiritual beggars. St. Amour submitted to the papal edict, and retired into his native province of Franche-Comte; but, under the pontificate of Clement IV., he returned to Paris, where he illustrated the tenets of his famous book in a more extensive work, and died esteemed and regretted by all, except the Mendicants.‡

XXIX. While the pontiffs accumulated upon the Mendicants the most honourable distinctions, and the most valuable privileges which they had to bestow, they exposed them still more and more to the envy and hatred of the rest of the clergy; and this hatred was considerably increased by the audacious arrogance that discovered itself every where in the con-

\* 2 Timothy, iii. 1.

† The doctors of the university of Paris profess still a high respect for the memory of St. Amour, esteem his book, and deny obstinately that he was ever placed in the list of heretics. The Dominicans, on the contrary, consider him as a heretic of the first magnitude, if we may use that expression. Such of his works as could be found were published in 1632, at Paris, (though the title bears *Constantia*), by Cordesius, who has introduced them by a long and learned preface, in which he defends the reputation and orthodoxy of St. Amour in a triumphant manner. This learned editor, to avoid the resentment and fury of the Mendicants, concealed his real name, and assumed that of Jo. Alitophitus. This did not, however, save his book from the vengeance of these friars, who obtained from Louis XIII. in 1633, an edict for its suppression, which Tournon, a Dominican friar, has published in his *Vie de St. Thomas*.—For a farther account of the life of this famous doctor, see Wadding, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. p. 366.—Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris* tom. iii. p. 266.—*Nat. Alex. Hist. Eccles. sæc. XIII.* cap. iii. art. vii. p. 95.—Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Biblioth. Eccles. de M. Du-Pin*, t. 1. p. 315.

\* Baluzii Miscellan. tom. vii. p. 441.

† See Jo. Launoii *Explicata Ecclesie Traditio circa Canonem. Omnis utriusque Sexus*, tom. I. part. i. op. p. 247.—Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques*, par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 326.—*L'Enfant, Histoire du Concile de Pise*, tom. i. p. 310. tom. ii. p. 8.—Eclardi *Scriptores Dominicani*, tom. i. p. 404. The circumstances of these flaming contests are mentioned by all the writers, both of this and the following centuries.

‡ See Cæs. Egass. du Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. iii. 138, 240, &c.—Jo. Cordesii, or (to mention him by the name he assumed) Jo. Alitophiti *Præf. Hist. et Apologetica ad Opera Gulielmi de S. Amore*.—Antoine Tournon, *Vie de St. Thomas*, p. 134.—Wadding, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. p. 247, 366. tom. iv. p. 14, 52, 106, 263.—Matth. Paris, *Hist. Major*, ad an. 1228.—Nangis *Chronicon*, apud d'Acheui *Spicilegium*, tom. iii. p. 38.



duct of these supercilious orders. They had the presumption to declare publicly, that they had a divine impulse and commission to illustrate and maintain the religion of Jesus; they treated with the utmost insolence and contempt all ranks and orders of the priesthood; they affirmed, without a blush, that the true method of obtaining salvation was revealed to them alone, proclaimed with ostentation the superior efficacy and virtue of their *indulgences*, and vaunted, beyond measure, their interests at the court of Heaven, and their familiar connexions with the Supreme Being, the Virgin Mary, and the saints in glory. By these impious wiles, they so deluded and captivated the miserable and blinded multitude, that they would not entrust any others but the Mendicants with the care of their souls, their spiritual and eternal concerns.\* We may give, as a specimen of these notorious frauds, the ridiculous fable, which the Carmelites impose upon the credulous, relating to Simon Stockius, the general of their order, who died about the beginning of this century. To this ecclesiastic, they tell us that the Virgin Mary appeared, and gave him a solemn promise, that the souls of such as left the world with the Carmelite cloak or scapulary upon their shoulders, should be infallibly preserved from eternal damnation.† And here let it be observed to the astonishment of all, in whom the power of superstition has not extinguished the plainest dictates of common sense, that this ridiculous and impious fiction found patrons and defenders even among the pontiffs.‡

XXX. It is however certain, that the Mendicant orders, though they were considered as the main pillars of the hierarchy, and the principal supports of the papal authority, involved the pontiffs, after the death of Dominic and Francis, in many perplexities and troubles, which were no sooner dispelled, than they were unhappily renewed; and thus the church was often reduced to a state of imminent danger. These tumults and perplexities began with the contests between the Dominicans and Franciscans about pre-eminence, in which these *humble* monks mutually indulged themselves in the bitterest invectives and the severest accusations both in their writings and their discourses, and opposed each other's interests with all the fury of disappointed ambition. Many schemes were formed, and various measures were employed, for terminating these scandalous dissensions; but the root of the evil still remained, and the flame was rather covered than extinguished.§ Beside this, the Franciscans were early divided among themselves, and split into several factions, which gathered strength and consistence from

day to day, and not only disturbed the tranquillity of the church, but struck at the supreme jurisdiction and prerogatives of the Roman pontiffs. And whoever considers with attention the series of events that happened in the Latin church from this remarkable period, will be fully convinced that the Mendicant orders (whether through imprudence or design we shall not determine) gave some very severe blows to the authority of the church of Rome, and excited in the minds of the people those ardent desires of a reformation, which produced, in after-times, such substantial and such glorious effects.

XXXI. The occasion of these intestine divisions among the Franciscans, was a dispute about the precise meaning of their rule. Their founder and chief had made absolute poverty one of their indispensable obligations. The religious orders before his time were so constituted, that, though no single monk had any personal property, the whole community, considered as one collective body, had possessions and revenues, from which every member drew the means of his subsistence. But the austere chief of the Franciscans absolutely prohibited both separate and collective property to the monks of his order, not permitting either the individual or the community to possess funds, revenues, or any worldly goods.\* This injunction appeared so severe to several of the friars-minors, that they took the liberty to dispense with it as soon as their founder was dead; and in this they were seconded by pope Gregory IX., who, in 1231, published an interpretation of this rule, which considerably mitigated its excessive rigour.† But this mitigation was far from being agreeable to all the Franciscans; it shocked the austere monks of that order, those particularly who were called the *Spirituals*,‡ whose melancholy temper rendered them fond of every thing harsh and gloomy, and whose fanatical spirit hurried them always into extremes. Hence arose a warm debate, which Innocent IV. decided, in 1245, in favour of those who were inclined to mitigate the severity of the rule in question. By his decree it was enacted, that the Franciscan friars should be permitted to possess certain places, habitations, chattels, books, &c. and to make use of them, but that the property of all these things should reside in St. Peter or the Roman church; so that without the pope's consent they might neither be sold, bartered, nor transferred, under any pretext whatever. This edict was considered by the gloomy part of the order as a most pernicious deprivation of their holy rule, and was, consequently, opposed and rejected by them with indignation. Hence

\* The words of the rule itself relating to this point are as follows: "Frates sibi nihil appropriant, nec domum, nec locum, nec aliquam rem sed, sicut peregrini et advenæ in hoc sæculo, in paupertate et humilitate famulantes Domino, vadant pro elemosyna confidenter . . . (i. e. let them be sturdy beggars) . . . Hac est illa celestudo altissima paupertatis quæ vos carissimos meos fratres hæredes et reges regni cælorum instituit."

† The bull was published by Emmanuel Roderic in his *Collectio Privilegiorum regularium Mendicantium, et non Mendicantium*, tom. i.

‡ Luc. Wadding, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. p. 99: they were also called Zelatores, and Cæsarians from their chief Cæsarius.

\* See Matth. Paris. ad an. 1246. *Histor. Maj.*

† See Jo. Lannou Lib. de Viso Stœckii, oper. tom. ii. part. ii. p. 379.—Acta Sæctor. tom. iii. Mensis Maii ad diem xvi.—Theop. Rainaudi *Scapulare Marianum*, tom. vii. op. p. 614.

‡ Benedict XIV., notwithstanding his pretended freedom from superstition and priestly fraud, deigned to appear among the supporters of this gross fiction, though he defended it with his usual air of pudence and timidity, in his book de Festis B. Mariæ Virg. lib. ii. cap. vi. p. 472, l. x. op. edit. Rom.

§ See the Alcoran des Cordeliers, tom. i. p. 256, 266, &c. Luc. Wadding, *Annales Minor.* tom. iii. p. 380.

many of these *spiritual* malcontents retired into the woods and deserts, while others were apprehended by Crescentius, the general of the society, and sent into exile.\*

XXXII. A change, however, arose in their favour, in 1247, when John of Parma was chosen general of the order. This famous ecclesiastic, who was zealously attached to the sentiments of the spiritual members, recalled them from their exile, and inculcated upon all his monks a strict and unlimited obedience to the very letter of the rule that had been drawn up by St. Francis.† By this reform, he brought back the order to its primitive state; and the only reward he obtained for his zealous labours, was to be accused as a rebellious heretic at the tribunal of pope Alexander IV., in consequence of which he was obliged to resign his post. He had also the mortification to see the monks who adhered to his sentiments thrown into prison, with great unhappy lot he himself escaped with great difficulty.‡ His successor, the famous Bonaventura, who was one of the most eminent scholastic divines of this century, proposed steering a middle course between the contending factions, having nothing so much at heart as to prevent an open schism. Nevertheless, the measures he took to reconcile the jarring parties, and to maintain a spirit of union in the order, were not attended with the degree of success which he expected from them; nor were they sufficient to hinder the less austere part of the Franciscans from soliciting and obtaining, in 1257, from Alexander IV. a solemn renewal of the mild interpretation which Innocent IV. had given of the rule of their founder.§ On the other hand, those who adhered to the sentiments of John of Parma maintained their cause with such success, that, in an assembly of the order holden in 1260, the explication of Innocent was abrogated and annulled, especially in those points wherein it differed from that which had been formerly given by Gregory IX.¶

XXXIII. This dispute concerning the true sense of the rule of St. Francis was followed by another of equal moment, which produced new and unhappy divisions among the monks of that order. About the commencement of this century, there were handed about in Italy several pretended prophecies of the famous Joachim, abbot of Sora in Calabria,‡ whom the multitude revered as a person divinely inspired, and equal to the most illustrious pro-

phets of ancient times. The greatest part of these predictions were contained in a work entitled the Everlasting Gospel, which was also usually called the Book of Joachim.\* This Joachim, (whether a real or fictitious person we shall not pretend to determine,) among many other future events, foretold the destruction of the church of Rome, whose corruptions he censured with the greatest severity, and the promulgation of a new and more perfect Gospel in the age of the Holy Ghost, by a set of poor and austere ministers, whom God was to raise up and employ for that purpose. For he divided the world into three ages, with reference to the three dispensations of religion. The two imperfect ages,—namely, the age of the Old Testament, which was that of the *Father*, and the age of the New, which was under the administration of the *Son*,—had according to the predictions of this fanatic, already expired, and the third age, that of the *Holy Ghost*, had commenced. The *Spiritual*, i. e. the austere Franciscans, who were, for the most part, well-meaning but wrong-headed enthusiasts, not only swallowed down, with the most voracious and implicit credulity, the prophecies and doctrines which were attributed to Joachim, but applied those predictions to themselves, and to the rule of discipline established by their holy founder St. Francis;‡ for they maintained, that he delivered to mankind the *true Gospel*, and that he was the angel whom St. John saw flying in the midst of heaven.†

XXXIV. When the intestine divisions among the Franciscans were at the greatest height, one of the *Spiritual* friars, whose name was

\* The Merlin of the English, the Malichi of the Irish, and Nostradamus of the French, those pretended soothsayers, who, under the illusory or feigned persuasion of a divine impulse, sang in uncouth verse the future revolutions of church and state, are just what we may suppose the Joachim of the Italians to have been. Many predictions of this latter were formerly handed about, and are still to be seen: they have passed through various editions, and have been illustrated by the lucubrations of several commentators. It is not to be doubted that Joachim was the author of some predictions, and that he, in a particular manner, foretold the reformation of the church, of which he might easily see the absolute necessity. It is however certain that the greatest part of the predictions and writings, which were formerly attributed to him, were composed by others; and this we may affirm even of the Everlasting Gospel, the work undoubtedly of some obscure, silly, and visionary author, who thought proper to adorn his reveries with the celebrated name of Joachim, in order to gain them credit, and to render them more agreeable to the multitude. The title of this senseless production is taken from Revelations, xiv. 6, and it contained three books; the first was entitled, *Liber Concordia Veritatis*, i. e. the Book of the Harmony of Truth; the second, *Apocalypsis Nova*, or the New Revelation; and the third, *Psalterium decem Chordarum*, i. e. the Ten-stringed Harp. This account was taken from a manuscript of that work in the library of the Sorbonne, by Jac. Ehard, who has published it in his *Scriptores Dominicane*, tom. i.

† This is acknowledged even by Wadding, notwithstanding his partiality in favour of the spiritual or austere Franciscans. See his *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 3—6.

‡ Revel. xiv. 6. 'And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the Everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth.' See on this subject Baluzii *Miscellan.* tom. i. p. 231, 235.—Echardi *Scriptor. Dominic.* tom. i. p. 202.—Codex *Inquisit. Tolosane a Linborchio* edit. p. 301.

\* Luc. Wadding, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii. iv.

† Luc. Wadding, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iii.

‡ Wadding, tom. iv.

§ This edict of Alexander IV. is published by Wadding, *Annal. Min.* t. iv. among the Records.

¶ The interpretation of Gregory mitigated the rule of St. Francis; but that of Innocent went much farther, and seemed to destroy its fundamental principles. See Wadding, *Annales Minor.* tom. iv. The lamentable divisions that reigned among the monks of this famous order, are described, in an accurate and lively manner, by Bonaventura himself, in a letter, which is extant in the work now cited.

‡ The resemblance between the words *Sora* and *Flora*, has probably led Dr. Mosheim here into a slight mistake. *Sora* is not in Calabria, but in the province of Capua. It must therefore have been *Flora*, that our author intended to write, as Spanheim, Fleury, and other ecclesiastical historians, have done.

Gerard, undertook the explication of the Everlasting Gospel ascribed to Joachim, in a book which appeared, in 1250, under the title of Introduction to the Everlasting Gospel.\* In

\* As the accounts given of this book, by ancient and modern writers, are not sufficiently accurate, it may not be improper to offer here some observations that may correct their mistakes. 1. They almost all confound the Everlasting Gospel, or the Gospel of the Holy Ghost, (for so it is also called, as we are told by Guil. de St. Amour, in his book de Periculis noviss. Temporum,) with the Introduction to the Everlasting Gospel. But these two productions must be carefully distinguished from each other. The Everlasting Gospel was attributed to the abbot Joachim, and it consisted of three books, as has been already observed. But the Introduction to this Gospel was the work of a Franciscan monk, who explained the obscure predictions of the pretended Gospel, and applied them to his order. The Everlasting Gospel was neither complained of by the university of Paris, nor condemned by the Roman pontiff, Alexander IV.; but the Introduction was complained of, condemned, and burned, as appears evidently from the letters of the above mentioned pontiff, which are to be seen in Boulay's *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. iii. p. 292. The former consisted, as productions of that nature generally do, of ambiguous predictions and intricate riddles, and was consequently despised or neglected; but the latter was dangerous in many respects. 2. It is farther to be observed, that the ancient writers are not agreed concerning the author of this Introduction. They are unanimous in attributing it to one of the mendicant friars; but the votaries of St. Francis maintain, that the author was a Dominican, while the Dominican party affirm as obstinately, that he was a Franciscan. The greatest part of the learned, however, are of opinion, that the author of the infamous work in question was John of Parma, general of the Franciscans, who is known to have been most warmly attached to the spiritual faction of that order, and to have maintained the sentiments of the abbot Joachim with an excessive zeal. See Wadding, (*Annal. Minor*, tom. iv.) who endeavours to defend him against this accusation, though without success. (See also the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. iii. Martii, p. 157; for John of Parma, though he preferred the Gospel of St. Francis to that of Christ, has, nevertheless, obtained a place among the saints.) The learned Eberhard is of a different opinion, and has proved, (in his *Scriptor. Dominican*, tom. i. p. 202.) from the curious manuscripts yet preserved in the Sorbonne, relating to the Everlasting Gospel, that Gerard, a Franciscan friar, was the author of the infamous Introduction to that book. This Gerard, indeed, was the intimate friend and companion to John of Parma, and not only maintained, with the greatest obstinacy, the cause of the spirituals, but also embraced all the sentiments that were attributed to the abbot Joachim, with such an ardent zeal, that he chose to remain 18 years in prison, rather than to abandon them. See Wadding, tom. 4. Those Franciscans who were called *observantes*, i. e. vigilant, from their professing a more rigid observance of the rule of their founder than was practised by the rest of their order, place Gerard among the saints of the first rank, and impudently affirm, that he was not only endowed with the gift of prophecy, but also with the power of working miracles. See Wadding, tom. iii. p. 213. It is to be observed, 3dly, that whoever may have been the writer of this detestable book, the whole mendicant order, in the judgment of the greatest part of the historians of this age, shared the guilt of its composition and publication, more especially the Dominicans and Franciscans, who are supposed to have fallen upon this impious method of deluding the multitude into a high notion of their sanctity, in order to establish their dominion, and to extend their authority beyond all bounds. This opinion, however, is ill founded, notwithstanding the numbers by which it has been adopted. The Franciscans alone are chargeable with the guilt of this horrid production, as appears most evidently from the fragments of the book itself, which yet remain; but we are obliged in justice to observe farther, that this guilt does not lie upon all the Franciscans, but only on the spiritual faction. Perhaps we might go still farther, and allege, that the charge ought not

this book, the fanatical monk, among other enormities, as insipid as impious, inculcated the following detestable doctrine: "That St. Francis, who was the angel mentioned in the Revelations xiv. 6, had promulgated to the world the true and everlasting gospel of God; that the gospel of Christ was to be abrogated in the year 1260, and to give place to this new and everlasting gospel, which was to be substituted in its room; and that the ministers of this great reformation were to be humble and bare-footed friars, destitute of all worldly emoluments."\* When this strange book was published at Paris in 1254, it excited in the doctors of the church, and indeed in all good men, the most lively feelings of horror and indignation against the mendicant friars, who had already, by other parts of their conduct, incurred the displeasure of the public. This general ferment engaged pope Alexander IV., though much against his will, to order the suppression of this absurd book in 1255; he, however, took care to have this order executed with the greatest possible mildness, lest it should hurt the reputation of the mendicants, and open the eyes of the superstitious multitude. But the doctors of the university of Paris, not being satisfied with these gentle and timorous proceedings, repeated without interruption their accusation and complaints, until the extravagant and obnoxious production was publicly committed to the flames. †

XXXV. The intestine flame of discord, which had raged among the Franciscans, and was smothered, though not extinguished, by the prudent management of Bonaventura, broke out anew with redoubled fury after the death of that pacific doctor. Those Franciscan monks who were fond of opulence and ease, renewed their complaints against the rule of their founder as unreasonable and unjust, de-

to be extended even to all the members of this faction, but to such alone as placed an idle and enthusiastic confidence in Joachim, and gave credit to all his pretended prophecies. These observations are necessary to the true understanding of what has been said concerning the Everlasting Gospel by the following learned men: Jo. Andr. Scamundus, *Dissertat. Holmst.* 1700.—Usserius, *de Successione Ecclesiar. Occident.* c. ix. sect. 30.—Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. iii. p. 292.—Natal. Alexander, *Hist. Eccles. sæc. XIII. artic. iv.*—Wadding, *Annal. Minor*, tom. iv.—Upon the whole it may be affirmed, that the book under consideration is not, as the greatest part of the learned have imagined, a monument of the arrogance of the mendicant orders in general, but rather a proof of the impious fanaticism and extravagance of a small number of Franciscans.

\* See Guil. de St. Amour de Periculis noviss. Temp., who observes that the book under consideration was not indeed published before the year 1254, but that the opinions contained in it had an earlier origin, and were propagated even in the year 1200. Several of the ancient writers have given large extracts from this infamous book. See Herin, *Corneri Chronicon*, in *Eccardi Corpore Histor. medi. Ævi*, tom. ii. p. 850.—*Chronicon Egmundianum*, in *Ant. Matthæi Anallectis veteris Ævi*, tom. ii. p. 517.—*Ricobaldus* apud *Eccardi Corp. tom. p. i. 1215*.—But between those extracts there is a great difference, which seems to have arisen from this, that some drew their citations from the Everlasting Gospel of Joachim, while others drew theirs from the Introduction of Gerard, not sufficiently distinguishing one work from the other.

† See Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. iii. p. 299.—*Jordan Chronicon* in *Muratorii Antiq. Ital.* tom. iv. p. 998.

manding what it was absolutely beyond the power of man to perform. Their complaints, however, were without effect; and their schemes were disconcerted by pope Nicolas III., who leaned to the side of the austere Franciscans, and who, in 1279, published that famous *constitution* which confirmed the rule of St. Francis, and contained an accurate and elaborate explication of the maxims it recommended, and the duties it prescribed.\* By this edict he renewed that part of the rule, which prohibited all kinds of property among the Franciscans, every thing that bore the least resemblance to a legal possession, or a fixed domain; but he granted to them, at the same time, the use of things necessary, such as houses, books, and other conveniences of that nature, the property of which, in conformity with the appointment of Innocent IV., was to reside in the church of Rome. Nor did the provident pontiff stop here; but prohibited, under the severest penalties, all private explanations of this new law, lest they should excite disputes, and furnish new matter of contention; and reserved the power of interpreting it to himself and his successors alone.†

XXXVI. However disposed Nicolas was to satisfy the spiritual and austere part of the Franciscan order, which had now become numerous both in Italy and France, and particularly in the province of Narbonne, the constitution above mentioned was far from producing that effect. The monks of that gloomy faction, who resided in Italy, received the papal edict with a sullen and discontented silence. Their brethren in France, and more especially in the southern parts of that kingdom, where the inhabitants are of a warm and sanguine complexion, testified, in an open and tumultuous manner, the disapprobation of this new constitution; and having at their head a famous Franciscan, whose name was Pierre Jean d'Olive, they excited new dissensions and troubles in the order.‡ Pierre was a native of Serignan in Languedoc, who had acquired a shining reputation by his writings, and whose eminent sanctity and learning drew after him a great number of followers; nor is it to be denied, that there were many important truths and wise maxims in the instructions he delivered. One of the great objects of which he never lost sight in his writings, was the corruption of the church of Rome, which he censured with extraordinary freedom and severity, in a work entitled *Postilla*, or a Commentary on the Revelations, affirming boldly, that this church was represented by the 'whore of Babylon, the mother of harlots,' whom St.

John beheld sitting upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads, and ten horns.\* It is however to be observed, that this severe censor of a corrupt church, was himself a most superstitious fanatic in several respects, having imbibed the greatest part of those monstrous opinions, which the Spirituals pretended to have received from the abbot Joachim; to which he added an impious and extravagant veneration for St. Francis, whom he considered as entirely transformed into the person of Christ.† In the debate concerning the sense of the rule of this famous chief, he seemed to adhere to neither of the contending parties; for he allowed to his followers the bare use of the necessaries of life; and being called upon, at different times, by the authority of his superiors, to declare his sentiments upon this head, he professed his assent to the interpretation that had been given of the rule in question by Nicolas III. He leaned, nevertheless, to the side of those austere and spiritual Franciscans, who not only opposed the introduction of property among the individuals of the order, but also maintained, that the whole community, considered collectively, was likewise to be excluded from possessions of every kind. Great was his zeal for these gloomy Franciscans, and he defended their cause with warmth;‡ hence he is looked upon as the chief of that faction, which disputed so often, and so vehemently, with the Roman pontiffs, in favour of the renunciation of property, in consequence of the institution of St. Francis.§

XXXVII. The credit and authority of Pierre d'Olive, whom the multitude considered, not only as a man of unblemished sanctity, but also as a prophet sent from above, added new force and vigour to the Spirituals, and encouraged them to renew the combat with redoubled fury. But the prudence of the heads of the order prevented, for some time, the pernicious effects of these violent efforts, and so over-ruled the impetuous motions of this enthusiastic faction, that a sort of equality was preserved between the contending parties.—But the promotion of Matthew of Aqua Sparta, who was elected general of the order in 1287, put an end to these prudential measures, and changed entirely the face of affairs. This

\* Revelations, xvii. 3, 5.

† Totum Christo configuratum. See the *Litera Magistrorum, de Postilla Fratris P. Joh. Olivi*, in *Baluzii Miscellan.* tom. i. p. 213.—Wadding, *Annales Minor.* tom. v. p. 51.

‡ The real sentiments of Pierre d'Olive will be best discovered in the last discourse he pronounced, which is yet extant in *Boulay's Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 535, and in *Wadding's Annal. Min. t. v. p. 378.*

§ For an account of this famous friar, see not only the common monastic historians, such as Raynaldus, Alexander, and Oudinus; but also the following: *Baluzii Miscel.* tom. i. p. 213. and his *Vit. Pontif. Avenion.* tom. ii. p. 752. *Car. Plessis d'Argenteu, Collectio Judiciorum de novis Ecclesie Argentoribus,* tom. i. p. 226.—*Wadding, Annal. Minor.* tom. v. p. 52, 108, 121, 140, 236, and more especially, p. 378, where he makes an unsuccessful attempt to justify this enthusiast.—*Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 535.—*Schellhornii Annonesitates Literaricæ,* tom. ix. p. 678. *Histoire Generale de Languedoc, par les Moines Benedictins,* tom. iv. p. 91, 179, 182. The bones of Pierre d'Olive were taken up by the order of pope John XXII. and burned publicly with his writings, in the year 1325.

\* Some affirm, that this constitution was issued by Nicolas IV.; but their opinion is refuted by Wadding, in his *Annal. Min.* tom. v.

† This constitution is yet extant in the *Jus. Canon.* lib. vi. *Decretal. Tit. xii. c. in p. 1028.* edit. Bohn, and is vulgarly called the *Constitution Exili*, from its beginning with that word.

‡ In some ancient records, this ring-leader is called *Petrus Biturrorensis*, i. e. Peter of Beziers, because he resided for a long time in the convent of Beziers, where he performed the functions of a public teacher. By others, he is named *Petrus de Serignano*, from the place of his nativity. This remark is so much the more necessary, as some authors have taken these three denominations for three distinct persons.

new chief suffered the ancient discipline of the Franciscans to dwindle away to nothing, indulged his monks in abandoning even the very appearance of poverty, and thus drew upon himself not only the indignation and rage of the austere part of the spiritual Franciscans, but also the disapprobation of the more moderate members of that party. Hence arose various tumults and seditious, first in the marquise of Ancona, and afterwards in France, which the new general endeavoured to suppress by imprisonment, exile, and corporal punishments; but, finding all these means ineffectual, he resigned his place in 1289.\* His successor, Raymond Goffredi, employed his utmost efforts to appease these troubles. For this purpose he recalled the banished friars, set at liberty those who had been thrown into prison, and put out of the way several of the austere Franciscans, who had been the principal encouragers of these unhappy divisions, by sending them into Armenia in the character of missionaries. But the disorder was too far gone to be easily remedied. The more moderate Franciscans, who had a relish for the sweets of property and opulence, accused the new general of a partial attachment to the Spirituals, whom he treated with peculiar affection and respect, and therefore employed their whole credit to procure his dismission from office, which, with much difficulty, they at length effected, under the pontificate of Boniface VIII. On the other hand, the more rigid part of the spiritual faction renounced all fellowship, even with such of their own party as discovered a pacific and reconciling spirit; and, forming themselves into a separate body, protested publicly against the interpretation which Nicolas III. had given of the rule of St. Francis. Thus, from the year 1290, the affairs of the Franciscans carried a dismal aspect, and portended nothing but seditious and schisms in an order which had been so famous for its pretended disinterestedness and humility.†

XXXVIII. In the year 1294, a certain number of Italian Franciscans, of the spiritual party, addressed themselves to Celestin V. for permission to form a separate order, in which they might not only profess, but also observe, in the strictest manner, that austere rule of absolute poverty, which St. Francis had prescribed to his followers. The good pontiff, who, before his elevation to the supremacy of the church, had led a solitary and austere life,‡ and was fond of every thing that looked like mortification and self-denial, granted with the utmost facility the request of these friars, and placed, at the head of the new order, a monk, whose

name was Liberatus, and who was one of the greatest self-tormentors of all the monastic tribe.\* Soon after this, Celestin, finding himself unfit for the duties of his high and important office, resigned the pontificate, in which he was succeeded by Boniface VIII. who annulled all the acts of his predecessor, and suppressed, among other institutions, the new order, which had assumed the title of the *Celestin Hermits of St. Francis*.† This disgrace was, as it were, the signal which drew upon them the most furious attacks of their enemies. The worldly-minded Franciscans persecuted them with the most unrelenting bitterness, accused them of various crimes, and even cast upon them the odious reproach of Manicheism. Hence many of these unhappy fanatics retired into Achia, whence they passed into a small island, where they imagined themselves secure from the rage of their adversaries, and at liberty to indulge themselves in all the austerities of that miserable life, which they looked upon as the perfection of holiness here below. But no retreat was sufficient to screen them from the vigilance and fury of their cruel persecutors, who left no means unemploy'd to perpetuate their miseries. In the mean time, the branch of the spiritual Franciscans that remained in Italy, continued to observe the rigorous laws of their primitive institution in spite of Boniface VIII., who used his utmost efforts to conquer their obstinacy. They erected societies of their order, first in the kingdom of Naples, afterwards in the Milanese, and in the marquise of Ancona; and, at length spreading themselves through the greatest part of Europe, they continued in the most violent state of war with the church of Rome, until the Reformation changed the face of things. In these conflicts they underwent trials and sufferings of every kind, and multitudes of them perished in the flames, as miserable victims to the infernal fury of the Inquisition.‡

\* Wadding, *Annales*, tom. v. p. 321, 338.

† Wadding, *Annales*, tom. vi.—*Bullarium Magnum*, Contin. III. IV. p. 108.

‡ The writers that serve generally as guides in this part of the history of the church, and whom I have been obliged to consult upon the divisions of the Franciscans, (whose history, as will soon appear, is peculiarly interesting and important,) are far from meriting the encomiums which are due to perspicuity and exactness. This part of the ecclesiastical history of what is called the Middle Age, has not hitherto been accurately illustrated by any writer, though it be, every way, worthy of the labours of the learned, and of the attention of Christians. Its principal merit consists herein, that it exhibits striking examples of piety and learning struggling against the power of superstition and ignorance, and against that spiritual tyranny of which they were the principal supports. And it may be observed, that these rebellious Franciscans, though fanatical and superstitious in several respects, deserve an eminent rank among those who prepared the way for the reformation in Europe, and who excited, in the minds of the people, a just aversion to the church of Rome. Raynaldus, Bezovius, Spoudanus, in their *Annals*, Eynicrus, in his *Directorium Inquisitionum*, and Natalis Alexander, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, relate the revolutions that happened in the Franciscan order, and in the church in general, during this period; but their accounts are neither so accurate, nor so ample, as the importance of the events deserved. And as it is from these authors that the protestant historians have drawn their materials, we need not to be surprised at the defects with which the latter abound. Wadding, who merits high encomiums as

\* Wadding, *Annales Min.* tom. v. p. 210, 235.

† *Idem opus*, t. v. p. 108, 121, 140, and more especially p. 235, 236.

‡ This pope, whose name was Peter Mucron, had retired very young to a solitary mountain, in order to devote himself entirely to prayer and mortification. The fame of his piety brought many to see him from a principle of curiosity, several of whom renounced the world, and became the companions of his solitude. With these he formed a kind of community, in 1254, which was approved by Urban IV. in 1264, and erected into a distinct order, called the *Hermits of St. Damien*. On his assumption of the pontifical name of Celestin V., his order, which must not be confounded with the new Franciscan *Celestin Hermits*, took the title of *Celestins*.

XXXIX. Toward the conclusion of this century arose in Italy the enthusiastic sect of the Fratricelli and Bizochi, which, in Germany and France, received the denomination of Beghards. They were condemned by Boniface VIII.,\* and by several of his successors; and the inquisitors were ordered by these despotic pontiffs to persecute them until they were extirpated, which commission they executed with their usual barbarity. The *Fratricelli*, or *Little Brethren*, were Franciscan monks, who separated themselves from the grand community of St. Francis, with an intention of obeying the laws of their parent and founder in a more strict and rigorous manner than they were observed by the other Franciscans, and who, accordingly, renounced every kind of possession and property both common and personal, and begged from door to door their daily subsistence.† They alleged that neither Christ nor

a laborious and learned writer, is yet an uncertain guide, when he treats of the matters now under consideration. His attachment to one party, and his fear of the others, subject him to restraints, that prevent his declaring the truth with a noble freedom. He shades his picture with dexterity. He conceals, dissembles, excuses, acknowledges, and denies, with such a timorous prudence and caution, that the truth could not but suffer considerably under his pen. He appears to have been attached to the rigid Franciscans, and yet had not the courage to declare openly, that they had been injured by the pontiffs. He saw, on the other hand, the tumults and perplexities in which these rigid Franciscans had involved the church of Rome, and the strokes which they had aimed, with no small success, at the majesty of the pontiffs: but he has taken all imaginable pains to throw such a shade upon this part of their conduct, as conceals its violence from the view of his readers. Such then being the characters of the writers who have handed down to us the history of the church in this important period, I could not follow any one of them as a sure or constant guide in all the events they relate, the judgments they form, or the characters they describe. I have not, however, been destitute of a clue to conduct me through the various windings of this intricate labyrinth. The testimonies of ancient authors, with several manuscripts that have never yet been published, such as the Diplomas of the pontiffs and emperors, the Acts of the Inquisition, and other records of that kind, are the authentic sources from which I have drawn my accounts of many things that have been very imperfectly represented by other historians.

\* See Trithemius, An. Hirsang. t. ii. p. 74, though this author is defective in several respects, and more especially in his accounts of the origin and sentiments of the Fratricelli. It is also to be observed, that he confounds, through the whole of his history, the sects and orders of this century one with another, in the most ignorant and unskilful manner. See rather Du Boulay, His. Acad. Paris. t. iii. p. 541, where the edict published in 1297, by Boniface VIII. against the Bizochi or Beghards, is inserted; as also Jordani Chronicon, in Muratorii Antiq. Italiae, tom. iv. p. 1020.

† The Fratricelli resembled the Spirituals in many of their maxims and observances: they, however, were a distinct body, and differed from them in various respects. The Spirituals, for instance, continued to hold communion with the rest of the Franciscans, from whom they differed in points of considerable moment, nor did they ever pretend to erect themselves into a particular and distinct order; the Fratricelli, on the contrary, renounced all communion with the Franciscans, and withdrawing their obedience from the superiors of that society, chose for themselves a new chief, under whom they formed a new and separate order. The Spirituals did not absolutely oppose their order's possessing certain goods jointly and in common, provided they renounced all property in these goods, and confined their pretensions to the mere use of them; whereas the Fratricelli rejected every kind of possession, whether personal or in common and embraced that ab-

his apostles had any possessions, either personal or in common; and that they were the models, whom St. Francis commanded his followers to imitate. After the example also of their austere founder, they went about clothed with sordid garments, or rather with loathsome rags, declaimed against the corruption of the church of Rome, and the vices of the pontiffs and bishops, foretold the reformation of the church and the restoration of the true Gospel, by the genuine followers of St. Francis, and declared their assent to almost all the doctrines, which were published under the name of the abbot Joachim. They esteemed and respected Celestin V., because, as has been already observed, he was, in some measure, the founder of their society, by permitting them to erect themselves into a separate order. But they refused to acknowledge, as true and lawful heads of the church, his successor Boniface and the subsequent pontiffs, who opposed the Fratricelli, and persecuted their order.\*

solute poverty and want which St. Francis had prescribed in his Rule and in his last Testament. We omit the mention of less important differences.

\* The accounts of the Fratricelli, that are given by ancient and modern writers, even by those who pretend to the greatest exactness, are extremely confused and uncertain. Trithemius, in his *Annal. Hirsang.* tom. ii. p. 74, affirms, that they derived their origin from Tanchelinus, and thus ignorantly confounds them with the Catharists: and other sects that arose in those times. The Franciscans leave no means unemployed to clear themselves from all relation to this society, and to demonstrate that such a pestilential and impious sect, as that of the Fratricelli, did not derive their origin from the order of St. Francis. In consequence of this, they deny that the Fratricelli professed the Franciscan rule; and maintain, on the contrary, that the society which was distinguished by this title was a heap of rabble, composed of persons of all kinds and all religions, whom Herman Pongilup, toward the conclusion of this century, assembled at Ferrara, and erected into a distinct order. See Wadding's *Annal. Minor.* tom. vi. p. 279. This author employs all his eloquence to defend his order from the infamous reproach of having given rise to that of the Fratricelli; but his efforts are vain; for he acknowledges, and even proves by unquestionable authorities, that this hated sect professed and observed, in the most rigorous manner, the rule of St. Francis; and nevertheless, he denies that they were Franciscans; by which he means, and indeed can only mean, that they were not such Franciscans as those who lived in subjection to the general of the order, and adopted the interpretation which the popes had given of the rule of their founder. All Wadding's boasted demonstration, therefore, comes to no more than this, that the Fratricelli were Franciscans who separated themselves from the grand order of St. Francis, and rejected the authority of the general of that order, and the laws and interpretations, together with the jurisdiction of the pontiffs; and this no mortal ever took into his head to deny. Hermanus, or (as he is called by many) Armanus Pongilup, whom Wadding and others consider as the parent of the Fratricelli, lived in this century at Ferrara, in the highest reputation for his extraordinary piety; and when he died, in 1269, he was interred with the greatest pomp and magnificence in the principal church of that city. His memory was, for a long time, honoured with a degree of veneration equal to that which is paid to the most illustrious saints; and it was supposed that the Supreme Being bore testimony to his eminent sanctity by various miracles. But, as Pongilup had been suspected of heresy by the Inquisitors of Heretical Depravity, on account of the peculiar austerity of his life, which resembled that of the Catharists, they made, even after his death, such an exact and scrupulous inquiry into his maxims and morals, that, many years after he was laid low in the grave, his impiety was detected and published to the world. Hence it was, that, in 1300, his tomb was destroyed;

XL. As the Franciscan order acknowledged, for its companions and associates, a set of men, who observed the third rule that was prescribed by St. Francis, and were therefore com-

his bones were dug up, and buried by the order of Boniface VIII., and the multitude effectually cured of the enthusiastic veneration they had for his memory. The judicial acts of this remarkable event are recorded by Muratori, in his *Antiquit. Italic. mediæ ævi*, tom. v. p. 93—147, and it appears evidently from them, that those learned men, who consider Pongilup as the founder of the order of the Fratricelli, have fallen into a gross error. So far was he from being the founder of this sect, that he was dead before it was in existence. The truth is, that this famous enthusiast was a Catharist, infected with Pelagian or Manichean principles, and a member of the sect entitled *baguolists*, from a town of that name in Provence, where they resided. Some modern writers, indeed, have seen so far into the truth, as to perceive that the Fratricelli were a separate branch of the rigid and austere Franciscans; but they err in this, that they consider them as the same sect with the Beghards or Beguins, under a different denomination. Such is the opinion adopted by Limborch, (in his *Hist. Inquist. lib. i. cap. xix.*) who seems to have been very little acquainted with the matters now under consideration; by Baluze, in his *Miscellan.* tom. i. p. 195, and Vit. Pontif. Avenionens. tom. i. p. 509; by Beausobre, in his *Dissertation* concerning the Adamites, subjoined to the *History of the Wars of the Hussites*, p. 380; and by Wadding, in his *Annal. Minor.* tom. v. p. 376. But notwithstanding the authorities of these learned men, it is certain, as we shall show in its place, that there was a real difference between the Fratricelli and the Beghards, not indeed with respect to their opinions, but in their rule of discipline and their manner of life.

The principal cause of the errors that have obscured the history of the Fratricelli, is the ambiguity in the denomination of their order. *Fratricellus* or *Fratereulus* (Little Brother) was an Italian nickname, or term of derision, that was applied in this century to all those who, without belonging to any of the religious orders, affected a monkish air in their clothing, their carriage, and their manner of living, and assumed a sanctimonious aspect of piety and devotion. See Villani, *Istorie Fiorentine*, lib. vii. c. 84.—Imola in Dante, p. 112, in Muratori's *Antiq. Ital.* tom. i. And as there were many vagabonds of this kind during this century, it happened that the general term of *Fratricelli* was applied to them all, though they differed considerably from one another in their opinions and in their methods of living. Thus the Catharists, the Waldenses, the Apostles, and many other sects who had invented new opinions in religion, were marked with this denomination by the multitude; while the writers of foreign nations, unacquainted with this ludicrous application of the word, were puzzled in their inquiries after the sect of the Fratricelli, (who had given so much trouble to the Roman pontiffs) were even led into the grossest mistakes, and imagined, at one time, that this order was that of the Catharists; at another, that it was the sect of the Waldenses, &c. But, in order to have distinct ideas of this matter, it must be considered that the word *Fratereulus*, or Little Brother, bore a quite different sense from the ludicrous one now mentioned, when it was applied to the austere part of the Franciscans, who maintained the necessity of observing, in the strictest manner, the rule of their founder. Instead of being a nick name, or a term of derision when applied to them, it was an honourable denomination in which they delighted, and which they preferred infinitely to all other titles. The import of *Fratricelli* corresponds with Friars-Minors; and every one knows, that the latter appellation was adopted by the Franciscans, as an expression of their extraordinary humility and modesty. In assuming this title, therefore, these monks did not, properly speaking, assume a new name, but only translated the ancient name of their order into the Italian language; for those whom the Latins called *Fratres Minores*, the Italians called *Fratricelli*. Of the many proofs we might draw from the best authors in favour of this account of the matter, we shall only allege one from the life of Thom. Aquinas, by Gulielmus de Thoco in *Actis*

monly called Tertiaries;\* so likewise the order of the Fratricelli, who were desirous of being considered as the only genuine followers of St. Francis, had a great number of Tertiaries attached to their cause. These half-monks were called, in Italy, *Bizochi* and *Bocasoli*; in France, *Beguins*; and in Germany *Begwards*, or *Beghards*, which last was the denomination by which they were commonly known in almost all places.† They differed from the Fratri-

Sanctor. Martii, tom. i. cap. ii. sect. xxi. "Destruxit (says that biographer) et tertium pestiferum pravitatis errorem St. Thomas . . . ejus sectatores simul et inventores se nunciant fratereulus de vita paupere, ut etiam sub hoc humilitatis sophistico nomine simplicium corda seducant . . . contra quem errorem pestiferum Johannes papa XXII. mirandam edidit decretalem."

Now this very Decretal of John XXII. against the Fratricelli, which Thoco calls admirable, is, to mention no other testimonies, a sufficient and satisfactory proof of what I have affirmed in relation to that sect. In this act (which is to be seen in the *Extravagantia Joh. XXII. Corp. Juris Canon.* tom. ii. p. 112, edit. Bolmer) the pontiff expresses himself thus: "Nonnulli profane multitudinis viri, qui vulgariter Fratricelli seu Fratres de paupere vita, Bizochi, sive Beguini, nuncupantur in partibus Italie, in insula Sicilia . . . publice medicare solent." He afterwards divides the Fratricelli into monks and tertiaries, or (which amounts to the same thing, as we shall show in its place) into Fratricelli and Beguins. With respect to the Fratricelli, properly so called, he expresses himself thus: "Plurimi regulam seu ordinem Fratrum Minorum . . . se profiteri ad literam conservare confingunt, præterdentes se a sancta memoria Celestino Papa Quinto, prædecessore nostro, hujus status seu vite privilegium habuisse. Quod tamen ceteri ostenderent, non valeret, cum Bonificus papa octavus ex certis causis rationabilibus omnia ab ipso Celestino concessa . . . viribus penitus evacuaverit." Here he describes clearly those Fratricelli, who, separating themselves from the Franciscans with a view to observe more strictly the rule of St. Francis, were erected into a distinct order by Celestin V. And in the following passage he characterises, with the same perspicuity, the Bizochi and Beguins, who entitled themselves of the third order of the penitents of St. Francis: "Nonnulli ex ipsis asserentes se esse de tertio ordine beati Francisci penitentium vocato, prædictum statum et ritum eorum sub velamine talis nominis satagunt palliare."

\* Beside two very austere rules drawn up by St. Francis, the one for the Friars-Minors, and the other for the Poor Sisters, called *Clarisses*, from St. Clara their founder, this famous chief drew up a third, whose demands were less rigorous, for such as, without abandoning their worldly affairs, or resigning their possessions, were disposed to enter with certain restrictions into the Franciscan order, and desirous of enjoying the privileges annexed to it. This rule prescribed fasting, continence, hours of devotion and prayer, mean and dirty apparel, gravity of manners, and things of that nature; but neither prohibited contracting marriage, accumulating wealth, filling civil employments, nor attending to worldly affairs. All the Franciscan historians have given accounts of this third rule, more especially Wadding, *Annal. Min.* tom. ii.—Helyot *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. vii. They who professed this third rule, were called *Friars of the Penance of Christ*, and sometimes also, on account of the meanness of their garments, *Brethren of the Sack*; but they were more generally known by the denomination of *Tertiaries*. The greatest part of the religious orders of the church of Rome imitated this institution of St. Francis, as soon as they perceived the various advantages that were derivable from it. And hence, at this day, these orders continue to have their Tertiaries.

† The Tertiaries that were connected with the order of the Fratricelli, arose about the year 1296, in the marquisate of Ancona and the neighbouring countries, and were called Bizochi, as we learn from the edict issued against them, in 1297, by Boniface VIII., and published by Du Boulay, in his *Historia*, Acad. Fans. tom. iii. p. 541. They are mentioned

celli, not in their opinions and doctrines, but only in their manner of living. The Fratricelli were real monks, subjected to the rule of St. Francis; while the Bizochi or Beguins, if

we except their sordid habit, and certain observances and maxims, which they followed in consequence of the injunctions of the famous saint above mentioned, lived after the manner

under the same title by John XXII. in the bull already cited. Add to all these authorities, that of the learned Du Fresnoy, who, in his Glossar. Latinit. medii, observes, that this denomination is derived from *Biochus*, which signifies in French *une Besace*, i. e. a sack or wallet, such as beggars in general, and these holy beggars in particular, were accustomed to carry about with them. The term *Becassotis*, (or *Vocassotis*, as Du-Boulay writes it,) has without doubt the same origin, and bears the same signification. It is used by Jordan, in his Chronicle, from which we shall cite a remarkable passage in the following note. The denominations of *Beghards* and *Beguins*, given to the Tertiaries in France and Italy, are very frequently met with in the ecclesiastical history of the middle ages. The accounts, however, which both ancient and modern writers generally give of these famous names, are so uncertain, and so different from each other, that we need not be surprised to find the history of the Beghards and Beguins involved in greater perplexity and darkness, than any other part of the ecclesiastical annals of the period now mentioned. It is therefore my present object to remove this perplexity, and dispel this darkness as far as that can be done in the short space to which I am confined, and to disclose the true origin of these denominations.

The words *Beghard* or *Beggehard*, *Begutta*, *Beghinus*, and *Begkind*, which only differ in their terminations, have all one and the same sense. The German and Belgic nations wrote *Beghard* and *Begutte*, which terminations are extremely common in the language of the ancient Germans. But the French substituted the Latin termination for the German, and changed *Beghard* into *Beghinus* and *Beghina*; so that those who in Holland and Germany were called *Beghard* and *Begutte*, were denominated, in France, *Beghini* and *Beghine*. Even in Germany and Holland, the Latin termination was gradually introduced instead of the German, particularly in the feminine term *Begutta*, of which change we might allege several probable reasons, if this were the proper place for disquisitions of that nature. There are many different opinions concerning the origin and signification of these terms, which it would be too tedious to mention, and still more so to refute. Besides, I have done this in a large work concerning the Beghards, wherein I have traced out, with the utmost pains and labour, (from records, the greatest part of which had never before seen the light,) the history of all the sects to whom these names have been given, and have, at the same time, detected the errors into which many learned men have fallen, in treating this part of the history of the church. At present, therefore, setting aside many opinions and conjectures, I shall confine myself to a brief inquiry into the true origin and signification of these words. They are undoubtedly derived from the old German word *beggen* or *beggeren*, which signifies to seek any thing with importunity, zeal, and earnestness. In joining to this word the syllable *hard*, which is the termination of many German words, we have the term *Beggehard*, which is applicable to a person who asks any thing with ardour and importunity; and, therefore, common mendicants, in the ancient German language, were called *Beghard*, from which the English word *beggar* is manifestly derived. *Begutta* signifies a female beggar.—When Christianity was introduced into Germany, the word *beggen*, or *beggeren*, was used in a religious sense, and expressed the act of devout and fervent prayer to the Supreme Being. Accordingly, we find, in the Gothic translation of the Four Gospels attributed to Ulphilas, the word *beggen* employed to express the duty of the earnest and fervent prayer. Hence, when any person distinguished himself from others by the frequency and fervour of his devotional service, he was called a *Beghard*, i. e. a devout man; and the denomination of *Begutta* was given in the same sense, to women of uncommon piety. And as they who distinguished themselves from others by the frequency of their prayers, thus assumed a more striking air of external devotion than the rest of their fellow-Christians, all those who were ambitious of appearing more religious and de-

vout than their neighbours, were called *Beghardi* or *Begutte*.

The observations we have hitherto made with respect to the origin and signification of the words in question, will serve as a clue to rescue the attentive reader from that labyrinth of difficulties in which the subject has been involved. They will also enable him to account for the prodigious multitudes of Beghards and Beguins that sprang up in Europe in the thirteenth century, and will show him how it happened, that these denominations were given to above 30 sects or orders, which differed widely from each other in their opinions, discipline, and manner of living. The original signification of the word *Beghard*, (or *Beggert*, as it was pronounced by the common people) was *importunate beggar*. Therefore, when the people saw certain persons, not only embracing with resignation, but also with the most voluntary choice, and under a pretext of devotion, the horrors of absolute poverty, begging their daily bread from door to door, and renouncing all their worldly possessions and occupations, they called all such persons *Beghards*, or, if they were women, *Beguttles*, without considering the variety of opinions and maxims by which they were distinguished. The sect called *Apostles*, the rigid Franciscans, the *brethren of the free spirit* (of whom we shall speak hereafter,) all embraced this sordid state of beggary; and though among these orders there was not only a wide difference, but even the greatest opposition, the Germans called them indiscriminately *Beghards*, from the miserable state which they had all embraced. Nor is this to be wondered at; the character which they possessed in common was striking, while the sentiments and maxims that divided them escaped the observation of the multitude.

But the word *Beghard* acquired a second, and a new signification, in this century, being employed, as we have already observed, to signify a person who prayed with uncommon frequency, and who distinguished himself from those about him by an extraordinary appearance of piety. The force of this term, in its new signification, is the same with that of the word *Methodist*, which is at present the denomination of a certain sect of fanatics in Great Britain. Such, therefore, as departed from the manner of living that was usual among their fellow-citizens, and distinguished themselves by the gravity of their aspect and the austerity of their manners, were comprehended under the general denomination of *Beghards* and *Beguttles* in Germany, and of *Beguins* and *Beguines* in France. These terms, as we could show by many examples, comprehended at first even the monks and nuns; but, in process of time, they were confined to those who formed a sort of intermediate order between the monks and citizens, and who resembled the former in the manner of living, without assuming their name or contracting their obligations. The Tertiaries, therefore, or half-monks of the Dominican, Franciscan, and, in general, of all the religious orders, were called *Beghards*; for though, as lay-citizens, they belonged to the body politic, yet they distinguished themselves by their monkish dispositions, and their profession of extraordinary piety and sanctity of manners. The fraternity of weavers, the Brethren of St. Alexius, the followers of Gerard the Great, in a word, all who pretended to an uncommon degree of sanctity and devotion, were called *Beghards*, although they procured the necessities of life by honest industry, without having recourse to the sordid trade of begging.

The denominations, therefore, of Beghards, Beguttles, Beguins, and Beguines, are rather honourable than otherwise, when we consider their origin; and they are mentioned as such, in several records and deeds of this century, whose authority is most respectable, particularly in the Testament of St. Louis, king of France. But, in the sequel, these terms lost gradually, as the case often happens, their primitive signification, and became marks of infamy and derision. For, among these religious beggars and these sanctimonious pretenders to extraordinary piety, there were many, whose piety was nothing more than the most senseless superstition; many, also,



of other men, and were therefore considered in no other light, than as seculars and laymen.\* It is, however, to be observed, that the Bizochi were divided into two classes, which derived their respective denominations of *perfect* and *imperfect*, from the different degrees of austerity that they discovered in their manner of living. The perfect lived upon alms, abstained from wedlock, and had no fixed habitations. The imperfect, on the contrary, had their houses, wives, and possessions, and were engaged, like the rest of their fellow-citizens, in the various affairs of life.†

XLI. We must not confound these Beguins and Beguines, who derive their origin from an austere branch of the Franciscan order, with the German and Belgic Beguines, who crept out of their obscurity in this century, and multiplied prodigiously in a very short time.‡

whose austere devotion was accompanied with opinions of a corrupt nature, entirely opposite to the doctrine of the church; and (what was still more horrible) many artful hypocrites, who, under the mask of religion, concealed the most abominable principles, and committed the most enormous crimes. These were the fools and knaves who brought the denomination of Beghard into disrepute, and rendered it both ridiculous and infamous; so that it was only employed to signify idiots, heretics, or hypocrites. The denomination of Lollards, of which sect we shall soon have occasion to speak, met with the same fate, and was rendered contemptible by the persons who masked their iniquity under that specious title.

\* See the Acta Inquis. Tolos. published by Limborch, p. 298, 302, &c. Among the various passages of ancient writers, which tend to illustrate the history of the Fratricelli and Beguins, I shall quote only one, which is to be found in Jordan's Chronicon, published by Muratori, in his Antiq. Ital. mediæ ævi, tom. iv. p. 1020, and confirms almost every thing we have said upon that head; anno 1294. "Petrus de Macerata et Petrus de Forbsenapromio apostate fuerunt ordinis Minorum et heretici. His penitentibus eremitice vivere, ut regulam B. Francisci ad literam servare possent; quibus plures Apostate adhererunt, qui statum communitatis damnabant et declarationes regula, et vocabant se Fratres S. Francisci (he ought to have said *Fratricellos*) Seculares, (i. e. the Tertiaries, who were the friends and associates of the Fratricelli, without quitting, however, their secular state, or entering into the monastic order;) Seculares autem vocarunt Bizochios aut Fratricellos vel Boesios." Jordan, however, errs in affirming, that the Seculares were called Fratricelli; for the latter name belonged only to the true monks of St. Francis, and not to the Tertiaries. The other circumstances of this account are exact, and show that the more austere professors of the Franciscan rule were divided into two classes, namely, friars and seculars, and that the latter were called *Bizochi*. "† Dogmatizabant, quod nullus summus pontifex regulam B. Francisci declarare possit. Item, quod angelus abstulit a Nicolao tertio papatus auctoritatem. . . . Et quod ipsi solent in via Dei et vera celestia," &c.

‡ This division is mentioned, or supposed by several authors, and more especially in the Acta Inquis. Tolosana, p. 303, &c.

§ In the seventeenth century, there was a great debate carried on in the Netherlands on this subject. In the course of this controversy it was proved, by the most authentic and unexceptionable records and diplomas, that, so early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries, there had been several societies of Beguines established in Holland and Flanders. It is true, that no more than three of these authentic acts were produced; the first was drawn up in 1065, the second in 1129, the third in 1151; and they were all three drawn up at Vilvorde by the Beguines. See Aub. Miraus, Opera Diplomatico-historica, tom. ii. c. xxvi. p. 948, and tom. iii. p. 623.—Erycius Puteanus, de Beghinarum apud Belgas Instituto. This treatise of Puteanus is to be found with another of the same author, and upon the same subject, in a work en-

Their origin was of earlier date than this century; but it was only now that they acquired a name, and made a noise in the world. Their primitive establishment was, undoubtedly, the effect of virtuous dispositions and upright intentions. A certain number of pious women, both virgins and widows, in order to maintain their integrity, and preserve their principles from the contagion of a vicious and corrupt age, formed themselves into societies, each of which had a fixed place of residence, and lived under the inspection and government of a female head. Here they divided their time between exercises of devotion, and works of honest industry, reserving to themselves the liberty of entering into the state of matrimony, as also of quitting the convent, whenever they thought proper. And as all those among the female sex, who made extraordinary professions of piety and devotion, were distinguished by the title of *Beguines*, (i. e. persons who were uncommonly assiduous in prayer,) that title was given to the women of whom we are now speaking.\* The first regular society of this kind that we read of, was formed at Nivelles in Brabant, in 1226;† and it was followed by so many institutions of a like nature in France, Germany, Holland, and Flanders, that, toward the middle of the thirteenth century, there was scarcely a city of any note, that had not its *beguinage*, or *vineyard*, as it was sometimes called in conformity to the style of the Song of Songs.‡ All these female so-

called Josephi Goldolphii a Ryckel Vita S. Begga, cum Annotationibus, p. 65—227. Duaci, 1631. Now, though we grant that those writers have not fallen into an error who place the rise of the Beguines in the twelfth or thirteenth century, yet the small number of authentic records, which they have to produce in favour of their antiquity, is an incontestable proof of the obscurity in which they lay concealed before the time in which these authors placed their origin, and may render it almost probable, that the only convent of Beguines, that existed before the thirteenth century, was that of Vilvorde.

\* All the Beghards and Beguines that yet remain in the Netherlands, where their convents have almost entirely changed their ancient and primitive form, affirm unanimously, that both their name and institution derive their origin from St. Begge, duchess of Brabant, and daughter of Pepin, mayor of the palace of the king of Austrasia, who lived in the seventh century. This lady, therefore, they consider as their patroness, and honour her as a kind of tutelary divinity with the deepest sentiments of veneration and respect. See Jos. Geld. a Ryckel, Vit. S. Begga, a work of great bulk and little merit, and full of the most silly and insipid fables.—Those who are not well wishers to the cause of the Beguines, adopt a quite different account of their origin, which they deduce from Lambert le Begne, a priest and native of Liege, who lived in the twelfth century, and was much esteemed for his eminent piety. The learned Peter Coens, canon of Antwerp, has defended this opinion with more erudition than any other writer, in his Disquisitio Historica de Origine Beghinarum et Beghinagiorum in Belgio, Leod. 1672.

§§ Other historians say, in 1207.

¶ See Math. Paris, Histor. Major, ad An. 1213 and 1250, p. 510, 686.—Thomas Cantuarvensis in Bono Universali de Apibus, lib. ii. cap. li.—Pet. de Herenthal, in his Annals, from which we have a very remarkable passage cited by Jos. Geld. a Ryckel, in his *Observationes ad Vitam S. Begga*, sect. cxvii. The origin and charters of the convents of Beguines, that were founded during this and the following century in Holland and Flanders, are treated in a ample manner by Aub. Miraus, in his Opera Historico-diplomatica, John Bapt. Grammaye, in his Antiquitates Belgicae, Anton. Sanders, in his Bra-

cieties were not governed by the same laws; but, in the greatest part of them, the hours that were not devoted to prayer, meditation, or other religious exercises, were employed in weaving, embroidering, and other manual labours. The poor, sick, and disabled Beguines, were supported by the pious liberality of such opulent persons as were friends to the order.

XLII. This female institution was soon imitated in Flanders by the other sex; and considerable numbers of unmarried men, both bachelors and widowers, formed themselves into communities of the same kind with those of the Beguines, under the inspection and government of a certain chief, and with the same religious views and purposes; reserving to themselves, however, the liberty of returning to their former mode of life.\* These pious persons were, in the style of this age, called *Beghards*, and (by a corruption of that term usual among the Flemish and Dutch) *Bogards*; from others they received the denomination of *Lollards*: in France they were distinguished at first by that of *Bons Valets*, or *Bons Garçons*, and afterwards by that of *Beguins*: they were also styled the *Fraternity of Weavers*, from the trade which the greatest part of them exercised. The first Beghard society seems to have been that which was established at Antwerp in 1228; and this establishment was followed by many similar associations in Germany, France, Holland, and Flanders, though, after all their success, their congregations were less numerous than those of the Beguines.† It is worthy of observation, that the Roman pontiffs never honoured the societies of the Beghards and Beguines with their solemn or explicit approbation, or confirmed their establishments by the seal of their authority. They, however, granted them a full toleration, and even defended them often against the stratagems and violence of their enemies, who were many in number. This appears by the edicts in favour of the Beghards, which the pontiffs granted in compliance with the solicitations of many illustrious personages, who wished well to that society. It did not, however, continue always to flourish. The greatest part of the convents, both of the Beghards and Beguines, are now either demolished, or converted to other uses. In Flanders, indeed, a considerable number of the latter still subsist, but few of the former are to be found in any country.

XLIII. After the accounts hitherto given of the rulers of the church, and of the religious orders that were instituted or became famous during this century, it will not be improper to conclude this chapter, by mentioning briefly

bantia et Flandria illustrata, and by other writers of the Belgic history.

\* Matth. Paris, Hist. Major, ad An. 1253.

† See Ryckeli Vita S. Begge, p. 635.—Ant. Sanderi Flandria Illustrata, lib. iii. c. xvi. Jo. Bapt. Grammaye's Antiquit. Fland. p. 22.—Aub. Mirai Opera Diplom. Hist. tom. iii. c. clxviii.—Helyot, Hist. des Ordres, tom. vii. p. 218, who is nevertheless chargeable with many errors.—Gerardus Antoninus, Pater Minister (so the head of the order is called in our times) Beghardorum Antwerpensium, in Epistola ad Ryckium de Beghardorum origine et fatis, in Ryckeli Vita S. Begge, p. 189. This author, indeed, from a spirit of partiality to his order, conceals the truth designedly in various places

the Greek and Latin writers, who, during the same period, acquired fame by their learned productions. The most eminent among the Greeks were,

Nicetas Acominatus, who composed a work, entitled the History and Treasure of the Orthodox Faith;

Germanus, the Grecian patriarch, of whom we have yet extant, among other productions of less note, a Book against the Latins, and an Exposition of the Greek Liturgy;

Theodorus Lascaris, who left behind him several treatises upon various subjects of a religious nature, and who also entered the lists against the Latins, which was the reigning passion among such of the Greeks as were endowed with tolerable parts, and were desirous of showing their zeal for the honour of their nation;

Nicephorus Blennida, who employed his talents in the salutary work of healing the divisions between the Greeks and Latins;

Arsenius, whose Synopsis of the Canon Law of the Greeks is far from being contemptible;

Georgius Acropolita, who acquired a high degree of renown, not only by his historical writings, but also by the transactions and negotiations in which he was employed by the emperor Michael;

Johannas Beccus or Veccus, who involved himself in much trouble, and excited the odium of many, by defending the cause of the Latins against his own nation with too much zeal;

George Metochita, and Constantine Meliteniota, who employed, without success, their most earnest efforts to bring about a reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins;

George Pachymeres, who acquired reputation by his commentary upon Dionysius, the pretended chief of the mystics, and by a history which he composed of his own time; and,

George the Cyprian, whose hatred of the Latins, and warm opposition to Veccus above-mentioned, rendered him more famous than all his other productions.\*

XLIV. The prodigious number of Latin writers that appeared in this century, renders it impossible for us to mention them all; we shall therefore confine our account to those among them, who were the most eminent, and whose theological writings demand most frequently our notice in the course of this history. Such were,

Joachim, abbot of Flora in Calabria, who was a man of mean parts and of a weak judgment, full of enthusiastic and visionary notions, but was esteemed for his piety and supposed knowledge, and was even considered, during his life and after his death, by the miserable and blinded multitude, as a prophet sent from above. The pretended prophecies of this silly fanatic are abundantly known, and have been frequently published;†

\* For a more ample account of all these writers, the reader may consult the Bibliotheca Græca of Fabricius.

† The life of Joachim was written in Italian by Gregory di Lauro, and published at Naples in 1660. The first edition of his prophecies appeared at Venice, in 1517; and it was followed by several new editions, to satisfy the curiosity of the populace great and small

Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, who wrote commentaries upon the greatest part of the books of Scripture;\*

Francis, the founder of the famous society of Friars-minors, or Franciscans, whose writings were designed to touch the heart, and excite pious and devout sentiments, but discover little genius, and less judgment.

Alan de l'Isle, a logician, who made no mean figure among the disputations tribe; who applied himself also to the study of chemistry, and published several moral discourses, in which are many wise and useful exhortations and precepts;†

Jacobus de Vitriaco, who acquired a name by his Oriental History; and Jacobus de Voragine, whose History of the Lombards‡ was received with applause.

The writers of this century, who obtained the greatest renown on account of their laborious researches in what was called philosophical or dialectical theology, were Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Bonaventura, who respectively possessed an inquisitive turn of mind, and a sublime and penetrating genius, accompanied with an uncommon talent of exploring the most hidden truths, and treating with facility the most abstruse subjects, though they are all chargeable with errors and reveries that do little honour to their memories.§ The other writers, who trod the same intricate paths of metaphysical divinity, were many in number, and several of them were justly admired, though much inferior in renown to the celebrated triumvirate now mentioned; such were Alexander Hales, the interpreter of Aristotle, William of Paris,|| Robert Capito,¶ Thomas Cantipratensis, John of Peckham, William Durand, Roger Bacon,\*\* Richard Middleton, Giles de Colonna, Armand de Bello-Visto, and several others.

Hugo de St. Caro gained much applause by his Concordance of the Holy Bible.††

Ⓔ \* Langton was a learned and polite author for the age in which he lived. To him we are indebted for the division of the Bible into chapters. He wrote commentaries upon all the books of the Old Testament, and upon St. Paul's Epistles.

† Several of the name of Alan lived in this century, who have been strangely confounded, both by ancient and modern writers. See Jac. le Boeuf, *Mémoires sur l'Hist. d'Auxerre*, tom. 1. and *Dissert. sur l'Hist. Civil. et Eccles. de Paris*, tom. ii.

‡ Jac. Echaridi Scriptor. *Domini*. t. i.—Bollandi *Præf. ad Acta Sanctorum*.

§ For an account of Albert, see Echarid. *Script. Dom. tom. i.*—For an account of Thomas Aquinas, who was called the *Angel of the Scholastics* among other splendid titles, see the *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i. and *Ant. Tournon, Vie de St. Thomas*, Paris, 1737.—We have also a circumstantial relation of whatever concerns the life, writings, and exploits of Bonaventura, the tutelar saint of the Lyonnais, in France, in the two following books, viz. *Colonia's Histoire Littéraire de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. and the *Histoire de la Vie et du Culte de St. Bonaventure*, par un Religieux Cordelier.

|| See the *Gallia Christiana*, published by the Benedictines, tom. vii.

¶ Anthony Wood has given an ample account of Robert Capito, in his *Antiquitat. Oxoniens.* tom. i.

Ⓔ \*\* We are surprised to find Roger Bacon thrust here into a crowd of vulgar literati, since that great man, whose astonishing genius and universal learning have already been noticed, was in every respect superior to Albert and Bonaventura, two of the heroes of Dr. Mosheim's triumvirate.

Ⓔ †† Hugo de St. Caro, or St. Cher, composed also

Gaillaume de St. Amour carried on with great spirit and resolution, but with little success, a literary and theological war against those friars who looked upon begging as a mark of sanctity.

Humbert de Romanis drew up a system of rules and precepts, with a view of subjecting to a better regulation the lives and manners of the monastic orders.

William Perald arose in this century to a high degree of literary renown, in consequence of a system of morals he published under the title of *Somma Virtutum et Vitiurum*.\*

Raymond Martin yet survives the oblivion that has covered many of his contemporaries; and his *Pugio Fidei*, or *Sword of Faith*, which he drew against the Jews and Saracens, has escaped the ruins of time.

John of Paris deserves an eminent rank among the glorious defenders of truth, liberty, and justice, since he maintained the authority of the civil powers, and the majesty of kings and princes, against the ambitious stratagems and usurpations of the Roman pontiffs, and declared openly his opposition to the opinion that was commonly adopted with respect to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and the presence of Christ in that holy ordinance.‡

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.*

I. HOWEVER numerous and deplorable were the corruptions and superstitious abuses which had hitherto reigned in the church, and deformed the beautiful simplicity of the Gospel, they were nevertheless increased in this century, instead of being reformed; and the religion of Christ continued to suffer under the growing tyranny of fanaticism and superstition. The progress of reason and of truth was retarded among the Greeks and Orientals, by their immoderate aversion to the Latins, their blind admiration of whatever bore the stamp of antiquity, the indolence of their bishops, the stupidity of their clergy, and the calamities of the times. Among the Latins, many concurring causes united to augment the darkness of that cloud which had already been cast over the divine lustre of genuine Christianity. On the one hand, the Roman pontiffs could not bear the thought of any thing that might have even the remotest tendency to diminish their authority, or to encroach upon their prerogatives; and therefore they laboured assiduously to keep the multitude in the dark, and to blasphemously every attempt that was made toward a reformation in the doctrine or discipline of the church. On the other hand, the school divines,

a very learned collection of the various readings of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin manuscripts of the Bible. This work, which he entitled *Correctorium Biblicæ*, is preserved in manuscript in the Sorbonne Library. We must not forget to observe also, that his Concordance is the first that ever was compiled.

\* See *Colonia, Histoire Littéraire de la Ville de Lyon*, tom. ii. p. 322.

‡ We may learn his opinion concerning the eucharist from his treatise entitled *Determinatio de S. Cæna*, published at London, by the learned Dr. Afix, in 1686.—See also Echaridi Scriptor. *Dominican.* tom. i. p. 501.—Baluzi *Vitæ Pontif. Avenionens.* tom. i.

among whom the Dominican and Franciscan monks made the greatest figure on account of their unintelligible jargon and subtlety, shed perplexity and darkness over the plain truths of religion by their intricate distinctions and endless divisions, and by that cavilling, quibbling, disputatious spirit, which is the mortal enemy both of truth and virtue. It is true that these scholastic doctors were not all equally chargeable with corrupting the truth; the most enormous and criminal corruptors of Christianity were those who led the multitude into the two following abominable errors: that it was in the power of man to perform, if he wished, a more perfect obedience than God required; and that the whole of religion consisted in an external air of gravity, and in certain composed bodily gestures.

II. It will be easy to confirm this general account of the state of religion by particular facts. In the fourth Lateran council, convoked by Innocent III., in 1215, and at which an extraordinary number of ecclesiastics were assembled,\* that imperious pontiff, without deigning to consult any body, published no less than seventy laws or decrees, by which not only the authority of the popes and the power of the clergy were confirmed and extended, but also new doctrines, or *articles of faith*, were imposed upon Christians. Hitherto the opinions of the Christian doctors, concerning the *manner* in which the body and blood of Christ were *present* in the eucharist, were extremely different; nor had the church determined, by any clear and positive decree, the sentiment that was to be embraced in relation to that important matter. It was reserved for Innocent to put an end to the liberty, which every Christian had hitherto enjoyed, of interpreting this presence in the manner he thought most agreeable to the declarations of Scripture, and to decide in favour of the most absurd and monstrous doctrine that the phrensy of superstition was capable of inventing. This audacious pontiff pronounced the opinion, which is embraced at this day in the church of Rome with regard to that point, to be the only true and orthodox account of the matter; and he had the honour of introducing and establishing the use of the term *Transubstantiation*, which was hitherto absolutely unknown.† The same pontiff placed, by his own authority, among the duties prescribed by the divine laws, that of *auricular confession* to a priest; a confession that implied not only a general acknowledgment, but also a particular enumeration of the sins and follies of the penitent. Before this period several doctors, indeed, looked upon this kind of confession as a duty inculcated by divine authority; but this opinion was not publicly received as the doctrine of the church; for, though the confession of sin was justly deemed an essential duty, yet it was left to every Christian's choice, to make the confession mentally to the Supreme Being, or to express it in words to a spiritual confidant and

director.\* These two laws, which, by the authority of Innocent, were received as laws of God, and consequently adopted as laws of the church, occasioned a multitude of new injunctions and rites, of which not even the smallest traces are to be found in the sacred writings, or in the apostolic and primitive ages; and which were much more adapted to establish and extend the reign of superstition, than to open the eyes of the blinded multitude upon the enormous abuses of which it had been the source.

III. There is nothing that will contribute more to convince us of the miserable state of religion in this century, and of the phrensy that prevailed in the devotion of these unhappy times, than the rise of the sect called *Flagellantes*, or *Whippers*, which sprang up in Italy, in 1260, and thence diffused itself through almost all the countries of Europe. The societies that embraced this new discipline, presented the most hideous and shocking spectacle that can well be conceived; multitudes, composed of persons of both sexes, and of all ranks and ages, ran through the public places of the most populous cities, and also through the fields and deserts, with whips in their hands, lashing their naked bodies with astonishing severity, filling the air with their wild shrieks, and beholding the firmament with an air of distraction, ferocity, and horror; and all this with a view to obtain the divine mercy for themselves and others, by their voluntary mortification and penance.‡ This method of appeasing the Deity was perfectly conformable to the notions of religion that generally prevailed in this century; nor did these fanatical Flagellators do any thing more, in this extravagant discipline, than practise the lessons which they had received from the monks, especially from the mendicant fanatics. Hence they attracted the esteem and veneration, not only of the populace, but also of their rulers, and were honoured and revered by all ranks and orders, on account of their extraordinary sanctity and virtue. Their sect, however, did not always continue in the same high degree of credit and reputation; for, though the primitive whippers were exemplary in point of morals, yet their societies were augmented, as might naturally be expected, by a turbulent and furious rabble, many of whom were infected with the most ridiculous and even impious opinions. Hence both the emperors and pontiffs thought proper to put an end to this religious phrensy, by declaring all devout flagellation contrary to the divine law, and prejudicial to the soul's eternal interests.

IV. The Christian interpreters and commentators of this century differ very little from those of the preceding times. The greatest part of them pretended to draw from the depths of truth, (or rather of their imagin-

\* See the book of the learned Daille, concerning Auricular Confession.

† Christ. Schotgenii Historia Flagellantium.—Jacques Boileau, Histoire des Flagellans, chap. ix. We have also a lively picture of this fanatical discipline of the Whippers, exhibited in Martenne's Voyage Littéraire de deux Benedictins, tom. ii. with which the reader may compare Muratori's Antiq. Ital. medii Ævi, tom. vi.

† See Edm. Albertinus, de Eucharistia, lib. iii. p. 972.

tions,) what they called the *internal juice and marrow* of the Scriptures, i. e. their hidden and mysterious sense; and this they did with so little dexterity, so little plausibility and invention, that the greater part of their explications must appear insipid and nauseous to such as are not entirely destitute of judgment and taste. If our readers be desirous of a proof of the justice of this censure, or curious to try the extent of their patience, they have only to peruse the explications that have been given by Archbishop Langton, Hugh de St. Cher, and Antony of Padua, of the various books of the Old and New Testament. The mystic doctors carried this visionary method of interpreting Scripture to the greatest height, and displayed the most laborious industry, or rather the most egregious folly, in searching for mysteries, where reason and common sense could find nothing but plain and evident truths. They were too *penetrating* and *quick-sighted* not to perceive clearly in the holy scriptures all those doctrines that were agreeable to their idle and fantastic system. Nor were their adversaries, the schoolmen, entirely averse to this arbitrary and fanciful manner of interpretation, though their principal industry was employed rather in collecting the explications given by the ancient doctors, than in inventing new ones, as appears from the writings of Alexander Hales, William Alvernus, and Thomas Aquinas himself. We must not, however, omit observing, that the scholastic doctors in general, and more especially these now mentioned, had recourse often to the subtleties of logic and metaphysics, to assist them in their explications of the sacred writings. To facilitate the study and interpretation of these divine books, Hugh de St. Cher composed his *Concordance*,\* and the Dominicans, under the eye of their supreme chief, the learned Jordan, gave a new edition of the Latin translation of the Bible, carefully revised and corrected from the ancient copies.† The Greeks contributed nothing that deserves attention toward the illustration of the Scriptures; the greatest part of which were expounded with great learning by Gregory Abulpharaj, that celebrated Syrian, whose erudition was famous throughout the east, and whom we have already had occasion to mention.‡

V. Systems of theology and ethics were multiplied exceedingly in this century; and of those writers, who treated of the divine perfections and worship and of the practical rules of virtue and obedience, the number is too great to permit specification. All such as were endowed with any considerable degree of genius and eloquence, employed their labours upon these noble branches of sacred science, more especially the academical and public teachers, among whom the Dominicans and Franciscans held the most eminent rank. It is, indeed, unnecessary to mention the names, or enumerate the productions of these doctors, since whoever is acquainted with the charac-

ters and writings of Albert the Great, and Thomas Aquinas, will know every thing that is worthy of note in the rest, who were no more than their echoes. The latter of these truly great men, commonly called the Angel of the Schools, or the Angelic Doctor, sat unrivalled at the head of the divines of this century, and deservedly obtained the principal place among those who digested the doctrines of Christianity into a regular system, and illustrated and explained them in a scientific manner. For no sooner had his system, or *sum* of theology and morals, seen the light, than it was received almost universally with the highest applause, placed in the same rank with Lombard's famous Book of Sentences, and admitted as the standard of truth, and the great rule according to which the public teachers formed their plans of instruction, and the youth their methods of study. Some writers, indeed, have denied that Thomas was the author of the celebrated system that bears his name;§ but the reasons which they allege in support of this notion are destitute of evidence and solidity.‡

VI. The greatest part of these doctors followed Aristotle as their model, and made use of the logical and metaphysical principles of that subtle philosopher, in illustrating the doctrines of Christianity, and removing the difficulties with which some of them were attended. In their philosophical explications of the more sublime truths of that divine religion, they followed the hypothesis of the *Realists*,‡ which sect, in this century, was much more numerous and flourishing than that of the *Nominalists*, on account of the lustre and credit it derived from the authority of Thomas Aquinas and Albert, its learned and venerable patrons. Yet, notwithstanding all the subtlety and penetration of these irrefragable, seraphic, and angelic doctors, as they were usually styled, they often appeared wiser in their own conceit, than they were in reality, and frequently did little more than involve in greater obscurity the doctrines which they pretended to place in the clearest light. For, not to mention the ridiculous oddity of many of their expressions, the hideous barbarity of their style, and their extravagant and presumptuous desire of prying into matters that infinitely surpass the comprehension of short-sighted mortals, they were chargeable with defects in their manner of reasoning, which every true philosopher will, of all others, be most careful to avoid. For they neither defined their terms accurately, (and hence arose innumerable disputes merely about words,) nor did they divide their subjects with perspicuity and precision; and hence they generally treated it in a confused and unsatisfactory manner. The great Angelic Doctor

\* See Jo. Laumon *Tractatus Ecclesie circa Simoniam*, p. 290.

† See Natalis Alexander, *Histor. Eccles. Sac.* xiii. p. 391.—Echard and Quetif, *Scriptor. Ordinis Prædicator. Sac.* xiii. tom. i. p. 293.—Ant. Touron, *Vie de St. Thomas*, p. 604.

‡ In the original we find *Positivi* in the margin, which is manifestly a fault; since the *Positivi* were quite opposite, in their method of teaching, to the schoolmen, and were the same with the *Biblici* mentioned in the following section. See above, *Cent. III. Part II. Ch. III. sect. VIII.*

\* Echard *Scriptor. Ord. Prædicator.* tom. i. p. 191.  
† Rich. Simon, *Crit. de la Bib. des Ant. Ecc.* par M. Du Pin, t. i. p. 341.

‡ Jos. Sim. *Accuratum Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. II. p. 177.

himself, notwithstanding his boasted method, was defective in these respects; his definitions are often vague, or obscure, and his plans or divisions, though full of art, are frequently destitute of clearness and proportion.

VII. The method of investigating divine truth by reason and philosophy remarkably prevailed, and was followed with such ardour, that the number of those who, in conformity with the example of the ancient doctors, drew their systems of theology from the holy scriptures and the writings of the fathers, and who acquired on that account the name of *Biblicists*,\* diminished from day to day. It is true, indeed, that several persons of eminent piety,† and even some of the Roman pontiffs,‡ exhorted with great seriousness and warmth the scholastic divines, and more especially those of the university of Paris, to change their method of teaching theology, and (relinquishing their philosophical abstraction and subtlety) to deduce the sublime science of salvation from the holy scriptures with that purity and simplicity with which it was delivered by the inspired writers. But these admonitions and exhortations were without effect; the evil was too inveterate to admit a speedy remedy, and the passion for logic and metaphysics had become so general and so violent, that neither remonstrances nor arguments could check its presumption or allay its ardour. In justice however to the scholastic doctors, it is necessary to observe, that they did not neglect the dictates of the Gospel or the authority of tradition, though it is sufficiently proved, by what they drew from these two sources, that they had studied neither with much attention or application of mind.§ And it is moreover certain, that, in process of time, they committed to others the care of consulting the sources now mentioned, and reserved to themselves the much-respected province of philosophy, and the intricate mazes of dialectical chicanery. And, indeed, independent of their philosophical vanity, we may assign another reason for this method of proceeding, drawn from the nature of their profession, and the circumstances in which they were placed. For the greatest part of these subtle doctors were Dominican or

Franciscan friars; and, as the monks of these orders had no possessions, not even libraries, and led, besides, wandering and itinerant lives, such of them as were ambitious of literary fame, and of the honours of authorship, were, for the most part, obliged to draw their materials from their own genius and memory, being destitute of all other succours.

VIII. The opinions which these philosophical divines instilled into the minds of the youth, appeared to the votaries of the ancient fathers highly dangerous and even pernicious; and hence they used their utmost efforts to stop the progress of these opinions, and to diminish the credit and influence of their authors. Nor was their opposition at all ill-grounded; for the subtle doctors of the school not only explained the mysteries of religion in a manner conformable to the principles of their presumptuous logic, and modified them according to the dictates of their imperfect reason, but also promoted the most impious sentiments and tenets concerning the Supreme Being, the material world, the origin of the universe, and the nature of the soul. And when it was objected to these sentiments and tenets, that they were in direct contradiction to the genius of Christianity, and to the express doctrines of Scripture, these scholastic quibblers had recourse, for a reply, or rather for a method of escape, to that perfidious distinction which has been frequently employed by modern deists,—that these tenets were philosophically true, and conformable to right reason, but that they were, indeed, theologically false, and contrary to the orthodox faith. This produced an open war between the *Biblicists* and the scholastic doctors; which was carried on with great warmth throughout the whole course of this century, particularly in the universities of Oxford and Paris, where we find the former loading the latter with the heaviest reproaches in their public acts and in their polemic writings, and accusing them of corrupting the doctrines of the Gospel, both in their public lessons, and in their private discourse.\* Even St. Thomas himself was accused of holding opinions contrary to the truth; his orthodoxy, at least, was looked upon as extremely dubious by many of the Parisian doctors.† He accordingly saw a formidable scene of opposition arising against him, but had the good fortune to ward off the storm, and to escape untouched. Others, whose authority was less extensive, and whose names were less respectable, were treated with greater severity. The living were obliged to confess publicly their errors; and the memories of the dead, who had persevered in them to the last, were branded with infamy.

IX. But the most formidable adversaries the scholastic doctors had to encounter were the Mystics, who, rejecting every thing that bore the least resemblance to argumentation or dispute about matters of doctrine and opin-

\* In the margin of the original, instead of *Biblicists*, which we find in the text, Dr. Moshien has written *Sententiarii*, which is undoubtedly an oversight. The *Sententiarii*, or followers of Peter Lombard, who is considered as the father of the scholastic philosophy, are to be placed in the same class with the philosophical divines, mentioned in the preceding section, and were very different from the *Biblicists*, both in their manner of thinking and teaching.

† See Du Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 9, 129, 180.—Ant. Wood, *Antiq. Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 91.

‡ See the famous epistle of Gregory IX. to the professors in the university of Paris, published in Du Boulay's *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. The pontiff concludes that remarkable epistle with the following words: "Mandamus et stricte precipimus, quatenus sine fermento mundanae scientie doceatis theologiam puritatem, non adulterantes verbum Dei philosophorum figmentis . . . sed, contenti terminis a patribus institutis, mentes auditorum vestrorum fructu celestis eloquii sagnetis, ut hauriant de fontibus Salvatoris."

§ Faydit, *Altération du Dogme Théologique par la Philosophie d'Aristote*, p. 289.—Richard Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque des Auteurs Eccles.* par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 170.

\* See Matth. Paris, *Hist. Major.* p. 541.—Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iii. p. 397, 430, &c.

† See J. Launoy, *Hist. Gymnas. Navarren.* part iii. lib. iii. chap. xvi. tom. iv. op. part. i. p. 485.—Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris.* tom. iv. p. 204.—Petri Zornii *Opuscula Sacra*, tom. i. p. 445.—R. Simon, *Lettres Choisies*, tom. ii. p. 266.—Echard *Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicatorum* tom. i. p. 433.

ion, confined their endeavours to the advancement of inward piety, and the propagation of devout and tender feelings, and thus acquired the highest degree of popularity. The people, who are much more affected with what touches their passions, than with what is only addressed to their reason, were attached to the Mystics in the warmest manner; and this gave such weight to the reproaches and invectives which they threw out against the schoolmen, that the latter thought it more prudent to disarm these favourites of the multitude by mild and submissive measures, than to return their reproaches with indignation and bitterness. They accordingly set themselves to flatter the Mystics, and not only extolled their sentimental system, but employed their pens in illustrating and defending it; they even associated it with the scholastic philosophy, though they were as different from each other as any two things could be. It is well known that Bonaventura, Albert the Great, Robert Capito, and Thomas Aquinas, contributed to this reconciliation between mysticism and dialectics by their learned labours, and even went so far as to write commentaries upon Dionysius, the chief of the Mystics, whom these subtle doctors probably looked upon with a secret contempt.

X. Both the schoolmen and Mystics of this century treated, in their writings, of the obligations of morality, the duties of the Christian life, and of the means that were most adapted to preserve or deliver the soul from the servitude and contagion of vice; but their methods of handling these important subjects were, as may be easily conceived, entirely different. We may form an idea of mystical morality from the observations of George Pachymeres, upon the writings of Dionysius, and from the *Spiritual Institutes*, or *Abridgment of Mystic Theology*, composed by Humbert de Romanis, of which productions the former was written in Greek, and the second in Latin. As to the scholastic moralists, they were principally employed in defining the nature of virtue and vice in general, and the characters of the various virtues and vices in particular; and hence a prodigious number of *sims*, or systematic collections of *virtues and vices*, appeared in this century. The schoolmen divided the virtues into two classes. The first comprehended the moral virtues, which differ, in no respect, from those which Aristotle recommended to his disciples. The second contained the theological virtues, which, in consequence of what St. Paul says, (1 Corinth. xiii. 13.) they made to consist in faith, hope, and charity. In explaining and illustrating the nature of the virtues comprehended in these two classes, they seemed rather to have in view the pleasures of disputing, than the design of instructing; and they exhausted all their subtlety in resolving difficulties which were of their own creation. Thomas Aquinas shone forth as a star of the first magnitude, though, like the others, he was often covered with impenetrable fogs. The second part of his famous *sum* was wholly employed in laying down the principles of morality, and in deducing and illustrating the various duties that result from them; and this part of his learned labour has had the honour and misfor-

lume of passing through the hands of a truly prodigious number of commentators.

XI. It is absolutely necessary to observe here, that the moral writers of this and the following centuries must be read with the utmost caution, and with a perpetual attention to this circumstance, that, though they employ the same terms that we find in the sacred writings, yet they use them in a quite different sense from that which they really bear in these divine books. They speak of justice, charity, faith, and holiness; but, from the manner in which these virtues are illustrated by those quibbling sophists, they differ much from the amiable and sublime duties, which Christ and his disciples inculcated under the same denominations. A single example will be sufficient to render this evident beyond contradiction. A *pious* and *holy* man, according to the sense annexed by our Saviour to these terms, is one who consecrates his affections and actions to the service of the Supreme Being, and accounts it his highest honour and felicity, as well as his indispensable duty, to obey his laws. But, in the style of the moral writers of this age, that person was *pious* and *holy*, who deprived himself of his possessions to enrich the priesthood, to build churches, and found monasteries, and whose faith and obedience were so implicitly enslaved to the imperious dictates of the Roman pontiff, that he believed and acted without examination, as these lordly directors thought proper to prescribe. Nor were the ideas which these writers entertained concerning *justice*, at all conformable to the nature of that virtue, as it is described in the holy scriptures, since in their opinion it was lawful to injure, revile, torment, persecute, and even put to death, a *heretic*, i. e. any person who refused to obey blindly the decrees of the pontiffs, or to believe all the absurdities which they imposed upon the credulity of the multitude.

XII. The writers of controversy in this century were more numerous than respectable. Nicetas Acominatus, who made a considerable figure among the Greeks, attacked all the different sects in his work entitled *The Treasure of the Orthodox Faith*; but he combated after the Grecian manner, and defended the cause which he had espoused, rather by the decrees of councils and the decisions of the fathers, than by the dictates of reason and the authority of Scripture. Raymond of Pennafort was one of the first among the Latins, who abandoned the unchristian method of converting infidels by the force of arms and the terrors of capital punishments, and who undertook to vanquish the Jews and Saracens by reason and argument.\* This engaged in the same controversy a considerable number of able disputants, who were acquainted with the Hebrew and Arabic languages; among whom Raymond Martini, the celebrated author of the *Sword of Faith*,† is unquestionably entitled to the first rank. Thomas Aquinas also appeared with dignity among the Christian

\* Ehard and Quetif apud Scriptores Ordinis Prædicator. tom. 1. sect. XIII.

† Bayle's Dictionary, at the article Martini. -Pauli Colomesii Hispania Orient. p. 200.

champions; and his book against the Gentiles\* is far from being contemptible: nor ought we to omit mentioning a learned book of Alan de l'Isle, which was designed to refute the objections both of Jews and Pagans.† The writers, who handled other (more particular) branches of theological controversy, were far inferior to those now mentioned in genius and abilities; and their works seemed less calculated to promote the truth, than to render their adversaries odious.

XIII. The grand controversy between the Greek and Latin church, was still carried on; and all the efforts that were made, during this century, to bring it to a conclusion, proved ineffectual. Gregory IX. employed the ministry of the Franciscan monks to bring about an accommodation with the Greeks, and pursued with zeal this laudable purpose from the year 1232, to the end of his pontificate, but without the least appearance of success.‡ Innocent IV. embarked in the same undertaking, in 1247, and with that view sent John of Parma, with other Franciscan friars, to Nice; while the Grecian pontiff came in person to Rome, and was declared legate of the apostolic see.§ But these previous acts of mutual civility and respect, which excited the hopes of such as longed for the conclusion of these violent discords, did not terminate in the reconciliation that was expected. New incidents arose to blast the influence of these salutary measures, and the flame of dissension gained new vigour. Under the pontificate of Urban IV., however, the aspect of things changed for the better, and the negotiations for peace were renewed with such success, as promised a speedy conclusion of these unhappy divisions; for Michael Palæologus had no sooner driven the Latins out of Constantinople, than he sent ambassadors to Rome to declare his pacific intentions, that thus he might establish his disputed dominion, and gain over the Roman pontiff to his side.|| But during the course of these negotiations, Urban's death left matters unfinished, and suspended once more the hopes and expectations of the public. Under the pontificate of Gregory X., proposals of peace were again made by the same emperor, who, after much opposition from his own clergy, sent ambassadors to the council of Lyons in the year 1274;¶ and these deputies, with the solemn consent of John Veccus, patriarch of Constantinople, and several Greek bishops, publicly agreed to the terms of accommodation proposed by the pontiff.\*\* This re-union, however, was

not durable; for the situation of affairs in Greece and Italy being changed some years after this convention, in such a manner as to deliver the former from all apprehensions of a Latin invasion, Andronicus, the son of Michael, assembled a council at Constantinople, in the palace of Blachernæ, A. D. 1284, in which, by a solemn decree, this ignominious treaty was annulled, and the famous Veccus, by whose persuasion and authority it had been concluded, was sent into exile.\* This resolute measure, as may well be imagined, rendered the divisions more violent than they had been before the treaty was signed; and it was also followed by an open schism, and by the most unhappy discords among the Grecian clergy.

XIV. We pass over several controversies of a more private kind, and of inferior moment, which have nothing in their nature or circumstances to claim the attention of the curious; but we must not forget to observe that the grand dispute concerning the eucharist was still continued in this century, not only in France, but also in some other countries; for, though Innocent III. had, in the Lateran council of the year 1215, presumptuously placed *transubstantiation* among the avowed and regular doctrines of the Latin church, yet the authority of this decree was called in question by many, and several divines maintained the probability of the opinions that were opposed to that monstrous doctrine. Those indeed who, adopting the sentiments of Berenger, considered the bread and wine in no other light than as signs or symbols of the body and blood of Christ, did not venture either to defend or profess this opinion in a public manner; while many thought it sufficient to acknowledge what was termed a *real presence*, though they explained the *manner* of this presence quite otherwise than the doctrine of Innocent had defined it.‡ Among these, John, surnamed Pungens Asinus,† a subtle doctor of the university of Paris, acquired an eminent and distinguished name, and without incurring the censure of his superiors, substituted *consubstantiation* for *transubstantiation* toward the conclusion of this century.

mer had bound himself by a solemn oath never to consent to a reconciliation between the Greek and Latin churches; for which reason the emperor, when he sent his ambassadors to Lyons, proposed to Joseph the following alternative: that, if they succeeded in bringing about an accommodation, he should renounce his patriarchal dignity; but if they failed in their attempt, he was to remain patriarch, being advised, at the same time, to retire to a convent, until the matter was decided. The ambassadors were successful: Joseph was deposed, and Veccus elected in his place; when, and not before, the latter ratified the treaty in question by his solemn consent to the ignominious article of supremacy and pre-eminence, which it confirmed to the Roman pontiff.

\* Leo Allatus, de perpetua Consensione Eccles. Orient. et Occident. lib. i. c. xv. xvi. p. 727.—Fred. Spanheim de Perpet. Dissensione Græcor. et Latin. tom. ii. op. p. 188, &c.

† Pet. Allix, Pref. ad F. Johannis Determinat. de Sacramento Altaris, published at London in 1686.

‡ The book of this celebrated doctor was published by the learned Allix above mentioned. See Baluzii Vita Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 576.—D'Arherii Spicileg. Veter. Scriptor. tom. iii. p. 58.—Echardi Scriptorum Dominic. tom. i. p. 561

\* Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Delect. Argumentorum et Scriptor. pro veritate Relig. Christian. p. 270.

† Liber contra Judæos et Paganos.

‡ See Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. li. p. 279, 296; and Echard, Scriptor. Ordin. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 103, 911.—Add to these Matth. Paris, Histor. Major, p. 386.

§ See Baluzii Miscellan. tom. vii. p. 370, 388, 393, 497.—Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iii. and iv. † Wadding, tom. iv. p. 181, 201, 223, 269, 303.

¶ See Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. iv. p. 313, 371. tom. v. p. 2, 9, 62.—Colonia, Hist. Liter. de la Ville de Lyon, tom. ii. p. 241.

\*\* Joseph (not Veccus) was patriarch of Constantinople, when this treaty was concluded. The tor



## CHAPTER IV.

*Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Christian Church during this Century.*

I. It would be endless to enumerate the additions that were made in this century to the external part of divine worship, in order to increase its pomp and render it more striking. These additions were produced in part by the public edicts of the Roman pontiffs, and partly by the private injunctions of the sacerdotal and monastic orders, who shared the veneration which was excited in the multitude by the splendour and magnificence of this religious spectacle. Instead of mentioning these additions, we shall only observe in general, that religion had now become a sort of a raree-show in the hands of the rulers of the church, who, to render its impressions more deep and lasting, thought proper to exhibit it in a striking manner to the external senses. For this purpose, at stated times, and especially upon the principal festivals, the miraculous dispensations of the divine wisdom in favour of the church, and the more remarkable events in the Christian history, were represented under allegorical figures and images, or rather in a kind of mimic show.\* But these scenic representations, in which there was a motley mixture of mirth and gravity, these tragi-conical spectacles, though they amused and affected in a certain manner the gazing populace, were highly detrimental, instead of being useful to the cause of religion; they degraded its dignity, and furnished abundant matter of laughter to its enemies.

II. It will not appear surprising that the bread, consecrated in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, became the object of religious worship; for this was the natural consequence of the monstrous doctrine of *transubstantiation*. But the effects of that impious and ridiculous doctrine did not end here; it produced a series of ceremonies and institutions, still used in the church of Rome, in honour of that *deified* bread, as they blasphemously call it. Hence arose those rich and splendid receptacles which were formed for the residence of God under this new shape,† and the lamps and other precious ornaments that were designed to beautify this habitation of the Deity; and hence the custom that still prevails of carrying about this *divine bread* in solemn pomp through the public streets, when it is to be ad-

\* It is probable that this licentious custom of exhibiting mimic representations of religious objects derived its origin from the Mendicant friars.

† This blasphemous language, which Dr. Mosheim is obliged to use in representing the absurdities of the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, is nothing in comparison with the impious figures that were used by the abettors of that monstrous tenet, to accommodate it, in some measure, to the capacities of the multitude. We need not wonder, that the Pagans metamorphosed their Jupiter into a bull, a swan, and other such figures, when we see the rulers of the Christian church transforming the Son of God into a piece of bread; a transformation so vile, and (even were it not vile) so useless, that it is inconceivable how it could enter into the head of any mortal, and equally so, how the bishops of Rome could countenance so far in the credulity of the people as to risk their authority by propagating such a doctrine.

ministered to sick or dying persons, with many other ceremonies of a like nature, which are dishonourable to religion, and opprobrious to humanity. But that which gave the finishing touch to this heap of absurdities, and displayed superstition in its highest extravagance, was the institution of the celebrated annual Festival of the Holy Sacrament, or, as it is sometimes called, of the Body of Christ; the origin of which was as follows: a certain devout woman, whose name was Juliana, and who lived at Liege, declared that she had received a revelation from heaven, intimating to her, that it was the will of God, that a peculiar festival should be annually observed in honour of the holy sacrament, or rather of the *real presence* of Christ's body in that sacred institution. Few gave attention or credit to this pretended vision, the circumstances of which were extremely equivocal and absurd,\* and which would have come to nothing, had it not been supported by Robert, bishop of Liege, who, in 1246, published an order for the celebration of this festival throughout the province, notwithstanding the opposition which he knew would be made to a proposal founded only on an idle dream. After the death of Juliana, one of her friends and companions, whose name was Eve, adopted her cause with uncommon zeal, and had sufficient credit with Urban IV. to engage him to publish, in 1264, a solemn edict, by which the festival in question was imposed upon all the Christian churches. This edict, however, did not produce its full effect, on account of the death of the pontiff, which happened soon after its publication; so that the festival in question was not universally celebrated in the Latin churches before the pontificate of Clement V.,‡ who, in the council which he held at Vienne in Dauphine, in 1311, confirmed the edict of Urban, and thus, in spite of all opposition, established a festival, which contributed more to render the doctrine of transubstantiation agreeable to the people, than the decree of the Lateran council under Innocent III., or than all the exhortations of his lordly successors.

III. About the conclusion of this century, Boniface VIII. added, to the public rites and ceremonies of the church, the famous jubilee, which is still celebrated at Rome, at a stated period, with the utmost profusion of pomp and magnificence. In 1299, a rumour was propagated among the inhabitants of that city, importing that all such as should visit, within the limits of the following year, the church of St. Peter, should obtain the remission of all their sins, and that this privilege was to be annexed to

\* This fanatical woman declared, that as often as she addressed herself to God, or to the saints in prayer, she saw the full moon with a small defect or breach in it; and that, having long studied to find out the signification of this strange appearance, she was *inwardly* informed by the Spirit, that the *moon* signified the *church*, and that the defect or breach was the want of an annual festival in honour of the holy sacrament.

† See Barthol. Eusen, *Origo prima Festi Corporis Christi ex Viso Sanctæ Virginis Julianæ oblatæ*, published at Liege in 1619.—Dallæus, de Cultus religiosi objecto, p. 287.—Acta Sanctæ. April. tom. i. p. 437, 903.—And above all Benedict XIV. *Pont. Max. de Festis Christi et Mariæ*, lib. i. c. xiii. p. 360. tom. x. op.

the performance of the same service once in every period of one hundred years. Boniface no sooner heard of this, than he ordered strict inquiry to be made concerning the author and the foundation of this report; and the result of the inquiry was answerable to his views; for he was assured, by many testimonies worthy of credit,\* (say the Roman-catholic historians) that, from the remotest antiquity, this important privilege of remission and indulgence was to be obtained by the service above-mentioned. No sooner had the pontiff received this information, than he addressed to all Christians an epistolary mandate, in which he enacted it as a solemn law of the church, that those who, in every hundredth or jubilee year, should confess their sins, and visit, with sentiments of contrition and repentance, the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome, should obtain thereby the entire remission of their various offences.† The successors of Boniface were not satisfied with adding a multitude of new rites and inventions, by way of ornaments, to this superstitious institution; but, finding by experience that it added to the lustre, and augmented the revenues of the Roman church, they rendered its return more frequent, and fixed its celebration to every five-and-twentieth year.‡

† \* These testimonies worthy of credit have never been produced by the Romish writers, unless we rank, in that class, that of an old man, who had completed his 107th year, and who, being brought before Boniface, declared (if we may believe the abbe Fleury) that his father, who was a common labourer, had assisted at the celebration of a jubilee, a hundred years before that time. See Fleury's Hist. Eccles. toward the end of the twelfth century. It is, however, a very unaccountable thing, if the institution of the jubilee year was not the invention of Boniface, that there should be neither in the acts of councils, nor in the records of history or writings of the learned, any trace or the least mention of its celebration before the year 1300. This, and other reasons of an irresistible evidence, have persuaded some Roman catholic writers to consider the institution of the jubilee year, as the invention of this pontiff, who, to render it more respectable, pretended that it was of a much earlier date. See Gluden, et Victorell. apud Philippi Bonamii Numism. Pontif. Rom. tom. i. p. 22, 23.

† So the matter is related by James Caietan, cardinal of St. George, and nephew to Boniface, in his Relatio de Centesimo seu Jubileo anno, which is published in his Magna Bibliotheca Vet. Patrum, tom. vi. p. 426, and in the Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum, tom. xxv. p. 267. Nor is there any reason to believe that this account is erroneous and false, or that Boniface acted the part of an impostor from a principle of avarice upon this occasion.

‡ N. B. It is not without astonishment, that we hear Dr. Mosheim deciding in this manner with respect to the good faith of Boniface, and the relation of his nephew. The character of that wicked and ambitious pontiff is well known, and the relation of the cardinal of St. George has been proved to be the most ridiculous, fabulous, motley piece of stuff, that ever usurped the title of an historical record. See the excellent Lettres de M. Chais sur les Jubiles, tom. i. p. 53.

† The various writers who have treated of the institution of the Roman Jubilee, are enumerated by Jo. Albert Fabricius in his Bibliogr. Antiquar. p. 316. Among the authors that may be added to this list, there is one whom we think it necessary to mention particularly, viz. the Reverend Charles Chais, whose Lettres Historiques et Dogmatiques sur les Jubiles et les Indulgences, were published in 1751.

‡ These letters of Mr. Chais (Minister of the French church at the Hague, and well known in the republic of letters) contain the most full and accurate account that has been ever given of the institu-

## CHAPTER V.

## Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.

I. WE have no account of any new sects that arose among the Greeks during this century. Those of the Nestorians and Jacobites, established in the remoter regions of the east, who equalled the Greeks in their aversion to the rites and jurisdiction of the Latin church, were frequently solicited, by the Franciscan and Dominican papal missionaries, to receive the Roman yoke. In 1246, Innocent IV. used his utmost efforts to bring both these sects under his dominion; and, in 1278, terms of accommodation were proposed by Nicolas IV. to the Nestorians, and particularly to that branch of the sect which resided in the northern parts of Asia.\* The leading men, both among the Nestorians and Jacobites, seemed to give ear to the proposals that were made to them, and to wish for a reconciliation with the church of Rome; but the prospect of peace soon vanished, and a variety of causes concurred to prolong the rupture.

II. During the whole course of this century, the Roman pontiffs carried on the most barbarous and inhuman persecution against those

tion of the Jubilee, and of the rise, progress, abuses, and enormities, of the infamous traffic of indulgences. This account is judiciously collected from the best authors of antiquity, and from several curious records that have escaped the researches of other writers; it is also interspersed with curious, and sometimes ludicrous anecdotes, that render the work equally productive of entertainment and instruction. In the first volume of these letters, the learned author lays open the nature and origin of the institution of the jubilee; he proves it to have been a human invention, which owed its rise to the avarice and ambition of the popes, and its credit to the ignorance and superstition of the people, and whose celebration was absolutely unknown before the thirteenth century, which is the true date of its origin. He takes notice of the various changes it underwent with respect to the time of its celebration, the various colours with which the ambitious pontiffs covered it in order to render it respectable and alluring in the eyes of the multitude; and exposes these delusions by many convincing arguments, whose gravity is seasoned with an agreeable and temperate mixture of decent raillery. He proves, with the utmost evidence, that the papal jubilee is an imitation of the Secular Games, which were celebrated with such pomp in pagan Rome. He points out the gross contradictions that reign in the bulls of the different popes, with respect to the nature of this institution, and the time of its celebration. Nor does he pass over in silence the infamous traffic of indulgences, the worldly pomp and splendour, the crimes, debaucheries, and disorders of every kind, that were observable at the return of each jubilee year. He lays also before the reader an historical view of all the jubilees that were celebrated from the pontificate of Boniface VIII. in the year 1300, to that of Benedict XIV. in 1750, with an entertaining account of the most remarkable adventures that happened among the pilgrims who repaired to Rome on these occasions. The second and third volumes of these interesting letters treat of the indulgences that are administered in the church of Rome. The reader will find here their nature and origin explained, the doctrine of the Roman catholic divines relating to them stated and refuted, the history of this impious traffic accurately laid down, and its enormities and pernicious effects circumstantially exposed, with learning, perspicuity, and candour.

\* Odor. Raynaldus, Annal. Eccles. tom. xiii. ad Annum 1247, sect. xxxii. et tom. xv. ad A. 1303, sect. xxii. et ad A. 1304, sect. xxiii.—Matth. Paris, Hist. Major, p. 372.

whom they branded with the denomination of *heretics*; i. e. against all those who called their pretended authority and jurisdiction in question, or taught doctrines different from those which were adopted and propagated by the church of Rome. For the sects of the Cathari, Waldenses, Petrobrussians, &c. gathered strength from day to day, spread imperceptibly throughout all Europe, assembled numerous congregations in Italy, France, Spain, and Germany, and formed by degrees such a powerful party as rendered them formidable to the pontiffs, and menaced the papal jurisdiction with a fatal revolution. To the ancient sects new factions were added, which, though they differed from each other in various respects, unanimously agreed in this point: "That the public and established religion was a motley system of errors and superstition, and that the dominion which the popes had usurped over Christians, as also the authority they exercised in religious matters, were unlawful and tyrannical." Such were the notions propagated by the sectaries, who refuted the superstitions and impostures of the times by arguments drawn from the holy scriptures, and whose declamations against the power, the opulence, and the vices of the pontiffs and clergy, were extremely agreeable to many princes and civil magistrates, who groaned under the usurpations of the sacred order. The pontiffs, therefore, considered themselves as obliged to have recourse to new and extraordinary methods of defeating and subduing enemies, who, both by their number and their rank, were every way proper to fill them with terror.

III. Of these dissenters from the church of Rome, the number was no where greater than in Narbonne Gaul,\* and the countries adjacent, where they were received and protected, in a singular manner, by Raymond VI. earl of Toulouse, and other persons of the highest distinction; and where the bishops, either through humanity or indolence, were so negligent and remiss in the prosecution of heretics, that the latter, laying aside all their fears, formed settlements, and multiplied greatly from day to day. Innocent III. was soon informed of all these proceedings; and, about the commencement of this century, he sent legates extraordinary into the southern provinces of France to do what the bishops had left undone, and to extirpate heresy, in all its various forms and modifications, without being at all scrupulous in the adoption of such methods as might seem necessary to effect this salutary purpose. The persons charged with this commission were Rainier,† a Cistercian monk, and Pierre de Castelnau,‡ archdeacon of Maguelone, who became also afterwards a Cistercian friar. These eminent missionaries were followed by

several others, among whom was the famous Spaniard, Dominic, founder of the order of preachers, who, returning from Rome in 1206, met with these delegates, embarked in their cause, and laboured both by his exhortations and actions in the extirpation of heresy. These spirited champions, who engaged in this expedition upon the sole authority of the pope, without either asking the advice or demanding the succours of the bishops, and who inflicted capital punishment upon such of the heretics as they could not convert by reason and argument, were distinguished in common discourse by the title of *Inquisitors*; and from them the formidable and odious tribunal, called the *Inquisition*, derived its origin.

IV. When this new set of heresy-hunters\* had executed their commission, and purged the provinces to which they were sent of the greatest part of the enemies of the Roman faith, the pontiffs were so sensible of their excellent services, that they established missionaries of a like nature, or, in other words, placed *Inquisitors* in almost every city, whose inhabitants had the misfortune to be suspected of heresy, notwithstanding the reluctance which the people showed to this new institution, and the violence with which they frequently expelled, and sometimes massacred, these bloody officers of the popish hierarchy. The council convoked at Toulouse, in 1229, by Romannus, cardinal of St. Angelo, and pope's legate, went still farther, and erected in every city a set or society of *inquisitors, consisting of one priest and three laymen.*† This institution was, however, superseded in 1233 by Gregory IX., who intrusted the Dominicans, or preaching friars, with the important commission of discovering and bringing to judgment the heretics who were lurking in France, and in a formal epistle discharged the bishops from the burthen of that painful office.‡ Immediately after this, the bishop of Tournay, who was the pope's legate in France, began to execute this new resolution, by appointing Pierre Cellan, and Guillaume Arnaud, inquisitors of heretical pravity at Toulouse, and afterwards proceeded in every city, where the Dominicans had a monastery, to constitute officers of the same nature, selected from the monks of that celebrated order.§ From this period we are to date the commencement of the dreadful tribunal of the *inquisition*, which in this and the following ages subdued such a prodigious multitude of heretics, part of whom were converted to the church by terror, and the rest committed to the flames without mercy. For the Dominicans erected, first at Toulouse and afterwards at Carcassone and other places, a tremendous

\* The term of heresy-hunters, for which the translator is responsible, will not seem absurd, when it is known, that the missionaries who were sent into the provinces of France to extirpate heresy, and the inquisitors who succeeded them, were bound by an oath, not only to seek for the heretics in towns, houses, cellars, and other lurking-places, but also in woods, caves, fields, &c.

† See Harduini Concilia, tom. vii. p. 175.

‡ Bern. Guido in Chronico Pontif. apud Jac. Echar-dum, Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 88.—Percini Historia Inquisit. Tolosana, subjoined to his Historia Conventus Frat. Prædicator. Tolosa, 1393.—Histoire Generale de Languedoc, tom. iii. p. 394.

§ Echar-d and Percinus, loc. citat.

\* That part of France, which, in ancient times, was termed Narbonne Gaul, comprehended the provinces of Savoy, Dauphine, Provence, and Languedoc.

† Instead of Rainier, other historians mention one Raoul, or Ralph, as the associate of Pierre de Castelnau. See Fleury's Histoire Eccles. liv. lxxvi. sect. xii.

‡ The greatest part of the Roman writers consider Pierre de Castelnau as the first inquisitor. It will appear hereafter in what sense this assertion may be admitted. For an account of this legate, see the Acta Sanctor. tom. i. Martii, p. 411.

court, before which were summoned not only heretics, and persons suspected of heresy, but likewise all who were accused of magic, sorcery, Judaism, witchcraft, and other crimes of a spiritual kind. This tribunal, in process of time, was erected in other countries of Europe, though not every where with the same success.\*

V. The method of proceeding in this court of inquisition was at first simple, and almost in every respect similar to that which was observed in the ordinary courts of justice.† But this simplicity was gradually changed by the Dominicans, to whom experience suggested several new methods of augmenting the pomp and majesty of their spiritual tribunal, and

\* The accounts which we have here given of the rise of the Inquisition, though founded upon the most unexceptionable testimonies and the most authentic records, are yet very different from those that are to be found in most authors. Some learned men tell us, that the Tribunal of the Inquisition was the invention of St. Dominic, and was first erected by him in the city of Toulouse; that he, of consequence, was the first inquisitor; that the year of its institution is indeed uncertain; but that it was undoubtedly confirmed in a solemn manner by Innocent III. in the Lateran council of 1215. See Jo. Alb. Fabricius, in his *Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exorients*, p. 569.—Phil. Limborchi *Historia Inquisit. lib. i. c. x.* and the other writers mentioned by Fabricius. I will not affirm, that the writers, who give this account of the matter, have advanced all this without authority; but this I will venture to say, that the authors, whom they have taken for their guides, are not of the first rate in point of merit and credibility. Limborch, whose history of the Inquisition is looked upon as a most important and capital work, is generally followed by modern writers in their accounts of that odious tribunal. But, however laudable that historian may have been in point of fidelity and diligence, it is certain that he was little acquainted with the ecclesiastical history of the middle ages; that he drew his materials, not from the true and original sources, but from writers of a second class, and thus has fallen, in the course of his history, into various mistakes. His account of the origin of the inquisition is undoubtedly false; nor does that which is given by many other writers approach nearer to the truth. The circumstances of this account, which I have mentioned in the beginning of this note, are more especially destitute of all foundation. Many of the Dominicans, who, in our times, have presided in the court of inquisition, and have extolled the sanctity of that *pious* institution, deny, at the same time, that Dominic was its founder, as also that he was the first inquisitor, or that he was an inquisitor at all. They go still farther, and affirm, that the court of inquisition was not erected during the life of St. Dominic. Nor is all this advanced inconsiderately, as every impartial inquirer into the proofs they allege will easily perceive. Nevertheless, the question, whether or not St. Dominic was an inquisitor, seems to be merely a dispute about words, and depends entirely upon the different significations of which the term *inquisitor* is susceptible. That word, according to its original meaning, signified a person invested with the commission and authority of the pope to extirpate heresy and opposers abettors, but not clothed with any judicial power. But it soon acquired a different meaning, and signified a person appointed by the pontiff to proceed *judicially* against heretics and such as were suspected of heresy, to pronounce sentence according to their respective cases, and to deliver over to the secular arm such as persisted obstinately in their errors. In the latter sense Dominic was not an inquisitor, since it is well known that there were no papal judges of this nature before the pontificate of Gregory IX.; but he was undoubtedly an inquisitor in the sense originally attached to that term.

† The records, published by the Benedictines in their *Histoire Gener. de Languedoc*, tom. iii. p. 371, show the simplicity that reigned in the proceedings of the inquisition at its first institution.

who made such alterations in the process, that the manner of taking cognizance of heretical causes became totally different from that which was usual in civil affairs. These friars were, to say the truth, entirely ignorant of judicial matters; nor were they acquainted with the proceedings of any other tribunal, than that which was called, in the Roman church, the *Tribunal of penance*. It was therefore from this, that they modelled the new court of *Inquisition*, as far as a resemblance was possible; and hence arose that strange system of inquisitorial law, which, in many respects, is so contrary to the common feelings of humanity, and the plainest dictates of equity and justice. This is the important circumstance by which we are enabled to account for the absurd and iniquitous proceedings of the inquisitors, against persons who are accused of holding, what they call, heretical opinions.

VI. That nothing might be wanting to render this spiritual court formidable and tremendous, the Roman pontiffs persuaded the European princes, and more especially the emperor Frederic II., and Louis IX. king of France, not only to enact the most barbarous laws against heretics, and to commit to the flames, on pretence of public justice, those who were pronounced such by the inquisitors, but also to maintain the latter in their office, and grant them their protection in the most open and solemn manner. The edicts to this purpose issued by Frederic II. are well known; edicts fit only to excite horror, and which rendered the most illustrious piety and virtue incapable of saving from the most cruel death such as had the misfortune to be disagreeable to the inquisitors.\* These execrable laws were not, however, sufficient to restrain the just indignation of the people against these inhuman judges, whose barbarity was accompanied with superstition and arrogance, with a spirit of suspicion and perfidy, and even with temerity and imprudence. Accordingly they were insulted by the multitude in many places, were driven in an ignominious manner out of some cities, and were put to death in others; and Conrad of Marpur, the first German inquisitor, who derived his commission from Gregory IX., was one of the many victims that were sacrificed upon this occasion to the vengeance of the public;‡ which his incredible

\* The laws of the emperor Frederic, in relation to the inquisitors, may be seen in Limborch's *History of the Inquisition*, as also in the *Epistles of Pierre de Vignes*, and in *Bovius*, *Raynaldus*, &c. The edict of St. Louis, in favour of these spiritual judges, is generally known under the title of *Capientes*; for so it is called by the French lawyers, on account of its beginning with that word. It was issued in 1229, as the Benedictine monks have proved sufficiently in their *Hist. Generale de Languedoc*, tom. iii. It is also published by Catehus, in his *Histor. Comit. Tolosanor.* and by many other authors. This edict is as severe and inhuman, to the full, as the laws of Frederic II.; for a great part of the sanctity of good king Louis consisted in his furious and implacable aversion to heretics, against whom he judged it more expedient to employ the influence of racks and gibbets, than the power of reason and argument. See Du Fresnoy, *Vita Ludovici a Joinville scripta*.

† The life of this furious and celebrated inquisitor was composed from the most authentic records, and also from several valuable manuscripts, by the learned John Herman Schminckius. See also Wadding,

barbarities had raised to a dreadful degree of vehemence and fury.\*

VII. When Innocent III., perceived that the labours of the inquisitors were not immediately attended with such abundant fruits as he had fondly expected, he addressed himself, in 1207, to Philip Augustus, king of France, and to the leading men of that nation, urging them, by the alluring promise of the most ample indulgences, to extirpate all, whom he thought proper to call heretics, by fire and sword.† This exhortation was repeated, with new accessions of fervour and earnestness, in the following year, when Pierre de Castelnau, the legate of this pontiff, and his inquisitor in France, was put to death by the patrons of the heretics.‡ Not long after this, the Cistercian monks, in the name of this pope, proclaimed a crusade against the heretics throughout France; and a storm seemed to be gathering against them on all sides. Raymond VI., earl of Toulouse, in whose territories Castelnau had been massacred, was solemnly excommunicated, and, to deliver himself from this ecclesiastical malediction, changed sides, and embarked in the crusade now mentioned. In 1209, a formidable army of cross-bearers commenced against the heretics (who were comprehended under the general denomination of *Albigenses*) an open war, which they carried on with the utmost exertions of cruelty, though with various success, for several years. The chief director of this war was Arnald, abbot of the Cistercians, and legate of the Ro-

man pontiff; and the commander in chief of the troops employed in this noble expedition was Simon, earl of Montfort. Raymond, who, consulting his safety rather than his conscience, had engaged in the crusade against the heretics, was now obliged to attack their persecutors. For Simon, who had embarked in this war, not so much from a principle of zeal for religion, or of aversion to the heretics, as from a desire of augmenting his fortune, cast a greedy eye upon the territories of Raymond, and his selfish views were seconded and accomplished by the court of Rome. After many battles, sieges, and a multitude of other exploits, conducted with the most intrepid courage and the most abominable barbarity, he received from the hands of Innocent, at the Lateran council, A. D. 1215, the county of Toulouse, and the other lands belonging to the obnoxious earl, as a reward for his zeal in supporting the *cause of God and of the church*. About three years after this, he lost his life at the siege of Toulouse. Raymond, his valiant adversary, died in 1222.

VIII. Thus were the two chiefs of this deplorable war taken off the scene; but this removal was far from extinguishing the infernal flame of persecution on the side of the pontiffs, or calming the restless spirit of faction on that of the pretended heretics. Raymond VII., earl of Toulouse, and Anulric, earl of Montfort, succeeded their fathers at the head of the contending parties, and carried on the war with the utmost vehemence, and with such various success as rendered the issue for some time doubtful. The former seemed at first more powerful than his adversary; and pope Honorius III., alarmed at the vigorous opposition he made to the orthodox legions, engaged Louis VIII., king of France, by the most pompous promises, to march in person with a formidable army against the enemies of the church. The obsequious monarch listened to the solicitations of the lordly pontiff, and embarked with a considerable military force in the cause of the church, but did not live to reap the fruits of his zeal. His engagements, however, with the court of Rome, and his furious designs against the heretics, were executed with the greatest alacrity and vigour by his son and successor Louis the Saint; so that Raymond, pressed on all sides, was obliged, in 1229, to make peace upon the most disadvantageous terms, even by making a cession of the greatest part of his territories to the French monarch, after having sacrificed a considerable portion of them, as a peace-offering to the church of Rome.\* This treaty gave a mortal

An. Minor. t. ii. p. 151, 355, and Echard, Scrip. Dominican. t. i. p. 487.

☞ \* The abbe Fleury acknowledges the brutal barbarity of this unrelenting inquisitor, who, under the pretext of heresy, not only committed to the flames a prodigious number of nobles, clerks, monks, hermits, and lay-persons of all ranks, but moreover caused them to be put to death on the very day when they were accused, without appeal. See Fleury's Hist. Eccles. liv. lxxx.

† Innocentii Tertii Epistolæ, lib. x. epist. 49.  
‡ Innoc. Epist. lib. xi. p. 26.—Acta Sanctor. Mart. tom. i. p. 411.

§ This term is used in two senses, of which one is general, and the other more confined. In its more general and extensive sense it comprehends all the various kinds of heretics who resided at that time in Narbonne Gaul, i. e. in the southern parts of France. This appears from the following passage of Petrus Sarnensis, who, in the dedication of his History of the Albigenses to Innocent III. expresses himself thus: "*Tolosani et aliarum civitatum et castro-rum heretici, et defensores eorum, generaliter Albigenses vocantur.*" The same author divides afterwards the Albigenses into various sects, (cap. ii. p. 3, and 8.) of which he considers that of the Waldenses as the least pernicious. "*Mali crant Waldenses, sed comparatione aliorum hereticorum longe minus perversi.*" It was not, however, from the city of Albizia, or Albi, that the French heretics were comprehended under the general title of Albigenses, but from another circumstance, namely, that the greatest part of Narbonne Gaul was, in this century, called Albigesium, as the Benedictine monks have clearly demonstrated in their *Histoire Generale de Languedoc*, tom. iii. The term *Albigenses*, in its more confined sense, was used to denote those heretics who inclined toward the Manichean system, and who were otherwise known by the denominations of Catharists, Publicans or Panchians, and Bogarians. This appears evidently from many incontestable authorities, and more especially from the *Codex Inquisitionis Tolosane*, (published by Lamborch, in his History of the Inquisition,) in which the Albigenses are carefully distinguished from the other sects that made a noise in this century.

☞ \* It was in consequence of this treaty (of which the articles were drawn up at Maux, and afterwards confirmed at Paris, in presence of Louis) that the university of Toulouse was founded, Raymond having bound himself thereby to pay the sum of 4000 silver marks, toward the support of two professors of divinity, two of canon law, two of grammar, and six of the liberal arts, during the space of ten years. We must also observe, that what Dr. Mosheim says of the cession that Raymond made of his lands is not sufficiently clear and accurate. These lands were not to be transferred till after his death, and they were to be transferred to the brother of Louis IX. who, according to the treaty, was to espouse the daughter of Raymond. See Fleury's Hist. Eccles. liv. lxxxix. sect. 50.

blow to the cause of heresy, and dispersed the champions that had appeared in its defence: the inquisition was established at Toulouse, and the heretics were not only exposed to the *pious* cruelties of Louis, but, what was still more shocking, Raymond himself, who had formerly been their patron, became their persecutor, and treated them upon all occasions with the most inhuman severity. It is true, this prince broke the engagements into which he had entered by the treaty above-mentioned, and renewed the war against Louis and the inquisitors, who abused, in the most odious manner, their victory and the power they had acquired. But this new effort, in favour of the heretics, was attended with little or no effect, and the unfortunate earl of Toulouse, the last representative of that noble and powerful family, dejected and exhausted by the losses he had sustained, and the perplexities in which he was involved, died, in 1249, without male issue. And thus ended a civil war, of which religion had been partly the cause, and partly the pretext, and which, in its consequences, was highly profitable both to the kings of France and to the Roman pontiffs.\*

IX. The severity which the court of Rome employed in the extirpation of heresy, and the formidable arguments of fire and sword, racks and gibbets, with which the popes and their creatures reasoned against the enemies of the church, were not sufficient to prevent the rise of new and pernicious sects in different countries. Many of these sects were inconsiderable in themselves, and transitory in their duration, while some of them made a noise in the world, and were suppressed with difficulty. Among the latter we may reckon that of the Brethren and Sisters of the free spirit, which about this time gained ground secretly and almost imperceptibly in Italy, France, and Germany, and seduced into its bosom multitudes of persons of both sexes, by the striking ap-

\* Many writers, both ancient and modern, have related the circumstances of this religious war, carried on against the earls of Toulouse and their confederates, and also against the heretics, whose cause they maintained. But the historians, whom I have consulted on this subject, have not treated it with that impartiality which is so essential to the merit of historic writing. The protestant writers, among whom Basnage deserves an eminent rank, are too favourable to Raymond and the Albigenses; the Roman catholic historians lean with still more partiality to the other side. Of the latter, the most recent are Benedict, a Dominican monk, author of the *Histoire des Albigeois, des Vaudois, et des Barbets*, published at Paris in 1691, and J. Bapt. L'Anglois, a Jesuit, who composed the *Histoire des Croisades contre les Albigeois*, published at Rouen in 1703, to which we must add Jo. Jac. Percini *Monumenta Conventus Tolosani Ordinis Fratrum Prædicatorum, in quibus Historia hujus Conventus distribuitur, et refertur totius Albigenis facti narratio*, Tolosa, 1693. These writers are chargeable with the greatest partiality and injustice for the reproaches and calumnies they throw out so liberally against the Raymonds and the Albigenses, while they disguise, with a perfidious dexterity, the barbarity of Simon of Montfort, and the ambitious views of extending their dominions that engaged the kings of France to enter into this war. The most ample and accurate account of this expedition against the heretics is that which is given by the learned Benedictines Claude le Vie and Joseph Varsette, in their *Histoire Generale de Languedoc*, tom. iii. in which, however, there are several omissions, which render that valuable work defective.

pearance of piety that was observed in the conduct of the members who composed it. How far the councils of this century proceeded against the new sect, we cannot say with certainty, because we have upon record only a few of the decrees that were issued upon that occasion. Perhaps the obscurity of the rising faction screened it, in a great measure, from public view. But this was not the case in the following age; the *Brethren and Sisters* above-mentioned issued from their retreats in proportion as their numbers increased: they drew upon them the eyes of the world, and particularly those of the inquisitors, who committed to the flames such of these unhappy enthusiasts as fell into their hands; while the councils, holden in Germany and other countries, loaded them with excommunications and damnatory edicts.

This sect took its denomination from the words of St. Paul,\* and maintained that the true children of God were invested with the privilege of a full and perfect freedom from the jurisdiction of the law.† They were called, by the Germans and Flemish, *Beghards* and *Beguttes*, names which, as we have seen already, were usually given to those who made an extraordinary profession of piety and devotion. They received from others the reproachful denomination of *Bicorni*, i. e. Idiots. In France, they were known by the appellation of *Beguins* and *Beguines*, while the multitude distinguished them by that of *Turlupins*, the origin and reason of which title I have not been able to learn.‡ Nothing carried a more shocking air of lunacy and distraction than their external aspect and manners. They ran from place to place clothed in the most singular and fantastic apparel, and begged their bread with wild shouts and clamours, rejecting with horror every kind of industry and labour, as an obstacle to divine contemplation, and to the ascent of the soul toward the Father of spirits. In all their excursions they were fol-

\* Romans, viii. 2, 14.

† The accounts here given of these wretched fanatics are, for the most part, taken from authentic records, which have not been yet published, from the decrees of synods and councils holden in France and Germany, from the diplomas of the Roman pontiffs, the sentences pronounced by the inquisitors, and other sources of information to which I have had access. I have also a collection of extracts from certain books of these enthusiasts, and more especially from that which treated of the *Nine Spiritual Rocks*, and which was in the highest esteem among the free brethren, who considered it as a treasure of divine wisdom and doctrine. As I cannot here expose these records to the examination of the curious reader, I beg leave to refer him to a long and ample edict issued out against these brethren by Henry I. archbishop of Cologne, and published in the *Statuta Coloniensis*, anno 1554. This edict is, in every respect, conformable to those published on the same occasion at Mentz, Aschaffenburg, Paderborn, Beziers, Treves, and other places.

‡ Many have written of the Turlupins, but none with accuracy and precision. See Beausobre's *Dissertation sur les Adamites*, part ii. p. 384, where that learned author has fallen into several errors, as usually happens to him when he treats subjects of this kind. I know not the origin of the word Turlupin; but I am able to demonstrate, by the most authentic records, that the persons so called, who were burned at Paris and in other parts of France, were no other than the Brethren of the free spirit, who were condemned by the Roman pontiffs, and also by various councils.

lowed by women, called *Sisters*, with whom they lived in the most intimate familiarity.\* They distributed, among the people, books which contained the substance of their doctrines; held nocturnal assemblies in places remote from public view; and seduced many from frequenting the ordinary institutions of divine worship.

X. These brethren, who gloried in the freedom which they pretended to have obtained, *through the spirit*, from the dominion and obligation of the *law*, adopted a certain rigid and fantastic system of mystic theology, built upon pretended philosophical principles, which bore a striking resemblance to the impious doctrines of the Pantheists. They held, "That all things flowed by emanation from God, and were finally to return to their divine source; that rational souls were so many portions of the Supreme Deity, and that the universe, considered as one great whole, was God: that every man, by the power of contemplation, and by calling off his mind from sensible and terrestrial objects, might be united to the Deity in an inexplicable manner, and become one with the Source and Parent of all things; and that they, who, by long and assiduous meditation, had plunged themselves, as it were, into the abyss of the Divinity, acquired a most glorious and sublime liberty, and were not only delivered from the violence of sinful lusts, but even from the common instincts of nature." From these and the like doctrines, the brethren drew this impious and horrid conclusion, "That the person who had ascended to God in this manner, and was absorbed by contemplation in the abyss of Deity, became thus a part of the Godhead, commenced God, was the *Son of God* in the same sense and manner in which Christ was, and was thereby raised to a glorious independence, and freed from the obligation of all laws human and divine." It was in consequence of all this, that they treated with contempt the ordinances of the Gospel, and every external act of religious worship, looking upon prayer, fasting, baptism, and the sacrament of the Lord's supper, as the first elements of piety adapted to the state and capacity of children, and as of no sort of use to the *perfect man*, whom long meditation had raised above all external things, and carried into the bosom and essence of the Deity.†

\* Hence they were styled, in Germany, *Schwerstriones*, as appears by the decrees of several councils.

† It may not be improper to introduce a certain number of sentences, translated faithfully from several of the more secret books of these heretics. The following will be sufficient to give the curious reader a full idea of their impiety.

"Every pious and good man is the only begotten Son of God, whom God engendered from all eternity: (for these heretics maintained, that what the Scriptures taught concerning the distinction of three persons in the divine nature, is by no means to be understood literally, and therefore explained it according to the principles of their mystical and fantastic system.)

"All created things are non-entities, or nothing: I do not say that they are small or minute, but that they are absolutely nothing.

"There is in the soul of man something that is neither created nor susceptible of creation, and that is, rationality, or the power of reasoning.

"God is neither good, nor better, nor best: whosoever therefore calls the Deity good, speaks as fool-

XI. Among these fanatics there were several persons of eminent probity, who had entered into this sect with the most upright intentions, and who extended that liberty of the spirit, which they looked upon as the privilege of true believers, no farther than to an exemption from the duties of external worship, and an immunity from the positive laws of the church. The whole of religion was placed by this class of men in internal devotion, and they treated with the utmost contempt the rules of monastic discipline, and all other external rites and institutions, as infinitely beneath the attention of the *perfect*. Nor were their exhortations and examples without effect; for, about the middle of this century, they persuaded a considerable number of monks and devout persons, in Suabia, "to live without any rule, and to serve God in the liberty of the spirit, which was the most acceptable service that could be presented to the Deity."\* The inquisitors, however, stopped these poor enthusiasts in the midst of their career, and committed several of them to the flames, in which they expired, not only with the most unclouded serenity, but even with the most triumphant feelings of cheerfulness and joy.

But we find among these Brethren of the free spirit another class of fanatics very different from these now mentioned, and much more extravagant, whose system of religion was as dangerous as it was ridiculous and absurd, since it opened a door to the most licentious manners. These wretched enthusiasts maintained, that, by continual contemplation, it was possible to eradicate all the instincts of nature out of the *heaven-born* mind, and to introduce, into the soul a certain divine stupor, and holy apathy, which they looked upon as the great characteristics of Christian perfection. The persons who adopted these sentiments took strange liberties in consequence of their pretended sanctity, and showed, indeed, by their conduct, that they had little regard to external appearances; for they held their secret assemblies in a state of nudity, and lay in the same beds with their spiritual sisters, or, indiscriminately, with other women, without the smallest scruple or hesitation. This shocking violation

isly as he who calls an object black which he knows to be white.

"God still engenders his only begotten son, and begets still the same son, whom he had begotten from eternity: for every operation of the Deity is uniform and one; and therefore he engenders his son without any division.

"What the Scriptures say concerning Christ is true of every good, of every divine man; and every quality of the divine nature belongs equally to every person whose piety is genuine and sincere."

To these horrid passages we may add the following sentences, in which John bishop of Strasbourg (in an edict he published against the Brethren of the free spirit, in 1317) discovers farther the blasphemous doctrine of this impious sect. "Deus (says these heretics) est formaliter omne quod est. Quilibet homo perfectus est Christus per naturam. Homo perfectus est liber in totum, nec tenetur ad servandam præcepta ecclesie data a Deo. Multa sunt potestata in Evangelio, quæ non sunt vera; et homines credere magis debent conceptionis ex anima sua Deo juncta profectis, quam Evangelio," &c.

\* See Mart. Crusius, *Annal. Suevicorum*, part. iii. lib. ii. cap. xiv. ad annum 1261.—This author has taken his materials from Felix Faber, an impartial writer.

of decency was a consequence of their pernicious system. They looked upon decency and modesty as marks of inward corruption, as the characters of a soul that was still under the dominion of the sensual, animal, and lascivious spirit, and that was not, as yet, re-united to the divine nature, its centre and source. And they considered, as at a fatal distance from the Deity, all such as either felt the carnal suggestions of nature, or were penetrated with warm emotions at the view or approach of persons of a different sex, or were incapable of vanquishing and suppressing the rising fervour of lust and intemperance.\*

There were, moreover, in this fanatical troop, certain enthusiasts, who far surpassed in impiety the two classes we have been now mentioning, who abused the system and doctrines of the sect, so as to draw from them an apology for all kinds of wickedness, and who audaciously maintained, that the divine man, the believer, who was intimately united to God, could not sin, let his conduct be ever so horrible and atrocious. This execrable doctrine was not, indeed, explained in the same manner by all the Brethren of the free spirit who were so outrageous to adopt it. Some held that the motions and actions of the body had no relation at all to the soul, which, by its union with God, was blended with the divine nature: others fell into a notion infinitely injurious to the Supreme Being, and maintained that the propensities and passions that arose in the soul of the divine man after his union with the Deity, were the propensities and affections of God himself, and were therefore, notwithstanding their apparent deformity and opposition to the law, holy and good, since the Supreme Being is infinitely exalted above all law and all obligation.† It is necessary to observe, before we

\* Certain writers, whose principal zeal is employed in the defence of these heretics, and who have accustomed themselves to entertain a high idea of the sanctity of all those who, in the middle ages, separated themselves from the communion of the church of Rome, suspect the inquisitors of having attributed falsely these impious doctrines to the Brethren of the free spirit, with a view to blacken these pious men, and to render them odious. But this suspicion is entirely groundless; and the account of this matter, which we have given in the text, is conformable to the strictest truth. The inquisitors have been less fabulous in their accusations of these heretics, than many are apt to imagine. They acknowledge that the Beghards, though destitute of shame, were not in general chargeable with a breach of the duties of chastity and abstinence. They were indeed of opinion, that the firmness of mind, and insensibility of heart, which rendered them proof against female charms, and deaf to the voice of nature, were privileges granted to them by the devil; for they adopted the opinion of honest Nieder, (Purmicar. lib. iii. cap. v.) and affirmed that it was in the power of that evil spirit to render men cold, and to extinguish the warm and lascivious solicitations of nature; and that Satan wrought this miracle upon his friends and adherents, in order to procure them a high reputation for sanctity, and make them appear superior in virtue to the rest of mankind. "Credo (saith Nieder, who was both a Dominican and an inquisitor) quosdam ex eis demonis opera affectos fuisse, ne moverentur ad naturales actus incontinentiæ . . . . Facillimum enim est demonibus infrigidare."

† This account will be confirmed by the following passage, which is faithfully translated from the famous book of the *Nine Rocks*, written originally in German: "Moreover the divine man operates and engenders whatever the Deity operates and engenders: for in God he produced and formed the heavens

leave this subject, that flagitious and impious impostors mingled themselves sometimes with this sect, and took the name of Beghards, that by a feigned piety they might impose upon the multitude, and deceive the simple into their snares.\*

XII. The famous Anaelric, professor of logic and theology at Paris, whose bones were dug up and publicly burned in 1209, (although he

and the earth. He is also the father of the eternal word. Neither could God produce any thing without this divine man, who is therefore obliged to render his will conformable to the will of God, that whatever may be agreeable to the Deity, may be agreeable to him also. If therefore it be the will of God that I should commit sin, my will must be the same, and I must not even desire to abstain from sin. This is true contrition. And although a man, who is well and truly united to God, may have committed a thousand mortal sins, he ought not to wish that he had not committed them: he should even be ready to die a thousand deaths rather than omit one of these mortal sins." Hence arose the accusation brought by the inquisitors against this impious sect, whom they reproach with maintaining that the "sin of a man united to God, is not sin, since God works in him and with him whatever he does." Henry Suso, a Dominican monk, and one of the most celebrated Mystic writers, composed, in the following century, another book concerning the Nine Rocks, which is to be found in the edition of his works published by Laurence Surinus. But this book is entirely different from that which was in such high esteem among the Beghards, though it bears the same title. The latter is of much older date, and was in vogue in Germany, among the Brethren of the free spirit, long before Suso was born. There fell some time ago into my hands an ancient manuscript, composed in Alsace during the fifteenth century, containing an account of various revelations and visions of that age. In this manuscript I found a piece entitled, *Declaratio Religiosorum eujusdam super Revelatione Carthusiano cuidam de Ecclesia per gladium reformatione, Lecti in anno 1453 facta*; and, almost in the beginning of this declaration, I met with the following passage relating to the book of the Nine Rocks: "Homo quidam devotissimus, licet laicus, librum de novem Rupibus conscripsit a Deo compulsus, ubi multa ad presens penitentia continentur de Ecclesie renovatione et pravicia gravi persecutione." These Nine Rocks signified, according to the fanatical doctrine of this wrong-headed sect, the different steps by which the divine man ascended to the Deity.

\* The founder of this famous sect, the place of its origin, and the time of its first appearance, are not known with certainty. I have in my possession eighty-nine Sentences of the Beghards, vulgarly called Schwestriones, but who style themselves Brethren of the sect of the free spirit and of voluntary poverty, with a refutation of the said sentences, written at Worms toward the conclusion of this century by one of the inquisitors. The 79th sentence runs thus: "To say that the truth is in Rhetia, is to fall into the heresy of Donatus, who said that God was in Africa, and not elsewhere." From these words it appears evident, that Rhetia was the country where the church of the Brethren of the free spirit was fixed and established, and that from this province they passed into Germany. I am not, however, of opinion, that this sect had its origin in that province; but am rather inclined to think, that Italy was its country, and that, being driven thence, it took refuge in Rhetia. Nor is at all improbable, that Italy, which saw so many religious factions arise in its bosom, was also the nursing mother of this blasphemous sect. We shall be almost fully confirmed in this opinion, when we consider that, in a long letter from Clement V. to Rainier bishop of Cremona, (published by Odor. Raynaldus, Annal. tom. xv. an. 1311.) the zealous pontiff exhorts that prelate to suppress and extirpate, with all his power, the sect of the Brethren of the free spirit, who were settled in several parts of Italy, and particularly in the province of Spoleto and the countries adjacent. Such are the terms of the pontiff's letter: "In nonnullis Italiae partibus, tam Spoletanae provincie, quam circumjacentium regionum."



had abjured his errors before his death,) and a considerable number of whose disciples and followers were committed to the flames on account of their absurd and pernicious doctrine, was undoubtedly of the same way of thinking with the sect whose opinions we have been now considering;\* for, though the writers of this barbarous age have given very different and confused accounts of his opinions, and even attributed some doctrines to him which he never maintained, it is nevertheless certain, that he taught, that all things were the parts of one substance, or, in other words, that the universe was God, and that not only the forms of all things, but also their matter or substance, proceed from the Deity, and must return to the source from which they were derived.† From these absurd and blasphemous principles he deduced that chimerical system of fanatical devotion, which we have already exposed to the view of the reader, pretended to demonstrate the possibility of incorporating or translating the human nature into the divine, and rejected all kinds of external worship, as insignificant and useless. The disciples of this enthusiast were men of exemplary piety, were distinguished by the gravity and austerity of their lives and manners, and suffered death in the most dreadful forms with the utmost resolution and constancy. David of Dinant, a Parisian doctor, was one of the most eminent among these; and he usually expressed the fundamental principle of his master in the following proposition; "God is the primary matter or substance of all things." He composed a work entitled *Quaternarii*, with several other productions, which were chiefly designed to

affect and gain the multitude; but he was at length obliged to save himself by flight.\* The bishops, assembled in council at Paris, in 1209, considered the philosophy of Aristotle as the source of these impious doctrines, and, on that account, prohibited all persons from reading or explaining, either in public or private, the metaphysical and other productions of the Grecian sage.‡

XIII. If we may depend upon the accounts given by certain writers, Amalric and his followers received with the utmost docility and faith the predictions, attributed to Joachim, abbot of Flora, concerning the reformation that was soon to be brought about in the church by the power of the sword,—the approaching *Age of the Holy Ghost*, that was to succeed those of the Father and the Son,—and other things of that nature, which raised the hopes and occupied the thoughts of the Spiritual Franciscans. Whether these accounts may be depended upon or not, we shall not determine. To us they appear extremely doubtful. It is, however, true, that certain persons were so far deluded by these pretended prophecies, as to form new sects with a view to their accomplishment, and to declare war against the established church, its system of doctrine, and its forms of worship. Among other fanatical sectaries, there arose one of a most extraordinary kind, a Bohemian woman, named Wilhelmina, who resided in the territory of Milan. This delirious and wrong-headed woman, having studied with attention the predictions concerning the age of the Holy Ghost, was so extravagant as to persuade herself, and (what is still more amazing) had sufficient influence to persuade others, that the Holy Ghost had become incarnate in her person, for the salvation of a great part of mankind. According to her doctrine, "None could be saved by the blood of Jesus, but true and pious Christians; while the Jews, Saracens, and unworthy Christians, were to obtain salvation through the Holy Spirit which dwelt in her; and, in consequence thereof, all that had happened to Christ, during his appearance upon earth in the human nature, was to be exactly renewed in her person, or rather in that of the Holy Ghost which was united to her." This mad woman died at Milan, in 1281, in the most fragrant odour of sanctity; and her memory was not only holden in the highest veneration by her numerous followers and the ignorant multitude, but was also honoured with religious worship both in public and in private. Her sect was at length discovered by the curious eye of persecution, in 1300, and fell under the cognizance of the inquisitors, who destroyed the magnificent monument that had been erected to her honour, ordered her bones to be committed to the flames, and in the same fire consumed the leaders of this

\* This did not escape the notice of the enemies of the Beghards or Brethren of the free spirit in Germany, much less that of the inquisitors, who, in their Refutation of the 89 sentences of the Beghards, mentioned in the preceding note, express themselves thus: (sent. 68.) "Dicere quod omnis creatura est Deus, heresis Alexandri\* est, qui dixit, materiam primam et Deum et hominem, hoc est mentes, esse in substantia, quod postea quidam David de Dinanto sequutus est, qui temporibus nostris de hac heresi de Francia fugatus est, et punitus fuisse, si deprehensus fuisset."

† The account given by Fleury, in his Ecclesiastical History, of the opinions of Amalric, is very different from that which is here given by Dr. Mosheim. The former observes, that Amalric, or Amauri, taught that "every Christian was obliged to believe himself a member of Jesus Christ, and that without this belief none could be saved;" and he observes also, that his disciples introduced errors still more pernicious, such as the following: "That the power of the Father had continued only during the Mosaic dispensation, that of the Son 1200 years after his entrance upon earth, and that, in the thirteenth century, the age of the Holy Spirit commenced, in which the sacraments and all external worship were to be abolished; that there would be no resurrection; that heaven and hell were mere fictions;" and many more sentiments of that nature, which, as the learned Spanheim imagines, were falsely imputed to Amalric, in order to render his memory odious, because he had opposed the worship of saints and images. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. lxxvi. sect. lix.—Dr Mosheim considered Amalric as a Pantheist; and many men of eminent learning are of this opinion. See, among others, Joh. Gerson apud Jac. Thomassium, and also Brucker's Hist. Philosoph. tom. iii. p. 688.

\* The person here mentioned is Alexander, the Epicurean, of whom Plutarch speaks in his Sympotium.

\* See Martenne's Thesaur. Anecd. tom. iv. p. 163, where there is an account of the heresies for which several priests were burned at Paris in 1209.—Natal. Alexander, Hist. Eccl. Sac. xiii. cap. iii. art. ii. p. 76.—Du Bois, Hist. Eccl. Paris. t. ii. p. 241.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. t. iii. p. 24, 48, 53.—Jac. Thomassium, de Evnitione Mundi Stoica, p. 130.

‡ Launoy, de varia Aristot. fortuna in Acad. Paris. p. 127.

wretched faction, among whom were persons of both sexes.\*

XIV. It was upon predictions similar to those mentioned in the preceding section, that the sect of the *Apostles* founded its discipline. The members of this sect made little or no alteration in the doctrinal part of the public religion; what they principally aimed at, was, to introduce among Christians the simplicity of the primitive times, and more especially the manner of life that was observed by the apostles. Gerard Sagarelli, the founder of this sect, obliged his followers to go from place to place as the apostles did, to wander about clothed in white, with long beards, dishevelled hair, and bare heads, accompanied with women whom they called their Sisters. They were also obliged to renounce all kinds of property and possessions, and to preach in public the necessity of repentance, while in their more private assemblies they declared the approaching destruction of the corrupt church of Rome, and the establishment of a purer service, and a more glorious church, which, according to the prophecies of the abbot Joachim, would certainly arise from its ruins. No sooner was the ill-fated leader of this faction committed to the flames,† than he was succeeded in that character by a bold and enterprising fanatic, named Dulcinus, a native of Novara, who published his predictions with more courage, and maintained them with more zeal, than his predecessor had done, and who did not hesitate to declare that, in a short time, pope Boniface VIII., the corrupt priests, and the licentious monks, were to perish by the hand of the emperor Frederic III., son of Peter, king of Aragon, and that a new and most holy pontiff was to be raised to the head of the church. These visionary predictions were, no doubt, drawn from the dreams of Joachim, who is said to have declared, among other things, that an emperor called Frederic III., was to bring to perfection what Frederic II. had left unfinished. Be that as it may, Dulcinus appeared with intrepid assurance at the head of the *apostles*; and acting, not only in the character of a prophet, but also in that of a general, he assembled an army to maintain his cause, and perhaps to accomplish, at least in part, his predictions. He was opposed by Raynerius, bishop of Vercelli, who defended the interests of the Roman pontiff, and carried on, above two years, a most sanguinary and dreadful war against this chief of the apostles. The issue of this contest was fatal to the latter, who, after several battles fought with obstinate courage, was at length taken prisoner, and put to death at Vercelli in a most barbarous manner, in 1307, together with Margaret, whom he had chosen for his spiritual sister,

\* The Milanese historians, such as Bernardinus Coriuss, and others, have related the adventures of this odd woman; but their accounts are very different from those given by the learned Muratori, in his *Antiq. Italiae mediæ ævi*, tom. v., and which he has drawn from the judicial proceedings of the court, where the extraordinary case of this female fanatic was examined. We are informed by the same excellent author, that a learned writer, named Paricelli, composed a history of Wilhelmina, and of her sect.

† This unhappy man was burned alive at Parma, in 1300.

according to the custom of his sect. The terrible end of Dulcinus was not immediately followed by the extinction of his sect, which still subsisted in France, Germany, and other countries, and stood firm against the most vehement efforts of its enemies, until the beginning of the 15th century, when, under the pontificate of Boniface IX., it was totally extirpated.\*

XV. This famous Joachim, abbot of Flora, whose fanatical predictions turned the heads of so many well-meaning people, and excited them to attempt reforming the church by the sword, and to declare open war against the Roman pontiffs, did not fall under the suspicion of heresy on account of these predictions, but in consequence of a new explication he had given of the doctrine of a Trinity of persons in the Godhead. He had in an elaborate work attacked very warmly Peter Lombard, the master of the sentences, on account of the distinction which this writer had made between the divine essence and the three persons in the Godhead; for Joachim looked upon this doctrine as introducing a fourth object, even an essence, into the Trinity. But the good man was too little versed in metaphysical matters, to carry on a controversy of such a subtle nature; and he was betrayed by his ignorance so far as to advance inconsiderately the most rash and most exceptionable tenets. For he denied that there was any thing, or any essence, that belonged in common to the three persons in the Trinity, or was jointly possessed by them; by which doctrine the *substantial* union, among the three persons, was taken away, and the union of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was reduced from a *natural, simple, and numerical* unity, to a *moral* one only; that is, to such an unity as reigns in the counsels and opinions of different persons, who embrace the same notions, and think and act with one accord. This explication of the Trinity was looked upon by many as very little different from the Arian system; and therefore pope Innocent III. pronounced, in 1215, in the Lateran council, a damnable sentence against the doctrine of Joachim; not extending, however, to the person or fame of the abbot himself. Notwithstanding this papal sentence, Joachim has at this day a considerable number of adherents and defenders, more especially among those Franciscans who are called *Observants*. Some of these maintain that the book of this abbot was corrupted and interpolated by his enemies, while the rest are of opinion that his doctrine

\* I composed in the German language an accurate history of this famous sect, which is very little known in our times; and I have in my hands materials, that will furnish an interesting addition to that history. That this sect subsisted in Germany, and in some other countries, until the pontificate of Boniface IX., is evident from the Chronicle of Herman Cornerus, published by Jo. George Echar, in his *Corpus Historicum mediæ ævi*, tom. ii., and may be sufficiently demonstrated by other authentic testimonies. In 1402, a certain member of this apostolic sect, whose name was William, or Wilhelmus, was burned alive at Lubeck. The Germans, who were accustomed to distinguish by the name of Beghards all those who pretended to extraordinary piety, and sought, by poverty and begging, an eminent reputation for sanctity and virtue, gave this title also to the sect of the *Apostles*.

was not thoroughly understood by those who opposed it.\*

\* See Dan. Papbrochius, *Disquis. Histor. de Florensi Ordine, Prophetiis, Doctrina, B. Joachimi*, in

*Actis Sanctorum, Maii*, tom. vi. p. 486, which contains the life of Joachim, written by Syllanus, and several other pieces of consequence. See also Natal. Alexander, *Hist. Eccles. sæc. xiii. dis. ii. v. 331.*—Luc. Wadding, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv.

## THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

### PART I.

#### THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

##### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. SEVERAL attempts were made by the princes of the west, at the instigation of the Roman pontiffs, to renew the war in Palestine against the Turks and Saracens, and to deliver the whole province of Syria from the oppressive yoke of those despotic infidels. The succession of pontiffs that resided in Avignon, evinced the greatest zeal for the renovation of this religious war, and left no artifice, no methods of persuasion unemployed, that could have the least tendency to engage the kings of England and France in an expedition to the Holy Land. But their success was not answerable to their zeal; and, notwithstanding the powerful influence of their exhortations and remonstrances, something still happened to prevent their producing the desired effect. Clement V. urged the renewal of this holy war with the greatest ardour in the years 1307 and 1308, and set apart a very large sum of money for prosecuting it with alacrity and vigour.\* John XXII. ordered ten ships to be fitted out in 1319, to transport an army of pious adventurers into Palestine,† and had recourse to the power of superstition, that is, to the influence of indulgences, for raising the funds necessary to the support of this great enterprise. These indulgences he offered to such as contributed generously to the war, and appointed legates to administer them in all the European countries that were subject to his spiritual jurisdiction. But, under this fair show of piety and zeal, John is supposed to have covered the most selfish and grovelling views; and we find Louis of Bavaria, who was at that time emperor, and several other princes, complaining loudly that this pontiff made use of the holy war as a pretext to disguise his avarice and ambition;‡ and indeed the character of this pope was of such a stamp as tended to accredit such complaints. Under the pontificate of Benedict XII., a formidable army was raised, in 1330, by Philip de Valois, king of France,

with a view, as was said, to attempt the deliverance of the Christians in Palestine;\* but, when he was ready to embark his troops, the apprehension of an invasion from England obliged him to lay aside this weighty enterprise. In 1345, Clement VI., at the request of the Venetians, engaged, by the persuasive power of indulgences, a prodigious number of adventurers to embark for Smyrna, where they composed a numerous army under the command of Guido, or Guy, dauphin of Vienne; but the want of provisions soon obliged this army to return with the general into Europe.† This disappointment did not, however, damp the spirits of the restless pontiffs; for another formidable army was assembled in 1363, in consequence of the zealous exhortations of Urban V., and was to be employed in a new expedition against the infidels, with John, king of France, at its head; but the unexpected death of that prince blasted the hopes that many had entertained from this grand project, and occasioned the dispersion of that numerous body which had repaired to his standard.‡

II. The missionaries who had been sent by the Roman pontiffs into China, Tartary, and the adjacent countries, in the preceding century, found their labours crowned with the desired success, and established a great number of Christian churches among those unenlightened nations. In 1307, Clement V. erected Cambalu (which at that time was the celebrated metropolis of Cathay, and is, undoubtedly, the same with Pekin, the capital city at present of the Chinese empire,) into an archbishopric, which he conferred upon John de Monte Corvino, an Italian friar who had been employed in propagating the Gospel in that country for many years. The same pontiff sent soon after, to assist this prelate in his pious labours, seven other prelates of the Franciscan order.§ John XXII. exerted in this

\* Baluzius, tom. i. p. 200.

† *Fragmenta Histor. Romanæ*, in Murator. *Antiq. Ital. mediæ Ævi*, tom. iii. p. 368.

‡ Baluzii *Vite Pontif. Avinion.* tom. i. p. 366, 368, 371, 401.

§ Wadding, *Annal. Ordin. Minor.* tom. vi. ad an. 1305, sect. xii. p. 69. ad an. 1307, p. 94, 368; tom. vii. p. 53, 221; tom. viii. p. 235.—J. S. Asseman. *Biblioth. Orient. Vatican.* tom. iii. sect. ii. p. 521.—J. Ehard, *Scriptor. Pædagogor.* tom. i. p. 537.—Acta Sanctor. tom. i. Januarii, p. 984.—Mosheim, *Historia Eccles. Tartar.*

\* Baluzii *Vite Pontif. Avinion.* tom. i. p. 15, 594; tom. ii. p. 55, 374, &c. Ant. Matthæi *Analecta veteris Ævi*, tom. ii. p. 577.

† Baluzii *Vite Pontif. Avinion.* tom. i. p. 125; tom. ii. p. 515.

‡ Baluzius, tom. i. p. 175, 786. Matthæi *Analecta vet. Ævi*, tom. ii. p. 595.

good cause the same zeal which had distinguished the pontificate of his predecessors. On the death of John de Monte Corvino, in 1333, he sent Nicolas of Benra to fill the vacant archbishopric of Cambalu, and charged him with letters to the emperor of the Tartars, who, at that time, was in possession of the Chinese dominions. In 1338, Benedict XII. sent new legates and missionaries into Tartary and China, in consequence of a solemn embassy\* with which he was honoured at Avignon from the kahn of the Tartars. During the time that the princes of the latter nation maintained themselves in the empire of China, the Christian religion flourished in those vast regions; and both Latins and Nestorians not only made a public profession of their faith, but also propagated it, without any apprehension of danger, through the northern provinces of Asia.

III. There remained in this century scarcely any European prince unconverted to Christianity, if we except Jagellon, duke of Lithuania, who continued in the darkness of paganism, and worshipped the gods of his idolatrous ancestors, until 1386, when he embraced the Christian faith, received in baptism the name of Ladislaus, and persuaded his subjects to open their eyes upon the divine light of the Gospel. We shall not pretend to justify the purity of the motives that first engaged this prince to renounce the religion of his fathers, as they were accompanied, at least, with views of policy, interest, and ambition. On the death of Louis, king of Poland, which happened in 1382, Jagellon was named among the competitors who aspired to the vacant throne; and, as he was a rich and powerful prince, the Poles beheld his pretensions and efforts with a favourable eye. His religion was the only obstacle to the accomplishment of his views. Hedwige, the youngest daughter of the deceased monarch, who, by a decree of the senate, was declared heiress of the kingdom, was as little disposed to espouse, as the Poles were to obey, a Pagan; and hence Jagellon was obliged to make superstition yield to royalty.† On the other hand, the Teutonic knights and crusaders extirpated by fire and sword all the remains of paganism that were to be found in Prussia and Livonia, and effected, by force, what persuasion alone ought to have produced.

We find also in the annals of this century many instances of Jews converted to the Christian faith. The cruel persecutions they suffered in several parts of Europe, particularly in France and Germany, vanquished their obstinacy, and bent their intractable spirits under the yoke of the Gospel. The reports‡ (whether

false or true, we shall not determine) that had been industriously spread abroad, of their poisoning the public fountains, of their killing infants and drinking their blood, of their profaning, in the most impious and blasphemous manner, the consecrated wafers that were used in the celebration of the eucharist, with other accusations equally enormous, excited every where the resentment of the magistrates and the fury of the people, and brought the most terrible sufferings, that unrelenting vengeance could invent, upon that wretched and devoted nation.

IV. The Saracens still maintained a considerable footing in Spain. The kingdoms of Granada and Murcia, with the province of Andalusia, were subject to their dominion; and they carried on a perpetual war with the kings of Castile, Arragon, and Navarre, in which, however, they were not always victorious. The African princes, and particularly the emperors of Morocco, became their auxiliaries against the Christians. On the other hand, the Roman pontiffs left no means unemployed to excite the Christians to unite their forces against the Moslems, and to drive them out of the Spanish territories; presents, exhortations, promises,—in short, all allurements that religion, superstition, or avarice, could render powerful,—were made subservient to the execution of this arduous project. The Christians, accordingly, united their counsels and efforts for this end; and though for some time the difficulty of the enterprise rendered their progress inconsiderable, yet even in this century their affairs wore a promising aspect, and gave them reason to hope that they might one day triumph over their enemies, and become sole possessors of the Spanish dominions.\*

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THE Turks and Tartars, who extended their dominions in Asia with an amazing rapidity, and directed their arms against the Greeks, as well as against the Saracens, destroyed wherever they went the fruits that had sprung up in such a rich abundance from the labours of the Christian missionaries, extirpated the religion of Jesus in several provinces and cities where it had flourished, and substituted the impostures of Mohammed in its place. Many of the Tartars had formerly professed the Gospel, and still more had tolerated the exercise of that divine religion; but, from the beginning of this century, things put on a new face; and that fierce nation renounced

which had been invented and dispersed to the disadvantage of the Jews, and in the fourteenth century, we find Benedict XII. and Clement VI. giving similar proofs of their equity toward an injured people. We find, in history, circular letters of the dukes of Milan and Venice, and imperial edicts of Frederic III. and Charles V., to the same purpose; and all these circumstances materially detract from the credibility of the reports mentioned by Dr. Moshem.

\* See J. de Ferreras, *Histoire d'Espagne*, tom. iv. v. vi.—*Fragmenta Histor. Romanæ*, in Muratorii *An. Ital. mediæ ævi*, tom. iii. p. 319, in which, however, there is a considerable mixture of falsehood with truth.—*Babazii Miscellan.* tom. ii. p. 267.

\* *Balazii Vita Pontificum Avinionensium*, tom. i. p. 212.

† *Odor. Raynaldus, Annal. Eccles.* ad an. 1386, sect. iv. *Wadding, Annal. Minor.* tom. ix. p. 71.—*Solignac, Histoire de Pologne*, tom. iii. p. 241.

‡ It seems more than probable that these reports were industriously forced out of animosity against the Jews, who had long been the peculiar objects of general odium. This will appear still more evidently to have been the case, when we consider that the popes Gregory IX. and Innocent IV., published, in the thirteenth century, declarations calculated to destroy the effect of several calumnies

every other religious doctrine, except that of the Koran. Even Timur-Bec, commonly called Tamerlane, their mighty emperor, embraced the doctrine of Mohammed, though under a form different from that which was adopted by the Tartars in general.\* This formidable warrior, after having subdued the greatest part of Asia, having triumphed over Bajazet (or Bayezid) emperor of the Turks, and even filled Europe with terror at the approach of his victorious arms, made use of his authority to force multitudes of Christians to apostatise from their holy faith. To the dictates of authority he added the compulsive power of violence and persecution, and treated the disciples of Christ with the utmost barbarity. Persuaded, as we learn from the most credible writers of his life and actions, that it was incumbent upon the true followers of Mohammed to persecute the Christians, and that the most ample and glorious rewards were reserved for such as were most instrumental in converting them to the religion of that supposed prophet,† he employed the most inhuman acts of severity to vanquish the magnanimous constancy of such as persevered in their attachment to the Christian religion, of whom some

\* This great Tamerlane, whose name seemed to strike terror even when he was no more, adhered to the sect of the Sunnites, and professed the greatest enmity against their adversaries, the Shiites. See Petit Croix, *Histoire de Timur-Bec*, tom. ii. p. 151; tom. iii. p. 228. It is, however, extremely doubtful, what was, in reality, the religion of Tamerlane, though he professed the Mohammedan faith. See Mosheim, *Hist. Eccles. Tartaror.* p. 124.

† Petit de la Croix, *Histoire de Timur-Bec*, tom. ii. p. 329; tom. iii. p. 137, 243, &c.

suffered death in the most barbarous forms, while others were condemned to perpetual slavery.<sup>‡</sup>

II. In those parts of Asia, which are inhabited by the Chinese, Tartars, Moguls, and other nations still less known, the Christian religion not only lost ground, but seemed to be totally extirpated. It is, at least, certain, that we have no account of any members of the Latin church residing in those countries, later than the year 1370; nor could we ever learn the fate of the Franciscan missionaries sent thither from Rome. We have, indeed, some records, from which it would appear that there were Nestorians residing in China so far down as the sixteenth century;§ but these records are not so clear as to remove all doubt. However that may be, the abolition of Christianity in those remote parts of the world may, without hesitation, be imputed to the wars that were carried on by the Tartars against the Chinese and other Asiatic nations; for, in 1369, the last emperor of the race of Genghiz-Khan was driven out of China, and his throne filled by the Mim family, who, by a solemn law, refused to all foreigners the privilege of entering that country.

\* Many instances of this we find in the *History of Timur-Bec*, written by a Persian named Sherfeddin; published at Delft, in 1723.—See also Herbelot, *Biblioth. Oriental.* at the article *Timur*, p. 277.—[The work of Sherfeddin is the same with that of M. de la Croix, who only professed himself, in this instance, a translator. *Epir.*]

† Nicol. Trigantius, *de Christ. Exped.* apud Sinae, lib. i. c. xi.—Jos. Sim. Assemani *Bib. Orient. Vatic.* t. iii.—Du Halde, *Descrip. de la Chine*, t. i.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the State of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.*

I. THE Greeks, though dejected by the foreign and intestine calamities in which they were involved, were far from withdrawing their attention and zeal from the cause of literature, as is evident from the great number of learned men who flourished among them during this period. In this honourable class we may reckon Nicephorus Gregoras, Manuel Chrysoloras, Maximus Planudes, and many others, who, by their indefatigable application to the study of history, antiquities, and the *belles lettres*, acquired considerable reputation. Omitting the mention of writers of inferior note, we may observe, that Theodorus Metochita, John Cantacuzenus, and Nicephorus Gregoras, applied themselves to the composition of history, though with different success. Nor ought we to pass over in silence Nicephorus Callistus, who compiled an ecclesiastical history, which, notwithstanding its being debased with idle stories and evident marks

of superstition, is highly useful on account of its illustration of many important facts.

II. As no sage of this century had the presumption to set up for a leader in philosophy, such of the Greeks as had a taste for philosophical researches adhered to Aristotle, as their conductor and guide; but we may learn from the tracts of Theodorus Metochita in what manner they explained the principles and tenets of the Stagirite. Plato also had his followers, especially among those who were fond of mysticism, which had for many ages been holden in the highest veneration by the Greeks. In the sublime sciences of mathematics and astronomy, Nicolas Cabasilas surpassed all his contemporaries. Balaam adopted the sentiments and precepts of the Stoics with respect to the obligations of morality and the duties of life, and digested them into a work which is known by the title of *Ethica ex Stoicis*.\*

III. In all the Latin provinces, schemes were carried into execution with considerable success, for promoting the study of letters, im-

\* Henrici Canisii *Lectiones Antiquae*, tom. iv. p. 403.

proving taste, and dispelling the pedantic spirit of the times. This laudable disposition gave rise to the erection of many schools and academies, at Cologne, Orleans, Cahors, Perugia, Florence, and Pisa, in which all the liberal arts and sciences, distributed into the same classes that still subsist in those places, were taught with assiduity and zeal. Opulent persons founded and amply endowed particular colleges, in the public universities, in which, beside the monks, young men of narrow circumstances were educated in all the branches of literature. Libraries were also collected, and men of learning animated to aspire to fame and glory, by the prospect of honourable rewards. It must be acknowledged, indeed, that the advantages arising to the church and state, from so many professors and learned men, did not wholly answer the expense and care bestowed on this undertaking by men of rank and fortune; yet we are by no means to conclude, as many have rashly done, that all the doctors of this age, who rose gradually from the lower to the higher and more honourable stations, were only distinguished by their stupidity and ignorance.

IV. Clement V., who was now raised to the pontificate, ordered the Hebrew and other Oriental languages to be taught in the public schools, that the church might never want a sufficient number of missionaries properly qualified to dispute with the Jews and Mohammedans, and to diffuse the divine light of the Gospel throughout the east;\* in consequence of which appointment, some eminent proficient in these tongues, and especially in the Hebrew, flourished during this age. The Greek language, which hitherto had been much neglected, was now revived, and taught with general applause, first by Leontius Pilatus, a Calabrian, who wrote a commentary upon Homer, and a few others,† but afterwards, with far greater success and reputation, by Manuel Chrysoloras,‡ a native of Constantinople. Nor were there wanting some extraordinary geniuses, who, by their zeal and application, contributed to the restoration of the ancient and genuine eloquence of the Latins, among whom the excellent and justly renowned Petrarch held the first place,§ and Dante Alighieri the second. Full of this worthy design, they both acted as if they had received an extraordinary commission to promote the reign of true taste and the progress of polite learning; and their success was answerable to the generous ambition that animated their efforts; for they had many followers and admir-

ers, not only among their countrymen, but also among the French and Germans.

V. The writings of this age furnish us with a long list of grammarians, historians, lawyers, and physicians, of whom it would be easy to speak more particularly; but, as such a detail is unnecessary, it will be sufficient to inform our readers, that there were few of this multitude, whose labours were strikingly useful to society. Great numbers applied themselves to the study of the civil and canon laws, because it was the readiest way to preferment both in church and state. Such as have any tolerable acquaintance with history, cannot be entirely strangers to the fame of Bartolus, Baldus, Andreas, and other doctors of laws in this century, who reflected honour on the universities of Italy. But, after all, it is certain that the jurisprudence of this age was a most intricate, disagreeable study, unenlivened either by history or style, and destitute of every allurement that could recommend it to a man of genius. As for the mathematics, they were cultivated by many; yet, if we except Thomas Bradwardine, the acute and learned archbishop of Canterbury, there were few who acquired any degree of reputation by this kind of study.

VI. The vast number of philosophers, who rather disgraced than adorned this century, looked upon Aristotle as their infallible oracle and guide, though they stripped him of all those excellences that really belonged to him, and were incapable of entering into the true spirit of his writings. So great was the authority of the peripatetic philosophy, that, in order to diffuse the knowledge of it as widely as possible, even kings and emperors ordered the works of Aristotle to be translated into the native language of their respective dominions. Among the most eminent of this class was Charles V. king of France, who ordered all the writings of the ancients, and especially those of Aristotle, to be translated into French by Nicolas Oresme.\* Those, however, who professed themselves philosophers, instead of being animated by the love of truth, were inflamed by a rage of disputation, which led them to perplex and deform the pure, simple doctrines of reason and religion, by a multitude of idle subtleties, trifling questions, and ridiculous distinctions. It is needless to enlarge either on the barbarity of their phraseology, in which they supposed the chief strength of their art consisted, or on that utter aversion to every branch of polite learning, in which they foolishly gloried. Those who wish to be acquainted with their methods of argumentation, and whatever else relates to this wrangling tribe, need only consult John Scotus, or Walter Burleaus. But, though they all followed one common track, there were several points on which they differed among themselves.

VII. The old disputes between the *Realists* and *Nominalists*, which had lain dormant a long time, were now revived, with an ardent seemingly inextinguishable, by an English Franciscan of the severe order, named William Oc-

\* See Ant. Wood, *Antiq. Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 156, 159.

† See Humph. Hody, de Græcis illustribus, *Linguae Græcæ Literarumque humaniorum Instauratoribus*, lib. i.—Calogera, *Opusculi Scientifici*, tom. xxv. p. 258.

‡ Hody, lib. i. p. 10.—Calogera, p. 348.—and more especially Christ. Fred. Borner's *Lib. de Græcis Litterarum Græcarum in Italia Instaurat.*

§ See Jac. Phil. Thomasini *Vita Petrarchè* in Jo. Ger. Meuschen *Vit. claror. Viror.* tom. iv. who, in his preface, enumerates all the other writers of his life. Of the celebrated poet Dante, several have treated, particularly his translator Benvenuto of Imola, from whom Muratori has borrowed large extracts in his *Antiquit. Ital. mediævi*, tom. i.

\* Launoy, *Hist. Gymnas. Navarr.* tom. iv. op. part i. p. 504.—Boulay, *Histor. Acad. Paris.* tom. iv. p. 379.—Le Brœuf, *Dissert. sur l'Hist. Eccles. et Civile de Par.* tom. iii. p. 456.

cam, who was a follower of the great Scotus, and a doctor of divinity at Paris. The Greeks and Persians never fought against each other with more hatred and fury, than these two discordant sects, whose angry disputations subsisted without any abatement, till the appearance of Luther, who soon obliged the scholastic divines to terminate their mutual wranglings, and to listen to terms of accommodation. The Realists despised their antagonists as philosophers of a recent date, branding them with the name of Moderns, while, through a great mistake, they ascribed a very high antiquity to the tenets of their own party. The Nominalists, on the other hand, inveighed against them as a set of dotting visionaries, who, despising substantial matters, were pursuing mere shadows. The Nominalists had the most eloquent, acute, and subtle doctors of Paris, for their leaders, among whom, beside Occam, the famous John Buridan\* was very eminent; the Realists, nevertheless, through the countenance given them by successive popes, prevailed; for, when Occam had joined the party of the Franciscan monks, who strenuously opposed John XXII., that pope himself, and his successors, left no means untried to extirpate the philosophy of the Nominalists, which was deemed highly prejudicial to the interests of the church; and hence it was, that, in 1339, the university of Paris, by a public edict, solemnly condemned and prohibited the philosophy of Occam, which was that of the Nominalists.† But, as it is natural for men to love and pursue what is forbidden, the consequence was, that the party of the Nominalists flourished more than ever.

VIII. Among the philosophers of these times, there were many who with their philosophy mingled *astrology*, i. e. the art of telling fortunes by the aspect of the heavens and the influence of the stars; and, notwithstanding the obvious folly and absurdity of this pretended science, both the higher and lower ranks were fond of it even to distraction. Yet, in spite of all this popular prejudice in favour of their art, these astrological philosophers, to avoid being impeached of witchcraft, and to keep themselves out of the hands of the inquisitors, were obliged to behave with great circumspection. The neglect of this caution was remarkably fatal to Cæcus Aesculanus, a famous peripatetic philosopher, astrologer, and mathematician, who first acted as physician to pope John XXII. and afterwards to Charles Sineterra, duke of Calabria. This unfortunate man, having performed some experiments in mechanics, that seemed miraculous to the vulgar, and having also offended many, and among the rest his master, by giving out some predictions, which were said to have been fulfilled, was universally supposed to deal with infernal spirits, and was committed to the flames, in 1327,

\* Rob. Gaguin wrote a particular account of this famous man, as we learn from Launoy, in his *Historia Gymnasii Navaræ*, tom. iv. op. part. i. p. 722. See also Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. iv. p. 2-2, 307, 341, &c.

† Steph. Baluzii *Miscel.* tom. iv. p. 532.  
 † Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. iv. p. 257; tom. v. p. 708.—Car. Pless. d'Argente, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, &c.

by the inquisitors of Florence.\* There is yet extant his commentary upon the Sphere of John de Sacrobosco, otherwise named Holywood, which shows him to have been deeply tainted with superstition.‡

IX. Raymond Lully was the author of a new and singular kind of philosophy, which he endeavoured to illustrate and defend by his voluminous writings. He was a native of Majorca, and admirable for the extent and fecundity of his genius; but was, at the same time, a strange compound of reason and folly. Being full of zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, and having performed many voyages, and undergone various hardships to promote it, he was slain at Bugia, in Africa, in 1315, by the Mohammedans whom he was attempting to convert. The Franciscans, to whose third order it is said he belonged, extol him to the skies, and have taken great pains to persuade several popes to canonise him; while many, on the contrary, and especially the Dominicans, inveigh bitterly against him, calling him a wild and visionary chemist, a hot-headed fanatic and heretic, a magician, and a mere compiler from the works of the more learned Moslems. The popes entertained different opinions of him; some regarding him as a harmless pious man, while others pronounced him a vile heretic. But whoever peruses the writings of Lully without prejudice, will not be biassed by either of these parties. It is at least certain, that he would have been a great man, had the warmth and fertility of his imagination been tempered with a sound judgment.‡

CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Doctors and Government of the Church during this Century.*

I. THE governors of the church in this period, from the highest to the lowest orders, were addicted to vices peculiarly dishonourable to their sacred character. We shall say nothing of the Grecian and Oriental clergy, who lived, for the most part, under a rigid, severe, and oppressive government, though they deserve their part in this heavy and ignominious charge. But, with regard to the Latins, our silence would be inexcusable, since the flagrant abuses that prevailed among them were attended with consequences equally pernicious to the interests of religion and the well-being of civil society. It is, however, necessary to observe, that there were, even in these degenerate times, some pious and worthy men, who ardently longed for a reformation of the church, both in *its head and members*, as

\* Paul Ant. Appianus wrote a defence of this unhappy man, which is inserted in Domen. Bernini *Storia di tutte l'Heretiche*, tom. iii. sect. xiv. cap. iii. p. 240. We have also a further account of him by Gio. Maria Crescimbeni, *Commentari della volgar Poesia*, vol. ii. part. ii. lib. iii. cap. xiv.

† Gahr. Naudæus, *Apologie pour les grands hommes qui ont été soupçonnez de Magie*, p. 270.  
 ‡ See John Salzinger's Preface to Raymond Lully's works, which John William, elector Palatine, caused to be collected at a great expense, and to be published in 1720. Luc. Wadding, *Annal. Minor.* tom. iv. p. 421; tom. v. p. 157, 316; tom. vi. p. 229. Concerning the famous invention of Lully, see the Polyhistor of Dan. George Merhoff, lib. ii. cap. v. p. 352.

they used to express themselves.\* To prevent the accomplishment of these laudable desires, many circumstances concurred; such as the exorbitant power of the popes, so confirmed by length of time that it seemed immovable, and the excessive superstition that enslaved the minds of the generality, together with the wretched ignorance and barbarity of the age, by which every spark of truth was stifled, as it were, in its very birth. Yet, firm and lasting as the dominion of the Roman pontiffs seemed to be, it was gradually undermined and weakened, partly by the pride and rashness of the popes themselves, and partly by unexpected events.

II. This important change may be dated from the quarrel which arose between Boniface VIII., who filled the papal throne about the beginning of this century, and Philip the Fair, king of France. This prince, who was endowed with a bold and enterprising spirit, soon convinced Europe, that it was possible to set bounds to the overgrown arrogance of the bishop of Rome, although many crowned heads had attempted it without success. Boniface sent Philip the laughtiest letters imaginable, in which he asserted, that the king of France, and all other kings and princes, were obliged, by a divine command, to submit to the authority of the popes, as well in all political and civil matters, as in those of a religious nature. The king answered him with great spirit, and in terms expressive of the utmost contempt. The pope rejoined with more arrogance than ever; and, in that famous *bull* (*unam sanctum*) which he published about this time, asserted that Jesus Christ had granted a twofold power to his church, or, in other words, the spiritual and temporal swords; that he had subjected the whole human race to the authority of the Roman pontiff, and that all who dared to dispute it, were to be deemed heretics, and excluded from all possibility of salvation.† The king, on the other hand, in an assembly of the peers of his kingdom, holden in 1303, ordered William de Nogaret, a celebrated lawyer,‡ to draw up an accusation against the pope, in which he publicly charged him with heresy, simony, and other vices and crimes, demanding, at the same time, the convocation of an œcumenical council, for the speedy deposition of such an execrable pontiff. The pope, in his turn, passed a sentence of excommunication, in that very year, against the king and all his adherents.

III. Philip, shortly after he received his sentence, held an assembly of the states of the kingdom, where he again employed some per-

\* Matt. Flacius, Catalog. testium Veritatis, lib. xiii. p. 1697. Jo. Launojus, de varia Fortuna Aristotelis p. 217. Jo. Henr. Ilottinger, Historia Eccles. sæc. xiv. p. 754.

† This *bull* is yet extant in the Corpus Juris Canon. Extravagant. Commun. lib. i. tit. de majoritate et obedientia.

‡ Of this distinguished man, who was the most intrepid and inveterate enemy the popes ever had before Luther, no writers have given us a more copious account than the Benedictine monks, Hist. Generale de Languedoc, tom. iii. p. 114, 117. Philip made him chancellor of France for his resolute opposition to the pope.

sons of the highest rank and reputation to sit in judgment upon the pope, and appeal to a general council. After this, he sent William de Nogaret with some others into Italy, to excite a sedition, to seize the pope's person, and then to convey him to Lyons, where the king was determined to hold the above-mentioned council. Nogaret, being a resolute active man, soon drew over to his assistance the powerful Colonna family, (then at variance with the pope,) levied a small army, seized Boniface, who lived in apparent security at Anagni, and treated him in the most shocking manner, carrying his resentment so far as to wound him on the head by a blow with his iron gauntlet. The inhabitants of Anagni rescued him out of the hands of this fierce and implacable enemy, and conducted him to Rome, where he died soon after of an illness occasioned by the rage and anguish into which these insults had thrown him.\*

IV. Benedict XI., who succeeded him, and whose name, before his accession to the papal chair, was Nicolas Boceacini, learned prudence by this fatal example, and pursued more moderate and gentle measures. He repealed, of his own accord, the sentence of excommunication which his predecessor had thundered out against the king of France and his dominions; but never could be prevailed upon to absolve Nogaret of his treason against the spiritual majesty of the pontificate. Nogaret, on the other hand, set a small value upon the papal absolution, and prosecuted, with his usual vigour and intrepidity, in the Roman court, the accusation that he had formerly adduced against Boniface; and, in the name of his royal master, insisted, that the memory of that pontiff should be branded with a notorious mark of infamy. During these transactions, Benedict died, A. D. 1304; upon which Philip, by his artful intrigues in the conclave, obtained the see of Rome for Bertrand de Got, archbishop of Bourdeaux, who was accordingly elected to that high dignity, on the 5th of June, 1305. This step was so much the more necessary, as the breach between the king and the court of Rome was not yet entirely healed, and (Nogaret not being absolved) might easily be renewed. Besides, the French monarch, inflamed with the desire of revenge, insisted upon the formal condemnation of Boniface by the court of Rome, the abolition of the order of Templars, and other concessions of great importance, which he could not reasonably expect from an Italian pontiff. Hence he looked upon a French pope, in whose zeal and compliance he could confide, as necessary to the execution of his designs. Bertrand assumed the name of Clement V., and, at the king's request, remained in France, and removed the papal residence to Avignon, where it continued during the space of seventy years. This period,

\* See the Acta inter Bonifacium VIII. Bened. XI. Clement. V. et Philippum Pulchrum, published in 1614 by Peter Puteanus.—Adr. Baillet, Hist. des Demelez du Pape Boniface VIII. avec Philippe le Bel.—Jo. Rubens, in Bonifacio, cap. xvi. p. 137. The other writers on this subject are mentioned by Baillet, in his Preface, p. 9.—See also Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iv.



the Italians call, by way of derision, the Babylonish captivity.\*

V. There is no doubt, that the continued residence of the popes in France greatly impaired the authority of the Roman see. For, during the absence of the pontiffs from Rome, the faction of the Ghibellines, their inveterate enemies, rose to a greater height than ever; and they not only invaded and ravaged St. Peter's patrimony, but even attacked the papal authority by their writings. This caused many cities to revolt from the popes: even Rome itself was the grand source and fomentor of cabals, tumults, and civil wars; insomuch, that the laws and decrees sent thither from France were publicly treated with contempt by the populace, as well as by the nobles.† The influence of this example was propagated from Italy through most parts of Europe; it being evident, from a vast number of instances, that the Europeans in general were far from paying so much regard to the decrees and thunders of the Gallic popes, as they did to those of Rome. This gave rise to various seditions against the pontiffs, which they could not entirely crush, even with the aid of the inquisitors, who exerted themselves with the most barbarous fury.

VI. The French pontiffs, finding that they could draw only small revenues from their Italian dominions, which were now torn in pieces by faction and ravaged by sedition, were obliged to contrive new methods of accumulating wealth. For this purpose, they not only sold indulgences to the people, more frequently than they had formerly done, whereby they made themselves extremely odious to several potentates, but also disposed publicly of scandalous licences, of all sorts, at an excessive price. John XXII. was remarkably shrewd and zealous in promoting this abominable traffic; for, though he was not the first inventor of the taxes and rules of the apostolic chancery, the Romish writers acknowledge that he enlarged and rendered them more extensively profitable to the holy treasury.‡ It is certain, that the origin of the tribute paid to the popes under the name of *Annates*, a tax which is generally affirmed to have been first imposed by him, is of a much earlier date.§ Beside the abuses now mentioned, these Gallic popes, having abolished the right of election, arrogated to themselves a power of conferring all the offices of the church, whether great or

small, according to their fancy, by which they soon amassed prodigious wealth. It was also under their government that reserves, provisions, expectatives, and other impositions of the like odious nature, which had seldom, (if ever) been heard of before, became familiar to the public ear, and filled all Europe with bitter complaints.\* These complaints exceeded all bounds, when some of these pontiffs, particularly John XXII., Clement VI., and Gregory XI., openly declared that they had reserved to themselves all churches and parishes within their jurisdiction, and were determined, in consequence of that sovereign authority and plenitude of power which Christ had conferred upon them, his vicars, to provide for them, and dispose of them without exception.† It was by these and other mean and selfish contrivances, which had no other end than the acquisition of riches, that these inconsiderate and rapacious pontiffs excited a general hatred against the Roman see, and thereby greatly weakened the papal empire, which had been visibly upon the decline from the time of Boniface.

VII. Clement V. was a mere creature of Philip the Fair, and was absolutely directed and governed by that prince as long as he lived. William de Nogaret, the implacable enemy of the late pontiff, although he was under a sentence of excommunication, had the boldness to prosecute his master's cause, and his own, against Boniface, even in the pope's court; an instance of assurance not easy to be paralleled. Philip insisted, that the dead body of Boniface should be dug up and publicly burned; but Clement averted this infamy by his advice and intreaties, promising implicit obedience to the king in every thing else. In order therefore to keep his word, he was obliged to abrogate the laws enacted by Boniface, to grant the king a bounty of five years' tithes, fully to absolve Nogaret of all his crimes, on condition of his submitting to a light penance, (which, however, he never performed,) to restore the citizens of Anagni to their reputation and honour, and to call a general council at Vienne, in 1311, in order to condemn the Templars, on whose destruction Philip was most ardently bent. In this council every thing was determined as the king thought proper; for Clement, terrified by the melancholy fate of Boniface, durst not venture to oppose this intrepid and obstinate monarch.‡

VIII. Upon Clement's death, which happened in 1314, fierce contentions arose in the conclave about choosing a successor, the French cardinals insisting upon a French, and those of Italy demanding an Italian pope.

\* For an account of the French popes, consult chiefly Vitæ Pontif. Avenionensium, published by Baluze in 1633. The reader may also peruse, but it must be with the utmost caution, Longueval's History of the Gallican Church, and the continuation of that work.—See more especially tom. xii. This Jesuit, and his successors, have shown great industry and eloquence in the composition of this history; but they, for the most part, artfully conceal the vices and enormities of the Roman pontiffs.

† See Baluze, Pontif. Avenion. tom. ii. p. 290, 301, 309.—Muratori, Antiq. Ital. tom. iii. p. 397, 401, &c.—Giannone, Historia di Napoli, t. iii.

‡ Jo. Ciampinus, de Vice-Cancellario Ecclesiæ Rom. p. 39.—Chais, Lettres sur les Jubiles, tom. ii. p. 67.

§ Bern. van Espen, *Jus Eccles. universale*, tom. ii. p. 876.—Boulay, *Histor. Acad. Paris*, tom. iv. p. 911.—Ant. Wood, *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 213.—Guil. Franc. Berthier, *Diss. sur les Annates*, tom. xii. *Hist. de l'Eglise Gallic.*

\* Steph. Baluzii *Miscellan.* tom. iii. p. 479, 518.—Ejus *Vit. Pontif. Avenion.* tom. ii. p. 60, 74, 154.—*Gallia Christiana Benedictinor.* tom. i. *Append.* p. 13.—Wood, *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 148, 201.—Boulay, *Hist. Acad. Paris*, tom. iv. p. 411.

† Baluzii *Pontif. Avenion.* tom. ii. p. 873, tom. i. p. 285, 311, 681.—Ant. Matthæi *Analecta vet. Aevi*, tom. v. p. 249.—*Gallia Christiana*, tom. i. p. 69, 1205.—*Histoire du Droit Eccles. Francois*, tom. ii. p. 129.

‡ Beside the common writers already cited, see Guil. Fran. Berthier, *Discours sur le Pontificat de Clement V.* tom. xiii. *Hist. Eccles. Gallic.*—Colonia, *Hist. Liter. de Lyon*, tom. i. p. 340.—*Gallia Christiana*, tom. i. ii.

After a contest, which continued two years, the French party prevailed, and, in 1316, elected James d'Ense, (a native of Cahors, and cardinal bishop of Porto,) who assumed the name of John XXII. He had a tolerable share of learning, but was crafty, proud, weak, imprudent, and covetous, which is allowed even by those writers who, in other respects, speak well of him. He is deservedly censured on account of his temerity, and the ill success that attended him, through his own imprudence, in many of his enterprises; but he is more especially blamed for that calamitous and unhappy war into which he entered against Louis of Bavaria. This powerful prince disputed the imperial throne of Germany with Frederic, duke of Austria; and they had been both chosen to that high dignity, in 1314, by their respective partisans among the electors and princes of the empire. John took it for granted, that the decision of this contest came under his spiritual jurisdiction. But, in 1322, the duke of Bavaria, having vanquished his competitor by force of arms, assumed the administration of the empire without asking the pope's approbation, and would by no means allow, that the dispute, already determined by the sword, should be again decided by the pontiff's judgment. John interpreted this refusal as a heinous insult upon his authority, and, by an edict issued in 1324, pretended to deprive the emperor of his crown. But this impotent resentment was very little regarded; and he was even accused of heresy by Louis, who, at the same time, appealed to a general council. Highly exasperated by these and other deserved affronts, the pontiff presumed, in 1327, to declare the imperial throne vacant a second time, and even to publish a sentence of excommunication against the chief of the empire. This new mark of papal arrogance was severely resented by Louis, who, in 1328, published an edict at Rome, by which John was declared unworthy of the pontificate, deposed from that dignity, and succeeded in it by one of his bitterest enemies, Peter de Corbieri, a Franciscan monk, who assumed the name of Nicolas V., and crowned the emperor at Rome, in a solemn and public manner. But, in 1330, this *imperial* pope voluntarily abdicated the chair of St. Peter, and surrendered himself to John, who kept him in close confinement at Avignon for the rest of his life. Thus ended the contest between the duke of Bavaria and John XXII., both of whom, notwithstanding their efforts to dethrone each other, continued in the possession of their respective dignities.\*

\* The particulars of this violent quarrel may be learned from the Records published by Steph. Baluzi in his Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. ii. p. 512.—Edm. Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. ii. p. 641.—Jo. Georg. Herwart, in Ludovico Imperatore defenso contra Bzovium, et Christ. Gewold, in Apologia pro Ludovico Bavaro, against the same Bzovius, who, in the Annals he had published, basely aspersed the memory of the emperor. See also Wadding, in Annalib. Minor. tom. vii. p. 77, 106, &c. Whoever attentively peruses the history of this war, will perceive that Louis of Bavaria followed the example of Philip the Fair, king of France. As Philip brought an accusation of heresy against Boniface, so did Louis with respect to John XXII. The French monarch made use of Nogaret and other accusers

IX. The numerous tribes of the Fratricelli, Beghards, and Spiritual Franciscans, adhered to the party of Louis. Supported by his patronage, and dispersed through the greatest part of Europe, they boldly attacked the reigning pontiff, as an enemy to the true religion, and loaded him with the heaviest accusations, and the bitterest invectives, both in their writings and in their ordinary conversation. These attacks did not greatly affect the pontiff, as they were made only by private persons, by a set of obscure monks, who, in many respects, were unworthy of his notice; but, toward the conclusion of his life, he incurred the disapprobation and censures of almost the whole Catholic church: for, in 1331, and the succeeding year, he asserted, in some public discourses, that the souls of the faithful, in their intermediate state, were permitted to behold Christ as man, but not the face of God, or the divine nature, before their re-union with the body at the last day. This doctrine highly offended Philip VI., king of France, was opposed by the pope's friends as well as by his enemies, and condemned in 1333 by the divines of Paris. This favourite tenet of the pope was thus severely treated, because it seemed highly prejudicial to the felicity of happy spirits in their unembodied state; otherwise the point might have been yielded to a man of his positive temper, without any material consequence. Alarmed by these vigorous proceedings, he immediately offered something by way of excuse for having espoused this opinion; and afterwards, in 1334, when he was at the point of death, though he did not entirely renounce, he in some measure softened it, by saying he believed that the unembodied souls of the righteous 'beheld the divine essence as far as their separate state and condition would permit.\* This declaration did not satisfy his adversaries: hence his successor, Benedict XII., after many disputes about it, put an end to this controversy by an unanimous resolution of the Parisian doctors, ordering it to be received as an article of faith, that the souls of the blessed, during their intermediate state, were capable of contemplating, fully and perfectly, the divine nature.† Benedict's publishing of this resolution could be in no way injurious to the memory of John; for, when the latter lay upon his death-bed, he submitted his opinion to the judgment of the church, that he might not be deemed a heretic after his decease.‡

against one pontiff: Louis employed Occam and the Franciscans, in that quality against the other. Each insisted upon the convocation of a general council, and the deposition of an obnoxious pontiff. I omit other circumstances that might be alleged to render the parallel more striking.

\* See Steph. Baluzii Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 175, 182, 197, 221, 766, &c.—Luc. D'Acherii Spicil. Scriptor. Veter. tom. i. p. 760, ed. vet.—Jo. Launoi Historia Gymnas. Navarreni, part i. cap. vii. p. 319. tom. iv. part i. op.—Boulay, Histor. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. p. 235, 250.—Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. vi. p. 371; tom. vii. p. 145.—Echard, Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 599, 608.

† Baluzii Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 197, 216, 221.

‡ All the heretical fancies of this pope about the *Beatific Vision* were nothing in comparison with a vile and most enormous practical heresy, that was found in his coffers after his death, viz. five and twenty millions of florins, of which there were eigh-

X. John dying in 1334, new contentions arose in the conclave between the French and Italian cardinals, about the election of a pope; but toward the end of the year they chose James Fournier, a Frenchman, and cardinal of St. Prisca, who took the name of Benedict XII. The writers of these times represent him as a man of great probity, who was not chargeable with that avarice, or that ambition, which had dishonoured so many of his predecessors.\* He put an end to the papal quarrel with the emperor Louis; and though he did not restore him to the communion of the church, because prevented, as it is said, by the king of France, yet he did not attempt any thing against him. He carefully attended to the grievances of the church, redressed them as far as was in his power, endeavoured to reform the fundamental laws of the monastic societies, whether of the mendicant, or more opulent orders; and died in 1342, while he was devising the most noble schemes for promoting a yet more extensive reformation. In short, if we overlook his superstition, the prevailing blemish of this barbarous age, it must be allowed that he was a man of integrity and merit.

XI. He was succeeded by a man of a very different disposition, Clement VI., a native of France, whose name was Peter Roger, and who was cardinal of St. Nereus and St. Achilles, before his elevation to the pontificate. Not to insist upon the most unexceptionable parts of this pontiff's conduct, we shall only observe, that he trod faithfully in the steps of John XXII. in *providing* for vacant churches and bishoprics, by *reserving* to himself the disposal of them, which showed his sordid and insatiable avarice; that he conferred ecclesiastical dignities and benefices of the highest consequence upon strangers and Italians, which drew upon him the warm displeasure of the kings of England and France; and lastly, that by renewing the dissensions that had formerly subsisted between Louis of Bavaria and the Roman see, he exposed his excessive vanity and ambition in the most odious colours. In 1343, he assailed the emperor with his thundering edicts; and when he heard that they were treated by that prince with the utmost contempt, his rage was augmented, and he not only threw out new maledictions, and published new sentences of excommunication against him, in 1346, but also excited the German princes to elect Henry VII., son of Charles IV., emperor in his place. This violent measure would infallibly have occasioned a civil war in Germany, had it not been prevented by the death of Louis, in 1347. Clement survived him above five years, and died near the close of the year 1352, famous for nothing but his excessive zeal for extending the papal authority, and for his having added

teen in specie, and the rest in plate, jewels, crowns, mitres, and other precious baubles, which he had squeezed out of the people and the inferior clergy during his pontificate. See Fleury, Hist. Eccles. liv. xciv. sect. xxvix.

\* See the Fragmenta Histor. Roman. in Muratorii Antiquit. Ital. tom. iii. p. 275.—Baluzii Vit. Pont. Avenion. tom. i. p. 205, 218, &c.—Boulay, Hist. Acad. Par. tom. iv.

Avignon, which he purchased of Joan, queen of Naples, to the patrimony of St. Peter.

XII. His successor, Innocent VI., whose name was Stephen Albert, was much more remarkable for integrity and moderation. He was a Frenchman, and before his election had been bishop of Ostia. He died in 1362, after having governed the church for almost ten years. His greatest blemish was, that he promoted his relatives with an excessive partiality; but, in other respects, he was a man of merit, and a great encourager of pious and learned men. He kept the monks closely to their duty, carefully abstained from *reserving churches*, and, by many good actions, acquired a great and deserved reputation. He was succeeded by William Grimoard, abbot of St. Victor at Marseilles, who took the name of Urban V., and was entirely free from all the grosser vices, if we except those which cannot easily be separated from the papal dignity. This pope, being prevailed on by the entreaties of the Romans, returned to Rome in 1367; but, in 1370, he revisited Avignon, to reconcile the differences that had arisen between the kings of England and France, and died there in the same year.

XIII. He was succeeded by Peter Roger, a French ecclesiastic of illustrious descent, who assumed the name of Gregory XI., a man who, though inferior to his predecessors in virtue, far exceeded them in courage and audacity. In his time, Italy in general, and the city of Rome in particular, were distressed with most outrageous and formidable tumults. The Florentines carried on with success a terrible war against the ecclesiastical state;\* upon which, Gregory, in hopes of quieting the disorders of Italy, and also of recovering the cities and territories which had been taken from St. Peter's patrimony, transferred the papal seat, in 1376, from Avignon to Rome. To this he was in a great measure determined by the advice of Catharine, a virgin of Sens, who, in this credulous age, was thought to be inspired with the spirit of prophecy, and made a journey to Avignon on purpose to persuade him to take this step.† It was not, however, long before Gregory repented that he had followed her advice; for, by the long absence of the popes from Italy, their authority was reduced to so low an ebb, that the Romans and Florentines made no scruple to insult him with the grossest abuse, which made him resolve to return to Avignon; but, before he could execute his determination, he was taken off by death, in 1378.

XIV. After the death of Gregory XI., the cardinals were assembled to consult about choosing a successor, when the people of Rome, unwilling that the vacant dignity should be conferred on a Frenchman, approached the conclave in a tumultuous manner, and with great clamours, accompanied with outrageous menaces, insisted that an Italian should be advanced to the popedom. The cardinals, terrified by this uproar, immediately proclaimed

\* See Colucii Salutati Epistola, written in the name of the Florentines, part 1. See also the preface to the second part.

† See Longueval, Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. xiv. p. 159, 192.

Bartholomew Pregnano, who was a Neapolitan, and archbishop of Bari, and assumed the name of Urban VI. This new pontiff, by his impolite behaviour, injudicious severity, and intolerable arrogance, had entailed upon himself the odium of people of all ranks, and especially of the leading cardinals. These latter, therefore, tired of his insolence, withdrew from Rome to Anagni, and thence to Fondi, where they elected to the pontificate Robert, count of Geneva, (who took the name of Clement VII.,) and declared at the same time, that the election of Urban was nothing more than a mere ceremony, which they had found themselves obliged to perform, in order to calm the turbulent rage of the populace. Which of these two we ought to consider as having been the true and lawful pope, is to this day, a doubtful point; nor will the records and writings, alleged by the contending parties, enable us to adjust that point with certainty.\* Urban remained at Rome: Clement went to Avignon. His cause was espoused by France, Spain, Scotland, Sicily, and Cyprus, while all the rest of Europe acknowledged Urban as the true vicar of Christ.

XV. Thus the union of the Latin church under one head, was destroyed at the death of Gregory XI., and was succeeded by that deplorable dissension, commonly known by the name of the *great western schism*.† This dissension was fomented with such dreadful success, and arose to such a shameful height, that, for fifty years, the church had two or three different heads at the same time; each of the contending popes forming plots, and thundering out anathemas against their competitors. The distress and calamity of these times are beyond all power of description; for, not to insist upon the perpetual contentions and wars between the factions of the several popes, by which multitudes lost their fortunes and lives, all sense of religion was extinguished in most places, and profligacy rose to a most scandalous excess. The clergy, while they vehemently contended which of the reigning popes ought to be deemed the true successor of Christ, were so excessively corrupt, as to be no longer studious to keep up even an appearance of religion or decency: and, in consequence of all this, many plain well-meaning people, who concluded that no one could partake of eternal life, unless united with the vicar of Christ, were overwhelmed with doubt, and plunged into the deepest mental distress.‡

\* See the acts and documents in Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. p. 463.—Luc. Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. ix. p. 12.—Steph. Baluze, Vit. Pontif. Avinion. tom. i. p. 442, 998.—Acta. Sanctor. tom. i. April. p. 728.

† An account of this dissension may be seen in Pierre du Puy, Histoire Generale du Schisme qui a été en l'Eglise depuis l'an. 1378 jusqu' en l'an. 1428, which, as we are informed in the preface, was compiled from the royal records of France, and is entirely worthy of credit. Nor should we wholly reject Louis Maimbourg's Histoire du grand Schisme d'Occident, though in general it be deeply tainted with the leaven of party spirit. Many documents are to be met with in Boulay's Hist. Acad. Paris. tom. iv. and v.; and also in Martenne's Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. ii. I always pass over the common writers upon this subject, such as Alexander, Raynald, Bzovius, Spondanus, and Du-Pin.

‡ Of the mischievous consequences of this schism,

Nevertheless, these abuses were, by their consequences, greatly conducive both to the civil and religious interests of mankind; for, by these dissensions, the papal power received an incurable wound; and kings and princes, who had formerly been the slaves of the lordly pontiffs, now became their judges and masters; and many of the least stupid among the people had the courage to disregard and despise the popes, on account of their odious disputes about dominion, to commit their salvation to God alone, and to admit it as a maxim, that the prosperity of the church might be maintained, and the interests of religion secured and promoted, without a visible head, crowned with a spiritual supremacy.

XVI. The Italian cardinals, attached to the interests of Urban VI., on the death of that pope, in 1389, set up for his successor Peter Thomacelli, a Neapolitan, who took the name of Boniface IX.; and Clement VII., dying in 1394, the French cardinals raised to the pontificate Peter de Luna, a Spaniard, who assumed the name of Benedict XIII. During these transactions, various methods were proposed and attempted for healing this melancholy breach in the church. Kings and princes, bishops and divines, appeared with zeal in this salutary project. It was generally thought that the best course to be taken was, what they then styled, the *Method of Cession*: but neither of the popes could be prevailed on, either by entreaties or threats, to give up the pontificate. The Gallican church, highly incensed at this obstinacy, renounced solemnly, in a council holden at Paris, in 1397, all subjection and obedience to both pontiffs; and, on the publication of this resolution, in 1398, Benedict was, by the express orders of Charles VI., detained prisoner in his palace at Avignon.\*

XVII. Some of the popes, particularly Benedict XII., were perfectly acquainted with the prevailing vices and scandalous conduct of the greatest part of the monks, which they zealously endeavoured to rectify and remove; but the disorder was too inveterate to be easily cured, or effectually remedied. The Mendicants, and more especially the Dominicans and Franciscans, were at the head of the monastic orders, and had, indeed, become the heads of the church: so extensive was the influence they had acquired, that all matters of importance, both in the court of Rome, and in the cabinets of princes, were carried on under their supreme and absolute direction. The multitude had such a high notion of the sanctity of these *sturdy beggars*, and of their credit with the Supreme Being, that great numbers of both sexes, some in health, others in a state of infirmity, others at the point of death, earnestly desired to be admitted into the Mendicant order, which they looked upon as a sure and infallible method of rendering Heaven propitious. Many made it an essential part of their last wills, that their carcasses, after death, should be wrapped in ragged Dominican or Francis-

we have a full account in the Histoire du Droit public Eccles. Francois, tom. ii. p. 166, 193, 202.

\* Beside the common historians, and Longueval's Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane, t. xiv. see the acts of this council in Boulay's Hist. t. iv.

can habits, and interred among the Mendicants; for, amidst the barbarous superstition and wretched ignorance of this age, the generality of people believed that they might readily obtain mercy from Christ at the day of judgment, if they should appear before his tribunal associated with the Mendicant friars.

XVIII. The high esteem attached to the Mendicant orders, and the great authority which they had acquired, only served to render them still more odious to such as had hitherto been their enemies, and to draw upon them new marks of jealousy and hatred from the higher and lower clergy, the monastic societies, and the public universities. So general was this odium, that in almost every province and university of Europe, bishops, clergy, and doctors, were warmly engaged in opposition to the Dominicans and Franciscans, who employed the power and authority they had received from the popes, in undermining the ancient discipline of the church, and assuming to themselves a certain superintendence in religious matters. In England, the university of Oxford made a resolute stand against the encroachments of the Dominicans,\* while Richard, archbishop of Armagh, Henry Crompton, Norris, and others, attacked all the Mendicant orders with great vehemence and severity.† But Richard, whose animosity was much keener against them than that of their other antagonists, went to the court of Innocent VI., in 1356, and vindicated the cause of the church against them with the greatest fervour, both in his writings and discourse, until the year 1360, in which he died.‡ They had also many opponents in France, who, together with the university of Paris, were secretly engaged in contriving means to overturn their exorbitant power: but John de Polliac set himself openly against them, publicly denying the validity of the absolution granted by the Dominicans and Franciscans to those who confessed to them, maintaining that the popes were disabled from granting them a power of absolution by the authority of the canon entitled *Omnis utriusque sexus*, and proving from these premises, that all those who would be sure of their salvation, ought to confess their sins to the priests of their respective parishes, even though they had been absolved by the monks. They suffered little or nothing, however, from the efforts of these numerous adversaries, being resolutely protected against all opposition, whether open or secret, by the popes, who regarded them as their best friends and most effectual supports. Accordingly, John XXII., by an extraordinary decree, in 1321, condemned the opinions of John de Polliac.§

XIX. But, among all the enemies of the

\* See Wood's *Antiquit. Oxon.* tom. i. p. 150, 196, &c.

† See Wood, tom. i. p. 181; tom. ii. p. 61.—Baluzii *Vitæ Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 338, 950.—Boulay, tom. iv. p. 336.—Wadding, tom. viii. p. 126.

‡ See Simon's *Lettres Choisies*, tom. i. p. 164. I have in my possession a manuscript treatise of Bartholomew de Brisac, entitled, "Solutions oppositæ Ricardi, Armachani episcopi, propositionibus contra Mendicantes in curia Romana coram Pontifice et cardinalibus factis, anno 1360."

§ See Jo. Launois, de *Canone Omnis utriusque Sexus*, tom. i. part. i. op. p. 271, 287, &c.—Baluzii

Mendicant orders, no one has been transmitted to posterity with more exalted encomiums on the one hand, or black calumnies on the other, than John Wickliff, an English doctor, professor of divinity at Oxford, and afterwards rector of Lutterworth; who, according to the testimony of the writers of these times, was a man of an enterprising genius, and extraordinary learning. In 1360, animated by the example of Richard, archbishop of Armagh, he defended the statutes and privileges of the university of Oxford, against all the orders of the Mendicants, and had the courage to throw out some slight reproofs against the popes, their principal patrons, which no true Briton ever imputed to him as a crime. After this, in 1367, he was deprived of the wardenship of Canterbury Hall, in the university of Oxford, by Simon Langham, archbishop of Canterbury, who substituted a monk in his place; upon which he appealed to pope Urban V., who confirmed the sentence of the primate against him, on account of the freedom with which he had inveighed against the monastic orders. Highly exasperated at this treatment, he threw off all restraint, and not only attacked all the monks, and their scandalous irregularities, but even the pontifical power itself and other ecclesiastical abuses, both in his sermons and writings. He proceeded to yet greater lengths, and, detesting the wretched superstition of the times, refuted, with great acuteness and spirit, the absurd notions that were generally received in religious matters, and not only exhorted the laity to study the Scriptures, but also translated into English these divine books, in order to render the perusal of them more general. Though neither the doctrine of Wickliff was void of error, nor his life without reproach, yet it must be allowed, that the changes he attempted to introduce, both in the faith and discipline of the church, were, in many respects, wise, useful, and salutary.\*

XX. The monks, whom Wickliff had principally exasperated, commenced a violent prosecution against him at the court of Gregory XI., who, in 1377, ordered Simon Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury, to take cognizance of the affair in a council convoked at London. Imminent as this danger evidently was, Wickliff escaped it, by the interest of the duke of Lancaster, and some other peers, who had a high regard for him; and soon after the death of Gregory, the fatal schism of the Romish church commenced, during which there was one pope at Rome, and another at Avignon; so that of course the controversy lay dormant a long time. The process against Wickliff was afterwards revived, however, by William de Courtenay, archbishop of Canterbury, in 1385, and was carried on with great vehemence in two councils holden at London and Oxford. The event was, that of the twenty-three opin-

*Vit. Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. et ii. *Ejus. Miscellanea*, tom. i.—*D'Acherii Spicil. Scriptor. Veter.* tom. i.—*Martenne. Thesaur. Anecdotor.* tom. i.

\* A work of his was published at Leipsic and Frankfurt, in 1753, entitled, *Dialogorum Libri quatuor*, which, though it does not contain all the branches of his doctrine, yet shows sufficiently the spirit of the man, and his way of thinking in general.

ions, for which Wickliff had been prosecuted by the monks, ten were condemned as heresies, and thirteen as errors.\* He himself, however, returned in safety to Luttherworth, where he died peaceably in 1387. The latter attack was much more dangerous than the former; but by what means he got safely through it, whether by the interest of the court, or by denying or abjuring his opinions, is to this day a secret.† He left many followers in England, and other countries, who were styled Wickliffites and Lollards, which last was a term of popular reproach translated from the Flemish tongue into English. Wherever they could be found, they were terribly persecuted by the inquisitors, and other instruments of papal vengeance. In the council of Constance, in 1415, the memory and opinions of Wickliff were condemned by a solemn decree; and, about thirteen years after, his bones were dug up, and publicly burned.

XXI. Although the Mendicants were thus vigorously attacked on all sides, by such a considerable number of ingenious and learned adversaries, they could not be persuaded to abate any thing of their excessive pride, to set bounds to their superstition, or to desist from imposing upon the multitude, but were as diligent as ever in propagating opinions highly detrimental to religion in general, and particularly injurious to the majesty of the Supreme Being. The Franciscans, forgetting, in their enthusiastic phrensy, the veneration which they owed to the Son of God, and animated with a mad zeal for advancing the glory of their order and its founder, impiously maintained, that the latter was a second Christ, in all respects similar to the first, and that their institution, doctrine, and discipline, were the true Gospel of Jesus. Yet, shocking as these foolish and impious pretensions were, the popes were not ashamed to patronise and encourage them by their letters and mandates, in which they made no scruple to assert, that the absurd fable of

\* In the original, Dr. Mosheim says, that of eighteen articles imputed to Wickliff, nine were condemned as heresies, and fifteen as errors. This contradiction, which we have taken the liberty to correct in the text, is an oversight of the learned author, who appears to have confounded the eighteen heresies and errors that were enumerated and refuted by William Woodford, in a letter to Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, with the twenty-three propositions that had been condemned by his predecessor Courtenay at London, of which ten were pronounced heretical, and thirteen erroneous. See the very curious collection of pieces, entitled, *Fasciculus rerum expendarum et fingendarum Orthuini Gratii*, published first at Cologne by the compiler, in 1535, and afterwards at London, in 1690, with an additional volume of ancient pieces and fragments, by the learned Mr. Edward Brown. The letter of Woodford is at full length in the first volume of this collection.

† We have a full and complete History of the Life and Sufferings of John Wickliff, published at London, in 1720, by Mr. John Lewis, who also published, in 1731, Wickliff's English translation of the New Testament from the Latin version called the Vulgate. This translation is enriched with a learned preface by the editor, in which he enlarges upon the life, actions, and sufferings, of that eminent reformer. The pieces, relative to the controversies which were occasioned by the doctrines of Wickliff, are to be found in the learned work of Wilkins, entitled, *Concilia Magnæ Britanniae et Hiberniæ*, tom. iii. p. 116, 136.—See also Boulay's *Hist. tom. iv. and Wood's Antiq. tom. i.*

the stigmas, or five wounds impressed upon Francis by Christ himself, on mount Alvernus, was worthy of credit, because matter of undoubted fact.\* Nor was this all; for they not only permitted to be published, without any mark of their disapprobation, but approved, and even recommended, an impious piece, stuffed with tales yet more improbable and ridiculous than either of the above-mentioned fictions, and entitled, *The Book of the Conformities of St. Francis with Jesus Christ*, which was composed, in 1385, by Bartholomew Albizi, a Franciscan of Pisa, with the applause of his order. This infamous tract, in which the Son of God is put upon a level with a wretched mortal, is an eternal monument of the outrageous enthusiasm and abominable arrogance of the Franciscan order, and also of the excessive imprudence of the pontiffs who extolled and recommended it.‡

XXII. The Franciscans, who adhered to the genuine and austere rule of their founder, and opposed the popes who attempted to mitigate the severity of its injunctions, were not in the

\* The story of the marks, or stigmas, impressed on Francis, is well known, as are also the letters of the Roman pontiffs, which enjoin the belief of it, and which Wadding has collected with great care, and published in his *Annales Minorum*, tom. viii. and ix. The Dominicans formerly made a public jest of this ridiculous fable; but, being awed into silence by the papal bulls, they are now obliged to deride it in secret, while the Franciscans, on the other hand, continue to propagate it with the most fervent zeal. That St. Francis had upon his body the marks or impressions of the five great wounds of Christ, is not to be doubted, since this is a fact proved by a great number of unexceptionable witnesses. But, as he was a most superstitious and fanatical mortal, it is undoubtedly evident that he imprinted on himself these holy wounds, that he might resemble Christ, and bear about on his body a perpetual memorial of the Redeemer's sufferings. It was customary in these times, for such as were willing to be thought more pious than others, to imprint upon their bodies marks of this kind, that, having thus continually before them a lively representation of the death of Christ, they might preserve a becoming sense of it in their minds. The words of St. Paul (*Galat. vi. 17.*) were sufficient to confirm in this wretched delusion an ignorant and superstitious age, in which the Scriptures were neither studied nor understood. A long list of these *stigmatised fanatics* might be extracted from the *Acta Sanctorum*, and other records of this and the following century: nor is this ancient piece of superstition entirely abolished, even in our times. Be that as it may, the Franciscan monks, having found these marks upon the dead body of their founder, took this occasion of making him appear to the world as honoured by Heaven above the rest of mortals, and invented, for this purpose, the story of Christ's having miraculously transferred his wounds to him.

‡ For an account of Albizi and his book, see *Wadding tom. ix. p. 158.*—*Fabricii Biblioth. Lat. medii Ævi*, tom. i. p. 131.—*Schellhornii Amen. Liter.* tom. iii. p. 160.—*Bayle's Dictionary*, at the article *Francis*, and the *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit.* at the article *Albizi*. Erasmus Albert made several extracts from this book, and published them under the title of the *Koran of the Franciscans*, which was frequently printed in Latin, German, and French.

§ The conformities between Christ and St. Francis, are only carried to forty, in the book of Albizi: but they are multiplied to 4000, by a Spanish monk of the order of Observants, in a work published, in 1651, under the following title, *Prodigiosum Naturæ et Gratiæ Portentum*. The conformities mentioned by Pedro de Alva Astorga, the austere author of this most ridiculous book, are whimsical beyond expression. See the *Bibl. des Sciences et des Beaux Arts*, t. iv. p. 318.

least wiser than those of the order, who acknowledged the jurisdiction and respected the decisions of the Roman pontiffs. By those antipapal Franciscans I mean the Fratricelli, or Minorites, and the Tertiaries of that order, otherwise called Beghards, together with the Spirituals, who resided principally in France, and embraced the opinions of Pierre d'Olive. These monastic factions were turbulent and seditious beyond expression; they gave incredible vexation to the popes, and for a long time disturbed, wherever they appeared, the tranquillity both of church and state. About the beginning of this century,\* the less austere Franciscans were outrageous in their resentment against the Fratricelli, who had deserted their communion;† upon which such of the latter as had the good fortune to escape the fury of their persecutors, retired into France, in 1307, and associated themselves with the Spirituals, or followers of Pierre d'Olive, in Provence, who had also abandoned the society. Soon after this, the whole Franciscan order in France, Italy, and other countries, formed two parties. Those who embraced the severe discipline and absolute poverty of St. Francis, were called Spirituals; such as insisted upon mitigating the austere injunctions of their founder, were styled the Brethren of the Community. The latter, being far more numerous and powerful, exerted themselves to the utmost, to oppress the former, whose faction was still weak, and, as it were, in its infancy; yet they cheerfully submitted to these hardships, rather than return to the society of those who had deserted the rules of their master. Pope Clement V., having drawn the leaders of these two parties to his court, took great pains to compose these dissensions; nevertheless, his pacific scheme advanced but slowly, on account of the inflexible obstinacy of each sect, and the great number of their mutual accusations. In the mean while, the Spirituals of Tuscany, instead of waiting for the decision of his holiness, chose a president and inferior officers; while those of France, being in the neighbourhood of Avignon, patiently expected the papal determination.‡

XXIII. After many deliberations, Clement, in a general council at Vienné in Dauphine, (where he issued the famous bull,§ *Exivi de paradiso*.) proposed an expedient for healing the breach between the jarring parties, by wise concessions on both sides. He gave up many points to the Spirituals, or rigid Franciscans, enjoining upon the whole order the profession of absolute poverty, according to their primitive rule, and the solemn renunciation of all property, whether common or personal, confining them to what was necessary for their immediate subsistence, and allowing them, even for that, a very scanty pittance. He, however, on the other hand, permitted the Franciscans, who lived in places where it was

extremely difficult to procure by begging the necessaries of life, to erect granaries and store-houses, where they might deposit a part of their alms as a stock, in case of want; and ordered that all such repositories should be under the inspection and management of overseers and store-keepers, who were to determine what quantity of provisions should be laid up in them. And, finally, in order to satisfy the Brethren of the Community, he condemned some opinions of Pierre d'Olive.\* These proceedings silenced the monastic commotions in France; but the Tuscan and Italian Spirituals were so exceedingly perverse and obstinate, that they could not be brought to consent to any method of reconciliation. At length, in 1313, many of them, not thinking themselves safe in Italy, went into Sicily, where they met with a friendly reception from Frederic, the nobility, and bishops.†

XXIV. Upon the death of Clement V. the tumult, which had been appeased by his authority, revived in France with as much fury as ever. For, in 1314, a hundred and twenty of the Spirituals made a violent attack upon the Brethren of the Community, drove them out of the convents of Narbonne and Beziers by force of arms, and inflamed the quarrel in a yet higher degree, by relinquishing their ancient habits, and assuming such as were short, close, and mean. They were soon joined by a considerable number from other provinces; and the citizens of Narbonne, where Olive was interred, enlisted themselves in the party. John XXII., who was raised to the pontificate in the year 1317, took great pains to heal this new disorder. The first thing he did for this purpose, was to publish a special bull, by which he ordered the abolition of the Fratricelli or Minorites, and their Tertiaries, whether Beguines or Beghards, who formed a body distinct from the Spirituals.‡ In the next place, he admonished the king of Sicily to expel all the Spirituals who had taken refuge in his dominions,§ and then ordered the French Spirituals to appear at Avignon, where he exhorted them to return to their duty, and as the first step to it, to lay aside the short, close habits, with the small hoods. The greatest part of them obeyed; but Fr. Bernard Delitiosi, who was the head of the faction, and twenty-four of the brethren, boldly refused to submit to the injunction. In vindication of their conduct, they alleged that the rules prescribed by St. Francis, were the same with the Gospel of Jesus Christ; that the popes therefore had no authority to alter them; that the pontiffs had acted sinfully in permitting the Franciscans to have granaries and storehouses; and that they added to their guilt in not allowing those habits to be worn that were enjoined by St. Francis. John, highly exasperated by this opposition, gave orders that these obstinate brethren should be

\* In 1306 and 1307.

† Wadding, t. vi. ad an. 1307.

‡ Wadding, tom. iv. ad an. 1310, p. 217.—Eccardi Corp. Hist. medi. Ævi, tom. i. p. 148.—Boulay, tom. iv. p. 129.—Eccardi Scriptor. Predicator, tom. i.

§ This bull is inserted in the *Jus Canonum inter Clementinas*, tit. xi. de verbor. signif. tom. n. p. 1095, edit. Bolmeri.

\* Wadding, tom. vi. p. 191, 197, 199.

† Wadding, tom. vi. p. 213, 211.—Boulay, tom. iv. p. 152, 165.—Argente, *Collectio junior. de novis error.* tom. i. p. 292.

‡ This law is called *Sacra Romana*, &c. and is to be found among the *Entravacantes Johannis XXII. tit. vii. de religiosis domibus*, tom. ii. *Jur. Canon.* p. 112.

§ Wadding, tom. vi. p. 205.

proceeded against as heretics. And surely nothing could make them appear viler heretics in the papal eye, than their venturing thus audaciously to oppose the authority and majesty of the Roman see. As for Delitiosi, who is sometimes called Delli Consi, he was imprisoned, and died in his confinement. Four of his adherents were condemned to the flames, in 1318, at Marseilles;\* and this horrible sentence was accordingly executed without mercy.

XXV. Thus these unhappy friars, and many more of their fraternity, who were afterwards cut off by this cruel persecution, suffered merely for their contempt of the decisions of the pontiffs, and for maintaining that the institute of St. Francis, their founder, which they imagined he had established under the direction of an immediate inspiration, was the very Gospel of Christ, and therefore ought not to be altered by the pope's authority. The controversy, considered in itself, was rather ridiculous than important, since it did not affect religion in the least, but turned wholly on these two points, the form of the habits to be worn by the Franciscan order, and their granaries and store-houses. The Brethren of the Community, or the less rigid Franciscans, wore long, loose, and good habits, with ample hoods; but the Spirituals went in short, scanty, and very coarse ones, which they asserted to be precisely the dress enjoined by the institute of St. Francis, and what therefore no power upon earth had a right to alter. And whereas the former, immediately after the harvest and vintage, were accustomed to lay up a stock of corn and wine in their granaries and cellars, the latter resolutely opposed this practice, as entirely repugnant to that profession of absolute poverty which had been embraced by the Fratricelli or Minorites. In order to put an end to these broils, the pope, in this very year, published a long mandatory letter, in which he ordered the contending parties to submit their disputes, upon the two points above-mentioned, to the decision of their superiors.†

XXVI. The effects of this letter, and of other decrees, were prevented by the unseasonable and impious severity of John, whose cruelty was condemned and detested even by his adherents. For the Spiritual Franciscans and their votaries, being highly exasperated at the cruel death of their brethren, maintained, that John, by procuring the destruction of these holy men, had rendered himself utterly unworthy of the papal dignity and was the true Antichrist. They moreover revered their four brethren, who were burned at Marseilles, as so many martyrs, paying religious veneration to their bones and ashes; and inveighed yet more vehemently than ever against long habits, large hoods, granaries, and store-houses. The inquisitors on the other hand, having,

by the pope's order, apprehended as many of these people as they could find, condemned them to the flames, and sacrificed them without mercy to papal resentment and fury: so that from this time a vast number of those zealous defenders of the institute of St. Francis, viz. the Minorites, Beghards, and Spirituals, were most barbarously put to death, not only in France, but also in Italy, Spain, and Germany.\*

XXVII. This dreadful flame continued to spread till it invaded the whole Franciscan order, which, in 1321, had revived the old contentions concerning the poverty of Christ and his apostles. A certain Beguin, or monk of the third order of St. Francis, who was apprehended this year at Narbonne, taught, among other things, "That neither Christ nor his apostles ever possessed any thing, whether in common or personally, by right of property or dominion." John de Belna, an inquisitor of the Dominican order, pronounced this opinion erroneous; but Berengarius Taloni, a Franciscan, maintained it to be orthodox, and perfectly consonant to the bull, *Exiit qui seminat*, of Nicolas III. The judgment of the former was approved by the Dominicans; the determination of the latter was adhered to by the Franciscans. At length the matter was brought before the pope, who prudently endeavoured to put an end to the dispute. With this view he called into his council Ubertinus de Casalis, the patron of the Spirituals, and a person of great weight and reputation. This eminent monk gave captious, subtle, and equivocal answers to the questions that were proposed to him. The pontiff, however, and the cardinals, persuaded that his decisions, however ambiguous, might contribute to terminate the quarrel, acquiesced in them, seconded them with their authority, and, at the same time, enjoined silence and moderation on the contending parties.‡

XXVIII. But the Dominicans and Franciscans were so exceedingly exasperated against each other, that they could by no means be brought to conform themselves to this order. The pope, perceiving this, permitted them to renew the controversy in 1322; and he himself proposed to some of the most celebrated divines of the age, and especially to those of Paris, the determination of this point, namely, "Whether those were to be deemed heretics, who maintained that Jesus Christ, and his apostles, had no common or personal property in any thing they possessed?" The Franciscans, who held an assembly in that year at Perugia, having gained intelligence of this proceeding, decreed that those who held this tenet were not

\* Baluze, Vitæ Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 116; tom. ii. p. 341, et Miscellan. tom. i. p. 195, 272. Wadding, tom. vi. p. 267. Martenne, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. v. p. 175. Martinus Fuldensis, in Ecardi Corpore Histor. medii Ævi, tom. i. p. 175, et Hieron. Cornerus, ibid. tom. ii. p. 981. Histoire generale de Languedoc, tom. iv. p. 179. Argentine, Collectio Judicior. de novis errorib. tom. i. p. 294.

† It may be seen in the Jus Canon. among the Extravag. communes de verbor. signif. See also Wadding, tom. vi.

\* Beside many other pieces that serve to illustrate the intricate history of this persecution, I have in my possession a treatise, entitled, Martyrologium Spiritualium et Fratricellorum, which was delivered to the tribunal of the inquisition at Carcassone, A. D. 1454. It contains the names of 113 persons of both sexes, who, from the year 1318 to the time of Innocent VI., were committed to the flames in France and Italy, for their inflexible attachment to the poverty of St. Francis. I reckon that from these and other records, published and unpublished, we may make out a list of two thousand martyrs of this kind. See Codex Inquis. Tolosana.

‡ Wadding, tom. vi. p. 361. Baluzii Miscellan. tom. i. p. 307. Ger. du Bois, Histor. Eccles. Paris. p. 611.



heretics, but maintained an opinion that was holy and orthodox, and perfectly agreeable to the decisions and mandates of the popes. They also sent a deputy to Avignon, to defend this unanimous determination of their whole order against all opponents whatever. The person whom they commissioned for this purpose was F. Bonagrata, of Bergamo, who also went by the name of Boncortese,\* one of their fraternity, and a man famous for his extensive learning. John, being highly incensed at this step, issued a decree, wherein he espoused an opinion diametrically opposite to that of the Franciscans, and declared them to be heretics, for obstinately maintaining "that Christ and his apostles had no common or personal property in what they possessed, nor a power of selling or alienating any part of it." Soon after, he proceeded yet farther, and, in another constitution, exposed the weakness and inefficacy of those arguments, commonly reduced from a bull of Nicolas III., concerning the property of the Franciscan possessions being transferred to the church of Rome, whereby the monks were supposed to be deprived of what we call right, and were only allowed the *simple use* of what was necessary for their *immediate* support. In order to confute this plea, he showed that it was absolutely impossible to separate *right* and *property* from the *lawful use* of such things as were immediately consumed by that use. He also solemnly renounced all property in the Franciscan effects, which had been reserved to the church of Rome by former popes, their churches and some other things excepted. And whereas the revenues of the order had been hitherto received and administered by procurators, on the part of the Roman church, he dismissed these officers, and abolished all the decrees and constitutions of his predecessors relating to this affair.†

XXIX. By this method of proceeding, the dexterous pontiff entirely destroyed that boasted *expropriation*, which was the main bulwark of the Franciscan order, and which its founder had esteemed the distinguishing glory of the society. It was therefore natural, that these measures should determine the Franciscans to an obstinate resistance. And such indeed was the effect they produced: for, in 1323, they sent their brother Bonagrata in the quality of legate to the papal court, where he vigorously and openly opposed the recent constitution of John, boldly affirming, that it was contrary to human as well as divine law.‡ The pope, on the other hand, highly exasperated against this audacious defender of the Franciscan poverty, threw him into prison, and ordained, by a new

edict, that all who maintained that Christ, and his apostles, had no common or special property in any of their possessions, should be deemed heretics, and corrupters of the true religion.\* Finding, however, that the Franciscans were not terrified in the least by this decree, he published another yet more flaming constitution, about the end of the year 1324, in which he confirmed his former edicts, and pronounced that tenet concerning the expropriation of Christ and his apostles, 'a pestilential, erroneous, damnable, and blasphemous doctrine, hostile to the catholic faith,' and declared all such as adhered to it, obstinate heretics, and rebels against the church.† In consequence of this merciless decree, great numbers of those who persisted in asserting that Christ and his apostles were exactly such mendicants as Francis would have his brethren to be, were apprehended by the Dominican inquisitors, who were implacable enemies of the Franciscans, and committed to the flames. The histories of France and Spain, Italy and Germany, during this and the following century, abound with instances of this atrocious cruelty.

XXX. The zealous pontiff pursued this affair with great warmth for several years; and, as this contest seemed to have taken its rise from the books of Pierre d'Olive, he branded with infamy, in 1325, the Postilla and other writings of that author, as pernicious and heretical.‡ The next step he took, was to summon to Avignon, some of the more learned and eminent brethren of the Franciscan order, of whose writings and eloquence he was particularly apprehensive, and to detain them at his court: and then, to arm himself against the resentment and indignation of this exasperated society, and to prevent their attempting any thing to his prejudice, he kept a strict guard over them in all places, by means of his friends the Dominicans. Michael of Cesena, who resided in Italy, and was the head of the order, could not easily dissemble the hatred he had conceived against the pope, who therefore ordered him to repair to Avignon, in 1327, and there deprived him of his office.§ But, prudent as this rigorous measure might appear at first sight, it served only to inflame the enraged Franciscans more than ever, and to confirm them in their attachment to the scheme of absolute poverty. For no sooner did the bitter and well-known contest, between John XXII. and Louis of Bavaria, break out, than the principal champions of the Franciscan cause, such as Marsilius of Padua, and John of Genoa, fled to the emperor, and under his protection published the most virulent pieces imaginable, in which they not only attacked John personally, but also levelled their satire at the power

\* I insert this caution, because I have observed that some eminent writers, by not attending to this circumstance, have taken these two names for two different persons.

† These constitutions are recorded in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, and also among the *Extravagantes*, tit. xiv. de verbor. signific. cap. ii. iii. p. 1121. For an account of the transaction itself, the reader should chiefly consult that impartial writer, Alvarus Pelagius, de *Planctu Ecclesie*, lib. ii. cap. 60. as also Wadding, tom. vi. p. 394. Both these authors blame pope John.

‡ Wadding, tom. vii. p. 2. 22. — Alvar. Pelagius, de *Planctu Ecclesie*, lib. ii. p. 167. — Trithemius, *Annal. Hirsau.* tom. ii. p. 157. — Theod. de Niem, in *Eccardi Corpore Histor. med. Ævi*, t. vii. p. 1491.

\* Wadding, tom. vii. p. 36. — Contin. de Nangis, in *D'Acherii Spicilegio*, tom. iii. p. 83. — Boulay, tom. iv. p. 205. — *Benedictinor. Gallia Christiana*, tom. ii. p. 1515.

† This constitution, and the two former already mentioned, are published among the *Extravagantes*, tit. xiv. de verbor. signif. Wadding, (i. vii. p. 36.) vigorously opposed this last; which is rather extraordinary in a man so immediately attached to the cause of the popes as he was.

‡ Wadding, tom. vii. p. 47. — *Eccardi Corpus Hist. med. Ævi*, tom. i. p. 592, and 1491.

§ Wadding, tom. vii. p. 69, 74.

and authority of the popes in general.\* This example was soon followed by others, particularly by Michael of Cesena, and William Occam, who excelled most men of his time in subtlety and acuteness of genius, and also by F. Bonagrata of Bergamo. They made their escape by sea from Avignon, in 1328, went first to the emperor, who was at that time in Italy, and thence proceeded to Munich. They were soon joined by many others, such as Benengarius, Francis de Esculo, and Henry de Halem, who were highly and deservedly esteemed, on account of their eminent parts and extensive learning.† All these learned fugitives defended the institute of their founder in long and laboured treatises, in which they reduced the papal dignity and authority within a very narrow compass, and loaded the pontiffs with reproaches and invectives. Occam surpassed them all in the keenness and spirit of his satire; and hence his Dialogues, together with his other productions, which were perused with avidity, and transmitted to succeeding generations, gave a very severe blow to the ambition and majesty of the Roman pontiffs.

XXXI. On the other hand, Louis, to express his gratitude to these his defenders, not only made the cause of the Franciscans his own, but also adopted their favourite sentiment concerning the poverty of Christ and his apostles; for, among the heresies and errors of which he publicly accused John, and for which he deprived him of the pontificate, the principal and most pernicious one, in the opinion of the emperor, was his maintaining that the poverty of Christ did not exclude all right and property in what he used as a subsistence.‡ The Fratricelli, Beghards, Beguines, and Spirituels, then at variance with the pope, were effectually protected by the emperor, in Germany, against the attempts of the inquisitors; so that, during his reign, that country was overrun with shoals of Mendicant friars. There was scarcely a province or city in the empire that did not abound with Beghards and Beguines; that is, monks and nuns who professed the third rule of St. Francis, and placed the chief excellence of the Christian life in a voluntary and absolute poverty.§ The Dominicans, on the other hand, as enemies to the Franciscans, and friends to the pope, were treated with great severity by his imperial majesty, who banished them with ignominy out of several cities.||

\* Luc. D'Acherii Spicilegium, tom. iii. p. 85. Bullar. Roman. tom. vi. p. 167. Martene, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. ii. p. 695, 704. Boulay, tom. iv. p. 216. There is a very noted piece on this subject written by Marsilius of Padua, who was professor at Vienna, and entitled, Defensor Pacis pro Ludovico Bavaro adversus usurpatam Romani Pontificis jurisdictionem.

† Wadding, tom. vii. p. 81.—Martene, Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. iii. p. 749, 757.—Trithemii Annal. Hirsauz, tom. ii. p. 167.—Boulay tom. iv. p. 217.—Eccardi Corpus Histor. tom. ii. p. 1034.—Baluzii Miscellanea, tom. i. p. 293, 315.—The reader may also consult those writers who have compiled indexes and collections of Ecclesiastical historians.

‡ See Processus Ludovici contra Johannem, an. 1328, d. 12. Dec. datus, in Baluzii Miscellanea, t. ii. p. 322, and also his Appellatio, p. 494.

§ I have many pieces upon this subject that were never published.

|| Mart. Diefenbach, de mortis genere, quo Henri-

XXXII. The rage of the contending parties subsided greatly from the year 1329. The pope ordered a diet of the Franciscans to be holden in that year at Paris, where, by means of Cardinal Bertrand, who was president of the assembly, and by the efforts of the Parisian doctors, who were attached to his interests, he so far softened the resentment of the greatest part of the brethren, that they ceased to defend the conduct of Michael of Cesena and his associates, and permitted another president, Gerard Odo, to be substituted in his room. They also acknowledged John to be a true and lawful pope; and then terminated the dispute concerning the poverty of Christ in such an ambiguous manner, that the constitutions and edicts of Nicolas III. and John XXII., however contradictory, maintained their authority.\* But, notwithstanding these pacific and mutual concessions, there were great numbers of the Franciscans in Germany, Spain, and Italy, who would by no means consent to this reconciliation. After the death of John, Benedict XII. and Clement VI. took great pains to close the breach, and showed some clemency and tenderness toward such of the order as thought the institute of their founder more sacred than the papal bulls. This lenity had some good effects. Many who had withdrawn themselves from the society, were hereby induced to return to it, in which number were Francis de Esculo and others, who had been some of John's most inveterate enemies.† Even those who could not be prevailed on to return to their order, ceased to insult the popes, observed the rules of their founder in a quiet and inoffensive manner, and would have no sort of connexion with those Fratricelli and Tertiaries in Italy, Spain, and Germany, who condemned the papal authority.‡

XXXIII. The German Franciscans, who were protected by the emperor Louis, held out their opposition much longer than any of the rest. But, in 1347, their imperial patron being dead, the halcyon days of the Spirituels, as also of their associates the Beghards or Tertiaries, were at an end in Germany. For Charles IV., who, by the interest of the pope, had been declared king of the Romans in 1345, was ready, in his turn, to gratify the desires of the court of Rome, and accordingly supported, both by his edicts and by his arms, the inquisitors who were sent by the Roman pontiff against his enemies, and suffered them to apprehend and put to death all obnoxious individuals who came within their reach. These ministers of papal vengeance acted chiefly in the districts of Magdeburg and Bremen, Thuringia, Saxony, and Hesse, where they extirpated all the Beghards and Beguines, or Tertiaries, the associates of those Franciscans, who held that Christ and his apostles had no property in any thing. These severe mea-

cus VII. obiit, p. 145, and others.—Eccardi Corpus Hist. t. i. p. 2103.—Boulay, t. iv. p. 220.

\* Wadding, tom. vii. p. 94.—D'Acherii Spicilegium, tom. iii. p. 91.

† Argente, Collectio Judicior. de novis erroribus, tom. i. p. 343.—Boulay, tom. iv. p. 281.—Wadding, tom. vii. p. 313.

‡ Wadding, tom. vii. p. 116, 126.—Argente, tom. i. p. 343, &c.

suers were approved by Charles IV., who then resided at Lucca, whence, in 1369, he issued several edicts, commanding all the German princes to extirpate out of their dominions the Beghards and Beguines, or, as he himself interpreted the names, the *voluntary beggars*,\* as enemies of the church, and of the Roman empire, and to assist the inquisitors in their proceedings against them. By another edict, published not long after, he gave the houses of the Beghards to the tribunal of the inquisition, ordering them to be converted into prisons for heretics; and, at the same time, ordered all the effects of the Beguines to be publicly sold, and the profits thence arising, to be equally divided among the inquisitors, the magistrates, and the poor of those towns and cities where such sale should take place.† The Beghards, being reduced to great distress, by this and other mandates of the emperor, and by the constitutions of the popes, sought a refuge in those provinces of Switzerland that border upon the Rhine, and also in Holland, Brabant, and various parts of Germany.‡ But the edicts and mandates of the emperor, together with the papal bulls and inquisitors, harassed them in their most distant retreats; and, during the reign of Charles IV., all Germany (except the provinces bordering upon Switzerland) was thoroughly purged of the Beghards, or rebellious Franciscans, both perfect and imperfect.

XXXIV. But no edicts, bulls, or inquisitors, could entirely pluck up the roots of this inveterate discord; for so ardently were many of the brethren bent upon observing, in the most perfect and rigorous manner, the institute of St. Francis, that numbers were to be found in all places, who either withstood the president of the society, or at least obeyed him with reluctance. At once, therefore, to satisfy both the lax and the rigid party, after various methods had been tried to no purpose, a division of the order was agreed to. Accordingly, in 1368, the president consented that Paulinus Fulginas, the chief of the more rigid Franciscans in Italy, together with his associates, who were numerous, should live separately from the rest of the brethren, according to the rules and customs they had adopted, and follow the institutes of their founder, in the strictest and most rigorous manner. The

\* Called, in the German language, *die wilgen Armen*.

† I have in my possession this edict, with other laws of Charles IV. enacted on this occasion, as also many of the papal constitutions, and other records which illustrate this affair, and which undoubtedly deserve to see the light. It is certain that Charles himself, in his edicts and mandates, clearly characterizes those people, whom he there styles Beghards and Beguines, as Franciscan Tertiaries, belonging to that party of the order then at variance with the pope. "They are (to use the emperor's own words, in his edict of the 18th of June, 1369) a pernicious sect, who pretend to a sacrilegious and heretical poverty, and who are under a vow, that they neither ought to have, nor will have, any property, whether special or common, in the goods they use;" (this is the poverty of the Franciscan institute, which John XXI. so strenuously opposed) "which they extend even to their wretched habits."—For so the spirituals and their associates used to do.

‡ See Odor. Raynaldus, *Annal. Eccles. ad an. 1372, sect. xxxiv.* See also the books of Felix Malleolus, written in the following century against the Beghards of Switzerland.

Spirituals and the followers of Pierre d'Olive, whose scattered remains were yet observable in several places, joined themselves gradually and imperceptibly to this party. And, as the number of those who were fond of the severe discipline continually increased in many provinces, the popes thought proper to approve that institute, and to give it the solemn sanction of their authority. In consequence of this, the Franciscan order was divided into two large bodies, namely, the Conventual Brethren, and the Brethren of the regular observance. Those who neglected the strict sense of the expressions in which the institute of their founder was conceived, and adopted the modifications given of them by the pontiffs, were called by the former name; and the council of Constance conferred the latter upon those who chose to be determined by the words of the institute itself, rather than by any explications of it.\* But the Fraticelli and the Beghards absolutely rejected this reconciliation, and persisted in disturbing the peace of the church during this and the following century, in the marquisate of Ancona, and in other districts.

XXXV. This century gave rise to other religious societies, some of which did not long subsist, and the rest never became famous. John Colombini, a nobleman of Sienna, founded in 1367, the order of the Apostolic clerks, who, because they frequently pronounced the name of Jesus, were afterwards called *Jesuates*. This institution was confirmed by Urban V., in the following year, and subsisted till the seventeenth century, when it was abolished by Clement IX.† The brethren belonging to it professed poverty, and adhered to the institute of St. Augustin. They were not, however, admitted to holy orders, but assisted the poor by their prayers and other pious offices, and prepared medicines for them, which they distributed *gratis*.‡ But these statutes were in a manner abrogated when Clement dissolved the order.

XXXVI. Soon after the commencement of this century, the famous sect of the Cellite Brethren and Sisters arose at Antwerp; they were also styled the Alexian Brethren and Sisters, because St. Alexius was their patron; and they were named Cellites, from the cells in which they were accustomed to live. As the clergy of this age took little care of the sick and dying, and deserted such as were infected with those pestilential disorders which were then very frequent, some compassionate and pious persons at Antwerp formed themselves into a society for the performance of these religious offices, which the sacerdotal orders so shamefully neglected. In the prosecution of this agreement, they visited and comforted the sick, assisted the dying with their prayers and exhortations, took care of the interment of those who were cut off by the plague, and on that account forsaken by the terrified clergy, and committed them to the

\* See Wadding, tom. viii. ix.

† In the year 1668.

‡ Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres*, tom. iii. p. 411.—*Pagi Breviar. Pontif.* tom. iv. p. 189.—Bonanni, and others, who have compiled histories of the religious orders.

grave with a solemn funeral dirge. It was with reference to this last office, that the common people gave them the name of Lollards.\* The example of these good people had such an extensive influence, that in a little time societies of the same kind, consisting both of men and women, were formed in most parts of Germany and Flanders, and were supported,

\* Many writers have given us copious accounts concerning the sect and name of the Lollards; yet none of them can be commended for their fidelity, diligence, or accuracy, on this head. This I can confidently assert, because I have carefully and expressly inquired into whatever relates to the Lollards, and from the most authentic records concerning them, both published and unpublished, have collected copious materials from which their true history may be compiled. Most of the German writers, as well as those of other countries, affirm, that the Lollards were a particular sect, who differed from the church of Rome in many religious points; and that Walter Lollhard, who was burned in this century at Cologne, was their founder. How so many learned men came to adopt this opinion, is beyond my comprehension. They indeed refer to Jo. Trithemius as the author of this opinion; yet it is certain, that no such account of these people is to be found in his writings. I shall therefore endeavour, with all possible brevity, to throw all the light I can upon this matter, that they who are fond of ecclesiastical history may have a just notion of it.

The term *Lollhard*, or *Lulhard*, (or, as the ancient Germans wrote it, *Lollert*, *Lullert*.) is compounded of the old German word *lullen*, *lollen*, *lalten*, and the well-known termination *hard*. *Lollen*, or *lullen*, signifies to sing with a low voice. It is yet used in the same sense among the English, who say, *lull a-sleep*, which signifies to sing any one into a slumber with a sweet indistinct voice. See Franc. Junii Etymologica Anglica. The word is also used in the same sense among the Flemings, Swedes, and other nations, as appears by their respective dictionaries. Among the Germans, both the sense and pronunciation of it have undergone some alteration; for they say, *lallen*, which signifies to pronounce indistinctly, or stammer. *Lolhard*, therefore, is a singer, or one who frequently sings. For, as the word *beggen*, which universally signifies to request any thing fervently, is applied to devotional requests or prayers, and, in the stricter sense in which it is used by the Germans, denotes praying fervently to God; in the same manner the word *lollen*, or *lullen*, is transferred from a common to a sacred song, and signifies, in its most limited sense, to sing a hymn. *Lolhard*, therefore, in the vulgar tongue of the ancient Germans, denotes a person who is continually praising God with a song, or singing hymns to his honour. Hoeseuius, a canon of Liege, has well apprehended and expressed the force of this in his *Gesta Pontificum Leodiensium*, lib. i. cap. xxvi. in Jo. Chapeauvilli *Gestis Pontificum Tungrunensium et Leodiensium*, tom. ii. p. 350. "In the same year," (1309,) says he, "certain strolling hypocrites, who were called *Lollards*, or praisers of God, deceived some women of quality in Hainault and Brabant." Because those who praised God generally did it in verse, to praise God, in the Latin style of the middle ages, meant to sing to him; and such as were frequently employed in acts of adoration, were called religious singers; and, as prayers and hymns were regarded as a certain external sign of piety toward God, those who aspire to a more than ordinary degree of piety and religion, and for that purpose were more frequently occupied in singing hymns than others, were, in the popular language, called *Lollards*. Hereupon this word acquired the same meaning with the term *Beghard*, which denoted a person remarkable for piety; for in all the old records, from the eleventh century, these two words are synonymous: so that all who were styled *Beghards* are also called *Lollards*, which may be proved to a demonstration from many authors.

The Brethren of the free spirit, of whom we have already given a large account, are by some styled *Beghards*, by others *Lollards*. The followers of Gerard Groote, or Priests of the community, are frequently called *Lollard Brethren*. The good man

partly by their manual labours, and partly by the charitable donations of pious persons. The magistrates and inhabitants of the towns, where these brethren and sisters resided, gave them peculiar marks of favour and protection on account of their great usefulness to the sick and needy. But the clergy, whose reputation was not a little hurt by them, and the

Walter, who was burned at Cologne, and whom so many learned men have unadvisedly represented as the founder of the sect of the Lollards, is by some called a *Beghard*, by others a *Lollard*, and by some a *Minorite*. The Franciscan Tertiaries, who were remarkable for their prayers and other pious exercises, were frequently called *Lollards*; and the *Cellite Brethren*, or *Alexians*, whose piety was very exemplary, no sooner appeared in Flanders, about the beginning of this century, than the people gave them the title of *Lollards*. A particular reason indeed for their being distinguished by this name was, that they were public singers, who made it their business to enter the bodies of those who died of the plague, and sang a dirge over them in a mournful and indistinct tone as they carried them to the grave. Among the many testimonies that might be alleged to prove this, we shall confine ourselves to the words of Jo. Bapt. Gramaye, a man eminently skilled in the history of his country, in his work entitled *Antverpia*, lib. ii. "The *Alexians*," says he, "who constantly employed themselves about funerals, had their rise at Antwerp; at which place, about the year 1300, some honest pious laymen formed a society. On account of their extraordinary temperance and modesty, they were styled *Matemanni*, (or *Moderatists*.) and also *Lollards*, from their attendance on funeral obsequies. From their cells, they were named *Cellite brethren*." To the same purpose is the following passage in his work entitled *Lovanium*: "The *Alexians*, who were wholly engaged in taking care of funerals, now began to appear. They were laymen, who, having wholly devoted themselves to works of mercy, were named *Lollards* and *Matemanni*. They made it their sole business to take care of all such as were sick, or out of their senses. These they attended both privately and publicly, and buried the dead." The same learned author tells us, that he transcribed some of these particulars from an old diary written in Flemish rhyme. Hence we find in the *Annals of Leuven and Utrecht*, in Ant. Matthæi *Analect.* vet. *Ævi.* tom. i. p. 431, the following words: "Die *Lollardjes* die brochten de dood en eën, i. e. the *Lollards* who collected the dead bodies;" which passage is thus paraphrased by *Matthæus*: "The managers of funerals, and carriers of the dead, of whom there was a fixed company, were a set of mean, worthless creatures, who usually spoke in a canting mournful tone, as if bewailing the dead; and hence it came to pass, that a street in Utrecht, in which most of these people lived, was called the *Loller street*." The same reason that changed the word *Beghard* from its primitive meaning, contributed also to give, in process of time, a different signification to that of *Lollard*, even to its being assumed by persons that dishonoured it; for, among those *Lollards* who made such extraordinary pretensions to piety and religion, and spent the greatest part of their time in meditation, prayer, and the like acts of piety, there were many abominable hypocrites, who entertained the most ridiculous opinions, and concealed the most enormous vices, under the specious mask of this extraordinary profession. But it was chiefly after the rise of the *Alexians*, or *Cellites*, that the name *Lollard* became infamous. For the priests and monks, being inveterately exasperated against these good men, propagated injurious suspicions of them, and endeavoured to persuade the people, that innocent and beneficent as the *Lollards* seemed to be, they were in reality the contrary, being tainted with the most pernicious sentiments of a religious kind, and secretly addicted to all sorts of vices. Thus by degrees it came to pass, that any person, who covered heresies or crimes under the appearance of piety, was called a *Lollard*. Hence it is certain, this was not a name to denote any one particular sect, but was formerly common to all persons, and all sects, who were supposed to be guilty of impiety toward God and the church, under an external profession of extraordinary piety.

Mendicant friars, who found their profits diminished by the growing credit of these strangers, persecuted them vehemently, and accused them to the popes of many vices and intolerable errors. Hence it was, that the word *Lollard*, which originally carried a good meaning, became a term of reproach, to denote a person who, under the mask of extraordinary piety, concealed either pernicious sentiments or enormous vices. But the magistrates, by their recommendations and testimonials, supported the Lollards against their malignant rivals, and obtained several papal constitutions, by which their institute was confirmed, and their persons, exempted from the cognizance of the inquisitors, were subjected entirely to the jurisdiction of the bishops. But, as these measures were insufficient to secure them from molestation, Charles, duke of Burgundy, in 1472, obtained a solemn bull from pope Sixtus IV., ordering that the Cellites, or Lollards, should be ranked among the religious orders, and delivered from the jurisdiction of the bishops; and, in 1506, Julius II. granted them yet greater privileges. Many societies of this kind are yet subsisting at Cologne, and in the cities of Flanders, though they have evidently departed from their ancient rules.\*

XXXVII. Among the Greek writers of this century, the following were the most eminent:

Nicephorus Callistus, whose *Ecclesiastical History* we have already mentioned;

Matthew Balaaras, who illustrated and explained the canon law of the Greeks;

Balaam, who was a very zealous champion in behalf of the Grecian cause against the Latins;

Gregory Acindynus, an inveterate enemy of the Palamites;

John Cantacuzenus, famous for his history of his own time, and his confutation of the Mohammedan law;

Nicephorus Gregoras, who compiled the Byzantine history, and left some other monuments of his genius to posterity;

Theophanes, bishop of Nice, a laborious defender of the truth of Christianity against the Jews, and the rest of its enemies;

Nilus Cabasilas, Nilus Rhodius, and Nilus Damyla, who most warmly maintained the cause of their nation against the Latin writers;

Philotheus, several of whose tracts are yet extant, and seem well adapted to excite a devotional temper and spirit;

Gregory Palamas, of whom more will be said hereafter.

XXXVIII. From the prodigious number of the Latin writers of this century, we shall only select the most famous. Among the scholastic doctors, who blended philosophy with divinity, John Duns Scotus, a Franciscan, and the great antagonist of Thomas, held the first

\* Beside many others, whom it is unnecessary to mention here, see Ægid. Gelenius, de admiranda sacra et civili magnitudine urbis Colonia, lib. iii. Syntagm. li. p. 534, 598.—Jo. Bapt. Gramay, in Antiquit. Belg.—Anton. Sanderus, in Brabantia et Flandria illustrat.—Aub. Miræus, in *Operibus Diplomatico-Historicis*, and many other writers of this period in various places of their works. I may add, that the Lollards are by many called *die Nollbruder*, from *nollen*, an ancient German word.

rank; and, though not entitled to any praise for his candour and ingenuity, was by no means inferior to any of his contemporaries in acuteness and subtlety of genius.\*

After him, the most celebrated writers of this class were Durand of St. Portian, who combated the commonly received doctrine of the divine co-operation with the human will,† Antonius Andreas, Hervæus Natalis, Francis Mayronius, Thomas Bradwardine, an acute, ingenious man,‡ Peter Aureolus, John Bacon, William Occam, Walter Burlæus, Peter de Alliaco, Thomas of Strasburg, and Gregory de Rimini.§

Among the Mystic divines, Jo. Tauler and Jo. Ruysbrock, though not entirely free from errors, were eminent for their wisdom and integrity;

Nicolas Lyranus, or de Lyra, acquired great reputation by his *Compendious Exposition of the whole Bible*;

Rayner of Pisa, is celebrated for his *Summary of Theology*, and Astesanus for his *Summary of Cases of Conscience*.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Concerning the Doctrine of the Christian Church during this Century.*

I. ALL those who are well acquainted with the history of these times, must acknowledge, that religion, either as it was taught in the schools, or inculcated upon the people as the rule of their conduct, was so extremely adulterated and deformed, that there was not a single branch of the Christian doctrine, which retained its primitive lustre and beauty. Hence it may easily be imagined, that the Waldenses and others, who ardently wished for a reformation of the church, and had separated themselves from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, though every where exposed to the fury of the inquisitors and monks, yet increased from day to day, and baffled all the attempts that were made for their extirpation. Many of these poor people, having observed, that great numbers of their party perished by the flames and other punishments, fled out of Italy, France, and Germany, into Bohemia, and the adjacent countries, where they afterwards associated with the Hussites, and other separatists from the church of Rome.

II. Nicolas Lyranus deservedly holds the first rank among the commentators on the Scriptures, having explained them in a manner far superior to the prevailing taste and spirit of his age. He was a perfect master of

\* The very laborious and learned Wadding favoured the public with an accurate edition of the works of Scotus, printed at Lyons, 1639, in twelve volumes folio. See Wood, *Antiq. Oxon.* tom. i.—Wadding, *Annal. Minor. frat.* tom. vi.—Boulay, tom. iv.

† See Launoy's treatise, entitled, *Syllabus rationum, quibus Durandi causa defenditur*; also *Gallia Christ.* tom. ii.

‡ Rich. Simon, *Lettres Choisies*, tom. iv. p. 232; and *Critique de la Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclesiast.* par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 360. Steph. Souriet, in *Observationibus ad h. l. p. 703.*—Nouv. *Dict. Hist. et Crit.* tom. ii. p. 500. He was archbishop of Canterbury.

§ For a full account of all these persons, see *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*, tom. xiv.

the Hebrew language, but not well versed in the Greek, and was therefore much happier in his exposition of the Old Testament, than in that of the New.\* All the other divines, who applied themselves to this kind of writing, were servile imitators of their predecessors. They either culled choice sentences from the writings of the more ancient doctors; or, departing from the obvious meaning of the words, they tortured the sacred writers to accommodate them to senses that were mysterious and abstruse. They who are desirous of being acquainted with this art, may have recourse to Vitalis a Furno, in his *Moral Mirror of the Scriptures*,† or to Ludolphus of Saxony, in his *Psalter Spiritualized*.‡ The philosophers, who commented upon the sacred writings, sometimes proposed subtle questions, drawn from what was called, in this century, *Internal Science*, and solved them in a dexterous and artful manner.

III. The greatest part of the doctors of this century, both Greek and Latin, followed the rules of the peripatetic philosophy, in expounding and teaching the doctrines of religion; and the Greeks, from their commerce with the Latins, seemed to have acquired some knowledge of those methods of instruction which were used in the western schools. Even to this day, the Greeks read, in their own tongue, the works of Thomas, and other capital writers of the scholastic class, which in this age were translated and introduced into the Greek church by Demetrius Cydonius and others.§ Prodigious numbers among the Latins were fond of this subtle method, in which John Scotus, Durand of St. Portian, and William Occam, peculiarly excelled. Some few had recourse to the decisions of Scripture and tradition in explaining divine truths, but they were overborne by the immense tribe of logicians, who carried all before them.

IV. This superiority of the schoolmen did not, however, prevent some wise and pious men among the Mystics, and in other sects, from severely censuring this presumptuous method of bringing before the tribunal of philosophy matters of pure revelation. Many, as it appears, were bold enough to oppose the reigning passion, and to recall the youth designed for the ministry, to the study of the Scriptures, and the writings of the ancient fathers. This proceeding kindled the flame of discord almost every where; but this flame raged with peculiar violence in some of the more famous universities, especially in those of Paris and Oxford, where many sharp disputes were continually carried on against the philosophical divines by those of the biblical party, who, though greatly inferior to their antagonists in point of number, were sometimes victorious. For the philosophical legions, chiefly tutored by Dominicans and Franciscans, were often extremely rash in their manner of disputing;

they defined and explained the principal doctrines of revealed religion in such a way, as really tended to overturn them, and fell into opinions that were evidently absurd and impious. Hence it came to pass, that some of them were compelled to abjure their errors, others to seek their safety in flight; some had their writings publicly burned, and others were thrown into prison.\* However, when these commotions were quelled, most of them returned, though with prudence and caution, to their former way of thinking, perplexed their adversaries by various contrivances, and deprived them of their reputation, their profits, and many of their followers.

V. It is remarkable, that the scholastic doctors, or philosophical theologians, far from agreeing among themselves, were furiously engaged in disputations with each other concerning many points. The flame of their controversy was, in this century, supplied with copious accessions of fuel, by John Duns Scotus, a learned friar already mentioned, who, animated against the Dominicans by a warm spirit of jealousy, had attacked and attempted to disprove several doctrines of Thomas Aquinas. Upon this, the Dominicans, taking the alarm, united from all quarters to defend their favourite doctor, whom they justly considered as the leader of the scholastics, while the Franciscans espoused with ardour the cause of Scotus, whom they looked upon as a divine sage sent down from heaven to enlighten bewildered and erring mortals. Thus these powerful and flourishing orders were again divided; and hence originated the two famous sects, the Scotists and Thomists, which, to this day, dispute the field of controversy in the Latin schools. The chief points about which they disagree are, the nature of the divine co-operation with the human will, the measure of divine grace that is necessary to salvation, the unity of form in man, or personal identity, and other abstruse and minute questions, the enumeration of which is foreign to our purpose. We shall only observe, that what contributed most to exalt the reputation of Scotus, and to cover him with glory, was his demonstration and defence of what was called the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary against the Dominicans, who entertained different notions of that point.†

VI. A prodigious number of the people, denominated Mystics, resided, and propagated their tenets, in almost every part of Europe. There were, undoubtedly, among them many persons of eminent piety, who endeavoured to wean men from an excessive attachment to the external part of religion, and to form them to the love of God, and the practice of genuine

\* See Boulay, tom. iv.—In 1340, several opinions of the schoolmen, concerning the Trinity and other doctrines, were condemned, p. 266.—In 1347, M. Jo. de Mercuria and Nic. de Ultricuria were obliged to abjure their errors, p. 298, 308.—In 1348, one Simon was convicted of some horrible errors, p. 322.—The same fate, in 1354, befell Guido of the Augustine order, p. 329. In 1362, the like happened to one Louis, p. 374, to Jo. de Calore, p. 377; in 1365, to Dion. Soulebat, p. 382. Oxford also had its share in transactions of this nature. See Ant. Wood, tom. i. p. 153, 183.

† See Waddier, tom. vi. p. 52.

\* Rich. Simon, *Histoire des principaux Commentaires du N. T.* p. 447, and *Critique de la Bibliothé des Auteurs Eccles.* par M. Du Pin, tom. i. p. 352.—Wadding, tom. v. p. 264.

† *Speculum Morale totius Scripturæ.*

‡ *Psalterium juxta spiritualem Sensus.*

§ Rich. Simon, *Créance de l'Eglise Orientale sur la Transubstantiation*, p. 166.

virtue. Such, among others, were Taulerus, Ruysbroekius, Suso, and Gerard of Zutphen,\* who, it must be allowed, have left many writings that are exceedingly well calculated to excite pious dispositions in the minds of their readers, though want of judgment, and a propensity to indulge enthusiastic visions, are failings common to them all. But there were also some senseless fanatics belonging to this party, who ran from one place to another, recommending a most unaccountable extinction of all the rational faculties, whereby they idly imagined the human mind would be transfused into the divine essence, and thus led their proselytes into a foolish kind of piety, that in too many cases bordered nearly upon licentiousness. The religious phrenzy of these enthusiasts rose to such a height, as rendered them detestable to the sober sort of Mystics, who charged their followers to have no connexions with them.†

VII. It is needless to say much concerning those who applied themselves to the study of morality, as their spirit is nearly of the same kind with that of the authors whom we have already noticed; though it may be proper to mention two circumstances, by which the reader may ascertain the true state of this science. The first is, that, about this time, more writers than in any former century made it their business to collect and solve, what they styled, *Cases of Conscience*; by which Astesanus, an Italian, Monaldus, and Bartholomew of St. Concordia, acquired a reputation superior to that of any of their contemporaries. This kind of writing was of a piece with the education then received in the schools, since it taught people to quibble and wrangle, instead of forming them to a sound faith and a suitable practice. A second thing worthy of notice is, that moral duties were explained, and their practice enforced, by allegories and comparisons of a new and whimsical kind, even by examples drawn from the natures, properties, and actions of the brute creation. These writers began, for instance, by explaining the nature and qualities of some particular animal, and then applied their description to human life and manners, to characterize the virtues and vices of moral agents. The most remarkable productions of this sort are Nieder's *Formicarius*, a treatise concerning Bees by Thomas Brabantinus, dissertations upon Beasts by Hugh of St. Victor, and a tract by Thomas Whalley, entitled, *The Nature of Brute Animals moralized*.

VIII. The defenders of Christianity in this age were, in general, unequal to the glorious cause they undertook to support; nor do their writings discover any striking marks of genius, dexterity, perspicuity, or candour. Some productions, indeed, appeared from time to time,

that were not altogether unworthy of notice. The learned Bradwardine, an English divine, advanced many pertinent and ingenious remarks, tending to confirm the truth of Christianity, in a Book upon Providence. The work, entitled, *Collyrium Fidei contra Hæreticos*, or, the "Eye-salve of Faith against the Heretics," shows, that its author, Alvaro Pelagio, was a well-meaning and judicious man, though he has by no means exhausted the subject in this performance. Nicolas de Lyra wrote against the Jews, as did also Perchetus Salvaticus, whose treatise, entitled, "The Triumph of Faith," is chiefly borrowed from the writings of Raymond Martin. Both these writers are much inferior to Theophanes, whose "Book against the Jews, and his Harmony between the Old and New Testament," contain many observations that are by no means contemptible.

IX. During this century, there were some promising appearances of a reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins. For the former, apprehending that they might want assistance to set bounds to the power of the Turks, which about this time was continually increasing, often pretended a willingness to submit to the Latin canons. Accordingly, in 1339, Andronicus the Younger sent Balaam as his ambassador into the west, to desire a reconciliation in his name. In 1349, another Grecian embassy was sent to Clement VI. for the same purpose, and, in 1356, a third was dispatched upon a like errand to Innocent VI. Nor was this all; for, in 1367, the Grecian patriarch arrived at Rome, in order to negotiate this important matter, and was followed, in 1369, by the emperor himself, John Palæologus, who, in order to conciliate the friendship and goodwill of the Latins, published a confession of his faith, which was agreeable to the sentiments of the Roman pontiff. But, notwithstanding these prudent and pacific measures, the major part of the Greeks could not be persuaded by any means to drop the controversy, or to be reconciled to the church of Rome, though several of them, from views of interest or ambition, expressed a readiness to submit to its demands; so that this whole century was spent partly in furious debates, and partly in fruitless negotiations.\*

X. In 1381, a furious controversy arose at Paris, between the university and the Dominican order. The author of it was John de Montesono, a native of Arragon, a Dominican friar and professor of divinity, who, in pursuance of the decisions and doctrine of his order, publicly denied that the blessed Virgin Mary was conceived without any stain of original sin; and moreover asserted, that all who believed the immaculate Conception were enemies of the true faith. The quarrel occasioned by this proceeding would certainly have been soon compromised, had not John, in a public discourse delivered in 1387, revived this opinion with more violence than ever. For this

\* Concerning these authors, see Petr. Pomet, *Erithoth. Mysticorum*, and Godofr. Arnold, *Historia et Descriptio Theol. Mystica*. Of Taulerus and Suso, Eckhard treats expressly in his *Scriptor. Prædicat.* tom. i. p. 653, 677. See also *Acta Sanctorum*. Januar. tom. ii. p. 652.

† Joh. Ruysbroekius inveighed bitterly against them, as appears from his *Work*: published by Laur. Surius, p. 50, 378, and also from his treatise *de vera Contemplatione*, cap. xviii. p. 608.

\* See Henr. Cantisi *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iv. p. 369.—Leo Allatus, *de perpetua consensione eccl. ces. Orient. et Occident.* lib. ii. cap. xvi. xvii. p. 782.—Wadding, tom. viii. p. 29, 40, 197, 201, 299. Baluze, *Vite Pontif. Avinion* tom. i. p. 348, 360, 403, 772.

reason the college of divines, and afterwards the whole university, condemned this, and some other tenets of Montesonus. For it may be proper to inform the reader, that the university of Paris, principally induced thereto by the discourses of John Duns Scotus, had, from the beginning almost of this century, publicly adopted the doctrine of the sinless conception of the holy Virgin.\* Upon this, the Dominicans, with their champion John de Montesono, appealed from the sentence of the university to pope Clement VII. at Avignon, and clamorously affirmed that St. Thomas himself was condemned by the judgment passed upon their brother. But, before the pope could decide the affair, the accused friar fled from the court of Avignon, went over to the party of Urban VI., who resided at Rome, and, during his absence, was excommunicated. Whether the pope approved the sentence of the university of Paris, we cannot say. The Dominicans, however, deny that he did, and affirm, that the professor was condemned purely on account of his flight;† though there are many others who assert, that his opinion was also condemned; and, as the Dominicans would not acknowledge the validity of the academic sentence, they were expelled in 1389, and were not restored to their ancient honours in the university before the year 1404.‡

#### CHAPTER IV.

*Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies used in the Church during this Century.*

I. WE must confine ourselves to a general and superficial view of the alterations which were introduced into the ritual of the church during this century, since it cannot reasonably be expected that we should insist largely upon this subject within the narrow limits of such a work as this. A principal circumstance that strikes us here, is the change that was made in the time of celebrating the jubilee. In 1350, Clement VI., in compliance with the request of the people of Rome, enacted that the jubilee, which Boniface VIII. had ordered to be celebrated in every hundredth year, should be celebrated twice in every century.§ In favour of this alteration he might have assigned a very plausible pretext, since it is well known that the Jews, whom the Roman pontiffs were always ready to imitate in whatever related to pomp and majesty, celebrated this sacred solemnity in every fiftieth year. But Urban VI., Sixtus VI., and other popes, who ordered a more frequent celebration of this salutary and profitable institution, would have had more difficulty in attempting to satisfy those who might have demanded sufficient reasons to justify this inconstancy.

II. Innocent V. instituted festivals, sacred to the memory of the lance with which our

\* See Wadding's Annals, tom. vi.

† See Jac. Echardi Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 691.

‡ Boulay, tom. iv. p. 599, 618, 638.—Baluzii Vit. Pont. Av. tom. i. p. 521; tom. ii. p. 992.—Argentre, Collectio judicior. de Novis errorib. tom. i. p. 61.—Jac. de Longueval, Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane, tom. xiv. p. 347.

§ Baluze, tom. i. p. 247, 257, 312, 387.—Muratori, Antiquit. Ital. tom. iii. p. 344, 481.

Saviour's side was pierced, of the nails that fastened him to the cross, and the crown of thorns he wore at his death.\* This, though evidently absurd, may be deemed pardonable upon the whole, if we consider the gross ignorance and stupidity of the times. But nothing can excuse the impious fanaticism and superstition of Benedict XII., who, by appointing a festival in honour of the marks of Christ's wounds, which, the Franciscans tell us, were imprinted upon the body of their chief and founder by a miraculous interposition of the divine power, gave credit to that grossly ridiculous and blasphemous fable. John XXII., beside the sanction he gave to many other superstitions, ordered Christians to add to their prayers those words with which the angel Gabriel saluted the Virgin Mary.

#### CHAPTER V.

*Concerning the Divisions and Heresies that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. DURING some part of this century, the Hesychasts, or, as the Latins call them, the Quietists, gave great trouble to the Greek church. To assign the true source of it, we must observe that Barlaam, or Balaam, a native of Calabria, who was a monk of St. Basil, and afterwards bishop of Gieracè in Calabria, made a progress through Greece to inspect the behaviour of the monks, among whom he found many things highly reprehensible. He was more especially offended at the Hesychasts of mount Athos, in Thessaly, who were the same with the Mystics, or more perfect monks, and who, by a long course of intense contemplation, endeavoured to arrive at a tranquillity of mind entirely free from tumult and perturbation. These Quietists, in compliance with an ancient opinion of their principal doctors, (who imagined that there was a celestial light concealed in the deepest recesses of the mind,) used to sit in a solitary corner, during a certain portion of every day, with their eyes eagerly and immovably fixed upon the middle region of the belly, or navel; and boasted, that while they remained in this posture, they found, in effect, a divine light beaming forth from the soul, which diffused through their hearts inexpressible sensations of pleasure and delight.‡

\* See Jo. Henr. a Seelen, Diss. de festo Lanceæ et Clavorum Christi.—Baluzii Miscell. tom. i. et Vit. Pontif. tom. i.

‡ We have no reason to be surprised at, and much less to disbelieve, this account. For it is a fundamental rule with all those people in the eastern world, whether Christians, Mohammedans, or Pagans, (who maintain the necessity of abstracting the mind from the body, in order to hold communion with God, which is exactly the same thing with the contemplative and mystic life among the Latins,) that the eyes must be steadily fixed every day for some hours upon some particular object; and that he who complies with this precept will be thrown into an ecstasy, in which, being united to God, he will see wonderful things, and be entertained with ineffable delights. See what is said of the Siamese monks and Mystics by Engelb. Kämpfer, in his History of Japan, tom. i. and also of those of India, in the Voyages of Bernier, tom. ii. Indeed, I can easily admit, that they who continue long in the above-mentioned posture, will imagine they behold many things which no man in his senses ever beheld or thought of; for certainly the combinations they form



To such as inquired what kind of light this was, they replied, by way of illustration, that it was the glory of God, the same celestial radiance that surrounded Christ during his transfiguration on the mount. Balaam, entirely unacquainted with the customs and manners of the Mystics, looked upon all this as highly absurd and fanatical, and therefore styled the monks who adhered to this institution, Massalians and Euchites,\* and also gave them the new name of Umbilicani.† On the other hand, Gregory Palamas, archbishop of Thessalonica, defended the cause of these monks against Balaam.‡

II. In order to put an end to this dissension, a council was convoked at Constantinople, in 1341, in which the emperor himself, Andronicus the younger, and the patriarch, presided. Here Palamas and the monks triumphed over Balaam, who was condemned by the council; whereupon he left Greece, and returned to Italy. Not long after this, another monk, named Gregory Acindynus, renewed the controversy, and, in opposition to the opinion maintained by Palamas, denied that God dwelt in an eternal light distinct from his essence, as also that such a light was beheld by the disciples on mount Tabor. This dispute was now no longer concerning the monks, but turned upon the light seen at mount Tabor, and also upon the nature and residence of the Deity. Nevertheless, he was condemned as a follower of Balaam, in another council holden at Constantinople. Many assemblies were convened about this affair; but the most remarkable of them all, was that of the year 1351, in which the Balaamites and their adherents received such a fatal wound, in consequence of the severe decrees enacted against them, that they were forced to yield, and leave the victory to Palamas. This prelate maintained, that God was encircled, as it were, with an eternal light, which might be styled his energy or operation, and was distinct from his nature and essence; and that he favoured the three disciples with a view of this light upon mount Tabor. Hence he concluded that this divine operation was really different from the sub-

of the unconnected notions that arise to their fancy while their minds are in this odd and unnatural state, must be most singular and whimsical; so much the more, as the rule itself, which prescribes the contemplation of a certain object as the means of arriving at a vision of the Deity, absolutely forbids all use of the faculty of reason during that ecstatic and sublime interval. This total suspension of reason and reflection, during the period of contemplation, was not, however, peculiar to the eastern Quietists; the Latin Mystics observed the same rule, and inculcated it upon their disciples. On a due examination of the subject, we may safely conclude, that the many surprising visions, of which these fanatics boast, are fables utterly destitute of reason and probability. But this is not the proper place for enlarging upon prodigies of this nature.

\* The *Massalians* (so called from a Hebrew word which signifies *prayer*, and *Euchites* from a Greek word of the same signification) formed themselves into a sect, during the fourth century, in the reign of Constantius. Their tenets resembled those of the Quietists in several respects.

† Ουμβιλικανι.

‡ For an account of these two famous men, Balaam and Gregory Palamas, see, in preference to all other writers, Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, tom. x. p. 127, and 151

stanco of the Deity; and farther, that no being could partake of the divine substance or essence, but that finite natures might possess a share of his divine light, or operation. The Balaamites, on the contrary, denied these positions, affirming, that the properties and operations of the Deity were not different from his essence, and that there was really no difference between the attributes and essence of God, considered in themselves, but only in our conceptions of them, and reasonings upon them.\*

III. In the Latin church the inquisitors, those active ministers and executioners of papal justice, extended their vigilance to every quarter, and most industriously hunted out the remains of those sects who opposed the religion of Rome, even the Waldenses, the Catharists, the Apostolists, and others; so that the history of these times abounds with numberless instances of persons who were burned or otherwise barbarously destroyed, by those unrelenting instruments of superstitious vengeance. But none of these enemies of the church gave the inquisitors and bishops so much employment of this sanguinary kind, as the Brethren and Sisters of the free spirit, who went under the common name of Beghards and Beguines in Germany and the Netherlands, and were differently denominated in other provinces. For, as this sort of people professed an uncommon and sublime species of devotion, endeavouring to call off men's minds from the external and sensible parts of religion, and to win them over to the inward and spiritual worship of God, they were greatly esteemed by many plain, well-meaning persons, whose piety and simplicity were deceived by a profession so seducing; and thus they made many converts to their opinions. It was on this account that such numbers of this turn and disposition perished in the flames of persecution during this century in Italy, France, and Germany.

IV. This sect was most numerous in the cities of Germany that lay upon the Rhine, especially at Cologne; which circumstance induced Henry I., archbishop of that diocese, to publish a severe edict against them, A. D. 1306;‡ an example that was soon followed by the bishops of Mentz, Treves, Worms, and Strasburg.‡ And as there were some subtle acute men belonging to this party, that eminently keen logician, John Duns Scotus,§ was sent to Cologne, in 1308, to dispute against them, and to vanquish them by dint of syllogism. In 1310, the famous Margaret Poretta,

\* See Jo. Cantuariensis, *Hist. lib. ii. cap. xxxix. p. 263*, and the observations of Gregor. Pontanus; also Nicephorus Gregoras, *Hist. Byzant. lib. xi. cap. x. p. 277*, and in many other places. But these two writers disagree in several circumstances. Many materials relative to this controversy are yet unpublished (see Montfaucon, *Biblioth. Coisliniana. p. 150, 174, 404*.) Nor have we ever been favoured with an accurate and well-digested history of it. In the mean time, the reader may consult Leo Allatius, *de perpetua consensione Orient. et Occid. Eccles. lib. ii. cap. xxii. p. 234*.—Henr. Canisii *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iv. p. 361.—Dion. Petavius, *Dogmat. Theol. tom. i. lib. i. cap. xii.*—Steph. de Altamura, *Panoplia contra Schisma Græcor. p. 31, &c.*

‡ See Statuta Coloniaensis, published in 1554.

‡ Johannes, apud Scriptores rerum Moguntinar. tom. iii. p. 298.—Martenne, *Thesaur. Anecdotor. tom. iv. p. 250.*

§ Wadding, *Annal. Minor. tom. vi. p. 108.*

who made such a shining figure in this sect, was committed to the flames at Paris with one of the brethren. She had undertaken to demonstrate in an elaborate treatise, "That the soul, when absorbed in the love of God, is free from the restraint of every law, and may freely gratify all its natural appetites, without extracting any guilt."\* Pope Clement V., exasperated by this and other instances of the pernicious fanaticism that prevailed among this sect, published in a general council at Vienne, A. D. 1311, a special constitution against the Beghards and Beguines of Germany; and though the edict only mentions imperfectly the opinions of this sect, yet, by the numeration of them, we may easily perceive that the Mystic Brethren and sisters of the free spirit are the persons principally intended.† Clement, in the same council, issued another constitution, by which he suppressed another and a very different sort of Beguines,‡ who had hitherto been considered as a lawful and regular society, and lived in fixed habitations appropriated to their order, but were now corrupted by the fanatics above mentioned; for the Brethren and Sisters of the free spirit had insinuated themselves into the greatest part of the convents of the Beguines, where they inculcated with great success their mysterious and sublime system of religion to these simple women; and these credulous females were no sooner initiated into this brilliant and chimerical system, than they were captivated with its delusive charms, and babbled, in the most absurd and impious manner, concerning the true worship of the Deity.§

V. The Brethren of the free spirit, oppressed by so many severe edicts and constitutions, formed the intention of removing from Upper Germany into the lower parts of the empire; and this scheme was so far put in execution, that Westphalia was the only province which refused admission to these dispersed fanatics, and was free from their disturbances. This tranquillity was produced by the provident measures of Henry, archbishop of Cologne, who, having called a council, in 1322, seriously admonished the bishops of his province of the approaching danger, and thus excited them to exert their utmost vigilance to prevent any of these people from coming into Westphalia. About the same time the Beghards|| upon the Rhine, lost their chief leader and champion, Walter, a Dutchman of remarkable eloquence, and famous for his writings, who came from Mentz to Cologne, where he was apprehended

and burned.\* The death of this person was highly detrimental to the affairs of the Brethren of the free spirit: it did not, however, ruin their cause, or extirpate their sect. For it not only appears from innumerable testimonies, that, for a long time afterwards, they held their private assemblies at Cologne, and in many other parts of Germany, but also that they had several men among them of high rank and great learning, of which number Henry Aycardus, or Eccard, a Saxon, was the most famous. He was a Dominican, and also the superior of that order in Saxony; a man of a subtle genius, and one who had acquitted himself with reputation as professor of divinity at Paris.† In 1330, pope John XXII., endeavoured to suppress this obstinate sect by a new and severe constitution, in which the errors of the sect of the free spirit are marked out in a more distinct and accurate manner than in the Clementina.‡ But this attempt was fruitless; the disorder continued, and was comblated both by the inquisitors and bishops in most parts of Europe to the end of this century.

VI. The Clementina, or constitution of the council of Vienne against the Beguines, or the female societies that lived together in fixed habitations, under a common rule of pious discipline and virtuous industry, gave rise to a persecution of these people, which lasted till the reformation by Luther, and ruined the cause both of the Beguines and Beghards in many places. For though the pope, in his last constitution, had permitted pious women to live as nuns in a state of celibacy, with or without taking the vow, and refused a tolera-

\* Jo. Trithemii Annal. Hirsaug. tom. ii. p. 155.—Schaten, Annal. Paderborn. tom. ii. p. 250.—This is that famous Walter, whom so many ecclesiastical historians have represented as the founder of the sect of the Lollards, and as an eminent martyr to their cause. Learned men conclude all this, and more, from the following words of Trithemius: 'That same Walter Lohareus, (so it stands in my copy, though I fancy it ought to have been *Lolhardus*, especially as Trithemius, according to the custom of his time, frequently uses this word when treating of the sects that dissented from the church,) a native of Holland, was not well versed in the Latin tongue.' I say, from this short passage, learned men have concluded that Walter's surname was Lohard; whence, as from its founder and master, they supposed his sect derived the name of Lollards. But it is very evident, not only from this, but from other passages of Trithemius, that Lohard was no surname, but merely a term of reproach applied to all heretics who concealed the poison of error under the appearance of piety. Trithemius, speaking of the very same man, in a preceding passage, calls him 'the head of the Fratricelli, or Minorites;' but these terms were very extensive, including people of various sects. This Walter embraced the opinions of the Mystics, and was the principal doctor among those Brethren of the free spirit, who lived on the banks of the Rhine.

† See Echardi Scriptor. Prædicator. tom. i. p. 507.—Odor. Raynaldus, Annal. tom. xv. ad an. 1329. sect. lxx. p. 389.

‡ This new constitution was never published entire. It began with the words, 'in agro Dominico;' and was inscribed thus, *contra singularia, dubia, suspecta, et temeraria, quæ Beghardi et Beghina prædicant et observant.* We are favoured with a summary of it by Herm. Cornerus in Eccardi Corp. Hist. Mediæ Ævi, tom. ii. p. 1035. It is also mentioned by Paul Languis, in Chronico Civitatis, apud Jo. Pistorii Scriptores rerum German. tom. i. p. 1200.

\* Luc. d'Acherii Spicil. veter. Scriptor. tom. iii. p. 63.—J. Bale, de Scriptor. Britan. Centur. iv. n. 88. p. 367.

† It is extant in the Corpus Juris Canon. inter Clementinas, lib. v. tit. iii. de Hæreticis, cap. iii. p. 1088.

‡ In Jure Canonico inter Clementinas, lib. iii. tit. xi. de religiosis domibus, cap. i. p. 1075, edit. Bohmer.

§ For this reason, in the German records of this century, we often find a distinction of the Beguines into those of the right and approved class, and those of the sublime and free spirit; the former of whom adhered to the public religion, while the latter were corrupted by the opinions of the Mystics.

|| By Beghards, here, Dr. Mosheim means particularly the Brethren of the Free Spirit who frequently passed under this denomination

tion only to such of them as were corrupted with the opinions of the Brethren of the free spirit, yet the vast number of enemies which the Beguines and Beghards had, partly among the mechanics, especially the weavers, and partly among the priests and monks, took a handle from the Clementina to molest them in their houses, to seize and destroy their goods, and offer them many other insults. John XXII. afforded some relief under these oppressions, in 1324, by means of a special constitution, in which he gave a favourable explication of the Clementina, and ordered that the persons, goods, and habitations, of the innocent Beguines, should be preserved from every kind of violence and insult;—an example of clemency and moderation which was afterwards followed by other popes. On the other hand, the Beguines, in hopes of disappointing more effectually the malicious attempts of their enemies, and avoiding their snares, embraced in many places the third rule of St. Francis, and of the Augustines. Yet all these measures in their favour could not prevent the loss both of their reputation and substance; for from this time they were oppressed in several provinces by the magistrates, the clergy, and the monks, who had cast a greedy eye upon their treasures, and were extremely eager to divide the spoil.\*

VII. Some years before the middle of this century, while Germany and many other parts of Europe were distressed with various calamities, the Flagellants, a sect forgotten almost every where, and especially in Germany, made their appearance anew, and rambling through many provinces, occasioned great disturbances. These new Flagellants, whose enthusiasm infected every rank, sect, and age, were much worse than the old ones. They not only supposed that God might be prevailed upon to show mercy to those who underwent voluntary punishments, but propagated other tenets highly injurious to religion. They held, among other things, "That flagellation was of equal virtue with baptism, and the other sacraments: that it would procure from God the forgiveness of all sins, without the merits of Jesus Christ: that the old law of Christ was soon to be abolished, and that a new law, enjoining the baptism of blood, to be administered by whipping, was to be substituted in its place," with other tenets more or less enormous than these; whereupon Clement VII. thundered out anathemas against these sectaries, many of whom were committed to the flames by the inhuman inquisitors. It was, however, found as difficult to extirpate them, as it had been to suppress the other sects of wandering fanatics.†

\* I have collected a great number of particulars relating to this long persecution of the Beguines. But the most copious of all the writers who have published any thing upon this subject (especially if we consider his account of the persecution at Basil, and of Mulbergus, the most inveterate enemy of the Beguines,) is Christian Wurstisen, or Urstisen, in his *Chronicon Basiliense*, written in German, lib. iv. cap. ix. p. 201, published at Basil, 1530. There are now in my hands, and also in many libraries, manuscript tracts of this celebrated Mulbergus, written against the Beguines in the following century.

† See Baluzi Vit. Pontif. Avenion. tom. i. p. 160, 316, and Miscellan. tom. i. p. 50—Matthæi Analecta

VIII. Directly the reverse of this melancholy sect was the merry one of the Dancers, which, in 1373, arose at Aix-la-Chapelle, whence it spread through the district of Liege, Hainault, and other parts of the Netherlands. It was customary among these fanatics, for persons of both sexes, publicly as well as in private, suddenly to begin dancing, and, holding each other's hands, to continue their motions with extraordinary violence, till, being almost suffocated, they fell down breathless together; and they affirmed, that, during these intervals of vehement agitation, they were favoured with wonderful visions. Like the Flagellants, they wandered about from place to place, had recourse to begging for their subsistence, treated with the utmost contempt both the priesthood and the public rites and worship of the church, and held secret assemblies. Such was the nature of this new phrensy, which the ignorant clergy of this age looked upon as the work of evil demons, who possessed, as they thought, this dancing tribe. Accordingly, the priests of Liege endeavoured to cast out the devils which rendered these fanatics so merry, by singing hymns and applying fumigations of incense; and they gravely tell us, that the evil spirit was entirely vanquished by these powerful charms.\*

IX. The most heinous and abominable tribe of heretics that infected this century, (if the enormities with which they stand charged be true,) were the Knights Templars, who had been established in Palestine about two hundred years before this period, and who were represented as enemies and deriders of all religion. Their principal accuser indeed was a person whose testimony ought not to be admitted without caution. This was Philip the Fair, an avaricious, vindictive, and turbulent prince, who loudly complained to Clement V. of their opinions and conduct. The pope, though at first unwilling to proceed against them, was under a necessity of complying with the king's desire; so that, in 1307, on an appointed day, and for some time afterwards, all the knights, who were dispersed throughout Europe, and not in the least apprehensive of any impending evil, were seized and imprisoned. Such as refused to confess the enormities of which they were accused, were put to death; and those who, by tortures and promises, were induced to acknowledge the truth of what was laid to their charge, obtained their liberty. In 1311, the whole order was extinguished by the council of Vieme. Of the rich revenues they possessed, a part was bestowed upon other orders, especially on the knights of St. John, and the rest confiscated to the respective treasuries of the sovereign princes in whose dominions their possessions lay.

vet. Ævi, tom. i. iii. iv.—Herm. Gygis Flores Temp. p. 139.

\* Baluz. tom. i. p. 485.—Matth. Analecta, tom. i. p. 51, where we find the following passage in the Belgic Chronicle, which gives but an obscure account of the sect in question: A. 1374. *Gingen* de Dancers, and then in Latin, *Gens, impacata cadit, cruciata salvat*. The French *convulsionists*, (or prophets,) who, in our age, were remarkable for the vehemence and variety of their agitations, greatly resembled these brethren and sister dancers.

X. The Knights Templars, if their judges be worthy of credit, were a set of men who insulted the majesty of God, turned into derision the Gospel of Christ, and trampled upon the obligation of all laws, human and divine. For it is affirmed, that candidates, upon their admission to this order, were commanded to spit, as a mark of contempt, upon an image of Christ; and that, after admission, they were bound to worship either a cat, or a wooden head covered with gold. It is farther affirmed, that, among them, the odious and unnatural act of sodomy was a matter of obligation; that they committed to the flames the unhappy fruit of their lawless amours; and added, to these, other crimes too horrible to be mentioned, or even imagined. It will, indeed, be readily allowed, that in this order, as in all the other religious societies of this age, there were shocking examples of impiety and wickedness; but that the Templars in general were thus enormously corrupt, is so far from being proved, that the contrary may be concluded even from the acts and records, yet extant, of the tribunals before which they were tried and examined. If to this we add, that some

of the accusations advanced against them, flatly contradict each other, and that many members of this unfortunate order solemnly avowed their innocence, while languishing under the severest tortures, and even with their dying breath, it would seem probable, that Philip set on foot this bloody tragedy, with a view of gratifying his avarice, and glutting his resentment against the Templars,\* and especially against their grand master, who had highly offended him.

\* See the Acts annexed to Putean's *Histoire de la Condemnation des Templiers*, and other writings of his relating to the history of France, published at Paris, in 1654. The most valuable edition of the history appeared at Brussels, in 1751, enlarged by the addition of a great number of documents, by which every diligent and impartial reader will be convinced that the Templars were greatly injured. See also Nicolai Gurtleri *Historia Templariorum*. If the reader has an opportunity, he would do well to consult Steph. Baluzius, *Vit. Pontif. Avenion.* tom. i. p. 8, 11, &c. Ger. du Bois, *Hist. Eccles. Paris.* tom. ii. p. 540. The principal cause of Philip's indelible hatred against the Templars, was, that in his quarrel with Boniface VIII. the knights espoused the cause of the pope, and furnished him with money to carry on the war; an offence which the king could never pardon.

## THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

### PART I.

#### THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

##### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the prosperous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. THE new subjects, that were added to the kingdom of Christ in this century, were altogether unworthy of that sublime title, unless we prostitute it by applying it to those who made an external and insincere profession of Christianity. Ferdinand, surnamed the Catholic, by the conquest of Granada, in the year 1492, entirely overturned the dominion of the Moors or Saracens in Spain. Some time after this happy revolution, he issued a sentence of banishment against a prodigious multitude of Jews, who, to avoid the execution of this severe decree, dissembled their sentiments, and feigned an assent to the Gospel;\* and it is well known that, to this very day, there are both in Spain and Portugal a great number of that dispersed and wretched people, who wear the outward mask of Christianity, to secure them against the rage of persecution, and to advance their worldly interests. The myriads of Saracens that remained in Spain after the dissolution of their government, were at first solicited by exhortations and entreaties to embrace the Gospel. When these gentle methods proved ineffectual to bring about their conversion,

the famous Ximenes, archbishop of Toledo, and prime minister of the kingdom, judged it expedient to try the force of the secular arm, in order to accomplish that salutary purpose. But even this rigorous measure was without the desired effect: the greatest part of the Mohammedans persisted, with astonishing obstinacy, in their fervent attachment to their voluptuous prophet.\*

II. The light of the Gospel was also carried in this century among the Samogetæ [*in Poland*] and the neighbouring nations, but with less fruit than was expected.† Toward the conclusion of this age, the Portuguese, who cultivated with ardour and success the art of navigation, had penetrated as far as Ethiopia and the Indies. In 1492, Christopher Columbus, by discovering the islands of Hispaniola, Cuba, and Jamaica, opened a passage into America;‡ and, after him, Americus Vesputius, a citizen of Florence, landed on the continent of that vast region.§ The new Argonauts, who thus discovered nations hitherto

\* *Esprit Flechier, Histoire du Cardinal Ximenes*, p. 89.—Geldes' *History of the Expulsion of the Mohammedans*, in his Miscellaneous Tracts, tom. i.

† *Jo. Henry Hottinger, Hist. Ecclesiast. sæc. XV.* p. 856.

‡ See Charlevoix, *Histoire de l'Isle de St. Dominigue*, tom. i. p. 64.

§ See the *Life of Americus Vesputius*, written in Italian by the learned Angelo Maria Bandini.

\* *J. de Ferreras, Hist. Generale d'Espagne.* tom. viii. p. 123, 132, &c.

unknown to the inhabitants of Europe, deemed it their duty to enlighten them with the knowledge of the truth. The first attempt of this pious nature was made by the Portuguese among those Africans who inhabited the kingdom of Congo, and who, with their monarch, were suddenly converted to the Romish faith, in 1491.\* But what must we think of a conversion effected with such astonishing rapidity, and of a people who at once, without hesitation, abandoned their inveterate prejudices? Has not such a conversion, a ridiculous or rather an afflictive aspect? After this religious revolution in Africa, Alexander VI. gave a rare specimen of papal presumption, in dividing America between the Portuguese and Spaniards, but showed at the same time his zeal for the propagation of the Gospel, by the ardour with which he recommended, to these two nations, the instruction and conversion of the Americans, both in the isles and on the continent of that immense region.† In consequence of this exhortation of the pontiff, a great number of Franciscans and Dominicans were sent into those countries, to enlighten the darkness of their inhabitants; and the success of the mission is abundantly known.‡

## CHAPTER II.

### *Concerning the calamitous Events that happened to the Church during this Century.*

I. IN the vast regions of the eastern world Christianity daily lost ground; and the Moslems, whether Turks or Tartars, united their barbarous efforts to extinguish its bright and salutary lustre. Asiatic Tartary, Mogolestan, Tangut, and the adjacent provinces, where the religion of Jesus had long flourished, were now become the dismal seats of superstition, which reigned among the people under the vilest forms. Nor in these immense tracts of land were there at this time any traces of Christianity visible, except in China, where the Nestorians still preserved some scattered remains of their former glory, and appeared like a faint and dying taper in the midst of a dark and gloomy firmament. That some Nestorian churches were still subsisting in these regions of darkness, is undoubtedly certain; for in this century the Nestorian pontiff, in

Chaldea, sent missionaries into Cathay and China, who were empowered to exercise the authority of bishops over the Christian assemblies, which lay concealed in the remoter provinces of those great empires.\* It is, at the same time, almost equally certain, that even these assemblies did not survive this century.

II. The ruin of the Grecian empire was a new source of calamities to the Christian church in a considerable part of Europe and Asia. When the Turks, conducted by Mohammed II., an able prince and a formidable warrior, had made themselves masters of Constantinople, in 1453, the cause of Christianity received a blow, from which it has not yet recovered. Its adherents in these parts had no resources left, which could enable them to maintain it against the perpetual insults of their fierce and incensed victors; nor could they stem that torrent of barbarism and ignorance which rushed in with the triumphant arms of the Moslem prince, and overspread Greece with a fatal rapidity. The Turks took one part of Constantinople by force of arms; the other surrendered upon terms.‡ Hence, in the former division, the public profession of the Gospel was prohibited, and every vestige of Christianity effaced; while the inhabitants of the latter were permitted to retain their churches and monasteries during the whole course of this century, and to worship God according to the precepts of the Gospel, and the dictates of their consciences. This valuable liberty was, indeed, considerably diminished in the reign of Selim I., and the Christian worship was loaded with severe and despotic restrictions.‡ The outward form of the Christian church was not, indeed, either changed or destroyed by the Turks; but its lustre was eclipsed, its strength was undermined, and it was gradually attenuated to a mere shadow under their tyrannic empire. Pope Pius II. wrote a warm and urgent letter to Mohammed II. to persuade that prince to profess the Gospel; but this letter is equally destitute of piety and prudence.§

\* This circumstance was communicated to the author in a letter from the learned Mr. Theophilus Siegfried Bayer, one of the greatest adepts in eastern history and antiquities, that this or any other age has produced.

† See in this account Dr. Mosheim has followed the Turkish writers. And indeed their account is much more probable than that of the Latin and Greek historians, who suppose that the whole city was taken by force, and not by capitulation. The Turkish relation diminishes the glory of the conquest, and therefore probably would not have been adopted, had it not been true.

‡ Demet. Cantemir, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, t. i. 11, 46, 54.

§ Dictionnaire Hist. et Critique de Bayle.

\* Labat, Relation de l'Europe Occidentale, tom. ii. p. 366.—Jos. Franc. Lafitau, Histoire des Decouvertes des Portugais dans le nouveau Monde, tom. i. p. 72.

† See the Bull itself, in the Bullarium Romanum, tom. i. p. 466.

‡ See Thom. Maria Mamachus, Orig. et Antiquitat. Christian. tom. ii. p. 326, where we have an account of the gradual introduction of the Christian religion into America.—See also Wadding, Annal. Minor. tom. xv. p. 10.

## PART II.

### THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### *Concerning the state of Letters and Philosophy during this Century.*

I. THE Grecian and Oriental Muses languished under the despotic yoke of the Mohammedans; their voices were mute, and their harps unstrung. The republic of letters had a quite different aspect in the Latin world, where the liberal arts and sciences were cultivated with zeal and spirit, under the most auspicious encouragement, and recovered their ancient lustre and glory. Several of the popes became their zealous patrons and protectors, among whom Nicolas V. deserves an eminent and distinguished rank; the munificence and authority of kings and princes were also nobly exerted in this excellent cause, and animated men of learning and genius to display their talents. The illustrious family of the Medici in Italy,\* Alphonso VI. king of Naples, and the other Neapolitan monarchs of the house of Aragon,† acquired immortal renown by their love of letters, their liberality to the learned, and their ardent zeal for the advancement of science. Under their auspices, or in consequence of their example, many academies were founded in Germany, France, and Italy, libraries were collected at a prodigious expense, and honours and rewards were lavished on the studious youth, to animate their industry by the views of interest and the desire of glory. To all these happy circumstances, in favour of the sciences, was now added an admirable discovery, which contributed, as much as any thing else, to their propagation, I mean the *art of Printing*, (first with wooden, and afterwards with metal types,) which was invented about the year 1440, at Mentz, by John Guttemberg. By the aid of this incomparable art, the productions of the most eminent Greek and Latin writers, which had lain concealed, before this interesting period, in the libraries of the monks, were now spread abroad with facility, and perused by many, who could never have had access to them under their primitive form.‡ The perusal of these noble composi-

\* We have a full account of the obligations of the republic of letters to the family of Medici, in a valuable work of Joseph Bianchini de Prato, *dei gran Duchii di Toscana delle reale Casa de Medici, Protectori delle Lettere e delle Belle Arti, Ragionamenti Historici*, published at Venice, in 1741.

† See Giannone, *Historia di Napoli*, tom. iii.—Anton. Panormitani *Dieta et Facta memorabilia Alphonso I. denuo edita a Jo. Ger. Meuschenio*, in *Vit. Erud. Viror.* tom. ii.

‡ Dr. Mosheim decides here, that Guttemberg of Mentz was the inventor of the art of printing; but this notion is opposed with zeal by several men of learning. Of the many treatises that have been published on this subject, not one is composed with greater erudition and judgment than that of professor Schoepflin, of Strasbourg, in which the learned author undertakes to prove that the art of printing, by the means of letters engraven on plates of wood, was invented at Haerlem, by Coster; that the method of printing, by moveable types, was the discovery of John Guttemberg, a discovery made during his residence at Strasbourg; and that the still more perfect manner of printing with types of metal cast in

tions purified the taste, excited the emulation of men of genius, and animated them with a noble ambition of excelling in the same way.\*

II. The ruin of the Grecian empire contributed greatly to the propagation and advancement of learning in the west. For, after the reduction of Constantinople, the most eminent of the Greek literati passed into Italy, and were thence dispersed into the other countries of Europe, where, to gain subsistence, these venerable exiles instructed the youth in Grecian erudition, and propagated throughout the western world the love of learning, and a true and elegant taste for the sciences. Hence it was, that every distinguished city and university possessed one or more of these learned Greeks, who formed the studious youth to literary pursuits.† But they received no where such encouraging marks of protection and esteem as in Italy, where they were honoured in a singular manner in various cities, and were more especially distinguished by the family of Medici, whose liberality to the learned seemed to have no bounds. It was consequently in Italy that these ingenious fugitives were most numerous; and hence that country became, in some measure, the centre of the arts and sciences, and the general rendezvous of all who were ambitious of literary glory.‡

III. The learned men who adorned at this time the various provinces of Italy, were principally employed in publishing accurate and elegant editions of the Greek and Latin classics, in illustrating these authors with useful

a mould, was the contrivance of John Schoeffer, and was first practised at Mentz. This learned work, in which the author examines the opinions of Marchand, Fournier, and other writers, was published in 1760, under the following title: *Jo. Daniels Schoeppfii Consil. Reg. ac Franciæ His. Vindicia Typographicae*,\* &c.

\* *Mich. Maittaire, Annales Typographici.—Prosp. Marchand, Histoire de l'Imprimerie.*

† *Jo. Henr. Maii Vita Reuchlini*, p. 11, 19, 23, 152, 165.—*Casp. Barthius ad Statium*, tom. ii. p. 1008.—*Boulay*, tom. v. p. 692.

‡ For a farther account of this interesting period of the history of learning, the reader may consult the learned work of Humphry Hody, *de Græcis illustribus Literarum Græcarum in Italia Instauratoribus*, to which may be added, Battier's Oration on the same subject, published in the *Museum Helveticum*, tom. iv.

§ \* So this note stands in the first edition of this History, in 4to. Since that time, the learned and ingenious Mr. Gerard Meerman, pensionary of Rotterdam, has published his laborious and interesting account of the origin and invention of the art of printing, under the following title, "*Origines Typographicae*,"—a work which sets this matter in its true light, by making certain distinctions unknown to the writers who treated this subject before him. According to the hypothesis of this writer, (an hypothesis supported by irresistible proofs,) Laurence Coster, of Haerlem, invented the moveable wooden types;—Gensfleisch and Guttemberg carved metallic types at Mentz, which, though superior to the former, were still imperfect, because often unequal; Schoeffer perfected the invention at Strasbourg, by casting the types in an iron mould, or matrix, engraven with a punchon. Thus the question is decided. Coster was evidently the *inventor* of printing; the others *improved* the art, or rendered it more perfect

commentaries, in studying them as their models, both in poetry and prose, and in throwing light upon the precious remains of antiquity, that were discovered from day to day. In all these branches of literature, many arrived at such degrees of excellence, as it is almost impossible to surpass, and extremely difficult to equal. Nor were the other languages and sciences neglected. In the university of Paris there was now a public professor, not only of the Greek, but also of the Hebrew tongue;\* and in Spain and Italy the study of that language, and of Oriental learning and antiquities in general, was pursued with the greatest success.† John Reuchlin, otherwise called Capnion, and Trithemius, who had made an extraordinary progress, both in the study of the languages and of the sciences, were the restorers of solid learning among the Germans.‡ Latin poetry was revived by Antony of Palermo, who excited a spirit of emulation among the favourites of the Muses, and had many followers in that sublime art;§ while Cyriac of Ancona, by his own example, introduced a taste for coins, medals, inscriptions, gems, and other precious monuments of antiquity, of which he himself made a large collection in Italy.||

IV. It is not necessary to give here a peculiar and minute account of the other branches of literature that flourished in this century; nevertheless, the state of philosophy deserves a moment's attention. Before the arrival of the Greeks in Italy, Aristotle reigned there without a rival, and captivated, as it were by a sort of enchantment, all without exception, whose genius led them to philosophical inquiries. The veneration that was shown him, degenerated into a foolish and extravagant enthusiasm; the encomiums with which he was loaded, surpassed the bounds of decency; and many carried matters so far as to compare him with the respectable precursor of the Messiah.¶ This violent passion for the Stagirite was however abated, or rather was rendered less general, by the influence which the Grecian sages, and particularly Gemistius Pletho, acquired among the Latins, many of whom they persuaded to abandon the contentious and subtle doctrine of the Peripatetics, and to substitute in its place the mild and divine wisdom of Plato. It was in the year 1439, about the time of the famous council of Florence, that this revolution happened in the empire of philosophy. Several illustrious personages among the Latins, charmed with the sublime sentiments and doctrines of Plato, propagated them among the studious youth, and particu-

larly among those of a certain rank and figure.

The most eminent patron of this divine philosophy, as it was termed by its votaries, was Cosmo de' Medici, who had no sooner heard the lectures of Pletho, than he formed the design of founding a Platonic academy at Florence. For this purpose, he ordered Marsilius Ficinus, the son of his first physician, to be carefully instructed in the doctrines of the Athenian sage, and, in general, in the language and philology of the Greeks, that he might translate into Latin the productions of the most renowned Platonists. Ficinus answered well the expectations, and executed the intentions of his illustrious patron, by translating successively into the Latin language, the celebrated works of Hermes Trismegistus, Plotinus, and Plato. The same excellent prince encouraged by his munificence, and animated by his protection, many learned men, such as Ambrose of Camaldoli, Leonardo Bruno, Poggio, and others, to undertake works of a like nature, that the Latin literature might be enriched with translations of the best Greek writers. The consequence of all this was, that two philosophical sects arose in Italy, who debated for a long time (with the warmest animosity in a multitude of learned and contentious productions) this important question, which was the greatest philosopher, Aristotle or Plato.\*

V. Between these opposite factions, some eminent men, among both Greeks and Latins, thought proper to steer a middle course. To this class belonged Johannes Picus de Mirandola, Bessarion, Hermolaus Barbarus, and others of less renown, who, indeed, considered Plato as the supreme oracle of philosophy, but would by no means suffer Aristotle to be treated with indifference or contempt, and who proposed to reconcile the jarring doctrines of these two famous Grecian sages, and to combine them into one system. These moderate philosophers, both in their manner of teaching, and in the opinions they adopted, followed the modern Platonic school, of which Ammonius was the original founder.† This sect was, for a long time, regarded with the utmost veneration, particularly among the Mystics; while the scholastic doctors, and all such as were infected with the itch of disputing, favoured the Peripatetics. But, after all, these reconciling Platonists were chargeable with many errors and follies; they fell into the most childish su-

\* R. Simon, Critique de la Bibl. Eccles. par M. Du-Pin, tom. i. p. 502. Boulay, Hist. Paris. tom. v. p. 252.

† Pauli Colomesii Italia Orientalis, et Hispania Orientalis.

‡ R. Simon, Lettres Choisies, tom. i. p. 262; tom. iv. p. 131, 140.

§ Dictionnaire Hist. et Critique de Bayle.

¶ See the Itinerarium of Cyriac, published at Florence in 1742, by Melius, from the original manuscript, together with a preface, annotations, and several letters of that learned man, who may be considered as the first antiquary that appeared in Europe.—See also the Epistles of Leonardo Aretino, tom. ii. lib. ix. p. 149.

¶ See Christ. August. Heumannii Acta Philosophorum, tom. iii. p. 345.

\* Boivin, dans l'Histoire de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres, tom. iv. p. 381.—Launoy, de varia Fortuna Aristotelis, p. 225.

Leo Allatius, de Georgiis, p. 391.—La Croze, Entretiens sur divers Sujets, p. 384.—Joseph Bianchini, dei Gran Duchi di Toscana.—Bruckert Historia Critica Philosophiae, tom. iv.

¶ It was not only the respective merit of these two philosophers, considered in that point of light, that was debated in this controversy; the principal question was, which system was most conformable to the doctrines of Christianity? And here the Platonic certainly deserved the preference, as was abundantly proved by Pletho and others. It is well known, that many of the opinions of Aristotle lead directly to atheism.

† See Bessarion's Letter in the Histoire de l'Academie des Inscriptions, tom. v. p. 456.—Thomasius, de Syncretismo Peripatetico, in ejus Oratioribus, p. 340.

perstitutions, and followed, without either reflection or restraint, the extravagant dictates of their wanton imaginations.

VI. Their system of philosophy was, however, much less pernicious than that of the Aristotelians, their adversaries, who still maintained their superiority in Italy, and instructed the youth in all the public schools of learning. For these subtle doctors, and more especially the followers of Averroes, (who maintained that all the human race were animated by one common soul,) imperceptibly sapped the foundations both of natural and revealed religion, and entertained sentiments very little, if at all, different from that impious pantheistical system, which confounds the Deity with the universe, and merely acknowledges one self-existent being, composed of infinite matter and infinite intelligence. Among this class of sophists, the most eminent was Peter Pomponace, a native of Mantua, a man of a crafty turn, and an arrogant, enterprising spirit, who, notwithstanding the pernicious tendency of his writings (many of which are yet extant) to undermine the principles, and corrupt the doctrines of religion,\* was almost universally followed by the professors of philosophy in the Italian academies. These intricate doctors did not, however, escape the notice of the inquisitors, who, alarmed both by the rapid progress and dangerous tendency of their metaphysical notions, took cognizance of them, and called the Aristotelians to give an account of their principles. The latter, tempering their courage with craft, had recourse to a mean and perfidious stratagem to extricate themselves from this embarrassing trial. They pretended to establish a wide distinction between philosophical and theological truth; and maintaining that their sentiments were *philosophically true*, and conformable to right reason, they allowed them to be deemed *theologically false*, and contrary to the declarations of the Gospel. This miserable and impudent subterfuge was condemned and prohibited in the following century, by Leo X. in a council which he held at the Lateran.

VII. The Realists and Nominalists continued their disputes in France and Germany with more vigour and animosity than ever; and, finding that reason and argument were feeble weapons, they had recourse to mutual invectives and accusations, penal laws, and even to the force of arms; a strange method, surely, of deciding a metaphysical question! The contest was not only warm, but was very general in its extent; for it infected, almost without exception, the French and German colleges. In most places, however, the Realists maintained a manifest superiority over the Nominalists, to whom they also gave the appellation of Terminists.† While the famous Gerson and the most eminent of his disciples were living, the Nominalists were in high esteem and credit in the university of Paris.

\* See the very learned Brucker's Hist. Crit. Philosophiæ, t. iv. p. 158.

† See Brucker's Historia Critica Philosophiæ, tom. iii. p. 301.—Jo. Salubert Philosophiæ Nominalium Vindicata, cap. i.—Baluzi Miscell. t. iv. p. 531.—Argentæ, Coll. Docum. de nov. Enon. t. i. p. 230.

But, on the death of these powerful and respectable patrons, the scene was changed to their disadvantage. In 1473, Louis XI., by the instigation of his confessor the bishop of Avranches, issued a severe edict against the doctrines of the Nominalists, and ordered all their writings to be seized, and secured in a sort of imprisonment, that they might not be perused by the people.\* But the same monarch mitigated this edict in the following year, and permitted some of the books of that sect to be delivered from their confinement.† In 1481, he went much farther; for he not only granted a full liberty to the Nominalists and their writings, but also restored that philosophical sect to its former authority and lustre in the university.‡

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Doctors and Ministers of the Church, and its Forms of Government, during this Century.*

I. THE most eminent writers of this century unanimously lament the miserable condition to which the Christian church was reduced by the corruption of its ministers, and which seemed to portend nothing less than its total ruin, if Providence should not interpose, by extraordinary means, for its deliverance and preservation. The vices that reigned among the Roman pontiffs, and, indeed, among all the ecclesiastical orders, were so flagrant, that the complaints of these good men did not appear at all exaggerated, or their apprehensions ill-founded; nor had any of the corrupt advocates of the clergy the courage to call them to an account for the sharpness of their censures and of their complaints. The rulers of the church, who lived in luxurious indolence, and in the infamous practice of all kinds of vice, were even obliged to hear with a placid countenance, and even to commend, these bold censurers, who declaimed against the degeneracy of the church, declared that there was scarcely any thing sound either in its visible head or in its members, and demanded the aid of the secular arm, and the destroying sword, to lop off the parts that were infected with this grievous and deplorable contagion. Affairs, in short, were brought to such a pass, that those were deemed the best Christians, and the most useful members of society, who, braving the terrors of persecution, and triumphing over the fear of man, inveighed with the greatest freedom and fervour against the court of Rome, its lordly pontiff, and the whole tribe of his followers and votaries.

II. At the commencement of this century, the Latin church was divided into two great factions, and was governed by two contending pontiffs, Boniface IX. who remained at Rome, and Benedict XIII. who resided at Avignon.

\* Naude's Additions à l'Histoire de Louis XI. p. 203.—Du Boulay, Hist. Acad. Paris, tom. v. p. 678, 705.—Launoy's Hist. Gymnas. Navar. t. iv. op. part. i. p. 201, 378.

† Boulay, t. v. p. 710.

‡ The proofs of this we find in Salubert's Philosophiæ Nominal. vindicata, cap. i.—See also Boulay, tom. v.



Upon the death of the former, the cardinals of his party rallied to the pontificate, in 1404, Cosmo de Meliorati, who assumed the name of Innocent VII.,\* and held that high dignity during the short space of two years only. After his decease, Angelo Corrario, a Venetian cardinal, was chosen in his room, and ruled the Roman faction under the title of Gregory XII. A plan of reconciliation was however formed, and the contending pontiffs bound themselves, each by an oath, to make a voluntary renunciation of the papal chair, if that step should be deemed necessary to promote the peace and welfare of the church; but both of them scandalously violated this solemn obligation. Benedict, besieged in Avignon by the king of France, in 1408, saved himself by flight, retiring first into Catalonia, his native country, and afterwards to Perpignan. Hence eight or nine of the cardinals, who adhered to his cause, seeing themselves deserted by their pope, went over to the other side, and, joining publicly with the cardinals who supported Gregory, they agreed to assemble a council at Pisa on the 25th of March, 1409, in order to heal the divisions and factions that had so long rent the papal empire. This council, however, which was designed to close the wounds of the church, had an effect quite contrary to that which was generally expected, and only served to open a new breach, and to excite new divisions. Its proceedings, indeed, were vigorous, and its measures were accompanied with a just severity. A heavy sentence of condemnation was pronounced, on the 5th day of June, against the contending pontiffs, who were declared guilty of heresy, perjury, and contumacy, unworthy of the smallest tokens of honour or respect, and separated *ipso facto* from the communion of the church. This step was followed by the election of one pontiff in their place. The election took place on the 25th of June, and fell upon Peter of Candia, known in the papal list by the name of Alexander V.,† but all the decrees and proceedings of this famous council were treated with contempt by the condemned pontiffs, who continued to enjoy the privileges and to perform the functions of the papacy, as if no attempts had been made to remove them from that dignity. Benedict held a council at Perpignan; and Gregory assembled one near Aquileia. The latter, however, apprehending the resentment of the Venetians,‡ made his escape in a clandestine manner from the territory of Aquileia, arrived at Caieta, where he threw himself upon the protection of Ladislaus, king of Naples, and, in 1412, fled thence to Rimini.

III. Thus was the Christian church divided

\* Beside the ordinary writers, who have given us an account of the transactions that happened under the pontificate of Innocent VII., see Leon. Aretin. *Epistol.* lib. i. ep. iv. v. et *Collic. Sanctat.* *Epistol.* lib. ii.—We have also an account of the pontificate of Gregory, in the *Epistles* of the same Aretin, and in Jo. Laubi, *Dehc. Eruditorum*, tom. i.

† See L'Enfant *Histoire*, du Concile de Pise.—F. Pagi, *Breviar. Pontif. Romanorum*, tom. iv.—and Bossuet, *Defensio Decreti Gallicani de Potestate Ecclesiastica*, tom. ii.

‡ He had offended the Venetians by deposing their patriarch, Antony Pancevami, and putting Antony du Pont the bishop of Concordia, in his place.

into three great factions, and its government violently carried on by three contending chiefs, who loaded each other with reciprocal maledictions, calumnies, and excommunications. Alexander V., who had been elected pontiff at the council of Pisa, died at Bologna in 1410; and the sixteen cardinals, who attended him in that city, immediately filled up the vacancy, by choosing, as his successor, Balthasar Cossa, a Neapolitan, destitute of all principles both of religion and probity, who assumed the title of John XXIII. The duration of this schism in the papacy was a source of many calamities, and became daily more detrimental both to the civil and religious interests of those nations among whom the flame raged. Hence it was that the emperor Sigismund, the king of France, and several other princes, employed all their zeal and activity, and spared neither labour nor expense, in restoring the tranquillity of the church, and uniting it again under one spiritual head. On the other hand, the pontiffs could not be persuaded by any means to prefer the peace of the church to the gratification of their ambition; so that no other method of accommodating this weighty matter remained, than the assembling of a general council, in which the controversy might be examined, and terminated by the judgment and decision of the universal church. This council was accordingly convoked at Constance, in 1414, by John XXIII. who was engaged in this measure by the entreaties of Sigismund, and also from an expectation, that the decrees of this grand assembly would be favourable to his interests. He appeared with a great number of cardinals and bishops, at this famous council, which was also honoured with the presence of the emperor, of many German princes, and of the ambassadors of all the European states, whose monarchs or regents could not be personally present at the decision of this important controversy.\*

IV. The great object of this assembly was the healing of the schism that had so long rent the papacy: and this purpose was happily accomplished. It was solemnly declared, in the fourth and fifth sessions of this council, by two decrees, that the Roman pontiff was inferior and subject to a general assembly of the universal church; and the same decrees vindicated and maintained, in the most effectual manner, the authority of councils.† This vigor-

\* The acts of this famous council were published in six volumes in folio, at Frankfurt, in 1700, by Herman von der Harlt. This collection, however, is imperfect, notwithstanding the pains that it cost the laborious editor. Many of the acts are omitted, and a great number of pieces are introduced which by no means deserve a place. The history of the same council by L'Enfant, is composed with great accuracy and elegance; but the supplement that was given to it by Bourgeois de Chastenet, a French lawyer, is a performance of little merit; it is entitled, 'Nouvelle Histoire du Concile de Constance, ou l'on fait voir combien la France a contribué à l'extinction du Schisme.'

† For an account of these two famous decrees, which set such wise limits to the supremacy of the pontiffs, see Natalis Alexand. *Hist. Eccl.* sac. XV. Diss. iv.—Bossuet, *Deicns Sententia Clarissimæ de Potest. Ecclesiasticæ* tom. ii.—L'Enfant, *Dissert. Historique et Apologétique pour Jean Gerson et le Concile de Constance*, which is subjoined to the history of that council.

ous proceeding prepared the way for the degradation of John, who, during the twelfth session, was unanimously deposed from the pontificate,\* on account of several flagitious crimes that were laid to his charge, and more especially for the scandalous violation of a solemn engagement which he had taken about the beginning of the council, to resign the papal chair, if that measure should appear necessary to the peace of the church; which engagement he broke some weeks after by a clandestine flight. In the same year (1415,) Gregory sent Charles de Malatesta to the council to make, in his name, a solemn and voluntary resignation of the pontificate. About two years after this, Benedict was deposed by a solemn resolution of the council,† and Otto de Colonna raised, by the unanimous suffrages of the cardinals, to the high dignity of head of the church, which he ruled under the title of Martin V. Benedict, who still resided at Perpignan, was far from being disposed to submit either to the decree of the council which deposed him, or to the determination of the cardinals with respect to his successor. On the contrary, he persisted until the day of his death, which happened in the year 1423, in assuming the title, the prerogatives, and the authority of the papacy. And when this obstinate man was dead, a certain Spaniard, named Giles Munoz, was chosen pope in his place by two cardinals, under the patronage of Alphonso, king of Sicily, and adopted the title of Clement VIII.; but this sorry pontiff, in 1429, was persuaded to resign his pretensions, and to leave the government of the church to Martin V.

V. If, from the measures that were taken in this council to check the lordly arrogance of the Roman pontiffs, we turn our eyes to the proceedings against those who were called heretics, we shall observe in this new scene nothing worthy of applause, but several things, on the contrary, that can only excite our indignation, and which no pretext, no consideration, can render excusable. Before the meeting of this council, great commotions had been excited in several parts of Europe, and more especially in Bohemia, by contests on religious subjects. One of the persons that gave occasion to these disputes was John Huss, who lived at Prague in the highest reputation, both on account of the sanctity of his manners, and the purity of his doctrine, who was distinguished by his uncommon erudition and eloquence, and performed, at the same time, the functions of professor of divinity in the university, and of ordinary pastor in the church of that famous city.‡ This eminent ecclesiastic declaimed

\* On the 29th of May, 1415.

† On the 26th of July, 1417.

‡ A Bohemian Jesuit, who was far from being favourable to John Huss, and who had the best opportunity of being acquainted with his real character, describes him thus: "He was more subtle than eloquent; but the gravity and austerity of his manners, his frugal and exemplary life, his pale and meagre countenance, his sweetness of temper, and his uncommon affability toward persons of all ranks and conditions, from the highest to the lowest, were much more persuasive than any eloquence could be." See Bohastus Balbinus, Epitom. Hist. Rer. Bohem. lib. iv. cap. v. p. 431.

with vehemence against the vices that had corrupted the clergy of all denominations; nor was he singular in this respect; for such remonstrances had become very common, and were generally approved by the wise and the good. Huss, however, went still farther; and, from the year 1408, used his most zealous endeavours to withdraw the university of Prague from the jurisdiction of Gregory XII., whom the kingdom of Bohemia had hitherto acknowledged as the true and lawful head of the church. The archbishop of Prague, and the clergy in general, who were warmly attached to the interests of Gregory, were greatly exasperated at these proceedings. Hence arose a violent quarrel between the incensed prelate and the zealous reformer, which the latter inflamed and augmented, from day to day, by his warm exclamations against the conduct of the court of Rome, and the corruptions that prevailed among the sacerdotal order.

VI. Such were the circumstances that first excited the resentment of the clergy against John Huss. This resentment, however, might have been easily calmed, and perhaps totally extinguished, if new incidents of a more important kind had not arisen to keep up the flame and increase its fury. In the first place, he adopted the philosophical opinions of the Realists, and showed his warm attachment to their cause, in the manner that was usual in this barbarous age, even by persecuting, to the utmost of his power, their adversaries, the Nominalists, whose number was great, and whose influence was considerable in the university of Prague.\* He also multiplied the number of his enemies, in 1408, by procuring, through his great credit, a sentence in favour of the Bohemians, who disputed with the Germans concerning the number of suffrages to which their respective nations were entitled in all points that were carried by election in the university. That the nature of this contest may be better understood, it will be proper to observe, that this famous university was divided, by its founder Charles IV., into four nations, namely, the Bohemians, Bavarians, Poles, and Saxons; of which, according to the original laws of the institutions, the first had three suffrages, and the other three, who were comprehended under the title of the German nation, only one. This arrangement, however, had not only been altered by custom, but was entirely inverted in favour of the Germans, who were vastly superior to the Bohemians in number, and assumed to themselves the three suffrages which originally belonged to the latter. Huss, therefore, whether animated by a principle of patriotism, or by an aversion to the Nominalists, who were peculiarly favoured by the Germans, raised his voice against this abuse,

\* See the *Litère Nominalium ad Regem Francie Ludovicum VI.*, in Balazii Miscellan. tom. iv. p. 534, where we read the following passage: "Legimus Nominales expulsos de Bohemia eo tempore, quo heretici voluerunt Bohemiam regnum suis haresibus inficere.—Quum dicti heretici non possent disputando superare, impetraverunt ab Abbesslaao (*Wenceslao*) principe Bohemiarum, ut gubernarentur studia Pragensis ritu Parisiensium; quo edicto coacti sunt supradicti Nominales Pragam civitatem relinquere, et se transtulerunt ad Lipzicam civitatem, et ibidem erexerunt universitatem sollempnissimam."

and employed, with success, the extraordinary credit he had obtained at court, by his flowing and masculine eloquence, in depriving the Germans of the privilege they had usurped, and in reducing their three suffrages to one. The issue of this long and tedious contest\* was so offensive to the Germans, that a prodigious number of them, with John Hoffman, the rector of the university, at their head,† retired from Prague, and repaired to Leipsic, where Frederic the Wise, elector of Saxony, erected for them, in 1409, that academic institution which still subsists in a flourishing state. This event contributed greatly to render Huss odious to many, and, by the consequences that followed it, was certainly instrumental in bringing on his ruin; for no sooner had the Germans retired from Prague, than he began not only to inveigh with greater freedom than he had formerly done against the vices and corruptions of the clergy, but even went so far as to recommend, in an open and public manner, the writings and opinions of the famous Wickliffe, whose new doctrines had already made such a noise in England. Hence an accusation was brought against him, in 1410, before the tribunal of John XXII., by whom he was solemnly expelled from the communion of the church. He treated, indeed, this excommunication with the utmost contempt, and, both in his conversation and his writings, exposed the disorders that preyed upon the vitals of the church, and the vices that dishonoured the conduct of its ministers;‡ and the fortitude and zeal which he discovered on this occasion were almost universally applauded.

VII. This eminent man, whose piety was truly fervent and sincere, though his zeal, perhaps, was rather too violent, and his prudence not always equally circumspect, was summoned to appear before the council of Constance. Obedient to this order, and thinking himself secured from the rage of his enemies, by the safe conduct which had been granted to him by the emperor Sigismund, both for his journey to Constance, his residence in that city, and his return to his own country, John Huss appeared before the assembled churchmen, to demonstrate his innocence, and to prove that the charge of his having deserted the church of Rome was entirely groundless. And it may be affirmed with truth, that his religious opinions, at least in matters of importance, were conformable to the established doctrine of the church in this age.§ He declaimed, indeed,

\* Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia, who was bribed by both of the contending parties, protracted instead of abridging this dispute, and used to say with a smile, that he had found a good goose, which laid every day a considerable number of gold and silver eggs. This was playing upon the word *Huss*, which, in the German language, signifies a goose.

† Historians differ much in their accounts of the number of Germans that retired from the university of Prague upon this occasion. *Aeneas Sylvius* reckons 5000; *Trithemius* and others 2000. *Dubravius* 21,000; *Lupatius* 44,000; *Lauda* (a contemporary writer) 36,000.

‡ See *Laur. Byzitii Diarium Belli Hussitici*, in *Ludewig's Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum*, tom. vi. p. 127.

§ It was observed in the preceding section, that John Huss adopted with zeal, and openly recommended the writings and opinions of Wickliffe; but this must be understood of the writings and

with extraordinary vehemence against the Roman pontiffs, the bishops and monks: but this freedom was deemed lawful in these times, and it was used every day in the council of Constance, where the tyranny of the court of Rome, and the corruption of the sacerdotal and monastic orders, were censured with the utmost severity. The enemies, however, of this good man, who were very numerous, coloured the accusation that was brought against him with such artifice and success, that, by the most scandalous breach of public faith, he was thrown into prison, declared a heretic, because he refused to obey the order of the council, which commanded him to plead guilty against the dictates of his conscience, and was burned alive on the 6th of July, 1415; which dreadful punishment he endured with unparalleled magnanimity and resignation, expressing in his last moments the noblest feelings of love to God, and the most triumphant hope of the accomplishment of those transporting promises with which the Gospel fortifies the true Christian at the approach of eternity. The same unhappy fate was borne with the same pious fortitude and constancy of mind by Jerome of Prague, the intimate companion of John Huss, who appeared at this council with the generous design of supporting and seconding his persecuted friend. Terrified by the prospect of a cruel death, Jerome at first appeared willing to submit to the orders of the council, and to abandon the tenets and opinions which it had condemned in his writings. This submission, however, was not attended with the advantages he expected from it; nor did it deliver him from the close and severe confinement in which he was kept. He therefore resumed his fortitude; professed anew, with an heroic constancy, the opinions which he had deserted for a while from a principle of fear, and maintained them in the flames, in which he expired on the 30th of May, 1416.\*

Many learned men have endeavoured to investigate the reasons that occasioned the pronouncing of such a cruel sentence against Huss and his associates; and, as no adequate reasons for such a severe proceeding can be found, either in the life or opinions of that good man, they conclude that he fell a victim to the rage and injustice of his unrelenting enemies. And indeed this conclusion is both natural and well-grounded; nor will it be difficult to show how it came to pass, that the reverend fathers of the council were so eagerly bent upon burning, as a heretic, a man who neither deserved such an injurious title, nor such a dreadful fate. In the first place, John Huss had excited, both by his discourses and by his writings, great commotions in Bohemia, and had rendered the clergy of all ranks and

opinions of that great man in relation to the papal hierarchy, the despotism of the court of Rome, and the corruption of the clergy; for, in other respects, it is certain that he adhered to the most superstitious doctrines of the church, as appears from various passages in two sermons which he had prepared for the council of Constance.

\* The translator has here inserted into the text the long note (a) of the original, which relates to the circumstances that precipitated the ruin of these two eminent reformers; and he has thrown the citations therein contained into several notes.

orders extremely odious in the eyes of the people. The bishops, therefore, together with the sacerdotal and monastic orders, were very sensible that their honours and advantages, their credit and authority, were in the greatest danger of being annihilated, if this reformer should return to his country, and continue to write and declaim against the clergy with the same freedom which he had formerly exercised. Hence they left no means unemployed to accomplish his ruin; they laboured night and day, formed plots, bribed men in power; they used, in short, every method that could have any tendency to rid them of such a formidable adversary.\* It may be observed, secondly, that in the council there were many men of great influence and weight, who looked upon themselves as personally offended by him, and demanded his life as the only sacrifice that could satisfy their vengeance. Huss, as has been already mentioned, was not only attached to the party of the Realists, but was peculiarly severe in his opposition to their adversaries. And now he was so unhappy, as to be brought before a tribunal which was principally composed of the Nominalists, with the famous John Gerson at their head, who was the zealous patron of that faction, and the mortal enemy of Huss. Nothing could equal the vindictive pleasure the Nominalists felt from an event that put this unfortunate prisoner in their power, and gave them an opportunity of satisfying their vengeance to the full; and accordingly, in their letter to Louis, king of France,† they do not pretend to deny that Huss fell a victim to the resentment of their sect, which is also confirmed by the history of the council. The animosities that always reigned between the Realists and Nominalists, were at this time carried to the greatest excess imaginable. Upon every occasion that offered, they accused each other of heresy and impiety, and constantly had recourse to corporal punishments to decide the dispute. The Nominalists procured the death of Huss, who was a Realist; and the Realists, on the other hand, obtained, in 1479, the condemnation of John of Wesel, who was attached to the opposite party.‡ These contending sects carried their blind fury so far as to charge each other with

the sin against the Holy Ghost,\* and exhibited the most miserable spectacle of inhuman bigotry to the Christian world. The aversion which John Huss, and Jerome, his companion, had against the Germans, was a third circumstance that contributed to determine their unhappy fate. This aversion they declared publicly at Prague, on all occasions, both by their words and actions; nor were they at any pains to conceal it even in the council of Constance, where they accused them of presumption and despotism in the strongest terms.† The Germans, on the other hand, remembering the affront they had received in the university of Prague, by the means of John Huss, burned with resentment and rage both against him and his unfortunate friend; and, as their influence and authority were very great in the council, there is no doubt that they employed them, with the utmost zeal, against these two formidable adversaries. Besides, John Hoffman, the famous rector of the university, whom Huss had been the occasion of expelling from that city, together with the Germans, and who in consequence thereof became his most virulent enemy, was consecrated bishop of Misnia, in 1413, and held in this council the most illustrious rank among the delegates of the German church. This circumstance was also most unfavourable to Huss, and was, without doubt, ultimately detrimental to his cause.

The circumstances now mentioned, as contributing to the unhappy fate of this good man, are, as we see, all drawn from the resentment and prejudices of his enemies, and have not the least colour of equity. It must, however, be confessed, that there appeared one *mark of heresy* in the conduct of this reformer, which, according to the notions that prevailed in this century, might expose him to condemnation with some shadow of reason and justice; I mean, his inflexible obstinacy, which the church of Rome always considered as a grievous *heresy*, even in those whose errors were of little moment. We must consider this man, as called before a council, which was supposed to represent the universal church, to confess his faults and to abjure his errors. This he

\* The bribery and corruption that were employed in bringing about the ruin of John Huss, are manifest from the following remarkable passages of the *Diarium Hassiticum* of Laur. Byzanzus: "Clerus perversus, precipue in regno Bohemiarum et marchionatu Moravia, condemnationem ipsius (Hussi) contributione pecuniarum et modis aliis diversis procuravit, et ad ipsius consensum interitum." "Clerus perversus regni Bohemiarum et marchionatus Moravia, et precipue episcopi, abbates, canonici, plebani, et religiosi, ipsius fideles ac salutariter admonitiones, adhortationes, ipsorum pompam, simoniam, avaritiam, fornicationem, vitique detestanda abominacionem detegentes, ferre non valendo, pecuniarum contributiones ad ipsius extinctionem faciendo procuraverunt."

† See Baluzi Miscell. tom. iv. p. 534. in which we find the following passage: "Suscitavit Deus doctores catholicos, Petrum de Albaro, Johannem de Gersono, et alios quam plures doctissimos homines Nominales, qui convocati ad concilium Constantiense, ad quod citati fuerunt heretici, et nominatim Hieronymus et Johannes—dictos hereticos per quadraginta dies disputando superaverunt."

‡ See the *Examen Magistrab et Theologicale Mag. Joh. de Wesalia*, in *Ortuali Gratii Fasciculo rerum expetend et fugiendarum* Colon. 1535.

\* In the *Examen* mentioned in the preceding note, we find the following striking passage, which may show us the extravagant length to which the disputes between the Nominalists and Realists were now carried.—"Quis nisi ipse diabolus seminavit illam zizaniam inter philosophos et inter theologos, ut tanta sui dissensio, *etiam animorum*, inter diversa opinantes? Adeo ut si universalia quinquam realia negaverit, existetur in Spiritum Sanctum peccavisse; mo summo et maximo peccato plenus creditur contra Deum, contra Christianam religionem, contra justitiam, contra omnem politiam, graviter deliquisse. Unde hec cœcitas mentis nisi a diabolo, qui phantasias nostras illudat?" We see by this passage, that the Realists charged their adversaries (whose only crime was the absurdity of calling *universal ideas* mere *denominations*) with sin against the Holy Ghost, with transgression against God, and against the Christian religion, and with a violation of all the laws of justice and civil polity.

† See Theod. de Niemi, *Inventiva* in Joh. XXIII., in *Harditi Actis Concilii Constant.* tom. ii. p. 450. "Improperabat etiam in publico Alamannis, dicendo, quod essent presumptuosi, et vellent ubique per orbem dominari.—Sicque factum fuisset saepe in Bohemia, ubi volentes etiam dominari Alamanni violenter exinde repulsi et male tractati fuissent."

obstinately refused to do, unless he was previously convicted of error; here, therefore, he resisted the authority of the catholic church, demanded a rational proof of the justice of the sentence it had pronounced against him, and intimated, with sufficient plainness, that he looked upon the church as *fallible*. All this certainly was most enormously criminal and intolerably heretical, according to the general opinion of the times; for it became a dutiful son of the church to renounce his eye-sight, and to submit his own judgment and will, without any exception or reservation, to the judgment and will of that holy mother, under a firm belief and entire persuasion of the infallibility of all her decisions. This ghostly mother had, for many ages past, followed, whenever her unerring perfection and authority were called in question, the rule which Pliny observed in his conduct toward the Christians: "When they persevered, (says he, in his letter to Trajan,) I put my threats into execution, from a persuasion that, whatever their confessions might be, their audacious and invincible obstinacy deserved an exemplary punishment."<sup>\*</sup>

VIII. Before sentence had been pronounced against John Huss and Jerome of Prague, the famous Wickliffe, whose opinions they were supposed to adopt, and who was long since dead, was called from his rest before this spiritual tribunal; and his memory was solemnly branded with infamy by a decree of the council. On the 4th day of May, in 1415, many propositions, invidiously culled out of his writings, were examined and condemned, and an order was issued to commit all his works, together with his bones, to the flames. On the 14th of June following, the assembled fathers passed the famous decree, which took the cup from the laity in the celebration of the eucharist; ordered "that the Lord's supper should be received by them only in one kind, i. e. *the bread*," and rigorously prohibited the communion in both kinds. This decree was occasioned by complaints that had been made of the conduct of Jacobellus de Misa, curate of the parish of St. Michael at Prague, who, about a year before, had been persuaded by Peter of Dresden, to administer the Lord's supper in both kinds, and was followed in this by several churches.† The council, being informed of this matter by a Bohemian bishop, thought proper to oppose with vigour the progress of this *heresy*; and therefore they enacted the statute, which ordered "the communion to be administered to the laity only in one kind," and which obtained the force and authority of a law in the church of Rome.

IX. In the same year, the opinion of John Petit, a doctor of divinity at Paris,‡ who maintained, that every individual had an undoubted right to take away the life of a tyrant, was brought before the council, and was condemned

as an odious and detestable heresy; but both the name and person of the author were spared, on account of the powerful patrons, under whose protection he had defended that pernicious doctrine. John, duke of Burgundy, had, in 1407, employed a band of ruffians to assassinate Louis duke of Orleans, only brother of Charles VI. king of France. While the whole city was in an uproar, in consequence of this horrible deed, Petit vindicated it in a public oration, in presence of the dauphin and the other princes of the blood, affirming, that the duke had done a laudable action, and that it was lawful to put a tyrant to death, "in any way, either by violence or fraud, without any form of law or justice, and even in opposition to the most solemn contracts and oaths of fidelity and allegiance." It is, however, to be observed, that by *tyrants*, this doctor did not mean the supreme rulers of nations, but those powerful and insolent subjects, who abused their opulence and credit to bring about measures that tended to the dishonour of their sovereign and the ruin of their country.‡ The university of Paris pronounced a severe and rigorous sentence against the author of this pernicious opinion; and the council of Constance, after much deliberation and debate, condemned the opinion without mentioning the author. This determination, though modified with the utmost clemency and mildness, was not ratified by the new pontiff Martin V., who dreaded too much the formidable power of the duke of Burgundy, to confirm a sentence which he knew would be displeasing to that ambitious prince.†

X. After these and other transactions of a like nature, it was now time to take into consideration a point of greater importance than had yet been proposed, even the reformation of the church in its head and in its members, by setting bound to the despotism and corruption of the Roman pontiffs, and to the luxury and immorality of licentious ecclesiastics. It was particularly with a view to this important object, that the eyes of all Europe were fixed upon the council, from a general persuasion of the necessity of this reformation, and an ardent desire of seeing it happily brought into execution. Nor did the assembled fathers deny, that this reformation was the principal end of their meeting. Yet this salutary work had so many obstacles in the passions and interests of those very persons by whom it was to be effected, that little could be expected, and still less was done. The cardinals and dignified clergy, whose interest it was that the church should remain in its corrupt and disordered state, employed all their eloquence and art to prevent its reformation; and observed, among other artful pretenses, that a work of

\* This appears manifestly from the very discourse of Petit, which the reader may see in L'Enfant's History of the Council of Pisa, tom. ii. p. 303.\* See also August. Leyseri Diss. qua Memoriam Joh. Burgundi et Doctrinam Joh. Parvi de Cæle per Duellum vindicatur.

† Boulay, tom. v.—Argenteo, Collectio Judicior. de novis Erroribus, tom. i. part. ii.—Gersonis Opera, edited by M. Du Pin, tom. v.—Bayle's Diction. tom. iii.

‡ See also the same author's History of the Council of Constance, book iii. sect. xix.

\* Plin. Epist. lib. x. ep. 97. "Perseverantes duci jussi. Neque enim dubitabam, qualecunque esset quod fatorentur, pervicaciam certe et inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri."

† Byzant. Diar. Huss. p. 121

‡ Some historians have erroneously represented Petit as a lawyer. See Dr. Smollet's History of England.

such high moment and importance could not be undertaken with any prospect of success, until a new pontiff should be elected. And, what was still more shocking, Martin V. was no sooner raised to that high dignity, than he employed his authority to elude and frustrate every effort that was made to set this salutary work on foot, and made it appear most evidently, by the laws he enacted, that nothing was more foreign from his intention than the reformation of the clergy, and the restoration of the church to its primitive purity. Thus this famous council, after sitting three years and six months, was dissolved, on the 22d day of April, 1418, without having effected its chief ostensible object; and the members postponed to a future assembly of the same kind, which was to be summoned five years after this period, that pious design of purifying a corrupt church, which had been so long the object of the expectations and desires of all good Christians.

XI. Not merely five years, but almost thirteen, elapsed without the promised meeting. The remonstrances, however, of those whose zeal for the reformation of the church interested them in this event, prevailed at length over the pretexts and stratagems which were employed to put it off from time to time; and Martin summoned a council to meet at Pavia, whence it was removed to Sienna, and thence to Basil. The pontiff did not live to be a witness of the proceedings of this assembly, being carried off by a sudden death on the 21st day of February, 1431, just about the time when the council was to meet. He was immediately succeeded by Gabriel Condolmerio, a native of Venice, and bishop of Sienna, who is known in the papal list by the title of Eugenius IV. This pontiff approved all the measures of his predecessor, in relation to the assembling of the council of Basil, which was accordingly opened on the 23d of July, 1431, under the superintendance of Cardinal Julian Cesarini, who performed the functions of president in the place of Eugenius.

The two grand points, proposed to the deliberation of this famous council, were, the union of the Greek and Latin churches, and the reformation of the church universal, both in its head and in its members, according to the resolution that had been taken in the late council; for that the Roman pontiff, or the head of the church, and the bishops, priests, and monks, who were looked upon as its members, had become excessively corrupt, and that, to use the expression of the prophet in a similar case, the 'whole head was sick and the whole heart faint,' were matters of fact too striking to escape the knowledge of the obscurest individual. On the other hand, as it appeared by the very form of the council,\* by its method of proceeding, and by the first de-

crees that were enacted by its authority, that the assembled fathers were in earnest, and firmly resolved to answer the end and purpose of their meeting, Eugenius was much alarmed at the prospect of a reformation, which he feared above all things; and beholding with terror the zeal and designs of these spiritual physicians, he twice attempted the dissolution of the council. These repeated attempts were vigorously opposed by the members, who proved by the decrees of the late assembly, and by other arguments equally conclusive, that the council was superior in point of authority to the Roman pontiff. This controversy was terminated in November, 1433, by the silence and concessions of the pope, who, in the following month, wrote a letter from Rome, expressing his approbation of the council, and his acknowledgment of its authority.\*

XII. These preliminary measures being finished, the council proceeded with zeal and activity to the accomplishment of the important purposes for which it was assembled. The pope's legates were admitted as members, but not before they had declared, upon oath, that they would submit to the decrees that should be enacted in it, and more particularly that they would adhere to the laws of the council of Constance, in relation to the supremacy of general councils, and the subordination of the pontiffs to their authority and jurisdiction. These very laws, which the popes beheld with such aversion and horror, were solemnly renewed by the assembly in 1434; and in the following year, the *Annates* (as they were called) were publicly abolished, notwithstanding the opposition that was made to this measure by the legates of the Roman see. On the 25th of March, 1436, a confession of faith was read, which every pontiff was to subscribe on the day of his election; it was voted that the number of cardinals should be reduced to twenty-four; and the papal impositions, called *Expectatives*, *Reservations*, and *Provisions*, were annulled. These measures, with others of a like nature, provoked Eugenius

\* The history of this grand and memorable council is yet a desideratum. The learned Stephen Baluze, (as we find in the *Histoire de l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres*, tom. vi. p. 544.) and after him M. L'Enfant, promised the world a history of this council; but neither of these valuable writers performed that promise.\* The acts of this famous assembly were collected with incredible industry, in a great number of volumes, from various archives and libraries, at the expense of Rodolphus Augustus, duke of Brunswick, by the very learned and laborious Herman von der Harde. They are preserved, as we are informed, in the library of Hanover; and they certainly deserve to be drawn from their retreat, and published to the world. In the mean time, the curious may consult the abridgment of the acts of this council, published at Paris, in 1512, of which I have made use in this history, as also the following authors: *Ænæ Sylvi Lib. duo de Concilio Basiliensi.*—Edo. Richerius, *Histor. Concilior. General. lib. iii. cap. 1.*—Henr. Canisii *Lectiones Antiquæ*, tom. iv. p. 447.

† \* By the form of the council, Dr. Mosheim undoubtedly means the division of the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, abbots, &c. into four equal classes, without any regard to the nation or province by which they were sent. This prudent arrangement prevented the cabals and intrigues of the Italians, whose bishops were much more numerous than those of other nations, and who, by their number, might have had it in their power to retard or defeat the laudable purpose which the council had in view, had things been otherwise ordered.

† \* Dr. Mosheim has here fallen into an error; for L'Enfant did in reality perform his promise, and composed the *History of the Council of Basil*, which he blended with his history of the war of the Hussites, on account of the connexion between these subjects, and also because his advanced age prevented his indulging himself in the hope of being able to give, separately, a complete history of the council of Basil.

in the highest degree, and induced him to form the intention, either of removing this troublesome and enterprising council into Italy, or of setting up a new assembly in opposition to it, which might fix bounds to its zeal for the reformation of the church. Accordingly, on the 7th of May, 1437, the assembled fathers having, on account of the Greeks, come to a resolution of holding the new council at Basil, Avignon, or some city in the duchy of Savoy, the intractable pontiff opposed this motion, and maintained that it should be transferred into Italy. Each of the contending parties persevered, with the utmost obstinacy, in the resolution they had taken; and this occasioned a warm and violent contest between the pope and the council. The latter summoned Eugenius to appear at Basil, in order to give an account of his conduct; but the pontiff, instead of complying with the requisition, issued a decree, by which he pretended to dissolve the council, and to assemble another at Ferrara. This decree, indeed, was treated with the utmost contempt by the council, which, with the consent of the emperor, the king of France, and several other princes, continued its deliberations, and pronounced a sentence of contumacy against the rebellious pontiff, for having refused to obey its order.

XIII. In the year 1438, Eugenius in person opened the council, which he had summoned to meet at Ferrara, and at the second session thundered out an excommunication against the fathers assembled at Basil. The principal business that was now to be transacted, was the proposed reconciliation between the Greek and Latin churches; and, in order to bring this salutary and important design to a happy issue, the emperor John Palæologus, the Grecian patriarch Josephus, with the most eminent bishops and doctors among the Greeks, arrived in Italy, and appeared at Ferrara. The extremity to which the Greeks were reduced by the Turks, and the pleasing hope, that their reconciliation with the Roman pontiff would contribute to engage the Latins in their cause, seem to have animated, in a particular manner, their zeal in this negotiation. Be that as it may, there was little done at Ferrara, where matters were carried on too slowly, to afford any prospect of an end of their dissensions: but the negotiations were more successful at Florence, whither Eugenius removed the council about the beginning of the year 1439, on account of the plague that broke out at Ferrara. On the other hand, the council of Basil, exasperated by the imperious proceedings of Eugenius, deposed him from the papacy on the 25th of June, 1439; which vigorous measure was not approved by the European kings and princes. It may be easily conceived what an impression this step made upon the affronted pontiff; he lost all patience; and devoted, for the second time, to hell and damnation, the members of the obnoxious council by a solemn and most severe edict, in which also he declared all their acts null, and all their proceedings unlawful. This new peal of papal thunder was held in derision by the council of Basil, whose members, persisting in their purpose, elected another pontiff, and raised to that high

dignity Amadeus, duke of Savoy, who then lived in the most profound solitude at a charming retreat, called Ripaille, upon the borders of the Lemane Lake, and who is known in the papal list by the name of Felix V.

XIV. This election was the occasion of the revival of that deplorable schism, which had formerly rent the church, and which had been terminated with so much difficulty, and after so many vain and fruitless efforts, at the council of Constance. The new breach was even more lamentable than the former one, as the flame was kindled not only between rival pontiffs, but also between the contending councils of Basil and Florence. The greatest part of the church submitted to the jurisdiction, and adopted the cause of Eugenius; while Felix was acknowledged, as lawful pontiff, by a great number of universities, and, among others, by that of Paris, as also in several kingdoms and provinces. The council of Basil continued to deliberate, to enact laws, and publish edicts, until the year 1443, notwithstanding the efforts of Eugenius and his adherents to put a stop to their proceedings. And, though in that year the members of the council retired to their respective places of abode, yet they declared publicly that the council was not dissolved.

In the mean time, the council of Florence, with Eugenius at its head, was chiefly employed in reconciling the differences between the Greeks and Latins; which weighty business was committed to the prudence, zeal, and piety, of a select number of eminent men on both sides. The most distinguished among those whom the Greeks chose for this purpose was the learned Bessarion, who was afterwards raised to the dignity of cardinal in the Romish church. This great man, engaged and seduced by the splendid presents and promises of the Latin pontiff, employed the whole extent of his authority, and the power of his eloquence, and even had recourse to promises and threats, to persuade the Greeks to accept the conditions of peace that were proposed by Eugenius. These conditions required their consent to the following points:—"That the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son, as well as from the Father; that departed souls were purified in the infernal regions, by a certain kind of fire, before their admission to the presence and vision of the Deity;—that unleavened bread might be used in the administration of the Lord's supper;—and lastly, which was the principal thing insisted upon by the Latins, that 'the Roman pontiff was the supreme judge, the true head of the universal church.' Such were the terms of peace to which all the Greeks were obliged to accede, except Mark of Ephesus, whom neither entreaties nor rewards could move from his purpose, or engage to submit to a reconciliation founded upon such conditions. And indeed this reconciliation, which had been brought about by various stratagems, was much more specious than solid, and had by no means stability sufficient to insure its duration. We find, accordingly, that the Grecian deputies had no sooner returned to Constantinople, than they declared publicly, that all things had been carried on

at Florence by artifice and fraud, and renewed the schism, which had been so imperfectly healed. The council put an end to its deliberations on the 26th of April, 1442,\* without having executed any of the designs that were proposed by it, in a satisfactory manner; for, beside the affair of the Greeks, they proposed bringing the Armenians, Jacobites, and more particularly the Abyssinians, into the bosom of the Romish church; but this project was attended with as little success as the other.

XV. Eugenius IV., who had been the occasion of the new schism in the see of Rome, died in February, 1447, and was succeeded, in a few weeks, by Thomas de Sarzano, bishop of Bologna, who filled the pontificate under the denomination of Nicolas V. This eminent prelate had, in point of merit, the best pretensions possible to the papal throne. He was distinguished by his erudition and genius; he was a zealous patron and protector of learned men; and, what was still more laudable, he was remarkable for his moderation, and for the meek and pacific spirit that discovered itself in all his conduct and actions. Under this pontificate, the European princes, and more especially the king of France, exerted their warmest endeavours to restore tranquillity and union to the Latin church; and their efforts were crowned with the desired success. For, in 1449, Felix V., resigned the papal chair, and returned to his delightful hermitage at Ripaille, while the fathers of the Council of Basil, assembled at Lausanne,† ratified his voluntary abdication, and, by a solemn decree, ordered the universal church to submit to the jurisdiction of Nicolas as their lawful pontiff. On the other hand, Nicolas proclaimed this treaty of peace with great pomp on the 18th of June, in the same year, and set the seal of his approbation and authority to the acts and decrees of the council. This pontiff distinguished himself in a very extraordinary manner, by his love of learning, and by his ardent zeal for the propagation of the liberal arts and sciences, which he promoted, with great success, by the encouragement he granted to the learned Greeks, who emigrated from Constantinople into Italy.‡ The principal occasion of his death was the fatal revolution that threw this capital of the Grecian empire into the hands of the Turks; this melancholy event

preyed upon his spirits, and hastened his death, which happened on the 24th of March, 1455.

XVI. His successor Alphonso Borgia, who was a native of Spain, and is known in the papal list by the denomination of Calixtus III., was remarkable for nothing but his zeal in animating the Christian princes to make war upon the Turks; his reign also was short, for he died in 1458. Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who succeeded him in the pontificate at that same year, under the title of Pius II., rendered his name much more illustrious, not only by his extensive genius, and the important transactions that were carried on during his administration, but also by the various and useful productions with which he enriched the republic of letters. The lustre of his fame was, indeed, tarnished by a scandalous proof which he gave of his fickleness and inconstancy, or rather perhaps of his bad faith; for, after having vigorously defended, against the pontiffs, the dignity and prerogatives of general councils, and maintained, with peculiar boldness and obstinacy, the cause of the council of Basil against Eugenius IV., he ignominiously renounced these principles upon his accession to the pontificate, and acted in direct opposition to them during the whole course of his administration. Thus, in 1460, he denied publicly that the pope was subordinate to a general council, and even prohibited all appeals to such a council under the severest penalties. In the following year he obtained from Louis XI., king of France, the abrogation of the *Pragmatic Sanction*, which favoured, in a particular manner, the pretensions of the general councils to supremacy in the church.\* But the most egre-

¶ \* There was a famous edict, entitled, *The Pragmatic Sanction*, issued by Louis IX., who, though he is honoured with a place in the Calendar, was yet a zealous assertor of the liberty and privileges of the Gallican church, against the despotic encroachments and pretensions of the Roman pontiffs. It was against their tyrannical proceedings, and intolerable extortions, that this edict was chiefly levelled; and though some creatures of the court of Rome have thrown out insinuations of its being a spurious production, yet the contrary is evident from its having been registered, as the authentic edict of that pious monarch, by the parliament of Paris, in 1461, by the states of the kingdom assembled at Tours in 1483, and by the university of Paris, in 1491.—See, for a farther account of this edict, the excellent History of France, (begun by the Abbe Velly, and continued by M. Villaret.) vol. vi. p. 57.

The edict which Dr. Mosheim has in view here, is the *Pragmatic Sanction* that was drawn up at Bourges, in 1438, by Charles VII. king of France, with the consent of the most eminent prelates and grandees of the nation, who were assembled at that place. This edict, (which was absolutely necessary in order to deliver the French clergy from the vexations they suffered from the encroachments of the popes, ever since the latter had fixed their residence at Avignon) consisted of twenty-three articles, in which, among other salutary regulations, the elections to vacant benefices were restored to their ancient purity and freedom,\* the *annates* and other pecuniary preten-

\* The history of this council, and of the frauds and stratagems that were practised in it, was composed by that learned Grecian, Sylvester Szyropulus, whose work was published at the Hague, in 1660, with a Latin translation, a preliminary Discourse, and ample notes, by the learned Robert Creighton, a native of Great Britain. This history was refuted by Leo Allatius, in a work entitled, *Excitationes in Creightoni Apparatum, Versionem, et Notas ad Historiam Concilii Florentini scriptam a Szyropulo, Rome, 1674.* See the same author's *Perpetua Consensio Ecclesie Oriental. et Occident.* p. 875, as also Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, tom. i. p. 213.—Spanheim, de *perpetua Dissensione Eccles. Orient. et Occident.* tom. ii. op. p. 491.—Hermann, *Historia concertat. de Pane azymo*, part ii. c. v.

† This abdication was made on the 9th of April, 1449, and was ratified on the 16th.

‡ See Dom. Georgii Vita Nicolai V. ad fidem veterum Monumentorum; to which is added a treatise, entitled, *Disquisitio de Nicolai V. erga Lateras et Lateranos Viros Patrocinio*, published at Rome, in 742.

¶ \* That is to say, these elections were wrested out of the hands of the popes, who had usurped them; and, by the new edict, every church had the privilege of choosing its bishop, and every monastery its abbot or prior. By the Concordat, or agreement, between Francis I. and Leo X., (which was substituted in the place of the Pragmatic Sanction) the nomination of the bishops in France, and the collation of certain benefices of the higher class, were vested in the kings of France. An ample and satisfactory



gious instance of impudence and perfidy that he exhibited to the world was in 1463, when he publicly retracted all that he had written in favour of the council of Basil, and declared without either shame or hesitation, that, as Æneas Sylvius, he was a damnable heretic, but that, as Pius II., he was an orthodox pontiff. This indecorous declaration was the last circumstance, worthy of notice, that happened during his pontificate; for he died in July, 1464.\*

XVII. Paul II., a Venetian by birth, whose name was Peter Barbo, was raised to the head of the church in 1464, and died in 1471. His administration was distinguished by some measures, which, if we consider the genius of the times, were worthy of praise; though it must at the same time be confessed, that he did many things which were evidently inexcusable, (not to mention his reducing the jubilee circle to twenty-five years, and thus accelerating the return of that most absurd and superstitious ceremony;) so that his reputation became at least dubious in aftertimes, and was viewed in different lights by different persons.† The following popes, Sixtus IV., and Innocent VIII., whose names were Francis Albescola and John Baptist Cibo, were neither remarkable for their virtues nor their vices. The former died in 1484, and the latter in 1492. Filled with the most terrible apprehensions of the danger that threatened Europe in general, and Italy in particular, from the growing power of the Turks, both these pontiffs attempted to put themselves

sions and encroachments of the pontiffs abolished, and the authority of a general council declared superior to that of the pope. This edict was drawn up in concert with the fathers of the council of Basil, and the articles were taken from the decrees of that council, though they were admitted by the Gallican church with certain modifications, which the nature of the times and the manners of the nation rendered expedient. Such then was the Pragmatic Sanction, which Pius II. engaged Louis XI. (who received upon that occasion, for himself and his successors, the title of *Most Christian*) to abolish by a solemn declaration; the full execution of which was, however, prevented by the noble stand made by the university of Paris in favour of the edict. The king also, perceiving that he had been deluded into this declaration by the treacherous insinuations of Geoffry, bishop of Arras, (whom the pope had bribed with a cardinal's cap, and large promises of a more lucrative kind,) took no sort of pains to have it executed, but published, on the contrary, new edicts against the pecuniary pretensions and extortions of the court of Rome; so that in reality the Pragmatic Sanction was not abolished before the adjustment of the Concordat or agreement, which was transacted between Francis I. and Leo X. in 1517, and was forced upon the French nation in opposition to the united efforts of the clergy, the university, the parliament, and the people. See, for a farther account of this matter, Du Clos, *Histoire de Louis XI.* vol. i. p. 115—132.

\* Beside the writers of ecclesiastical history, see *Newaveau Diction. Histor. et Critique*, tom. ii. at the article *Eneæ Sylvius*.

† Paul II. has had the good fortune to find, in one of the most eminent and learned men of this age, (the famous cardinal Quirini,) a zealous apologist. See, among the productions of that illustrious prelate, the piece entitled, "*Pauli II. Vita, ex Codice Anglicæ Bibliothecæ desumpta, præmissis ipsius Vindicis adversus Platinam aliosque obtractatores*, Romæ, 1740."

account of this convention may be seen in bishop Burnet's excellent *History of the Reformation*, vol. iii. and in a book entitled, *Histoire du Droit public Ecclesiastique François*, published in 1737.

in a posture of defence, and warmly exhorted the European princes to check the progress of that warlike people; but many obstacles arose, which rendered their exhortations ineffectual. The other undertakings that were projected or carried on, during their continuance at the head of the church, are not of sufficient importance to require particular notice.

XVIII. In the series of pontiffs that ruled the church during this century, the last, in order of time, was Alexander VI., a Spaniard by birth, whose name was Roderic Borgia. The life and actions of this man show, that there was a Nero among the popes, as well as among the emperors. The crimes and enormities, that history has imputed to this papal Nero, evidently prove him to have been not only destitute of all religious and virtuous principles, but even regardless of decency, and hardened against the very feeling of shame; and, though the malignity of his enemies may have forged false accusations against him, and, in some instances, exaggerated the horror of his real crimes, yet we have upon record an authentic list of undoubted facts, which, both by their number and their atrocity, are sufficient to render the name and memory of Alexander VI. odious and detestable, in the opinion even of such as have the smallest tincture of virtuous principles and feelings. An inordinate affection for his children was the principal source from which proceeded a great part of the crimes he committed. He had four sons by a concubine with whom he had lived many years; among whom was the infamous Cæsar Borgia. A daughter, named Lucretia, was likewise among the fruits of this unlawful commerce. The tenderness of the pontiff for his spurious offspring was excessive beyond all expression; his only aim was to load them with riches and honours; and, in the execution of this purpose, he trampled with contempt upon every obstacle, which the demands of justice, the dictates of reason, and the remonstrances of religion, threw in his way.\* Thus he persisted in his profligate career until the year 1503, when the poison, which he and his son Cæsar had mingled for others who stood in the way of their avarice and ambition, cut short, by a happy mistake, his own days.†

XIX. The monastic societies, as we learn from a multitude of authentic records, and from the testimonies of the best writers, were, at this time, so many herds of lazy, illiterate, profligate, and licentious Epicureans, whose views in life were confined to opulence, idleness, and pleasure. The rich monks, particularly those of the Benedictine and Augustinian orders, perverted their revenues to the gratification of their lusts; and renouncing, in their conduct, all regard to their respective rules of discipline, drew upon themselves great

\* The life of this execrable tyrant was written in English by Mr. Alexander Gordon; but the same subject has been treated with greater moderation by the ingenious and learned author of the *Histoire du Droit Publ. Eccles. François*, to which work are subjoined the lives of Alexander VI. and Leo X.

† Such is the account which the best historians have given of the death of Alexander VI. Notwithstanding these authorities, Voltaire has pretended to prove that this pontiff died a natural death.

popular odium by their sensuality and licentiousness.\* This was matter of affliction to many wise and good men, especially in France and Germany, who formed the pious design of stemming the torrent of monkish luxury, and excited a spirit of reformation among that degenerate order.† Among the German reformers, who undertook the restoration of virtue and temperance in the monasteries, Nicolas de Mazon, an Austrian abbot, and Nicolas Dunkelshuhl, professor at Vienna, held the first rank. They attempted, with unparalleled zeal and assiduity, the reformation of the Benedictines throughout Germany, and succeeded so far as to restore, at least, a certain air of decency and virtue in the conventual establishments of Suabia, Franconia, and Bavaria.‡ The reformation of the same order was attempted in France by many, and particularly by Guy Juvenal, a learned man, whose writings, upon that and on other subjects, were received with applause.§ It is, however, certain, that the majority of the monks, both in France and elsewhere, resisted, with obstinacy, the salutary attempts of these spiritual physicians, and returned their zeal with the worst treatment that it was possible to show them.

XX. While the opulent monks exhibited to the world scandalous examples of luxury, ignorance, indolence, and licentiousness, accompanied with a barbarous aversion to every thing that carried the remotest aspect of science, the Mendicants, and more especially the Dominicans and Franciscans, were chargeable with irregularities of another kind. Beside their arrogance, which was excessive, a quarrelsome and litigious spirit, an ambitious desire of encroaching upon the rights and privileges of others, an insatiable zeal for the propagation of superstition, and the itch of disputing and of starting absurd and intricate questions of a religious kind, prevailed among them, and drew upon them justly the displeasure and indignation of many. It was this wrangling spirit that seriously protracted the controversies which had subsisted so long between them and the bishops, and, indeed, the whole sacerdotal order; and it was their vain curiosity, and their inordinate passion for novelty, that made the divines, in the greatest part of the European colleges, complain of the dangerous and destructive errors which they had introduced into religion. These complaints were repeated, without interruption, in all the provinces where the Mendicants had any credit; and the same complaints were often presented to the court of Rome, where they exercised sufficiently both the patience and subtlety of the pope and his ministers. The different pontiffs who ruled the church during this century, were differently affected toward the Mendicants; some

patronised them, others opposed them: and this circumstance frequently changed the aspect of affairs, and, for a long time, rendered the decision of the contest dubious.\* The persecution that was carried on against the Beguins became also an occasion of increasing the odium that had been cast upon the begging monks, and was extremely prejudicial to their interests. For the Beguins and Lollards, to escape the fury of their inveterate enemies, the bishops and others, frequently took refuge in the third order of the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians, hoping that, in the patronage and protection of these numerous and powerful societies, they might find a secure retreat from the calamities that oppressed them. Nor were their hopes entirely disappointed; but the storm that hitherto pursued them, fell upon their new patrons and protectors, the Mendicants; who, by affording a refuge to a sect so odious to the clergy, drew upon themselves the indignation of that sacred order, and were thereby involved in various difficulties and perplexities.†

XXI. The more austere and rebellious Franciscans, who, separating themselves from the church, renounced their allegiance to the Roman pontiffs, and were distinguished by the appellation of Fratricelli or Minorites, continued, with their Tertiaries, the Beghards, to carry on an open war against the court of Rome. Their head-quarters were in Italy, in the marquise of Ancona and the neighbouring countries; for it was there that their leader and chief ruler resided. They were persecuted, about the middle of this century, with the greatest severity, by pope Nicolas V., who employed every method he could devise to vanquish their obstinacy, sending for that purpose successively against them the Franciscan monks, armed hosts, and civil magistrates, and committing to the flames many of those who remained unmoved by all these means of conversion.‡ This heavy persecution was carried on by the succeeding pontiffs, and by none with greater bitterness and vehemence than by Paul II., though it is said, that this pope chose rather to conquer the headstrong and stubborn perseverance of this sect by imprisonment and exile, than by fire and sword.§ The Fratricelli, on the other hand, animated by the protection of several persons of great influence, who became their patrons on account of the striking appearance of sanctity which they exhibited, had recourse to violence, and went so far as to put to death some of the inquisitors, among whom Angelo of Camaldoli fell a victim to their vengeance.||

\* See Launoy, *Lib. de Canone Utriusque Sexus*, op. tom. i. part. i.—Boulay, tom. v.—Ant. Wood, tom. i.

† See the history of the preceding century.

‡ Mauritius Sartius, *de Antiqua Picentium civitate Cupromontana*, in *Angeli Calogeræ Raccolta di Opuscoli Scientifici*, tom. xxxix. where we have several extracts from the manuscript dialogue of Jacobus de Marchia against the Fratricelli.

§ Ang. Mar. Quirini *Vita Pauli II.* p. 78.—Jo. Targionius, *Præf. ad claror. Venetor. Epistolæ ad Mag. liabehelium*, tom. i. p. 43, where we have an account of the books that were written against the Fratricelli by Nicolas Palmerius and others under the pontificate of Paul II. and which are yet in manuscript.

|| See the *Acta Sanctor.* tom. ii. Maii. p. 356.

\* See Martin Senging, *Tuitions Ordinis S. Benedicti*, seu *Oratio in Concilio Basiliensi*, an. 1433, *contra vitia Benedict. recitata*, in Bern. Pezzi *Bib. Ascetica*, t. viii.

† See Leibnitz *Præf. ad t. ii. Script. Brun.*

‡ For an account of these reformers, see Martin Kropf, *Bibliotheca Mellicensis, seu de Vitis et Scrip. Benedict. Mellicens.* p. 143, 163, 203.

§ See Liron's *Singularites Historiques et Littéraires*, tom. iii. p. 49.

Nor were the commotions raised by this troublesome sect confined to Italy; other countries felt the effects of their petulant zeal; and Bohemia and Silesia (where they preached with warmth their favourite doctrine, "that the true imitation of Christ consisted in beggary and extreme poverty") became the theatres of the spiritual war.\* The king of Bohemia was well affected to these fanatics, granted them his protection, and was on that account excommunicated by Paul II.† In France, their affairs were far from being prosperous; such of them as fell into the hands of the inquisitors, were committed to the flames,‡ and they were eagerly searched after in the province of Toulouse and the adjacent countries, where great numbers of them lay concealed, and endeavoured to escape the vigilance of their enemies; while several of their scattered parties removed to England and Ireland.§ Even the dreadful series of calamities and persecutions that harassed this miserable sect did not entirely extinguish it; for it subsisted to the time of the reformation in Germany, when its remaining votaries adopted the cause, and embraced the doctrines and discipline of Luther.

XXII. Of the religious fraternities that were founded in this century, not one deserves a more honourable mention than the Brethren and Clerks of the common life, (as they called themselves,) who lived under the rule of St. Augustine, and were eminently useful in promoting the cause of religion, learning, and virtue. This society had been formed in the preceding age by Gerard Groote, a native of Deventer,¶ remarkable for his fervent piety and extensive erudition; it was not, however, before the present century, that it received a proper degree of consistence, and, having obtained the approbation of the council of Constance, flourished in Holland, the Lower Germany, and the adjacent provinces. It was divided into two classes, the Lettered Brethren or Clerks, and the Illiterate, who, though they occupied separate habitations, lived in the firmest bonds of fraternal union. The Clerks applied themselves with exemplary zeal and assiduity to the study of polite literature, and to the education of youth. They composed learned works for the instruction of their contemporaries, and erected schools and seminaries of learning wherever they went. The Illiterate Brethren, on the other hand, were employed in manual labour, and exercised with success the mechanic arts. No religious vows restrained the members of either class; yet they had all things in common, and this community was the great bond of their union. The Sisters of this virtuous society lived much in the same manner, and employed the hours,

that were not consecrated to prayer and reading, in the education of young females, and in branches of industry suitable to their sex. The schools, that were erected by the clerks of this fraternity, acquired a great and illustrious reputation in this century. From them issued those immortal restorers of learning and taste which gave a new face to the republic of letters in Germany and Holland, such as Erasmus of Rotterdam, Alexander Hegius, John Murnelius, and several others.\* But the institution of the order of Jesuits seemed to diminish the credit of these excellent schools, which, from that period, began to decline. It ought to be added, that the Brethren of the common life, however encouraged by the public, were exposed to the insults and opposition of the clergy and monks, who had a strong aversion to every thing that bore the remotest aspect of learning or taste.†

XXIII. Of the Greeks, who acquired fame by their learned productions, the most eminent were,

Simeon of Thessalonica, the author of several treatises, and, among others, of a book against the heresies that had troubled the church; to which we may add his writings against the Latins, which are yet extant;‡

Josephus Bryennius, who wrote a book concerning the Trinity, and another against the Latins;§

Macarius Maeres, whose animosity against the Latins was carried to the greatest height;||

George Phranza, whose historical talent makes a figure in the compilation of the Byzantine historians;¶

Marcus Ephesius, who was an obstinate enemy to the council of Florence;§§

Cardinal Bessarion, the illustrious protector and supporter of the Platonic school, a man of unparalleled genius and erudition; but much hated by the Greeks, because he seemed to lean to the party of the Latins, and proposed an union of the two nations to the prejudice of the former;|||

George Scholarius, otherwise called Gennadius, who wrote against the Latins, especially

\* Accounts of this order have been given by Aub Miraus, in his *Chronicon*, ad an. 1381, and by Holyot in his *Histoire des Ordres*, tom. iii. But, in that which I have here given, there are some circumstances taken from ancient records not yet published. † I have in my possession several manuscripts, which furnish materials for a much more clear and circumstantial account of the institution and progress of this order, than can be derived from the books that have hitherto appeared on that subject.

‡ We read frequently, in the records of this century, of schools erected by the Lollards, and some times by the Beghards, at Deventer, Brunswick Koningsberg, and Munster, and many other places. Now these Lollards were the clerks of the common life, who, on account of their virtue, industry, and learning, which rendered them very useful in the education of youth, were invited by the magistrates of several cities to reside among them.

§ Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* vol. xiv. p. 49.—Rich. Simon, *Critique de la Bibliothèque Eccles.* par M. Du Pin, tom. i. p. 400.

§§ Rich. Simon, tom. i. p. 431.

|| For an account of Bessarion and the other learned men here mentioned, see *Dornarius* and *Holy*, in their histories of the restoration of letters in Italy, by the Greeks who took refuge there, after the taking of Constantinople; add to these the *Bibliotheca Græca* of Fabricius.

\* Jo. Georgii Schellhornii *Acta Historica Eccles.* part. i.

† Quirini *Vita Pauli* H. p. 73.

‡ I have in manuscript the acts or decrees of the inquisition against John Gualdini de Castellione and Francis d'Archata, both of them Fraticelli, who were burned in France, in 1151.

§ Wood's *Antiq. Oxoniens.* tom. i. p. 232.

¶ The life of this famous Dutchman, Gerard Groote, was written by Thomas a Kempis, and is to be found in his works. It stands at the head of the lives of eleven of his contemporaries, composed by this eminent writer.

against the council of Florence, with greater learning, candour, and perspicuity, than the rest of his countrymen displayed;\*

George Gemistus Pletho, a man of eminent learning, who excited many of the Italians to the study, not only of the Platonic philosophy in particular, but of Grecian literature in general;

George of Trapesond, who translated several of the most eminent Grecian authors into Latin, and supported the cause of the Latins against the Greeks by his dexterous and eloquent pen;

George Codinus, of whom we have yet remaining several productions relating to the Byzantine history.

XXIV. The tribe of Latin writers that adorned or dishonoured this century, cannot easily be numbered. We shall therefore confine ourselves to the enumeration of those who wrote upon theological points; and even of these we shall only mention the most eminent. At their head we may justly place John Gerson, chancellor of the university of Paris, the most illustrious ornament that this age could boast of, a man of the greatest influence and authority, whom the council of Constance looked upon as its oracle, the lovers of liberty as their patron, and whose memory is yet precious to such among the French, as are zealous for the maintenance of their privileges against papal despotism.† This excellent man published a considerable number of treatises that were admirably adapted to reform the corruptions of a superstitious worship, to excite a spirit of genuine piety, and to heal the wounds of a divided church; though, in some respects, he does not seem to have thoroughly understood the demands and injunctions of the Gospel. The most eminent among the other theological writers were,

Nicolas de Clemangis, a man of uncommon candour and integrity, who, in the most eloquent and affecting strains, lamented the calamities of the times and the unhappy state of the Christian church;‡

Alphonsus Tostatus, bishop of Avila, who loaded the Scriptures with unwieldy and voluminous commentaries, and also composed other works, in which there is a great mixture of good and bad;

Ambrose of Camaldoli, who acquired a high degree of reputation by his profound knowledge of the Greek language, and his uncommon acquaintance with Grecian literature, as also by the zeal and industry he discovered in his attempts to effectuate a reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins;

Nicolas de Cusa, a man of vast erudition, and no mean genius, though not famed for the

\* Rich. Simon, *Croyance de l'Eglise Orientale sur la Transubstantiation*, p. 87.

† See Du Pin's *Gersoniana*, prefixed to the edition of the works of Gerson, which we owe to that laborious author, and which appeared at Amwerp in five volumes folio, in 1706. See also Jo. Launoii *Historia Gymnasii Regii Navarreni*, *part. ii. lib. ii. cap. i. p. 514*, *tom. iv. p. i. op.*—Herm. von der Hardt, *Acta Concilii Constant.* *tom. i. part. iv.*

‡ See Launoii *Hist. tom. iii. lib. u. cap. iii.*—Lon gueval, *Hist. de l'Eglise Gallicane*, *tom. xiv. p. 436.*—The works of Clemangis were published by Lydus at Leyden, with a glossary, in 1631.

solidity of his judgment, as may appear from a work of his, entitled, "Conjectures concerning the last Day;"\*

John Nieder, whose writings are very proper to give us an accurate notion of the manners and spirit of the age in which he lived, and whose journeys and transactions have rendered him famous;

John Capistran, who was in high esteem at the court of Rome on account of the ardour and vehemence with which he defended the jurisdiction and majesty of the pontiffs against all their enemies and opposers;‡

John Wesselus and Jerome Savanarola, who may justly be placed among the wisest and worthiest men of this age. The former, who was a native of Groningen, and on account of his extraordinary penetration and sagacity was called the Light of the World, propagated several of those doctrines, which Luther afterwards inculcated with greater evidence and energy, and animadverted with freedom and candour upon the corruptions of the Romish church.‡ The latter was a Dominican and a native of Ferrara, remarkable for piety, eloquence, and learning; who touched the sores of the church with a heavier hand, and inveighed against the pontiffs with greater severity. For this freedom he severely suffered. He was committed to the flames at Florence in 1498, and bore his fate with the most triumphant fortitude and serenity of mind;§

Alphonsus Spina, who wrote a book against the Jews and Saracens, which he called *Fortalium Fidei*.

To all these we must join the whole tribe of the scholastic writers, whose chief ornaments were, John Capreolus, John de Turrecremata, Antoninus of Florence, Dionysius à Ryckel, Henry Goreomius, Gabriel Biel, Stephen Brulifer, and others. The most remarkable among the Mystics were, Vincent Ferrerius, Henry Harphius, Laurence Justinianus, Bernardine of Sienna, and Thomas à Kempis, who shone among these with a superior lustre, and to whom the famous book, concerning the imitation of Christ, is commonly attributed.¶

### CHAPTER III.

*Concerning the State of Religion, and the Doctrine of the Church, during this Century.*

I. THE state of religion had become so corrupt among the Latins, that it was utterly des-

\* Bayle, *Reponse aux Questions d'un Provincial*, *tom. ii. cap. cxvii.*

† L'Enfant's *Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites*, *tom. ii. Wadding, Annales Minorum*, *tom. ix.*

‡ Jo. Henr. Mau *Vita Reuchlini*, p. 156.

§ Jo. Franc. Buddei *Parerga Historico-Theologica*. The life of Savanarola was written by J. Francis Picens, and published at Paris, with various annotations, letters, and original pieces, by Quetif, in 1674. The same editor published also the *Spiritual and Ascetic Epistles of Savanarola*, translated from the Italian into Latin. See *Etchard, Scriptor. Prædicator.* *tom. i. p. 884.*

¶ The late abbe Lenglet du Fresnoy promised the world a demonstration that this work, whose true author has been so much disputed among the learned, was originally written in French by a person named Gersen, or Gerson, and only translated into Latin by Thomas à Kempis. See *Granelius in Lau-noianis*, *part. ii. tom. iv. part. ii. op. p. 414.* The history of this celebrated production is given by Vin

tute of any thing that could attract the esteem of the truly virtuous and judicious part of mankind. This is a fact, which even those individuals whose prejudices render them unwilling to acknowledge it, will never presume to deny. Among the Greeks and Orientals, religion had scarcely a better aspect than among the Latins; at least, if the difference was in their favour, it was far from being considerable. The worship of the Deity consisted in a round of frivolous and insipid ceremonies. The discourses of those who instructed the people in public, were not only destitute of sense, judgment, and spirit, but even of piety and devotion, and were in reality nothing more than a motley mixture of the grossest fictions and the most extravagant inventions. The reputation of Christian knowledge and piety was easily acquired; it was lavished upon those who professed a profound veneration for the sacred order, and their spiritual head the Roman pontiff, who studied to render the saints (*i. e.* the clergy, their ministers) propitious by frequent and rich donations, who were exact and regular in the observance of the stated ceremonies of the church, and who had wealth enough to pay the fines which the papal quæstors had annexed to the commission of all the different degrees of transgression; or, in other words, to purchase indulgences. Such were the ingredients of ordinary piety; but persons who added to these a certain degree of austerity and bodily mortification were placed in the highest order of worthies, and considered as the peculiar favourites of Heaven. On the other hand, the number of those who were studious to acquire a just notion of religion, to investigate the true sense of the sacred writings, and to model their lives and manners after the precepts and example of the divine Saviour, was extremely small; and such had much difficulty in escaping the flames, at a time when virtue and sense were deemed heretical.

II. This miserable state of affairs, this enormous perversion of religion and morality, throughout almost all the western provinces, were observed and deplored by many wise and good men, who all endeavoured, though in different ways, to stem the torrent of superstition, and to reform a corrupt church. In England and Scotland, the disciples of Wickliffe, whom the multitude had stigmatized with the odious title of Lollards, continued to inveigh against the despotic laws of the pontiffs, and the licentious manners of the clergy.\* The Waldenses, though persecuted and oppressed on all sides, raised their voices even in the remote valleys and lurking-places whither they were driven by the violence of their enemies, and called aloud for succour to the expiring cause of religion and virtue. Even in Italy, many, and among others the famous Savanarola, had the courage to declare, that Rome was become the image of Babylon; and this notion was soon adopted by multitudes of all ranks and conditions. But the greatest part of the clergy

and monks, persuaded that their honours, influence, and riches, would diminish in proportion to the increase of knowledge among the people, and would receive inexpressible detriment from the downfall of superstition, vigorously opposed every thing that had the remotest aspect of a reformation, and imposed silence upon these importunate censors by the formidable authority of fire and sword.

III. The religious dissensions that had been excited in Bohemia by the ministry of John Huss and his disciple Jacobellus de Misa, were doubly inflamed by the deplorable fate of Huss and Jerome of Prague, and broke out into an open war, which was carried on with unparalleled barbarity. The followers of Huss, who pleaded for the administration of the cup to the laity in the holy sacrament, being persecuted and oppressed in various ways by the emissaries and ministers of the court of Rome, retired to a steep and high mountain in the district of Bechim, in which they held their religious meetings, and administered the sacrament of the Lord's supper under both kinds. This mountain they called Tabor, from the tents which they at first created there for their habitation; and in process of time they raised a considerable fortification for its defence, and adorned it with a well-built and regular city. Forming more grand and important projects, they chose for their chiefs Nicolas of Hussinetz, and the famous John Ziska, a Bohemian knight, a man of the most untaught courage and resolution; and proposed, under the standards of these violent leaders, to revenge the death of Huss and Jerome upon the creatures of the Roman pontiff, and obtain a liberty of worshipping God in a more rational manner than that which was prescribed by the church of Rome. After the death of Nicolas, which happened in 1420, Ziska commanded alone this warlike body, and had the satisfaction to see his army daily increase. During the first tumults of this war, which were no more than a prelude to calamities of a much more dreadful kind, Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia, resigned his breath in the year 1419.†

IV. The emperor Sigismund, who succeeded him on the throne of Bohemia, employed not only edicts and remonstrances, but also the terror of penal laws and the force of arms, to put an end to these lamentable divisions; and great numbers of the Hussites perished, by his orders, in the most barbarous manner. The Bohemians, irritated by these inhuman proceedings, threw off his despotic yoke in 1420, and, with Ziska at their head, made war against their sovereign. This famous leader, though deprived of his sight, discovered, in every step he took, such an admirable mixture of prudence and intrepidity, that his name became a terror to his enemies. Upon his death, which happened in 1424, the majority of the Hus-

centius Thurlerius, in the Opera Posthuma Mabilon et Reinarti, tom. iii. p. 54.

\* See Wilkins, Conclia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ tom. iv.—Wood, Antiq. Oxon. tom. i.

† \* This prince had no sooner begun to execute the decrees of the council of Constance against the Hussites, than the inhabitants of Prague took fire at the proceeding, raised a tumult, murdered the magistrates who published the order, and committed other outrages, which filled the court of Wenceslaus with consternation, and so affected that pusillanimous monarch, that he was seized with an apoplexy, of which he died in a few days.

sites chose for their general Procopius Raza, a man also of undaunted courage and resolution, who maintained their cause, and carried on the war with spirit and success. The acts of barbarity, committed on both sides, were shocking and terrible beyond expression; for, notwithstanding the irreconcilable opposition that existed between the religious sentiments of the contending parties, both agreed in this one horrible point, that it was innocent and lawful to persecute and extirpate with fire and sword the enemies of the true religion; and such they appeared to be in each other's eyes. The Bohemians maintained, that Huss had been unjustly put to death at Constance, and consequently revenged, with the utmost fury, the injury which he had suffered. They acknowledged it, nevertheless, as an incontestable principle, that heretics deserved capital punishment; but they denied obstinately that Huss was a heretic. This pernicious maxim, then, was the source of that cruelty which disgraced both parties in this dreadful war; and it is, perhaps, difficult to determine, which of the two carried this cruelty to the greatest height.

V. All those who undertook to avenge the death of the Bohemian martyr, set out upon the same principles; and, at the commencement of the war, they seemed to agree both in their religious sentiments, and in their demands upon the church and government from which they had withdrawn themselves. But, as their numbers increased, their union diminished; and their army being prodigiously augmented by a confluence of strangers from all quarters, a great dissension arose among them, which, in 1420, came to an open rupture, and divided this multitude into two great factions, which were distinguished by the titles of Calixtines and Taborites. The former, who were so called from their insisting upon the use of the chalice, or cup, in the celebration of the eucharist, were mild in their proceedings, and modest in their demands, and showed no disposition to overturn the ancient system of church government, or to make any considerable changes in the religion which was publicly received. All that they required, may be comprehended under the four articles which follow. They demanded, first, that the word of God should be explained to the people in a plain and perspicuous manner, without the mixture of superstitious comments or inventions; secondly, that the sacrament of the Lord's supper should be administered in both kinds; thirdly, that the clergy, instead of employing all their attention and zeal in the acquisition of riches and power, should turn their thoughts to objects more suitable to their profession, and be ambitious of living and acting as became the successors of the holy apostles; and, fourthly, that transgressions of a more heinous kind, or mortal sins, should be punished in a manner suitable to their enormity. In this great faction, however, there were some subordinate sects, who were divided upon several points. The administration of the Lord's supper was one occasion of dispute; Jacobellus de Misa, who had first proposed the celebration of that ordinance under both kinds, was of opinion, that infants had a right to par-

take of it, and this opinion was adopted by many; while others maintained the contrary doctrine, and confined the privilege in question to persons of riper years.\*

VI. The demands of the Taborites, who derived their name from a mountain well known in sacred history, were much more ample. They not only insisted upon reducing the religion of Jesus to its primitive simplicity, but required also, that the system of ecclesiastical government should be reformed in the same manner, the authority of the pope destroyed, the form of divine worship changed: they demanded, in a word, the erection of a new church, a new hierarchy, in which Christ alone should reign, and all things should be carried on by a divine impulse. In maintaining these extravagant demands, the principal doctors of this sect, (such as Martin Loquis, a Moravian, and his followers) went so far as to flatter themselves with the chimerical notion, that Christ would descend upon earth, armed with fire and sword, to extirpate heresy, and purify the church from its multiplied corruptions. These fantastical dreams they propagated in different countries, and taught them even in a public manner with unparalleled confidence and presumption. It is this enthusiastic class of the Hussites alone, that we are to look upon as accountable for all those abominable acts of violence, rapine, desolation, and murder, which are too indiscriminately laid to the charge of the Hussites in general, and of their two leaders Ziska and Procopius in particular.† It must indeed be acknowledged, that a great number of the Hussites had imbibed the most barbarous sentiments with respect to the obligation of executing vengeance upon their enemies, against whom they breathed nothing but bloodshed and fury, without any mixture of humanity or compassion.

VII. In the year 1433, the council of Basil endeavoured to put an end to this dreadful war, and for that purpose invited the Bohemians to the assembly. The Bohemians, accepting this

\* Byzini Diarium Hussiticum, p. 130.

† From the following opinions and maxims of the Taborites, which may be seen in the Diarium Hussiticum of Byzinius, we may form a just idea of their detestable barbarity: "Omnes legis Christi adversarii debent puniri septem plagis novissimis, ad quarum executionem fideles sunt provocandi.—In isto tempore ultionis Christus in sua humilitate et miseratione non est imitandus ad ipsos peccatores, sed in zelo et furore et justa retributione.—In hoc tempore ultionis, quilibet fidelis, etiam presbyter, *quantumcumque spiritualis, est maledictus, qui gladium summi corporalem prohibet a sanguine adversariorum legis Christi, sed debet manus suas lavare in eorum sanguine et sanctificare.*"—From men, who adopted such horrid and detestable maxims, what could be expected but the most abominable acts of injustice and cruelty? For an account of this dreadful and calamitous war, the reader may consult (beside the ancient writers, such as Sylvius, Theobaldus, Cochleus, and others) L'Enfant's Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites, published at Amsterdam in 1731. To this history it will, however, be advisable to add the Diarium Belli Hussitici of Byzinius, a book worthy of the highest esteem, on account of the candour and impartiality with which it is composed, and which Mr. L'Enfant does not seem to have consulted. This valuable production was published, though incomplete, in the sixth volume of the Reliquiæ Manuscriptorum of the very learned John Peter Ludwíg. See also Beausobre's Supplement to the Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites, Lausanne, 1745

invitation, sent ambassadors, and among others Procopius their leader, to represent them in that council. But, after many warm debates, these messengers of peace returned without having effected any thing that might even prepare the way for a reconciliation so long and so ardently desired. The Calixtines were not averse to peace; but no methods of persuasion could engage the Taborites to yield. This matter, however, was transacted with more success by Æneas Sylvius and others, whom the council sent into Bohemia to renew the conferences; for these new legates, by allowing to the Calixtines the use of the cup in the holy sacrament, satisfied them in the point which they had chiefly at heart, and thus reconciled them with the Roman pontiff. But the Taborites adhered inflexibly to their first principles; and neither the artifice nor the eloquence of Sylvius, nor the threats, sufferings, and persecutions to which their cause exposed them, could vanquish their obstinate perseverance. From this period, indeed, they began to review their religious tenets, and their ecclesiastical discipline, with a view of rendering them more perfect. This review, as it was executed with great prudence and impartiality, produced a very good effect, and gave a rational aspect to the religion of these sectaries, who withdrew themselves from the war, abandoned the doctrines, which, upon serious examination, they found to be inconsistent with the spirit and genius of the Gospel, and banished from their communion all persons whose disordered brains, or licentious manners, might expose them to reproach.\* The Taborites, thus new-modelled, were the same with those Bohemian Brethren (or Picards, i. e. *Beghards*, as their adversaries called them) who joined Luther and his successors at the reformation, and of whom there are at this day many of the descendants and followers in Poland and other countries.

VIII. Among the greatest part of the interpreters of Scripture that lived in this century, we find nothing worthy of applause, if we except their zeal and their good intentions. Such of them as aimed at something higher than the character of mere compilers, and ventured to draw their explications from their own sense of things, did little more than amuse, or rather delude, their readers, with mystical and allegorical fancies. At the head of this class we may place Alphonsus Tostatus, bishop of Avila, whose voluminous commentaries upon the sacred writings exhibit nothing remarkable but their enormous bulk. Laurentius Valla is entitled to a more favourable judgment; and his small collection of Critical and Grammatical Annotations upon the New Testament is far from being destitute of merit, since it pointed out to succeeding authors the true method of removing the difficulties that sometimes present themselves to such as study with attention the divine oracles. It is proper to observe

\* See Adriani Regenvolsii *Historia Eccles. provinciar. Sclavonicar.* lib. ii. cap. viii. p. 165.—Joach. Camerarii *Historia Narratio de Fratrum Ecclesiar. in Bohemia, Moravia, et Polonia.*—Jo. Lasitri *Historia Fratrum Bohemorum*, which I possess in manuscript, and of which the eighth book was published at Amsterdam, in 1649.

here, that these sacred books were, in almost all the kingdoms and states of Europe, translated into the language of each nation, particularly in Germany, Italy, France, and Britain. This circumstance naturally excited the expectations of a considerable change in the state of religion, and made the thinking few hope, that the doctrine of the church would be soon reformed by the light that could not but arise from consulting the genuine sources of divine truth.

IX. The schools of divinity made a miserable figure in this century. They were filled with teachers, who loaded their memory, and that of their disciples, with unintelligible distinctions and unmeaning sounds, that they might thus dispute and discourse, with an appearance of method, upon matters which they did not understand. There were now few remaining, of those who proved and illustrated the doctrines of religion by the positive declarations of the holy scriptures, and the sentiments of the ancient fathers, and who, with all their defects, were much superior to the vain and obscure pedants of whom we have been speaking. The senseless jargon of the latter did not escape the just and heavy censure of some learned and judicious persons, who considered their methods of teaching as highly detrimental to the interests of true religion, and to the advancement of genuine and solid piety. Accordingly, various plans were formed by different individuals, some of which had for their object the abolition of this method, others its reformation, while, in the mean time, the enemies of the schoolmen increased from day to day. The Mystics, of whom we shall have occasion to speak more largely hereafter, were ardently bent upon banishing entirely this scholastic theology out of the Christian church. Others, who seemed disposed to act with greater moderation, did not insist upon its total suppression, but were of opinion, that it was necessary to reform it, by abolishing all vain and useless subjects of debate, by restraining the rage of disputing that had infected the seminaries of theology, and by seasoning the subtlety of the schoolmen with a happy temperature of mystic sensibility and simplicity. This opinion was adopted by the famous Gerson, who laboured with the utmost zeal and assiduity in correcting and reforming the disorders and abuses which the scholastic divines had introduced into the seminaries,\* as also by Savanarola, Petrus de Alliaco, and Nicolas Cusanus, whose treatise concerning Learned Ignorance is still extant.

X. The litigious herd of schoolmen found a new class of enemies equally keen, in the restorers of eloquence and letters, who were not all, however, of the same opinion with respect to the manner of treating these solemn quibblers. Some of them covered the scholastic doctrine with ridicule, loaded it with invectives, and demanded its suppression, as

\* Rich. Simon. *Lettres Choisies*, tom. ii. p. 269, and *Critique de la Bibliothèque Ecclesiastique de M. Du Pin*, tom. i. p. 491.—Thomasi *Origines Histor. Philos.* p. 56, and principally Gersonis *Methodus Theologiarum student. in Launoni Historia Gymnas. Navarrensi*, tom. iv. op. part. i. p. 330.

a most trifling and absurd system, that was highly detrimental to the culture and improvement of the mind, and could only prevent the growth of genius and true science. Others looked upon this system as supportable, and only proposed illustrating and polishing it by the powers of eloquence, thus to render it more intelligible and elegant. Of this class was Paulus Cortesius, who wrote, with this view, a commentary on the Book of Proverbs, in which, as we learn from himself, he forms a happy union between eloquence and theology, and clothes the principal intricacies of scholastic divinity with the graces of an agreeable and perspicuous style.\* After all, the scholastic theology, supported by the extraordinary credit and authority of the Dominicans and Franciscans, maintained its ground against its various opposers; nor could these two religious orders, who excelled in that litigious kind of learning, bear the thought of losing the glory they had acquired by quibbling and disputing in the pompous jargon of the schools.

XI. This vain philosophy, however, grew daily more contemptible in the esteem of the judicious and the wise; while the Mystics gathered strength, and saw their friends and advocates multiply on all sides. Among these there were some men of distinguished merit, who are chargeable with few of the errors and extravagances that were mingled with the discipline and doctrine of that famous sect, such as Thomas à Kempis, (the author of the Germanic theology, so highly commended by Luther,) Laurentius Justinianus, Savanarola, and others. There are, on the other hand, some writers of this sect, such as Vincentius Ferrerius, Henricus, Harphius, and Bernard of Sienna, in whose productions we must carefully separate certain notions which were the effects of a warm and irregular fancy, as also the visions of Dionysius, whom the Mystics consider as their chief, from the noble precepts of divine wisdom with which they are mingled. The Mystics were defended against their adversaries, the Dialecticians, partly by the Platonists, who were in general highly esteemed, and partly by some, even of the most eminent scholastic doctors. The former considered Dionysius as a person whose sentiments had been formed and nourished by the study of Platonism, and wrote commentaries upon his writings; of which we have an eminent example in Marcilius Ficinus, whose name adds a lustre to the Platonic school. The latter attempted a certain sort of association between the scholastic theology and that of the Mystics; and in this class were John Gerson, Nicolas Cusanus, Dionysius the Carthusian, and others.

XII. The controversy with the enemies of Christianity was carried on with much more vigour in this than in the preceding ages; and several learned and eminent men seemed now to exert themselves with peculiar industry and zeal in demonstrating the truth of that divine religion, and defending it against the various objections of its adversaries. This appears

from the learned book of Marcilius Ficinus concerning the Truth of Christianity, Savanarola's Triumph of the Cross, the Natural Theology of Raymond de Sabunde, and other productions of a like nature. The Jews were refuted by Perezius and Jerome de St. Foi, the Saracens by Johannes de Turcremata; and both these classes of unbelievers were opposed by Alphonso de Spina, in the Fortress of Faith. Nor were these pious labourers in the defence of the Gospel at all unseasonable or superfluous: on the contrary, the state of things at this time rendered them necessary. For, on the one hand, the Aristotelian philosophers in Italy seemed, in their public instructions, to strike at the foundations of all religion; and, on the other hand, the senseless subtleties and quarrels of the schoolmen, who modelled religion according to their extravagant fancies, tended to bring it into contempt. Add to all this, that the Jews and Saracens lived in many places promiscuously with the Christians, who were therefore obliged, by the proximity of the enemy, to defend themselves with the utmost assiduity and zeal.

XIII. We have already taken notice of the fruitless attempts which were made to heal the unhappy divisions of the Greek and Latin churches. After the council of Florence, and the violation of the treaty of pacification by the Greeks, Nicolas V. exhorted and entreated them again to turn their thoughts towards the restoration of peace and concord. But his exhortations were without effect; and in about the space of three years after the writing of this last letter, Constantinople was besieged and taken by the Turks. And from that fatal period to the present time, the Roman pontiffs, in all their attempts to bring about a reconciliation, have always found the Grecian patriarchs more obstinate and intractable than they were when their empire was in a flourishing state. Nor is this circumstance so difficult to be accounted for, when all things are properly considered. This obstinacy was the effect of a rooted aversion to the Latins and their pontiffs, that acquired, from day to day, new degrees of strength and bitterness in the hearts of the Greeks; an aversion, produced and nourished by a persuasion, that the calamities which they suffered under the Turkish yoke might have been easily removed, if the western princes and the Roman pontiffs had not refused to succour them against their haughty tyrants. And accordingly, when the Greek writers deplore the calamities that fell upon their devoted country, their complaints are always mingled with heavy accusations against the Latins, whose cruel insensibility to their unhappy situation they paint in the strongest and most odious colours.

XIV. We pass over in silence many trifling controversies among the Latins, which have no claim to the attention of our readers. But we must not omit mentioning the revival of that famous dispute concerning the kind of worship that was to be paid to the blood of Christ, which was first kindled at Barcelona, in 1351, between the Franciscans and Dominicans, and had been left undecided by Cle-

\* This work was published at Rome in 1512, and at Basil in 1513.



ment VI.\* This controversy was renewed at Brixen, in 1462, by James à Marchia, a celebrated Franciscan, who maintained publicly, in one of his sermons, that the blood which Christ shed upon the cross, did not belong to the divine nature, and of consequence was not to be considered as an object of divine and immediate worship. The Dominicans rejected this doctrine, and adopted with such zeal the opposite side of the question, that James of Brixen, who performed the office of inquisitor, called the Franciscan before his tribunal, and accused him of heresy. Pope Pius II., having made several ineffectual attempts to suppress this controversy, was at last persuaded to submit the affair to the examination and judgment of a select number of able divines. But many obstacles arose to prevent a final decision, among which we may reckon, as the principal, the influence and authority of the contending orders, each of which had embarked with zeal in the cause of their respective champions. Hence, after much altercation and chicanery, the pontiff thought proper to impose silence on both the parties in this miserable dispute, in 1464; declaring, at the same time, that "both sides of the question might be lawfully maintained until Christ's vicar upon earth should find leisure and opportunity for examining the matter, and determining on which side the truth lay." This *leisure* and *opportunity* have not yet been offered to the pontiffs.†

CHAPTER IV.

*Concerning the Rites and Ceremonies that were used in the Church during this Century.*

I. THE state of religious ceremonies among the Greeks may be learned from the book of Simeon of Thessalonica, concerning Rites and Heresies,‡ from which it appears, that the substance of religion was lost among that people; that a splendid shadow of pomp and vanity was substituted in its place by the rulers of the church; and that all the branches of divine worship were ordered in such a manner as to strike the imaginations, and captivate the senses of the multitude. They pretended, indeed, to allege several reasons for multiplying, as they did, the external rites and institutions of religion, and throwing over the whole of divine worship such a pompous garb of worldly splendour. But in these reasons, and in all their explications of this gaudy ritual, subtlety and invention are more apparent than truth or good sense. The origin of these multiplied rites, that cast a cloud over the native beauty and lustre of religion, is often obscure, and frequently dishonourable; and such as, by force of ill-applied genius and invention, have endeavoured to derive honour to these ceremonies from the circumstances that gave occasion to them, have failed egregiously in this desperate attempt. The deceit is too palpable to seduce any mind that is void of prejudice, and capable of attention.

II. Though the more rational and judicious of the Roman pontiffs complained of the multiplicity of ceremonies, festivals, temples, and the like, and did not seem unwilling to have this enormous mass diminished, they nevertheless distinguished, every one his own pontificate, by some new institution, and thought it their duty to perpetuate their fame by some new edict of this nature. Thus Calixtus III., to immortalize the remembrance of the deliverance of Belgrade from the powerful arms of Mohammed II., who had been obliged to raise the siege of that city, ordered, in 1456, the festival in honour of the transfiguration of Christ (which had been celebrated in some places by private authority before this period) to be religiously observed throughout the western world. And Sixtus IV., in 1476, granted indulgences, by a particular edict, to all those who should devoutly celebrate an annual festival in honour of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin, with respect to which none of the Roman pontiffs before him had thought proper to make any express declaration, or any positive appointment.\* The other additions that were made to the Roman ritual, relating to the worship of the Virgin Mary, public and private prayers, the traffic of indulgences, and other things of that nature, are of too little importance to deserve an exact and circumstantial enumeration. We need not such a particular detail to convince us, that in this century religion was reduced to mere show, to a show composed of pompous absurdities and splendid trifles.

CHAPTER V.

*Concerning the Heresies, Sects, and Divisions, that troubled the Church during this Century.*

I. NEITHER the severe edicts of pontiffs and emperors, nor the barbarity and vigilance of unrelenting inquisitors, could extirpate the remains of the ancient heresies, or prevent the rise of new sects. We have already seen the Franciscan order at open war with the church of Rome. In Bosnia, and the adjacent countries, the Manicheans or Paulicians, who were the same with the sect named Catharists in Italy, propagated their doctrines with confidence, and held their religious assemblies with impunity. It is true, indeed, that the great protector of the Manicheans, Stephen Thomas, king of Bosnia, abjured their errors, received baptism by the ministry of John Carvajal, a Roman cardinal, and, in consequence thereof, expelled those heretics from his dominions. But it is also certain, that he afterwards changed his mind; and it is well known, that, toward the conclusion of this century, the Manicheans inhabited Bosnia, Servia, and the neighbouring provinces. The Waldenses also still subsisted in several European provinces, more especially in Pomerania, Brandenburg, the district of Magdeburgh, and Thuringia, where they had a considerable number of friends and followers. It appears, however, from authentic records not yet pub-

\* Luc. Wadding, *Annal. Minor. tom. viii. p. 52.*—Jac. Echardi Scriptor. *Prædicator. tom. i. p. 150.*

† Wadding, *Annal. Minor. tom. xiii. p. 206.*—Nat. Alexander, *Hist. Eccles. Sec. XV.*

‡ J. A. Fabricius has given an account of the contents of this book in his *Biblioth. Græca. vol. xiv.*

\* See Volaterrani Comment. Urbani, lib. viii. p. 289.—Aeneas Sylvius de Statu Europæ sub Frederico III. cap. x in Proben Scriptor. *Rerum Germanicar. tom. ii. p. 104.*

lished, that a great part of the adherents of this unfortunate sect, in the countries now mentioned, were discovered by the inquisitors, and delivered over by them to the civil magistrates, who committed them to the flames.

II. The Brethren and Sisters of the free spirit (who were called in Germany *Beghards* or *Schneestriones*, and in France *Turlupins*, and whose distinctive character was a species of mysticism that bordered upon phrenzy) wandered about in a secret and disguised manner in various parts of France, Germany, and Flanders, and particularly in Suabia and Switzerland, where they spread the contagion of their enthusiasm, and caught the unwary in their snares. The search, however, that was made after them, was so strict and well conducted, that few of the teachers and chiefs of this fanatical sect escaped the hands of the inquisitors.\* When the war between the Hussites and the votaries of Rome broke out in Bohemia, in 1418, a troop of these fanatics, headed by a person whose name was John, repaired thither and held secret assemblies, first at Prague, and afterwards in different places, whence they at length retired to a certain island, where they were less exposed to the notice of their enemies. It was, as we have already had occasion to observe, one of the leading principles of this sect, that the tender instincts of nature, with that bashfulness and modesty which generally accompany them, were evident marks of inherent corruption, and showed, that the mind was not sufficiently purified or rendered conformable to the divine nature, whence it derived its origin. And they alone were deemed perfect by these fanatics, and supposed to be united to the Supreme Being, who could behold without any emotion, the naked bodies of the sex to which they did not belong, and who, in imitation of what was practised before the fall by our first parents, went entirely naked, and conversed familiarly in this manner with males and females, without feeling any of the tender propensities of nature. Hence it was that the *Beghards* (whom the Bohemians, by a change in the pronunciation of that word, called *Picards*.) when they came into their religious assemblies, and were present at the celebration of divine worship, appeared without any veil or covering whatever. They had also constantly in their mouths a maxim, which, indeed, was very suitable to the genius of the religion they professed; namely, 'that they were not free (*i. e.* sufficiently extricated from the shackles of the body) who made use of garments, particularly such garments as covered the thighs and the

parts adjacent.' These tenets could not but cast a deserved reproach upon this absurd sect; and though in their religious assemblies nothing passed that was contrary to the rules of virtue, yet they were universally suspected of the most scandalous incontinence, and of the most lascivious practices. Ziska, the austere general of the Hussites, gave credit to these suspicions, and to the rumours they occasioned; and, falling upon this miserable sect in 1421, he put some to the sword, and condemned the rest to the flames, which dreadful punishment they sustained with the most cheerful fortitude, and also with a contempt of death that was peculiar to their sect, and which they possessed in a degree that seems to surpass credibility.\* Among the various titles by which these extravagant enthusiasts were distinguished, that of *Adamite* was one; and it was given them on account of their being so studious to imitate the state of innocence in which the first man was created. The ignominious term of *Beghards*, or *Picards*, at first peculiar to the small sect of which we now treat, was afterwards applied to the *Hussites*, and to all the Bohemians who opposed the tyranny of the Romish church. All these were called by their enemies, and indeed by the multitude in general, *Picard friars*.

III. A new sect, which made a great noise, and infected the multitude with the contagion of its enthusiasm, arose about the beginning of this century. A priest whose name is not known, descended from the Alps,† arrayed in a white garment, and accompanied with a pro-

\* See the *Historia Fratrum Bohemorum*. MS. lib. ii. sect. lxxvi. by Lasius, who proves, in a satisfactory and circumstantial manner, that the Hussites and the Bohemian Brethren were entirely distinct from these Picards, and had nothing in common with them. The other authors who have written upon this subject are honourably mentioned by Isaac de Beausobre in his Dissertation sur les Adamites de Boheme, subjoined to L'Enfant's *Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites*. This learned author has taken great pains to justify the Picards, or Bohemian Adamites, whom he supposes to have been the same with the Waldenses, and a set of men eminent for their piety, whom their enemies loaded with the most groundless accusations. But this is manifestly endeavouring to wash the Æthiopian white; for it may be demonstrated, by the most unexceptionable and authentic records, that the account I have given of the matter is true. The researches I have made, and the knowledge they have procured me of the civil and religious history of these times, entitle me perhaps to more credit in such a point as this, than the laborious author from whom I differ, who was not profoundly acquainted with the history of the middle ages, and was by no means exempt from prejudice and partiality.

† Theodoric de Niem tells us, that the sect came from Scotland, and that its leader gave himself out for the prophet Elias. Sigonius and Platina inform us, that this enthusiast came from France; that he had white apparel, carried in his aspect the greatest modesty, and seduced prodigious numbers of people of both sexes, and of all ages; that his followers, (called *penitents*.) among whom were several cardinals and priests, were clothed in white linen down to their heels, with caps, which covered their whole faces, except their eyes; that they went in troops of ten, twenty, and forty thousand persons, from one city to another, calling out for mercy, and singing hymns; that wherever they came they were received with great hospitality, and made innumerable proselytes; that they fasted, or lived upon bread and water, during the time of their pilgrimage, which continued generally nine or ten days. See *Annal. Mediol. ap. Muratori*.—Niem, lib. ii. cap. xvi.

\* Felix Malleolus (whose German name is *Hamerlein*) in his account of the Lollards, subjoined to his book *contra validos Medicantes*, *i. e.* against the sturdy *Beggars*, has given us a list, though a very imperfect one, of the *Beghards* who were committed to the flames in Switzerland and the adjacent countries, during this century. This author, in his books against the *Beghards* and *Lollards*, has (either through design, or by a mistake founded on the ambiguity of the terms) confounded three different classes of persons, who were usually known by the appellations of *Beghards* and *Lollards*: as, 1st, the Tertians; or third order of the more austere Franciscans; 2dly, the Brethren of the free spirit; and, 3dly, the *Collite* or *Alexian* friars. Many writers have fallen into the same error.

digious number of persons of both sexes, who after the example of their chief, were also clothed in white linen, whence they were distinguished by the name of *Fratres Albi*, i. e. *White Brethren*. This enthusiastic multitude went in a kind of procession through several provinces, following a cross, which their leader held erected like a standard, and, by the striking appearance of their sanctity and devotion, captivated to such a degree the minds of the people wherever they went, that persons of all ranks and orders flocked in crowds to augment their number. The new chief exhorted his followers to appease the anger of an incensed Deity, emaciated his body by voluntary acts of mortification and penance, endeavoured to persuade the Christian nations to renew the war against the infidels in Palestine, and pretended, that he was favoured with divine visions, which instructed him in the will and in the secrets of Heaven. Boniface IX. apprehending that this enthusiast or impostor concealed insidious and ambitious views,\* ordered him to be seized and committed to the flames; upon which his followers were dispersed, and his sect entirely extinguished. Whether a punishment so severe was inflicted with reason and justice, is a point that has been debated, and yet remains uncertain; for several writers of great credit and authority maintain the innocence of the sectary, while others assert that he was convicted of the most enormous crimes.†

IV. In the year 1411, a sect was discovered in the Netherlands, and more especially at Brussels, which owed its origin to an illiterate man, whose name was Ægidius Cantor, and to William of Hildenissen, a Carmelite monk; and whose members were distinguished by the title of *Men of Understanding*. There were many things reprehensible in the doctrine of this sect, which seemed to be chiefly derived from the theology of the Mystics. For they pretended to be honoured with celestial visions; denied that any could arrive at a perfect knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, without the extraordinary succours of a divine illumination; declared the approach of a new revelation from heaven, more complete and perfect than the Gospel of Christ; maintained, that the resurrection was already accomplished in the person of Jesus, and that no other resurrection was to be expected; affirmed, that the inward man was not defiled by the outward actions, whatever they were; that the pains of hell were to have an end, and that not only all mankind, but even the devils themselves, were to return to God, and be made partakers of eternal felicity. This sect seems to have been a branch of that of the Brethren and Sisters of the free spirit; since they declared, that a new

dispensation of grace and of spiritual liberty was to be promulgated to mortals by the Holy Ghost. It must however be acknowledged, on the other hand, that their absurdities were mingled with several opinions, which showed, that they were not totally void of understanding; for they maintained, among other things, “1st, That Christ alone had merited eternal life and felicity for the human race, and that therefore men could not acquire this inestimable privilege by their own actions alone; 2dly, That the priests, to whom the people confessed their transgressions, had not the power of absolving them, but that it was Christ alone in whom this authority was vested; and 3dly, That voluntary penance and mortification were not necessary to salvation.” These propositions, however, and some others, were declared heretical by Peter d’Ailly, bishop of Cambrai, who obliged William of Hildenissen to abjure them,\* and opposed with the greatest vehemence and success the progress of this sect.

V. The sect of the Flagellantes, or Whippers, continued to excite commotions in Germany, more especially in Thuringia and the Lower Saxony; but these fanatics were very different from the ancient heretics of the same name, who ran wildly in troops through various provinces. The new Whippers rejected not only the sacraments, but also every branch of external worship, and placed their only hopes of salvation in faith and flagellation; to which they added some strange doctrines concerning the evil spirit, and other matters, which are not explained in history with sufficient perspicuity. The person that appeared at the head of this sect in Thuringia was Conrad Schmidt; and he was committed to the flames, with many of his followers,‡ in 1414, by Schonefeld, who was, at that time, inquisitor in Germany, and rendered his name famous by his industry and zeal in the extirpation of heresy. Nicolas Schaden suffered at Quedlinburgh for his attachment to this sect; and, though Berthold Schade, who was seized at Halberstadt in 1481, escaped death, as appears most probable, by abjuring their doctrine,§ we find in the records of these unhappy times a numerous list of the Flagellantes, whom the German inquisitors devoted to the flames.

\* See the records of this transaction in Steph Baluz. Miscellan. tom. ii. p. 277.

† Excerpta Monachi Perennis, in Jo. Burch. Menkmi Scriptor. Rerum Germanicar. tom. ii. p. 1521.—Chron. Monaster. in Anton. Matthei Analect. vol. Evi. tom. v. p. 71.—Chron. Magdeb. in Meibomii Scriptor. Rerum German. tom. ii. p. 362.—From sixteen articles of faith adopted by this sect, which were committed to writing by a certain inquisitor of Brandenburg in the year 1411, and which Conrad Schmidt is said to have taken from the papers of Walkenried, we may derive a tolerable idea of their doctrine, of which the substance is as follows:—“That the opinions adopted by the Roman church, with respect to the efficacy of the sacraments, the flames of purgatory, praying for the dead, and several other points, are entirely false and groundless; and that the person who believes what is contained in the Apostles’ Creed, repeats frequently the Lord’s prayer, and the Ave Maria, and at certain times lashes his body severely, as a voluntary punishment for the transgressions he has committed, shall obtain eternal salvation.”

‡ See the account of this matter, which is given by the learned Jo. Ernest Kappus, in his *Relat. de reb. Theologicis Antiquis et Novis*, an. 1717, p. 475.

§ What Dr. Mosheim hints but obscurely here, is explained by Sigonius and Platina, who tell us, that the pilgrims, mentioned in the preceding note, stopped at Viterbo, and that Boniface, fearing that the priest who headed them might endeavour by their assistance to seize the pontificate, sent a body of troops thither, who apprehended the false prophet, and carried him to Rome, where he was burned.

\* See L’Enfant, *Hist. du Concile de Pise*, tom. i. p. 102.—Poggi, *Hist. Florentina*, lib. iii. p. 122.—Marc. Anton. Sabellicus in *Enneadibus Rhapsodiæ His. Ennead. ix. lib. ix. t. ii. op. p. 530*, pub at Basil in 1560.















BW900 .M917 1832 v.1  
An ecclesiastical history, ancient and

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00065 7520